



Adaptive Dynamics: The Continuity Argument

Meszana, G.

**IIASA Interim Report
June 2005**



Meszana, G. (2005) Adaptive Dynamics: The Continuity Argument. IIASA Interim Report. Copyright © 2005 by the author(s). <http://pure.iiasa.ac.at/7803/>

Interim Report on work of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis receive only limited review. Views or opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the Institute, its National Member Organizations, or other organizations supporting the work. All rights reserved. Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage. All copies must bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. For other purposes, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, permission must be sought by contacting repository@iiasa.ac.at



International Institute for
Applied Systems Analysis
Schlossplatz 1
A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria

Tel: +43 2236 807 342
Fax: +43 2236 71313
E-mail: publications@iiasa.ac.at
Web: www.iiasa.ac.at

Interim Report

IR-05-032

Adaptive Dynamics: The Continuity Argument

Géza Meszéna (geza.meszena@elte.hu)

Approved by

Ulf Dieckmann
Program Leader, Adaptive Dynamics Network

June 2005

Interim Reports on work of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis receive only limited review. Views or opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the Institute, its National Member Organizations, or other organizations supporting the work.



The Adaptive Dynamics Network at IIASA fosters the development of new mathematical and conceptual techniques for understanding the evolution of complex adaptive systems.

Focusing on these long-term implications of adaptive processes in systems of limited growth, the Adaptive Dynamics Network brings together scientists and institutions from around the world with IIASA acting as the central node.

Scientific progress within the network is collected in the IIASA Studies in Adaptive Dynamics series.

- No. 1 Metz JAJ, Geritz SAH, Meszéna G, Jacobs FJA, van Heerwaarden JS: *Adaptive Dynamics: A Geometrical Study of the Consequences of Nearly Faithful Reproduction*. IIASA Working Paper WP-95-099 (1995). van Strien SJ, Verduyn Lunel SM (eds): *Stochastic and Spatial Structures of Dynamical Systems*, Proceedings of the Royal Dutch Academy of Science (KNAW Verhandelingen), North Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 183-231 (1996).
- No. 2 Dieckmann U, Law R: *The Dynamical Theory of Coevolution: A Derivation from Stochastic Ecological Processes*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-001 (1996). *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 34:579-612 (1996).
- No. 3 Dieckmann U, Marrow P, Law R: *Evolutionary Cycling of Predator-Prey Interactions: Population Dynamics and the Red Queen*. IIASA Preprint (1995). *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 176:91-102 (1995).
- No. 4 Marrow P, Dieckmann U, Law R: *Evolutionary Dynamics of Predator-Prey Systems: An Ecological Perspective*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-002 (1996). *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 34:556-578 (1996).
- No. 5 Law R, Marrow P, Dieckmann U: *On Evolution under Asymmetric Competition*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-003 (1996). *Evolutionary Ecology* 11:485-501 (1997).
- No. 6 Metz JAJ, Mylius SD, Dieckmann O: *When Does Evolution Optimize? On the Relation Between Types of Density Dependence and Evolutionarily Stable Life History Parameters*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-004 (1996).
- No. 7 Ferrière R, Gatto M: *Lyapunov Exponents and the Mathematics of Invasion in Oscillatory or Chaotic Populations*. *Theoretical Population Biology* 48:126-171 (1995).
- No. 8 Ferrière R, Fox GA: *Chaos and Evolution*. IIASA Preprint (1996). *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 10:480-485 (1995).
- No. 9 Ferrière R, Michod RE: *The Evolution of Cooperation in Spatially Heterogeneous Populations*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-029 (1996). *The American Naturalist* 147:692-717 (1996).
- No. 10 van Dooren TJM, Metz JAJ: *Delayed Maturation in Temporally Structured Populations with Non-Equilibrium Dynamics*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-070 (1996). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 11:41-62 (1998).
- No. 11 Geritz SAH, Metz JAJ, Kisdi É, Meszéna G: *The Dynamics of Adaptation and Evolutionary Branching*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-077 (1996). *Physical Review Letters* 78:2024-2027 (1997).
- No. 12 Geritz SAH, Kisdi É, Meszéna G, Metz JAJ: *Evolutionary Singular Strategies and the Adaptive Growth and Branching of the Evolutionary Tree*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-114 (1996). *Evolutionary Ecology* 12:35-57 (1998).
- No. 13 Heino M, Metz JAJ, Kaitala V: *Evolution of Mixed Maturation Strategies in Semelparous Life-Histories: The Crucial Role of Dimensionality of Feedback Environment*. IIASA Working Paper WP-96-126 (1996). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B* 352:1647-1655 (1997).
- No. 14 Dieckmann U: *Can Adaptive Dynamics Invade?* IIASA Working Paper WP-96-152 (1996). *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 12:128-131 (1997).
- No. 15 Meszéna G, Czibula I, Geritz SAH: *Adaptive Dynamics in a 2-Patch Environment: A Simple Model for Allopatric and Parapatric Speciation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-001 (1997). *Journal of Biological Systems* 5:265-284 (1997).
- No. 16 Heino M, Metz JAJ, Kaitala V: *The Enigma of Frequency-Dependent Selection*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-061 (1997). *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 13:367-370 (1998).
- No. 17 Heino M: *Management of Evolving Fish Stocks*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-062 (1997). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 55:1971-1982 (1998).
- No. 18 Heino M: *Evolution of Mixed Reproductive Strategies in Simple Life-History Models*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-063 (1997).
- No. 19 Geritz SAH, van der Meijden E, Metz JAJ: *Evolutionary Dynamics of Seed Size and Seedling Competitive Ability*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-071 (1997). *Theoretical Population Biology* 55:324-343 (1999).
- No. 20 Galis F, Metz JAJ: *Why Are There So Many Cichlid Species? On the Interplay of Speciation and Adaptive Radiation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-072 (1997). *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 13:1-2 (1998).

