

Impact of parity in rock-paper-scissors type models

P.P. Avelino,^{1,2} B.F. de Oliveira,³ and R.S. Trintin³

¹*Instituto de Astrofísica e Ciências do Espaço, Universidade do Porto, CAUP, Rua das Estrelas, PT4150-762 Porto, Portugal*

²*Departamento de Física e Astronomia, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade do Porto, Rua do Campo Alegre 687, PT4169-007 Porto, Portugal*

³*Departamento de Física, Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Av. Colombo 5790, 87020-900 Maringá, PR, Brazil*

We investigate the impact of parity on the abundance of weak species in the context of the simplest generalization of the rock-paper-scissors model to an arbitrary number of species — we consider models with a total number of species (N_S) between 3 and 12, having one or more (weak) species characterized by a reduced predation probability (by a factor of \mathcal{P}_w with respect to the other species). We show, using lattice based spatial stochastic simulations with random initial conditions, large enough for coexistence to prevail, that parity effects are significant. We find that the performance of weak species is dependent on whether the total number of species is even or odd, especially for $N_S \leq 8$, with odd numbers of species being on average more favourable to weak species than even ones. We further show that, despite the significant dispersion observed among individual models, a weak species has on average a higher abundance than a strong one if \mathcal{P}_w is sufficiently smaller than unity — the notable exception being the four species case.

I. INTRODUCTION

Non-hierarchical predator-prey models are an important tool for the understanding of the dynamics of complex biological systems involving a large number of species. Several models of this type have been proposed and investigated in the literature [1–26], most of them considering three basic interactions — predator-prey, reproduction and mobility — usually assumed to happen with the same probability for all species (reproduction and mobility) or pairs of non-minimally interacting species (predator-prey). Parity — the even or odd nature of the total number of species — has been observed to play an important role in many of these models. It can affect not only the dynamics of the network, and consequently coexistence, but also the properties of the geometrical patterns associated to the resulting dynamical structures or the symmetric/asymmetric evolution of the interface profiles separating different domains [1–6, 8, 13].

In [13] a generalization of the rock-paper-scissors (RPS) model to an arbitrary number of species has been developed. This family of models generates dynamical spiral structures with a number of arms equal to the number of species. If the predation, reproduction and mobility rates do not vary from species to species, the resulting average density is the same for all species, assuming that the simulation box is large enough for coexistence to prevail — for smaller simulation boxes, the survival probabilities are also equal for all species, assuming unbiased initial conditions.

In realistic biological systems the species strength is not expected to be the same for all species, which can affect both the population sizes and the chances of survival of the different species. Species with a reduced predation probability are usually referred to as weak. Nevertheless, it has been shown, in the context of three species RPS

models, that weak species may often have a strong performance both in terms of population abundance and survival probability [27–30] (see also [31]). Recent research [32] on the dynamics of three strains of *E. coli* interacting cyclically also concluded for the dominance of the weakest strain. Still, no systematic difference in the global performance of weak and strong species has been found in the context of RPS models with four species [33]. This result raises the following question: is parity a key factor on the performance of weak and strong species?

In this paper we consider the simplest generalization of the spatial stochastic RPS model to an arbitrary number of species proposed in [13], but shall relax the assumption that all species have equal strength. We investigate the impact that a reduction of the predation probability of some of the species — the weak ones — has on the overall dynamics of the network and, in particular, on the abundance of such species. We shall consider models with a total number of species N_S between 3 and 12, paying particular attention to the impact of parity on the overall abundance of weak and strong species.

