

SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST AND ZERO SUM GAMES*

APOORVA PATEL

CTS and SERC, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore-560012, India
adpatel@cts.iisc.ernet.in

Received (30 May 2002)

Revised (15 October 2002)

Accepted (6 November 2002)

Competition for available resources is natural amongst coexisting species, and the fittest contenders dominate over the rest in evolution. The dynamics of this selection is studied using a simple linear model. It has similarities to features of quantum computation, in particular conservation laws leading to destructive interference. Compared to an altruistic scenario, competition introduces instability and eliminates the weaker species in a finite time.

Keywords: Darwinian evolution; Markov chain; quantum algorithms.

1. Darwinian Evolution

Charles Darwin explained the evolution of living organisms on the basis of the observation that only the species best adapted to their surroundings survive in a competitive environment. This idea, paraphrased as “survival of the fittest”, has since become the cornerstone of evolutionary theories. The idea has been refined over the years, and we now understand its genetic underpinnings. Hereditary transmission of genetic information is not perfect, and occasional errors in DNA replication produce mutations of living organisms. The mutated organism is in essentially the same environment as the original one, and both have to compete for the available resources. The resources are limited, and so the organism that can use them more efficiently obtains an edge over its competitors. The net result is that if the mutation improves the ability of the organism to survive, the mutated organism grows in number, otherwise it fades away. In this mechanism, the mutations are not conscious adaptations. They occur randomly—as a matter of fact most of them fail—but once in a while they modify the organism in the right manner and improve the chances of its survival. If the intermediate steps are glossed over, the outcome looks like a solution to the optimisation problem, with the organisms adapting to the selection pressures exerted by the environment. All this is fairly logical, and can be illustrated by many examples (see for instance [1]). My aim here is to quantify this mechanism using a simple evolutionary model.

*Special Issue on Game Theory and Evolutionary Processes: Order from Disorder—The Role of Noise in Creative Processes, eds. D. Abbott, P.C.W. Davies and C.R. Shalizi, [quant-ph/0206014](#).

More specifically, I consider the situation where a number of species are dependent on a common physical resource, say food. (This leaves out predator-prey conflicts where one species may become another's resource.) When the resource is available in plenty, there is hardly any competition, and all species prosper. The rate of growth of a species is then proportional to its population, and so all populations grow exponentially. This typically happens in the early stage of evolution of a new species. No resource is unlimited, however, even if it is continuously regenerated (e.g. food availability ultimately depends on sunlight). A time comes when competition for the resource is inevitable. In the later stage of evolution, therefore, one species can prosper only at the expense of another, and eventually populations stabilise.

Such a situation can be described by a set of linear evolution equations. (Quadratic evolution equations are more appropriate in a predator-prey setting.) Let the index i label a set of coexisting species in a given environment, and let $\phi_i(t)$ denote their populations at time t . Then the discrete time evolution of the populations can be written as a matrix equation (generically M is not symmetric),

$$\phi_i(t + \Delta t) = \sum_j M_{ij}(\Delta t) \phi_j(t) , \quad \phi_i(t) \geq 0 . \quad (1)$$

The fact that the next generation populations must arise from the present generation ones, even in case of mutations, makes this equation homogeneous. The diagonal terms M_{ii} represent the individual rates of growth, while the off-diagonal terms $M_{i \neq j}$ represent interactions between species. As mentioned above, when the resource is available in plenty, the populations evolve according to:

$$M_{i \neq j} \approx 0 \implies \phi_i(t) \approx (M_{ii})^{t/\Delta t} \phi_i(t = 0) . \quad (2)$$

The interesting situation is the competitive stage, where the populations become interdependent due to mutual interactions and the nature of the interactions (parametrised by $M_{i \neq j}$) determines how they evolve.