- No. 21 Boerlijst MC, Nowak MA, Sigmund K: *Equal Pay for all Prisoners/ The Logic of Contrition*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-073 (1997). American Mathematical Society Monthly 104:303-307 (1997). Journal of Theoretical Biology 185:281-293 (1997).
- No. 22 Law R, Dieckmann U: *Symbiosis Without Mutualism and the Merger of Lineages in Evolution*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-074 (1997). Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B 265:1245-1253 (1998).
- No. 23 Klinkhamer PGL, de Jong TJ, Metz JAJ: *Sex and Size in Cosexual Plants*. IIASA Interim Report IR-97-078 (1997). Trends in Ecology and Evolution 12:260-265 (1997).
- No. 24 Fontana W, Schuster P: *Shaping Space: The Possible and the Attainable in RNA Genotype-Phenotype Mapping*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-004 (1998). Journal of Theoretical Biology 194:491-515 (1998).
- No. 25 Kisdi É, Geritz SAH: *Adaptive Dynamics in Allele Space: Evolution of Genetic Polymorphism by Small Mutations in a Heterogeneous Environment*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-038 (1998). Evolution 53:993-1008 (1999).
- No. 26 Fontana W, Schuster P: *Continuity in Evolution: On the Nature of Transitions*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-039 (1998). Science 280:1451-1455 (1998).
- No. 27 Nowak MA, Sigmund K: *Evolution of Indirect Reciprocity by Image Scoring/ The Dynamics of Indirect Reciprocity*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-040 (1998). Nature 393:573-577 (1998). Journal of Theoretical Biology 194:561-574 (1998).
- No. 28 Kisdi É: *Evolutionary Branching Under Asymmetric Competition*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-045 (1998). Journal of Theoretical Biology 197:149-162 (1999).
- No. 29 Berger U: *Best Response Adaptation for Role Games*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-086 (1998).
- No. 30 van Dooren TJM: *The Evolutionary Ecology of Dominance-Recessivity*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-096 (1998). Journal of Theoretical Biology 198:519-532 (1999).
- No. 31 Dieckmann U, O'Hara B, Weisser W: *The Evolutionary Ecology of Dispersal*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-108 (1998). Trends in Ecology and Evolution 14:88-90 (1999).
- No. 32 Sigmund K: *Complex Adaptive Systems and the Evolution of Reciprocation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-100 (1998). Ecosystems 1:444-448 (1998).
- No. 33 Posch M, Pichler A, Sigmund K: *The Efficiency of Adapting Aspiration Levels*. IIASA Interim Report IR-98-103 (1998). Proceedings of the Royal Society London Series B 266:1427-1435 (1999).
- No. 34 Mathias A, Kisdi É: *Evolutionary Branching and Coexistence of Germination Strategies*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-014 (1999).
- No. 35 Dieckmann U, Doebeli M: *On the Origin of Species by Sympatric Speciation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-013 (1999). Nature 400:354-357 (1999).
- No. 36 Metz JAJ, Gyllenberg M: *How Should We Define Fitness in Structured Metapopulation Models? Including an Application to the Calculation of Evolutionarily Stable Dispersal Strategies*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-019 (1999). Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B 268:499-508 (2001).
- No. 37 Gyllenberg M, Metz JAJ: *On Fitness in Structured Metapopulations*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-037 (1999). Journal of Mathematical Biology 43:545-560 (2001).
- No. 38 Meszéna G, Metz JAJ: *Species Diversity and Population Regulation: The Importance of Environmental Feedback Dimensionality*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-045 (1999).
- No. 39 Kisdi É, Geritz SAH: *Evolutionary Branching and Sympatric Speciation in Diploid Populations*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-048 (1999).
- No. 40 Ylikarjula J, Heino M, Dieckmann U: *Ecology and Adaptation of Stunted Growth in Fish*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-050 (1999). Evolutionary Ecology 13:433-453 (1999).
- No. 41 Nowak MA, Sigmund K: *Games on Grids*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-038 (1999). Dieckmann U, Law R, Metz JAJ (eds): The Geometry of Ecological Interactions: Simplifying Spatial Complexity, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 135-150 (2000).
- No. 42 Ferrière R, Michod RE: *Wave Patterns in Spatial Games and the Evolution of Cooperation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-99-041 (1999). Dieckmann U, Law R, Metz JAJ (eds): The Geometry of Ecological Interactions: Simplifying Spatial Complexity, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 318-332 (2000).
- No. 43 Kisdi É, Jacobs FJA, Geritz SAH: *Red Queen Evolution by Cycles of Evolutionary Branching and Extinction*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-030 (2000). Selection 2:161-176 (2001).
- No. 44 Meszéna G, Kisdi É, Dieckmann U, Geritz SAH, Metz JAJ: *Evolutionary Optimisation Models and Matrix Games in the Unified Perspective of Adaptive Dynamics*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-039 (2000). Selection 2:193-210 (2001).
- No. 45 Parvinen K, Dieckmann U, Gyllenberg M, Metz JAJ: *Evolution of Dispersal in Metapopulations with Local Density Dependence and Demographic Stochasticity*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-035 (2000). Journal of Evolutionary Biology 16:143-153 (2003).
- No. 46 Doebeli M, Dieckmann U: *Evolutionary Branching and Sympatric Speciation Caused by Different Types of Ecological Interactions*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-040 (2000). The American Naturalist 156:S77-S101 (2000).
- No. 47 Heino M, Hanski I: *Evolution of Migration Rate in a Spatially Realistic Metapopulation Model*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-044 (2000). The American Naturalist 157:495-511 (2001).
- No. 48 Gyllenberg M, Parvinen K, Dieckmann U: *Evolutionary Suicide and Evolution of Dispersal in Structured Metapopulations*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-056 (2000). Journal of Mathematical Biology 45:79-105 (2002).
- No. 49 van Dooren TJM: *The Evolutionary Dynamics of Direct Phenotypic Overdominance: Emergence Possible, Loss Probable*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-048 (2000). Evolution 54: 1899-1914 (2000).
- No. 50 Nowak MA, Page KM, Sigmund K: *Fairness Versus Reason in the Ultimatum Game*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-57 (2000). Science 289:1773-1775 (2000).
- No. 51 de Feo O, Ferrière R: *Bifurcation Analysis of Population Invasion: On-Off Intermittency and Basin Riddling*. IIASA Interim Report IR-00-074 (2000). International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos 10:443-452 (2000).