II. RPS TYPE MODELS WITH N_S SPECIES

Here, we shall briefly describe the simplest generalization of the spatial stochastic RPS model to N_S species (May-Leonard formulation) [13]. In this model the different species are labelled by i (or j) with $i, j = 1, \dots, N_S$, and modular arithmetic, where integers wrap around upon reaching 1 or N_S , is used (the integers i and j represent the same species whenever $i = j \bmod N_S$, where \bmod denotes the modulo operation). We shall perform spatial stochastic simulations on a square lattice with N^2 sites and periodic boundary conditions, employing a May-Leonard formulation in which every site is either occupied by a single individual of one of the N_S species




Figure 1. Predator-prey interactions of a sample of models with 5, 6, 7 and 8 species studied in the present paper (corresponding to the first three models listed in Table I with that number of species). Filled and open circles represent weak and strong species, respectively.

or empty (an empty site is represented by a ‘0’). The number of individuals of the species i and the number of empty sites is denoted by I_i and I_0 , respectively — the density of individuals of the species i and the density of empty sites are defined respectively by $\rho_i = I_i/N^2$ and $\rho_0 = I_0/N^2$. The allowed interactions are predation [$i (i+1) \rightarrow i 0$], reproduction [$i 0 \rightarrow i i$], and mobility [$i \odot \rightarrow \odot i$], where \odot represents either an individual of any species or an empty site. Reproduction and mobility interactions occur, respectively, with probabilities r and m (assumed to be the same for all the species). In our baseline model the predation probability p is the same for all possible predator-prey interactions. However, in this paper we shall investigate the dynamical impact of a reduction of the predation probability the weak species by a factor of $\mathcal{P}_w \in]0, 1[$ (the other species are sometimes referred to as strong).

The predator-prey interactions of a sample of models with 5, 6, 7 and 8 species studied in the present paper (corresponding to the first three models listed in Table I with that number of species) are represented in Fig. 1, with filled and open circles representing weak and strong species, respectively. The one-sided arrows represent one-directional predator-prey interactions between

$N_S = 5$	12	123	1	1234	134
	13				
$N_S = 6$	12	123	125	14	1234
	1245	1	12345	124	12355
	13	135			
$N_S = 7$	12	123	125	1245	1236
	126	1234	12356	1	12345
	124	14	1235	123456	12346
	1246	13	135		
$N_S = 8$	12	123	1234	127	1256
	1245	125	1236	12356	12456
	12347	1237	126	1257	123467
	1	14	124	12457	12345
	1247	123456	123567	1235	12346
	1234567	136	123457	12357	1246
	15	13	135	1357	

Table I. List of all the different models with $N_S = 5, 6, 7, 8$. The digits identifying each model represent the weak species. The models have been ordered in decreasing order (from left to right, and then top to bottom) of the value of $\mathcal{A}_w(\mathcal{P}_w = 0.5)$ shown in the four panels .

species i and $i+1$, while the double sided arrows represent the possible bi-directional predator-prey interactions between species i and $i+2, \dots, i+N_S-2$. The list of all the different models with $N_S = 5, 6, 7, 8$ is displayed in Table I, where the digits identifying each model represent the weak species. For each value of N_S , the models listed in Table I have been ordered in decreasing order (from left to right, and then top to bottom) of the value of \mathcal{A}_w for $\mathcal{P}_w = 0.5$ shown in Fig. 6 (the relevance of this ordering will become clear later on, when discussing the results shown in Fig. 6). Notice that there are in general several combinations of digits corresponding to a single model. In particular, any permutation among weak or among strong species results in an equivalent model. Also, relabeling all the species i as $i+n$, where n is an integer, does not lead to a different model. Hence, only one equivalent combination is listed in Table I. For example, models 21, 23, 32, 34, 43, 45, and 54 are all equivalent to 12 for any $N_S \geq 5$, which is the digit combination which appears in table I (also notice that, for $N_S = 5$, models 15 and 51 would also both be equivalent to 12).