2. Zero Sum Games

To analyse the competitive stage, let us choose normalisations such that a unit population of any species consumes the same amount of resource, and the total resource available at any time is one. Then we have the conservation laws:

$$\sum_i \phi_i = 1 , \quad \sum_i M_{ij} = 1 . \quad (3)$$

The constraint on ϕ_i arises because the total population supported by a fixed resource is fixed. When applied to both sides of Eq.(1), it yields the constraint on M_{ij} as a consistency condition. The continuity of evolution in time implies that

$$M_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + C_{ij} , \quad C_{ij} = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t) , \quad \sum_i C_{ij} = 0 . \quad (4)$$

The matrix C_{ij} , describing the change in populations, clearly shows that what is gained by some species is lost by some others. Obviously $M_{i \neq j}$ can take positive as

well as negative values. As a matter of fact, situations of both positive and negative interactions occur routinely in biological systems (e.g. catalysis and inhibition, symbiosis and parasitic behaviour, defence mechanisms and cancer, etc.).

Situations of this type, where there is no net gain or loss, have been formally called zero sum games. In the conventional form of zero sum games, a multitude of strategies are available to the players, and competition amongst the players leads them to choose a stable strategy. This stable strategy turns out to be a “mini-max solution”, i.e. each player chooses the strategy that maximises his minimum gain [2]. No player can improve his performance by unilaterally departing from this stable strategy, and the explicit solution can be obtained by linear programming methods.

The model described by Eqs.(1) and (3) is somewhat different. First, in the evolutionary context, the strategies are not actively chosen but are created by random mutations. Also competition for the resource is guaranteed, because mutations produce closely related species in the same environment. It is then of importance to study the dynamics of the system to understand how the incorrect strategies are eliminated and the correct ones are selected. That requires not just the evaluation of the stable solution but also the manner in which it is approached.

Second, the quantitative gains and losses of various species depend not only on the choice of strategy but also on their current populations. In a sense, the more populous species gets more chances to grab the resources, and that alters the final outcome of the competition.

3. Stochastic Evolution

Let us first look at the simpler situation when $0 \leq M_{ij} \leq 1$. Eqs.(1) and (3) then describe stochastic evolution of probability distributions, which has been extensively studied (see for instance [3]). The linear evolution is a Markov chain, which in the generic case is ergodic and converges to a unique stationary distribution. (If the matrix M has a block-diagonal structure, then each block can be studied independently.) To see this, consider the asymptotic behaviour of M^n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. At every iteration, $(M^{l+1})_{ij}$ is the weighted average of $(M^l)_{ik}$ ($k = 1, \dots, N$) with weights M_{kj} . The process of repeated averaging converges to the fixed point,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (M^n)_{ij} = m_i, \quad \sum_i m_i = 1. \quad (5)$$

With all rows identical, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M^n$ has only one non-vanishing eigenvalue, equal to one. It follows that M has the leading eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = 1$ corresponding to the stationary distribution, and remaining eigenvalues $|\lambda_{p \neq 1}| < 1$ corresponding to transient distributions. The left and right eigenvectors for the leading eigenvalue are,

$$(e_1^L)_i = 1/N, \quad (e_1^R)_i = m_i. \quad (6)$$

The left and right eigenvectors satisfy the orthogonality relation, $\sum_i (e_p^L)_i (e_q^R)_i = 0$ for $p \neq q$. All transient distributions are orthogonal to e_1^L and necessarily contain negative components. The next-to-leading eigenvalue λ_2 provides the rate of convergence towards the stationary distribution, and can be obtained by maximising

$\sum_{ij} x_i M_{ij} y_j$, with the vectors x and y orthogonal to e_1^R and e_1^L respectively, and $\sum_i x_i y_i = 1$. The convergence is monotonic because $M_{ij} \geq 0$, $\phi_i \geq 0$.

All these properties belong to altruistic evolution, since $C_{i \neq j} \geq 0$ while $C_{ii} \leq 0$. In the competitive case, some of the $M_{i \neq j} < 0$, and the consequences need to be analysed. The presence of both positive and negative contributions produces cancellations. Monotonic convergence is no longer automatic; oscillations and instabilities may occur in stead. An important restriction is imposed by the physical requirement that no population can become negative. (Note that there is no such requirement on the components of the individual eigenvectors of M .) The evolution must be modified whenever it drives some ϕ_i negative. The correct procedure is to stop the evolution at the instance ϕ_i becomes zero, eliminate i^{th} row and column from the matrix M , and then continue evolution in the reduced dimensional space. Obviously, ϕ_i can be driven negative only if some $M_{i \neq j}$ is negative. The reduction of dimensionality, therefore, decreases the number of negative M_{ij} and increases the stability of the system. The inverse process, increasing dimensionality of the space, occurs when chance mutation creates a new species.