- No. 52 Heino M, Laaka-Lindberg S: *Clonal Dynamics and Evolution of Dormancy in the Leafy Hepatic Lophozia Silvicola*. IIASA Interim Report IR-01-018 (2001). *Oikos* 94:525-532 (2001).
- No. 53 Sigmund K, Hauert C, Nowak MA: *Reward and Punishment in Minigames*. IIASA Interim Report IR-01-031 (2001). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA* 98:10757-10762 (2001).
- No. 54 Hauert C, De Monte S, Sigmund K, Hofbauer J: *Oscillations in Optional Public Good Games*. IIASA Interim Report IR-01-036 (2001).
- No. 55 Ferrière R, Le Galliard J: *Invasion Fitness and Adaptive Dynamics in Spatial Population Models*. IIASA Interim Report IR-01-043 (2001). Clobert J, Dhondt A, Danchin E, Nichols J (eds): *Dispersal*, Oxford University Press, pp. 57-79 (2001).
- No. 56 de Mazancourt C, Loreau M, Dieckmann U: *Can the Evolution of Plant Defense Lead to Plant-Herbivore Mutualism*. IIASA Interim Report IR-01-053 (2001). *The American Naturalist* 158: 109-123 (2001).
- No. 57 Claessen D, Dieckmann U: *Ontogenetic Niche Shifts and Evolutionary Branching in Size-Structured Populations*. IIASA Interim Report IR-01-056 (2001). *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 4:189-217 (2002).
- No. 58 Brandt H: *Correlation Analysis of Fitness Landscapes*. IIASA Interim Report IR-01-058 (2001).
- No. 59 Dieckmann U: *Adaptive Dynamics of Pathogen-Host Interactions*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-007 (2002). Dieckmann U, Metz JAJ, Sabelis MW, Sigmund K (eds): *Adaptive Dynamics of Infectious Diseases: In Pursuit of Virulence Management*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 39-59 (2002).
- No. 60 Nowak MA, Sigmund K: *Super- and Coinfection: The Two Extremes*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-008 (2002). Dieckmann U, Metz JAJ, Sabelis MW, Sigmund K (eds): *Adaptive Dynamics of Infectious Diseases: In Pursuit of Virulence Management*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 124-137 (2002).
- No. 61 Sabelis MW, Metz JAJ: *Perspectives for Virulence Management: Relating Theory to Experiment*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-009 (2002). Dieckmann U, Metz JAJ, Sabelis MW, Sigmund K (eds): *Adaptive Dynamics of Infectious Diseases: In Pursuit of Virulence Management*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 379-398 (2002).
- No. 62 Cheptou P, Dieckmann U: *The Evolution of Self-Fertilization in Density-Regulated Populations*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-024 (2002). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B* 269:1177-1186 (2002).
- No. 63 Bürger R: *Additive Genetic Variation Under Intraspecific Competition and Stabilizing Selection: A Two-Locus Study*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-013 (2002). *Theoretical Population Biology* 61:197-213 (2002).
- No. 64 Hauert C, De Monte S, Hofbauer J, Sigmund K: *Volunteering as Red Queen Mechanism for Co-operation in Public Goods Games*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-041 (2002). *Science* 296:1129-1132 (2002).
- No. 65 Dercole F, Ferrière R, Rinaldi S: *Ecological Bistability and Evolutionary Reversals under Asymmetrical Competition*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-053 (2002). *Evolution* 56:1081-1090 (2002).
- No. 66 Dercole F, Rinaldi S: *Evolution of Cannibalistic Traits: Scenarios Derived from Adaptive Dynamics*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-054 (2002). *Theoretical Population Biology* 62:365-374 (2002).
- No. 67 Bürger R, Gimelfarb A: *Fluctuating Environments and the Role of Mutation in Maintaining Quantitative Genetic Variation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-058 (2002). *Genetical Research* 80:31-46 (2002).
- No. 68 Bürger R: *On a Genetic Model of Intraspecific Competition and Stabilizing Selection*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-062 (2002). *Amer. Natur.* 160:661-682 (2002).
- No. 69 Doebeli M, Dieckmann U: *Speciation Along Environmental Gradients*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-079 (2002). *Nature* 421:259-264 (2003).
- No. 70 Dercole F, Irisson J, Rinaldi S: *Bifurcation Analysis of a Prey-Predator Coevolution Model*. IIASA Interim Report IR-02-078 (2002). *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 63:1378-1391 (2003).
- No. 71 Le Galliard J, Ferrière R, Dieckmann U: *The Adaptive Dynamics of Altruism in Spatially Heterogeneous Populations*. IIASA Interim Report IR-03-006 (2003). *Evolution* 57:1-17 (2003).
- No. 72 Taborsky B, Dieckmann U, Heino M: *Unexpected Discontinuities in Life-History Evolution under Size-Dependent Mortality*. IIASA Interim Report IR-03-004 (2003). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B* 270:713-721 (2003).
- No. 73 Gardmark A, Dieckmann U, Lundberg P: *Life-History Evolution in Harvested Populations: The Role of Natural Predation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-03-008 (2003). *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 5:239-257 (2003).
- No. 74 Mizera F, Meszéna G: *Spatial Niche Packing, Character Displacement and Adaptive Speciation Along an Environmental Gradient*. IIASA Interim Report IR-03-062 (2003). *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 5: 363-382 (2003).
- No. 75 Dercole F: *Remarks on Branching-Extinction Evolutionary Cycles*. IIASA Interim Report IR-03-075 (2003). *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 47: 569-580 (2003).
- No. 76 Hofbauer J, Sigmund K: *Evolutionary Game Dynamics*. IIASA Interim Report IR-03-078 (2003). *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 40: 479-519 (2003).
- No. 77 Ernande B, Dieckmann U, Heino M: *Adaptive Changes in Harvested Populations: Plasticity and Evolution of Age and Size at Maturation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-03-058 (2003). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences*, 271: 415-423 (2004).
- No. 78 Hanski I, Heino M: *Metapopulation-Level Adaptation of Insect Host Plant Preference and Extinction-Colonization Dynamics in Heterogeneous Landscapes*. IIASA Interim Report IR-03-028 (2003). *Theoretical Population Biology* 63:309-338 (2003).
- No. 79 van Doorn G, Dieckmann U, Weissing FJ: *Sympatric Speciation by Sexual Selection: A Critical Re-Evaluation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-003 (2004). *American Naturalist* 163: 709-725 (2004).
- No. 80 Egas M, Dieckmann U, Sabelis MW: *Evolution Restricts the Coexistence of Specialists and Generalists - the Role of Trade-off Structure*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-004 (2004). *American Naturalist*, 163: 518-531 (2004).