At every simulation step, the algorithm randomly picks an occupied site to be the active one, randomly selects one of its adjacent neighbour sites to be the passive one, and randomly chooses an interaction to be executed by the individual at the active position: predation, mobility or reproduction with probabilities p , m and r , respectively — in this paper we use the von Neumann neighbourhood (or 4-neighbourhood) composed of a central cell (the active one) and its four non-diagonal adjacent cells (it has been shown in [29], in the context of a three species model, that a Moore neighbourhood leads to the same qualitative results). These three actions are repeated until a possible interaction is selected — note that




Figure 2. The panels display snapshots of the spatial distribution of the different species on a 1000^2 lattice at $t = 1.1 \times 10^4$ for realizations of the spatial stochastic RPS type models with: (a) $N_S = 5$, (b) $N_S = 6$, (c) $N_S = 7$ and (d) $N_S = 8$ (the other model parameters are $m = 0.2$, $p = 0.4$, $r = 0.4$, and $\mathcal{P}_w = 1$). Notice the appearance of spiral patterns with a number of arms equal to the number of species N_S .

the interaction cannot be carried out whenever predation is selected and the passive is not a prey of the active, or if reproduction is selected and the passive is not an empty site. A generation time (our time unit) is defined as the time necessary for N^2 successive interactions to be completed.

III. RESULTS

In this section we present the results of 1000^2 spatial stochastic numerical simulations, considering models with a number of species in the interval $[3, 12]$ and different values of \mathcal{P}_w . The parameters $m = 0.2$, $p = 0.4$, $r = 0.4$ are assumed in all simulations.

Fig. 2 displays the distribution of the different species on a square lattice after 1.1×10^4 generations for a model in which all the species have the same strength ($\mathcal{P}_w = 1.0$). The number of species are (a) $N_S = 5$ (top left panel), (b) $N_S = 6$ (top right panel), (c) $N_S = 7$ (bottom left panel) and (d) $N_S = 8$ (bottom right panel). Spiral patterns with a number of arms equal to the number of species are present in all the simulations. Also, no clear predominance of one species over the others is observed in any of the snapshots (as expected, since $\mathcal{P}_w = 1.0$).

Fig. 3 is analogous to the bottom panels of Fig. 2 (Figs. 2c and 2d, which contemplate cases with seven and eight species, respectively), but now considering models 1




Figure 3. The same as in Fig. 2c and Fig. 2d (RPS type models with seven and eight species), but now considering $\mathcal{P}_w = 0.5$: (a) $N_S = 7$, model 1; (b) $N_S = 7$, model 12; (c) $N_S = 8$, model 1; (d) $N_S = 8$, model 12. Notice the significant differences between the shapes and characteristic sizes of the domains associated to the different species.

and 12, and $\mathcal{P}_w = 0.5$: (a) $N_S = 7$, model 1; (b) $N_S = 7$, model 12; (c) $N_S = 8$, model 1; (d) $N_S = 8$, model 12. Contrarily to Fig. 2, Fig. 3 shows that some species are more dominant than others. Also, although the spiral patterns are still easily recognizable, significant differences exist between the shapes and characteristic sizes of the domains associated to the different species. This is true both for the models with one weak species (left panels) and two weak species (right panels), but more so in the latter.

Fig. 4 displays the evolution of the densities of the different species and empty spaces for the realizations of spatial stochastic RPS type models with 7 and 8 species considered in 3: (a) $N_S = 7$, model 1 (1st panel); (b) $N_S = 7$, model 12 (2nd panel); (c) $N_S = 8$, model 1 (3rd panel); (d) $N_S = 8$, model 12 (4th panel). The impact that the reduced predation probability of one or two weak species has on the abundance of the different species is qualitatively similar for models with seven and eight species. In model 1, with a single weak species, the most abundant species is the prey of the weak species (represented by a blue filled circle), followed by the weak species (represented by a red open circle). In model 12, with two weak species, the most abundant species is one of the weak species (the one represented by a blue open circle), followed by its prey (represented by a yellow filled circle), and then by the other weak species (represented by a red open circle).