It is known that even with $0 \leq M_{ij} \leq 1$, Eq.(1) cannot be evolved backward in time *indefinitely*. This is true in spite of the fact that generic stochastic matrices are positive definite and M^{-1} exists. If backward evolution is attempted, some ϕ_i is driven negative at some stage, and beyond that point interpretation of ϕ_i as populations (or probabilities) is lost. Evolution further back in time is possible only by modifying M . This is easy to see because eigenvalues of M^{-1} are the reciprocals of those for M , and with $|\lambda_{p \neq 1}^{-1}| > 1$, the growing transient distributions drive some ϕ_i out of their physically allowed range $[0, 1]$.

4. Similarity to Quantum Computation

It is useful to compare this evolution problem to quantum algorithms. Both are constrained by conservation laws. While Eq.(3) preserves the linear norm of the vector, quantum evolution preserves the quadratic norm. The most general evolution preserving the quadratic norm is described by orthogonal transformations for real variables, and by unitary transformations for complex variables. Orthogonal transformations are generated by antisymmetric matrices (generating matrices parametrise infinitesimal group transformations in the neighbourhood of identity), and they inevitably contain negative matrix elements—the negative elements are an automatic consequence of the underlying conservation laws. (Only orthogonal transformations without any negative matrix elements are simple permutation matrices.) Although complete understanding of quantum evolution requires use of complex numbers, classical language extended to include negative probabilities can explain unusual features of certain simple systems (e.g. quantum correlations of two spins violating Bell's inequalities) [4]. Recent developments in algorithms for quantum computation (see for instance [5]) offer a hint of how evolution may change in presence of negative matrix elements.

Classical algorithms based on Boolean logic can be expressed in terms of permutation matrices. Quantum algorithms exploit two features to beat them, superposition of states (which is a generic property of waves) and quantum entanglement (which is not relevant here). Superposition means letting multiple states be in the

same place at the same time, and it can reduce the spatial degrees of freedom required for the algorithm exponentially. Cleverly designed destructive interference amongst superposed states can reduce the the time required to execute the algorithm by eliminating unwanted states. Coexistence of species in biological evolution is not quite the same as superposition; it allows simultaneous evolution of all species but without reducing the spatial degrees of freedom. But destructive interference is still an option available to reduce the evolution time. The known quantum algorithms reduce the execution time compared to their classical counterparts, at least by a constant factor if not polynomially or exponentially. It is important to note that biological evolution occurs over long time scales, and even a tiny change in the rate of growth—fraction of a percent—matters because that can translate into exponential changes in populations over a long time. The lessons learnt from quantum computation thus suggest that negative values of M_{ij} may create destructive interference and help the species reach their asymptotic populations faster, i.e. competition should beat altruism in picking a winner amongst the contenders.

5. Consequences of Destructive Interference

Let us now explicitly analyse how evolution changes, when the range of $M_{i \neq j}$ is extended to include negative values. Clearly, extending the range of M_{ij} cannot make the evolutionary process any less powerful. The stationary eigenvalue of M , $\lambda_1 = 1$, which follows just from the averaging properties as described above, remains unaffected. But other eigenvalues and eigenvectors change, and modify evolution.