- No. 81 Ernande B, Dieckmann U: *The Evolution of Phenotypic Plasticity in Spatially Structured Environments: Implications of Intraspecific Competition, Plasticity Costs, and Environmental Characteristics*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-006 (2004). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 17 (3): 613-628 (2004).
- No. 82 Cressman R, Hofbauer J: *Measure Dynamics on a One-Dimensional Continuous Trait Space: Theoretical Foundations for Adaptive Dynamics*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-016 (2004).
- No. 83 Cressman R: *Dynamic Stability of the Replicator Equation with Continuous Strategy Space*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-017 (2004).
- No. 84 Ravigné V, Olivieri I, Dieckmann U: *Implications of Habitat Choice for Protected Polymorphisms*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-005 (2004). *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 6: 125-145 (2004).
- No. 85 Nowak MA, Sigmund K: *Evolutionary Dynamics of Biological Games*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-013 (2004). *Science* 303: 793-799 (2004).
- No. 86 Vukics A, Asbóth J, Meszéna G: *Speciation in Multidimensional Evolutionary Space*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-028 (2004). *Physical Review*, 68: 041-903 (2003).
- No. 87 de Mazancourt C, Dieckmann U: *Trade-off Geometries and Frequency-dependent Selection*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-039 (2004). *American Naturalist*, 164: 765-778 (2004).
- No. 88 Cadet CR, Metz JAJ, Klinkhamer PGL: *Size and the Not-So-Single Sex: disentangling the effects of size on sex allocation*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-084 (2004). *American Naturalist*, 164: 779-792 (2004).
- No. 89 Rueffler C, van Dooren TJM, Metz JAJ: *Adaptive Walks on Changing Landscapes: Levins' Approach Extended*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-083 (2004). *Theoretical Population Biology*, 65: 165-178 (2004).
- No. 90 de Mazancourt C, Loreau M, Dieckmann U: *Understanding Mutualism When There is Adaptation to the Partner*. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-016 (2005). *Journal of Ecology*, 93: 305-314 (2005).
- No. 91 Dieckmann U, Doebeli M: *Pluralism in Evolutionary Theory*. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-017 (2005).
- No. 92 Doebeli M, Dieckmann U, Metz JAJ, Tautz D: *What We Have Also Learned*. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-018 (2005). *Evolution*, 59: 691-695 (2005).
- No. 93 Egas M, Sabelis MW, Dieckmann U: *Evolution of Specialization and Ecological Character Displacement of Herbivores Along a Gradient of Plant Quality*. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-019 (2005). *Evolution*, 59: 507-520 (2005).
- No. 94 Le Galliard J, Ferrière R, Dieckmann U: *Adaptive Evolution of Social Traits: Origin, Trajectories, and Correlations of Altruism and Mobility*. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-020 (2005). *American Naturalist*, 165: 206-224 (2005).
- No. 95 Doebeli M, Dieckmann U: *Adaptive Dynamics as a Mathematical Tool for Studying the Ecology of Speciation Processes*. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-022 (2005).
- No. 96 Brandt H, Sigmund K: *The logic of reprobation: assessment and action rules for indirect reciprocity*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-085 (2004). *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 231: 475-486 (2004).
- No. 97 Hauert C, Haiden N, Sigmund K: *The dynamics of public goods*. IIASA Interim Report IR-04-086 (2004). *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series B*, 4:575-587 (2004).
- No. 98 Meszéna G, Gyllenberg M, Jacobs FJA, Metz JAJ: *Dynamics of Similar Populations: The Link between Population Dynamics and Evolution*. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-026 (2005).
- No. 99 Meszéna G: *Adaptive Dynamics: The Continuity Argument*. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-032 (2005).