In order to quantify the impact of the species strength




Figure 4. The evolution of the density of the different species and empty sites (ρ_i and ρ_0) over time for realizations of spatial stochastic RPS type models with 7 and 8 species considered in Fig. 3a, Fig. 3b, Fig. 3c and Fig. 3d (from top to bottom, respectively). Notice the impact that the inclusion of one or two weak species has on the abundance of the different species.

on their overall abundance, we define the average density of weak and strong species as

$$\langle \rho_w \rangle = \frac{1}{\#W} \sum_{i \in W} \langle \rho_i \rangle, \quad \langle \rho_s \rangle = \frac{1}{\#S} \sum_{i \in S} \langle \rho_i \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where W and S are, respectively, the sets whose elements are the weak and the strong species, and $\#$ is used to represent the number of elements of each set. Let us also




Figure 5. The relative advantage in being a weak species \mathcal{A}_w (or disadvantage if $\mathcal{A}_w < 0$) as a function of \mathcal{P}_w and N_S for models with one (top panel) or two (bottom panel) weak species, considering a total number of species N_S between 3 and 12 and \mathcal{P}_w between 0.5 and 1 (in the bottom panel the average value of \mathcal{A}_w among models with two weak species is considered). Notice the impact of parity, specially for $N_S \leq 8$.

define the parameter

$$\mathcal{A}_w = \frac{\langle \rho_w \rangle - \langle \rho_s \rangle}{\max(|\langle \rho_w \rangle|, |\langle \rho_s \rangle|)}, \quad (2)$$

whose absolute value represents the relative advantage (if $\mathcal{A}_w > 0$) or disadvantage (if $\mathcal{A}_w < 0$) in being a weak species.

The top panel of Fig. 5 shows the relative advantage in being a weak species \mathcal{A}_w (or disadvantage if $\mathcal{A}_w < 0$) as a function of \mathcal{P}_w and N_S , for models with one weak species, considering a total number of species N_S between 3 and 12 and \mathcal{P}_w between 0.5 and 1. The bottom panel displays the average relative advantage among all two weak species models with N_S species (also represented by \mathcal{A}_w for simplicity of notation) as a function of \mathcal{P}_w and N_S . In both models the impact of parity is significant at least up to $N_S = 8$, with odd numbers of species being more favourable to weak species than even ones. In these




Figure 6. The relative advantage in being a weak species \mathcal{A}_w (or disadvantage if $A_w < 0$) as a function of \mathcal{P}_w for the cases with $N_S = 5$, $N_S = 6$, $N_S = 7$ and $N_S = 8$. The dashed black line represents $\mathcal{A}_w = 0$. The different colors and line types represent models with a different number of weak species.




Figure 7. The average relative advantage in being a weak species \mathcal{A}_w as a function of \mathcal{P}_w and N_S , for models with a total number of species between 3 and 8. Again, the impact of parity is significant for $N_S \leq 8$, with odd numbers of species being more favourable to weak species than even ones.

models the weak species generally have a significant an advantage if \mathcal{P}_w is sufficiently smaller than unity, the exception being the models with $N_S = 4$ (this particular case has been investigated in detail in [33]).

Taking into account that parity effects are most noticeable for $N_S \leq 8$, we shall now consider the models

with a number of species N_S between 5 and 8 one by one (the models with 3 and 4 species have already been investigated in detail in [29, 30] and [33], respectively). Fig. 6 displays the relative advantage in being a weak species \mathcal{A}_w (or disadvantage if $A_w < 0$) as a function of \mathcal{P}_w for all models with $N_S = 5$, $N_S = 6$, $N_S = 7$ and $N_S = 8$ (the dashed black line represents $\mathcal{A}_w = 0$). The different colors and line types represent models with a different number of weak species. In order to allow for a better identification of the models in Fig. 6, the models in Table I have been ordered in decreasing order (from left to right, and then top to bottom) of the value of \mathcal{A}_w obtained for $\mathcal{P}_w = 0.5$.

Fig. 6 shows that for any particular N_S between 5 and 8 there is a significant dispersion of the curves of $\mathcal{A}_w(\mathcal{P}_w)$. This is true even if only models with a fixed number of weak species are selected. Fig. 6 also shows that, for any value of N_S between 5 and 8, the average abundance of a weak species is higher than that of a strong one in most models. Still, there are a few models with an even number of species which are highly adverse for weak species (e.g. models 135 and 1357, respectively for $N_S = 6$ and $N_S = 8$) — this does not happen if the number of species is odd.