An example with two interacting species illustrates the possibilities. In this case, the solution of Eq.(1) in terms of the (unnormalised) right eigenvectors of the evolution matrix is:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \alpha & \beta \\ \alpha & 1 - \beta \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_1^R(\lambda_1 = 1) = \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_2^R(\lambda_2 = 1 - \alpha - \beta) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

$$\phi(t = 0) = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ 1 - a \end{pmatrix} \implies \phi(t) = \left(\frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \right) e_1^R + (\lambda_2)^{t/\Delta t} \left(a - \frac{\beta}{\alpha + \beta} \right) e_2^R. \quad (8)$$

α, β are small, $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t)$. The evolutionary behaviour depends on their signs :

(a) $\alpha \geq 0, \beta \geq 0$: The asymptotic population is proportional to e_1^R . $\lambda_2 < 1$ and the transient part proportional to e_2^R fades away. The two species coexist, and their population ratio is stable against small perturbations. Such a behaviour does not occur in quantum algorithms.

(b) $\alpha\beta < 0$: Both e_1^R and e_2^R contain negative components, and so the non-negative population vector has to be a mixture of the two. In course of evolution, the population ϕ_i with $M_{i \neq j} < 0$ is monotonically driven to zero. Thereafter evolution has to continue in the reduced dimensional space.

(c) $\alpha \leq 0, \beta \leq 0$: The eigenvalue $\lambda_2 > 1$, and dominance of e_2^R drives one of the ϕ_i to zero. The relative size of initial populations (i.e. comparison of $a/(1 - a)$ vs. β/α) determines which ϕ_i is driven to zero. Afterwards evolution has to continue in the reduced dimensional space. Such a dependence on the initial populations is quite distinct from the “mini-max analysis”.

These results for two interacting species have a topological interpretation. The three regimes can be looked upon as minimisation of a function over an interval,

when it (a) has a single minimum, (b) is monotonic, and (c) has a single maximum. The relation between linear evolution and gradient of a quadratic form is generic, and the features exhibited in the above example can be expected to generalise to more complicated multi-species systems. Specifically, whenever some $M_{i \neq j} < 0$:

- (1) The non-stationary eigenvectors play an important part in evolution.
- (2) Having any $M_{i \neq j} < 0$ makes the stationary eigenvector unstable, and drives the system towards reduced dimensionality.
- (3) Evolution one by one eliminates species ϕ_i with some $M_{ij} < 0$, till the reduced dimensional system no longer has any $M_{ij} < 0$.
- (4) The elimination of species takes place in finite time, which depends on initial populations and M_{ij} , but is roughly $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t/C_{ij})$. This is in contrast to exponentially decaying tails of transient parts in an altruistic evolution.
- (5) The surviving population is given not by the stationary eigenvector of the original system, but by the stationary eigenvector of the reduced dimensional system.

The simple model presented above provides a quantification of features anticipated in Darwinian evolution. The crucial ingredient has been the limited availability of a resource leading to destructive interference. Chance mutation may introduce a species that snatches away the resource from another one. This always produces an instability, which eliminates the weaker species in a finite time. The stronger survivors are stable until the next mutation instability. It is worthwhile to observe that the elementary components of biological systems are so simple and cheap that they can be produced in large numbers even with limited resources. As a result, biological systems often exhibit wastefulness, e.g. millions of eggs and pollen grains are produced when a few would have sufficed to propagate the species in a secure environment. Such an overkill actually strengthens the competition and enforces survival of the fittest.

To summarise, the analysis presented in this article is straightforward, and points out certain similarities between competitive evolution, zero-sum games and quantum computation. The latter two possess a sound mathematical framework, and so even a simple analogy with them can help us understand better the behaviour of highly complex biological systems. The analogies are not perfect, however, and the effect of the differences has to be incorporated properly in the results. My conclusion is that limited availability of resources leads to competition, which eliminates the weaker species in a finite time. The arguments presented here can also be applied to other competitive situations, e.g. economic and social interactions.

References

- [1] R. Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (1989).
- [2] J. von Neumann, *Zur Theorie der Gesellschaftsspiele*, *Mathematische Annalen* **100** (1928) 295-320.
- [3] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*, John Wiley & Sons, New York (1968).
- [4] R. Feynman, *Negative probability*, in *Quantum Implications: Essays in honour of David Bohm*, eds. B. Hiley and F. David Peat, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London (1987) 235-248.
- [5] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2000).