Issues of the IIASA Studies in Adaptive Dynamics series can be obtained at www.iiasa.ac.at/Research/ADN/Series.html or by writing to adn@iiasa.ac.at.

Adaptive dynamics: the continuity argument

Géza Meszéna

Department of Biological Physics, Eötvös University

Pázmány 1A, H-1117 Budapest, Hungary

In reply to the target review by Waxman & Gavrillets (2005), I wish to explain why I consider adaptive dynamics as something simple, understandable, robust and beautiful.

Adaptive dynamics, as I see it, is a continuity argument. The following statement will be referred to here as the *Continuity Tenet*:

Relative abundance of similar strategies has little effect on the adaptive landscape.

First, note that this statement makes sense only for a continuous strategy (phenotype, trait) space. This raises the single most important assumption of adaptive dynamics: we are talking about a continuous trait (for simplicity, I will consider a single one) and the small evolutionary changes of it. We can use a continuity argument only in the case of continuity, after all. (But see Meszéna & Szathmáry, 2001 about the delicate interplay between the continuous phenotype and the sequence space of the genotype.)

Secondly, note the mathematical non-triviality of the simple-looking statement. If someone intends to formalize it, he/she should consider the interactions of the populations (i.e. of their combined population dynamics) of several strategies, which are “similar”, i.e. the difference between them – in all respects – goes to zero. Forget it for the purpose of this reply. I am talking to our common sense here.

Thirdly, note that the *Continuity Tenet* is self-evident. It is just inconceivable to be false. Can anyone imagine a significant dependence of the fitness landscape on the relative abundance of phenotype A and phenotype B, when the only difference between them is that their optimal size of food differs by 1 μm ? Probably A and B will not even be recognized as different.

Let us accept the *Tenet* and talk about its consequences. We will assume large population sizes, which allow us to use a deterministic treatment. As ecology-dependent selection tends to be complicated, we will start by considering an asexual context.

Consequence One.

Invasion of a rare type against a resident implies that the invader will eventually win, and oust the resident, provided that the fitness gradient is non-zero and the two strategies are sufficiently similar. If the two strategies are *not* similar, initial invasion predicts nothing because the increasing abundance of the invader may change the situation such that its advantage is lost. However, if they are similar, the *Tenet* guarantees that the direction of the fitness gradient will not be reversed by the increase of the invader. That is, the initial advantage survives until the final victory. This answers the questions raised in Section 2.6 of the review from the common sense point of view. The formal proof appeared only recently (Geritz, 2005, see also Jacobs et al., in prep.), so the Reviewers were right to consider the issue as unsettled.

Consequence Two.

Consider now an arbitrary population, sexual or asexual, with a sufficiently small, but nonzero variance. Then, it will evolve in the direction of increasing fitness, with or without

frequency dependence. While this statement looks trivial, it is not. It would not be true without the validity of the *Continuity Tenet*. Specifically, see Dieckmann & Law (1996) for the gradient dynamics for mutation limited asexual populations. It is analogous to, but different from, the Lande equation (Lande, 1976) of population genetics.

Surprise One.

From the intuitive point of view, the most surprising feature of frequency-dependent selection is that directional evolution towards increasing fitness may end up in a local minimum, instead of the maximum, of the fitness. We need to de-learn our notion of a fixed fitness function to accept it. Ecology helps. Being *different* from the rest of the population may be so advantageous that the majority strategy is a fitness minimum, even in cases when it would be an optimum without the presence of the population. I consider the discovery of this possibility, which predates the emergence of adaptive dynamics, as the single most important contribution in understanding frequency dependence. As far as I understand, the discovery was made by several people independently. I am not sure whether the following list is complete: Eshel (1983), Taylor (1989), Christiansen (1991), Abrams (1993).

From a strictly formal point of view, the possibility of convergence to a fitness minimum is not a result, but a *lack* of it. If evolution can change the adaptive landscape on the way, there is no reason to conclude that we should reach a local maximum. While frequency dependence should be weak *locally*, it may be strong enough to affect the *global* outcome.

Consequence Three.