Fig. 7 shows the average relative advantage as a function of the number of species and a total number of species N_S between 3 and 8. Again the impact of parity is noticeable, with odd numbers of species being on average more favourable to weak species than even ones if \mathcal{P}_w

is sufficiently smaller than unity. The results displayed in Fig. 7 for $N_S \leq 8$ are qualitatively similar to those of Fig. 5.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we investigated the dynamics of RPS type models with a total number of species between 3 and 12, in the presence of one or more weak species. We showed that parity effects are significant, with the abundance of weak species having a significant dependence on whether the number of species is even or odd for $N_S \leq 8$.

We have shown that, unlike in the case of RPS models with three different species [29, 30], the relative advantage in being a weak species may vary significantly from model to model in models with more than four species and a fixed value of the reduced predation probability — a significant dispersion is observed even among models with a fixed number of weak species. These results are

in agreement with the findings of [33] where only models with four species were considered.

Notwithstanding the large dispersion among models, we found that a weak species has on average a significant advantage over a strong one if \mathcal{P}_w is sufficiently smaller than unity, the only exception being the four species case. Still, we have shown that parity plays a key role, with odd numbers of species being on average more favourable to weak species than even ones in terms of the overall abundance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

P.P.A. acknowledges the support Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) through the research grants UIDB/04434/2020, UIDP/04434/2020. B.F.O. and R.S.T. thank CAPES - Finance Code 001, Fundação Araucária, and INCT-FCx (CNPq/FAPESP) for financial and computational support.

-
- [1] K. Kobayashi and K. Tainaka, Critical phenomena in cyclic ecosystems: Parity law and selfstructuring extinction patten, *Journal os the Physical Society of Japan* **66**, 38 (1996).
 - [2] K. Tainaka and N. Araki, Press perturbation in lattice ecosystems: Parity law and optimum strategy, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **197**, 1 (1999).
 - [3] K. Sato, N. Yoshida, and N. Konno, Parity law for population dynamics of n-species with cyclic advantage competitions, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* **126**, 255 (2002).
 - [4] G. Szabó, A. Szolnoki, and G. A. Sznaider, Segregation process and phase transition in cyclic predator-prey models with an even number of species, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 051921 (2007).
 - [5] G. Szabó and A. Szolnoki, Phase transitions induced by variation of invasion rates in spatial cyclic predator-prey models with four or six species, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 011906 (2008).
 - [6] M. Peltomäki and M. Alava, Three- and four-state rock-paper-scissors games with diffusion, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 031906 (2008).
 - [7] G. Szabó, A. Szolnoki, and I. Borsos, Self-organizing patterns maintained by competing associations in a six-species predator-prey model, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 041919 (2008).
 - [8] N. Nakagiri, Y. Sakisaka, T. Togashi, S. Morita, and K. Tainaka, Effects of habitat destruction in model ecosystems: Parity law depending on species richness, *Ecological Informatics* **5**, 241 (2010).
 - [9] S. Allesina and J. M. Levine, A competitive network theory of species diversity, *PNAS* **108**, 5638 (2011).
 - [10] P. P. Avelino, D. Bazeia, L. Losano, and J. Menezes, von neumann's and related scaling laws in rock-paper-scissors-type games, *Phys. Rev. E* **86**, 031119 (2012).
 - [11] Y. Li, L. Dong, and G. Yang, The elimination of hierarchy in a completely cyclic competition system, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **391**, 125 (2012).
 - [12] A. Roman, D. Konrad, and M. Pleimling, Cyclic competition of four species: domains and interfaces, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2012**, P07014 (2012).
 - [13] P. P. Avelino, D. Bazeia, L. Losano, J. Menezes, and B. F. Oliveira, Junctions and spiral patterns in generalized rock-paper-scissors models, *Phys. Rev. E* **86**, 036112 (2012).
 - [14] A. F. Lütz, S. Risau-Gusman, and J. J. Arenzon, Intransitivity and coexistence in four species cyclic games, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **317**, 286 (2013).
 - [15] A. Roman, D. Dasgupta, and M. Pleimling, Interplay between partnership formation and competition in generalized may-leonard games, *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 032148 (2013).
 - [16] H. Cheng, N. Yao, Z.-G. Huang, J. Park, Y. Do, and Y.-C. Lai, Mesoscopic interactions and species coexistence in evolutionary game dynamics of cyclic competitions, *Scientific Reports* **4**, 7486 (2014).
 - [17] A. Szolnoki, M. Mobilia, L.-L. Jiang, B. Szczesny, A. M. Rucklidge, and M. Perc, Cyclic dominance in evolutionary games: a review, *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **11**, 20140735 (2014).
 - [18] Y. Kang, Q. Pan, X. Wang, and M. He, A five species cyclically dominant evolutionary game with fixed direction: A new way to produce self-organized spatial patterns, *Entropy* **18**, 284 (2016).
 - [19] A. Roman, D. Dasgupta, and M. Pleimling, A theoretical approach to understand spatial organization in complex ecologies, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **403**, 10 (2016).
 - [20] B. L. Brown and M. Pleimling, Coarsening with non-trivial in-domain dynamics: Correlations and interface fluctuations, *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 012147 (2017).
 - [21] J. Park, Y. Do, B. Jang, and Y.-C. Lai, Emergence of unusual coexistence states in cyclic game systems, *Scientific Reports* **7**, 7465 (2017).