The argument for *Consequence One* loses its validity when the fitness gradient becomes zero, i.e., at the “singular” points. An arbitrarily small change can tilt the horizontal fitness landscape in either direction. Initial increase no longer guarantees the final outcome. In particular, two arbitrarily similar strategies may be able to coexist near to the singular strategy, both of them invading the other, when rare. Nevertheless, we can re-use the argument for the *curvature* of the fitness function, which is supposedly non-zero. This leads to the classification of the singular points (Gertiz et al., 1997, 1998). Especially, *strategies near to a fitness maximum evolve towards each other, while strategies near to a fitness minimum evolve away from each other*. After *Surprise One*, this is a highly non-trivial result of the general theory (Metz et al., 1996; Geritz et al., 1997, 1998). See Meszéna et al. (2001) for the comparison with matrix games, where the linearity of the fitness function, i.e., the zero curvature, introduces peculiarities.

Surprise Two: Evolutionary branching.

As a result of *Consequence Three*, an asexual population that has evolved to a fitness minimum, will branch and the two branches will evolve away from each other. Then, adaptive dynamics argumentation can be applied, again, to the branches. This is the other big thing. The people who recognised *Surprise One*, also usually expected something like this. However, it was the great achievement of my colleagues, Stefan Geritz and Hans Metz (Metz et al., 1996; Geritz et al., 1997, 1998) to develop the theory of the (asexual) branching and note the generality and importance of the phenomenon. It is difficult to *not* see some resemblance to speciation, but I will come back to this point later.

Most importantly, this is the *End of Complications*, as far as *continuous* evolution of *asexuals* is concerned. (And modulo continuity, differentiability, genericity, etc. assumptions, of course.) *This is the beauty of adaptive dynamics*. We do know that the properties of the singular strategies control the qualitative picture, and we do know the possibilities there. We

cannot hope for a general analytic theory of frequency-dependent selection, just as we cannot hope for a general analytic solution for all possible dynamical systems. However, we have a fixed-point analysis for both of them, which helps a lot.

There are several ways to tell a single story. Often, it depends on personal taste. Meszéna et al. (1997), Vukics et al. (2003) relied on this intuitive argument of continuity. To concentrate on the issue of singular point classification, and to avoid the mathematical complications, Geritz et al. (1997, 1998) *assumed* rare mutations (i.e. at most a single mutant is present at any specific time) and *assumed* that the outcome of the contest between two strategies is unequivocally determined by the mutual invasibilities. (That is, contrary to the Reviewers' suggestion of the hidden assumptions, we were overcautious in these papers in stating the conditions.) The precise mathematical treatment of the continuity argument is coming (Meszéna et al., submitted).

As the initial population size of the mutant population is small, we have to deal with *Initial Stochasticity*. Fortunately, the situation is simple. As mentioned in the review, the mutant has a positive probability to invade if, and only if, the deterministic criterion of invasion is met. The actual probability is proportional to the invasion exponent. That is, stochasticity affects the speed of evolution, but not the location and the classification of the singular strategies. The issue was known to the adaptive dynamics community from the very beginning and mentioned already in Metz et al. (1996). It played a key role in Dieckmann & Law's (1996) development of gradient dynamics for mutation limited asexual evolution. (Without taking into account the *Initial Stochasticity*, the speed of evolution would be independent of the slope of the landscape, which would be absurd!) Individual-based simulations (like those of Dieckmann & Doebeli, 1999; Mizera & Meszéna, 2003) took the effect into account automatically, so there was no reason to discuss stochasticity separately. I hereby acknowledge that we made a mistake in Meszéna et al. (1997). We simulated population growth deterministically without taking into account *Initial Stochasticity*. This affects the exact shape of the branching curve on Figure 3, but nothing else. Figures in some other publications may suffer from the same problem. As the relative speed in different directions is an important issue for a multidimensional trait space, we discussed *Initial Stochasticity* carefully in Vukics et al. (2003). The Reviewers' claim, that the adaptive dynamics literature neglects the issue in an essential way, is overstated.

When we declare victory against frequency-dependent selection for continuous evolution of asexuals, the Reader may feel that we have not yet met the real enemy. At the end of the day, we have to face the *Complications of Sex*, especially because of the appealing connection to speciation. Will sex change the conclusions? It is obvious/known that the directional evolution, the end of evolution at a fitness maximum, and the possible arrival to a fitness minimum, are the same for asexuals and for sexuals (see Taylor & Day, 1997, among others). However, the consequences of the disruptive selection at a fitness minimum differ. They will depend crucially on genetic assumptions. In a random mating population frequency-dependent disruptive selection tends to increase and maintain genetic variance (Christiansen & Loeschke, 1980). Some of us think that conditions may exist under which disruptive selection ends up in the development of reproductive isolation. Why not, when it selects against the intermediate types? Call the phenomenon, if it exists, as *Adaptive Speciation* irrespective whether the process is sympatric or allopatric. The very first condition is to have an evolvable trait controlling the assortativity of mating, i.e., abandoning the assumption of random mating.

Does a “branching” type singularity of adaptive dynamics predict adaptive speciation? Certainly, *not*. First, because we have got a new problem: the evolution of the sexual behaviour. It is not fully determined by the adaptive dynamics of the ecological trait, where our branching point has appeared. Secondly, because we lost the applicability of the *Continuity Tenet* even for the ecological trait when we let the variance increase under disruptive selection. We can no longer suppose that only the first, or second, derivative of the fitness matter. (I thank Freddy Christiansen for pointing me to the second issue.) From a mathematical point of view, it is not mandatory for a “practitioner of adaptive dynamics”, as the Reviewers call us, to believe in adaptive speciation. Note also, that one can use all the arguments of adaptive dynamics in a continuous allele model (Kisdi & Geritz, 1999; van Dooren, 1999). Then, it is a sexual application of adaptive dynamics, without caveats. Then evolutionary branching of the allelic value corresponds to an increase of variance of the population, instead of speciation.

I happen to be a fan of adaptive speciation. My reason is that ecology must be a part of the story, anyway. Without ecological segregation, the new species will not be able to coexist with the already existing one. (One can, of course escape from this requirement in a non-complete model.) From a *biological* point of view, the simplest possible idea of speciation is the adaptive/competitive/ecological one (Rosenzweig, 1978): suppose that speciation is driven by adaptation to an empty niche. As one can learn from Christiansen (1988), ecology generates frequency dependence. In turn, frequency dependence may result in convergence to a fitness minimum, i.e. to disruptive selection. Things seem to fit.

For reasons that I do not fully understand, the many people consider adaptive speciation as an extremely difficult possibility, at best. Turelli et al. (2001) states explicitly that the “allopatric” theory of speciation goes well without mathematical modelling, because it is intuitively clear. However, ecological speciation supposedly depends on detailed mathematical analysis in a crucial way. But this tilts the playing field. While it is a widely accepted *assumption* of the allopatric theory that mutual infertility arises as a consequence of diverging evolution in allopatry, the Reviewers asks whether the *emerging* reproductive isolation of Dieckmann & Doebeli (1999) is robust against introducing a cost of assortativity. The issue of adaptive speciation, i.e. equating asexual branching with sexual speciation, would be trivial by *assuming* that ecological divergence results in reproductive isolation automatically.

There are several models supporting the possibility of adaptive emergence of reproductive isolation. Matessi et al. (2001) is one of them – even if it was written to stress that the selection force should be strong enough. Obviously, the Reviewers are right in claiming that any cost of assortativity will decrease the parameter range allowing speciation. I could suggest many other factors, which would either help or prevent adaptive emergence of reproductive isolation. But the same could be done for any evolutionary process. It will take several years to see the full picture, I am sure.

In particular, I do not think that the model of Dieckmann & Doebeli (1999) is the final word on the issue. Nevertheless, I am puzzled that the Reviewers seem to suspect trivial-level mistakes in it. (I happen to know how clean and reliable the code behind this work is and how careful the authors are in avoiding the traps.) Why should it be a problem that they start the simulation with the maximal variance, when the maximal variance is the stable fixed point under disruptive selection (Bulmer, 1980, p. 171), anyway? Why should it be a problem that they chose a mutation rate higher than the natural one just to compensate for the fact that they

use small population size and small number of loci for numerical convenience? When the whole model is far from the quantitative fidelity, anyway? Why should it be a problem that the model is not about generating variance, which is a solved problem, but about sorting them out to different species, which is their topic? I am sure the authors of this model will falsify the “easily falsifiable” hypothesis of the Reviewers. But here the point is why are our intuitions so different?

Contrary to Turelli et al. (2001), I feel that ecological speciation is at least as intuitively appealing, simple and understandable, as anything else. (Nevertheless, it needs quantitative modelling, as anything else!) I am sure it is related to my involvement in adaptive dynamics. The behaviour of Occam’s razor depends on whether one considers frequency-dependent selection and convergence to the fitness minimum something strange and complicated, or an elementary fact of ecology that is easy to interpret and which is under control. My version of Occam’s razor implies studying the consequences of ecology-generated fitness landscape first. While adaptive dynamics does not imply adaptive speciation in any mathematical way, it is not an accident that some of the adaptive dynamicists support adaptive speciation.

As I consider adaptive dynamics something transparent, I disagree with the judgement of the Reviewers about the “hidden limitations and unconscious or implicit assumptions”. Of course, adaptive dynamics, as any other theory, has limitations in describing the real world. For instance, if speciation is a process driven by neutral evolution, as Gavrilets (2003, 2004) supposes, then it has nothing to do with adaptive dynamics. Adaptive dynamics is, by definition, concerned with adaptive evolution. However, this is something different from the Reviewers’ claim that AD overlooks genetic drift, in its own context, as a hidden assumption.

Similarly, if the evolutionary process is dominated by a small number of large mutational steps, instead of a roughly continuous evolution of a trait, the simplification of the *Continuity Tenet* does not apply. An exact mathematical wording would require “infinitesimal” mutational step for the applicability of adaptive dynamics. The real-world-oriented translation is that “it should be small in any relevant comparisons”. For instance, and most importantly, the mutation step size should be too small to jump to the other side of a fitness minimum, or the description cannot be based on gradient dynamics. Practitioners of adaptive dynamics meet this issue each day in each of their model. Again, this is not a hidden assumption, but the very essence of the approach.

Similarly, if the genetic details are important, then one should not attempt to describe the evolutionary process on the phenotypic level. In general, applicability of adaptive dynamics in a given context depends on the nature of the phenomenon we are investigating. If there is a disagreement on the biological essence of the speciation process, then we will disagree on the applicability of adaptive dynamics, of course. But this is natural; it has nothing to do with the supposedly hidden assumptions of adaptive dynamics.

As far as I understand, the theory itself is fairly stable by now.

Last, but not least, I wish to apologise for the apparently arrogant nature of this commentary. Neither the expected length, nor the supposed style, allowed me an in-depth discussion of all specific points the Reviewers raised. I could not discuss technical details of the mathematical issues, either. My only goal was to express and motivate my general judgement: Adaptive dynamics is transparent. I thank all of my colleagues for the rewarding years of learning together and the Reviewers for the possibility of this exchange.