- [22] Bazeia, D., Menezes, J., de Oliveira, B. F., and Ramos, J. G. G. S., Hamming distance and mobility behavior in generalized rock-paper-scissors models, *EPL* **119**, 58003 (2017).
- [23] C. A. Souza-Filho, D. Bazeia, and J. G. G. S. Ramos, Apex predator and the cyclic competition in a rock-paper-scissors game of three species, *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 062411 (2017).
- [24] S. Esmaeili, B. L. Brown, and M. Pleimling, Perturbing cyclic predator-prey systems: How a six-species coarsening system with nontrivial in-domain dynamics responds to sudden changes, *Phys. Rev. E* **98**, 062105 (2018).
- [25] P. P. Avelino, J. Menezes, B. F. de Oliveira, and T. A. Pereira, Expanding spatial domains and transient scaling regimes in populations with local cyclic competition, *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 052310 (2019).
- [26] A. Szolnoki, B. F. de Oliveira, and D. Bazeia, Pattern formations driven by cyclic interactions: A brief review of recent developments, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **131**, 68001 (2020).
- [27] M. Frean and E. R. Abraham, Rock-scissors-paper and the survival of the weakest, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* **268**, 1323 (2001).
- [28] M. Berr, T. Reichenbach, M. Schottenloher, and E. Frey, Zero-one survival behavior of cyclically competing species, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 048102 (2009).
- [29] P. P. Avelino, B. F. de Oliveira, and R. S. Trintin, Predominance of the weakest species in lotka-volterra and may-leonard formulations of the rock-paper-scissors model, *Phys. Rev. E* **100**, 042209 (2019).
- [30] P. P. Avelino, B. F. de Oliveira, and R. S. Trintin, Weak species in rock-paper-scissors models (2021), arXiv:2104.14276.
- [31] J. Menezes, B. Moura, and T. A. Pereira, Uneven rock-paper-scissors models: Patterns and coexistence, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **126**, 18003 (2019).
- [32] M. J. Liao, A. Miano, C. B. Nguyen, L. Chao, and J. Hastly, Survival of the weakest in non-transitive asymmetric interactions among strains of *e. coli*, *Nature Communications* **11**, 6055 (2020).
- [33] P. P. Avelino, B. F. de Oliveira, and R. S. Trintin, Performance of weak species in the simplest generalization of the rock-paper-scissors model to four species, *Phys. Rev. E* **101**, 062312 (2020).