References

- Abrams P.A., Matsuda, H. & Harada, Y. 1993. Evolutionarily unstable fitness maxima and stable fitness minima of continuous traits. *Evol. Ecol.* 7: 465-487.
- Bulmer, M.G. 1980. The mathematical theory of quantitative genetics. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Christiansen, F.B. & Loeschcke, V. 1980. Evolution and intraspecific exploitative competition. I. One locus theory for small additive gene effects. *Theor. Pop. Biol.* 18: 297-313.
- Christiansen, F.B. 1988. Frequency dependence and competition. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 319: 587-600.
- Christiansen, F.B. 1991. On conditions for evolutionary stability for a continuously varying character. *Am. Nat.* 138: 37-50.
- Dieckmann, U. & Law, R. 1996. The dynamical theory of coevolution: a derivation from stochastic ecological processes. *J. Math. Biol.* 34: 579-612.
- Dieckmann, U. & Doebeli, M. 1999. On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. *Nature*, 400: 354-357.
- Eshel, I. 1983. Evolutionary and continuous stability. *J. theor. Biol.* 103: 99-111.
- Gavrilets, S. 2003. Models of speciation: what have we learned in 40 years? *Evolution* 57: 2197-2215.
- Gavrilets, S. 2004. *Fitness Landscapes and the Origin of Species*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Geritz, S.A.H., Kisdi, É., Meszéna, G. & Metz, J.A.J. 1997. The dynamics of adaptation and evolutionary branching. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78: 2024-2027.
URL <http://angel.elte.hu/~geza/GeritzPRL.pdf>
- Geritz, S.A.H., Kisdi, É., Meszéna, G. & Metz, J.A.J. 1998. Evolutionary singular strategies and the evolutionary growth and branching of the evolutionary tree. *Evolutionary Ecology* 12: 35-57.
- Geritz, S.A.H. (2005) Resident-invader dynamics and the coexistence of similar strategies *J. Math. Biol.* 44: 548-560.
- Jacobs, F.J.A., Metz, J.A.J., Geritz, S.A.H. & Meszéna, G. (in prep) Invasion implies fixation.
- Kisdi É. & Geritz, S.A.H. 1999. Adaptive dynamics in allele space: Evolution of genetic polymorphism by small mutations in a heterogeneous environment. *Evolution* 53: 993-1008.
- Lande, R. 1976. Natural selection and random genetic drift in phenotypic evolution. *Evolution* 30: 314-334.
- Matessi, C., Gimelfarb, A. & Gavrilets, S. 2001. Long-term buildup of reproductive isolation promoted by disruptive selection: how far does it go? *Selection* 2: 41-64.
- Meszéna, G., Czibula, I. & Geritz, S.A.H. 1997. Adaptive dynamics in a 2-patch environment: a toy model for allopatric and parapatric speciation. *Journal of Biological Systems* 5: 265-284. URL <http://angel.elte.hu/~geza/MeszenaEtal1997.pdf>
- Meszéna, G. & Szathmáry, E. 2001. Adaptive dynamics of parabolic replicators. *Selection* 2: 147-159. URL <http://angel.elte.hu/~geza/FEJ-10.PDF>
- Meszéna, G., Kisdi, É., Dieckmann, U., Geritz, S.A.H. & Metz, J.A.J. 2001. Evolutionary optimisation models and matrix games in the unified perspective of adaptive dynamics. *Selection* 2: 193-210. URL <http://angel.elte.hu/~geza/FEJ-13.PDF>
- Meszéna, G., Gyllenberg, M., Jacobs, F.J.A. & Metz, J.A.J. (submitted) Population dynamics of similar strategies: the link to Darwinian evolution. IIASA Interim Report IR-05-026

- Metz, J.A.J., Geritz, S.A.H., Meszéna, G., Jacobs, F.J.A. & van Heerwaarden, J.S. 1996. Adaptive dynamics, a geometrical study of the consequences of nearly faithful reproduction I, In: S.J. van Strien & S.M. Verduyn Lunel (eds.) Stochastic and spatial structures of dynamical systems. North Holland, Elsevier, 1995, pp. 183-231.
- Nowak, M. 1990. An evolutionary stable strategy may be inaccessible. *J. theor. Biol.* 142: 237-241.
- Rosenzweig, M.L. 1978. Competitive speciation. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc. (Lond.)* 10: 275-289.
- Taylor, P.D. 1989. Evolutionary stability in one-parameter models under weak selection. *Theor. Pop. Biol.* 36: 125-143.
- Taylor, P. & Day, T. 1997. Evolutionary stability under the replicator and the gradient dynamics. *Evol. Ecol.* 11: 579-590.
- Turelli, M., Barton, N.H. & Coyne, J.A. 2001. Theory of speciation. *Trend Ecol. Evol.* 16: 330-343.
- Vukics, A., Asbóth, J. & Meszéna, G. 2003. Speciation in multidimensional evolutionary space. *Phys. Rev. E* 68, 041903. URL <http://angel.elte.hu/~geza/PRE41903.pdf>
- Van Dooren, T.J.M. 1999. The evolutionary ecology of dominance-recessivity. *J. theor. Biol.* 198: 519-532
- Waxman, D. & Gavrillets, S. 2005. 20 questions on Adaptive Dynamics: a target review. *J. Evol. Biol.* in press