## Exercise sheet 4: Foraging

Sex, Ageing and Foraging Theory

## **Exercise 1: Competition for renewable resources among relatives**

Here we model the evolution of foraging effort when individuals forage with relatives. We consider a scenario where each female lays its eggs in a single and unique patch (i.e. one patch per female) where eggs hatch and offspring exploit local resources. These resources follow Schaefer's model, i.e. the density of the resource in a patch where there are  $n_c$  offspring expressing foraging effort x changes in time according to

$$\frac{dn}{dt} = r\left(1 - \frac{n}{K}\right)n - n_{\rm c}h(x)n. \tag{1}$$

We assume that the harvesting function is simply,

$$h(x) = x. (2)$$

After gathering resources offspring leave the patch and compete globally to become the adults of the next generations.

Assuming that the number of offspring per patch  $n_c$  is large, the fitness of a mutant individual with foraging effort  $y_r$ , when its local relatives on average express effort  $y_r$ , and the rest of the population express x, is proportional to

$$w(y, y_{\rm r}, x) \propto y \hat{n}(y_{\rm r}) - c(y), \tag{3}$$

where  $\hat{n}(y_{\rm r})$  is the equilibrium density of the resource in a patch where individuals have foraging effort  $y_{\rm r}$ , and

$$c(y) = \frac{c_0}{2}y^2,\tag{4}$$

is the individual cost of foraging.

- a. Calculate the equilibrium resource density,  $\hat{n}(y_r)$ , from eqs. (1) and (2).
- b. Calculate the selection gradient, which when there are interactions among relatives is given by

$$s(x) = \frac{\partial w(y, y_{\rm r}, x)}{\partial y} \bigg|_{y=y_{\rm r}=x} + R_2 \left. \frac{\partial w(y, y_{\rm r}, x)}{\partial y_{\rm r}} \right|_{y=y_{\rm r}=x},\tag{5}$$

where  $R_2$  is the relatedness among offspring foraging together.

c. Show that the strategy  $x^*$  that selection favours (i.e. the strategy  $x^*$  such that  $s(x^*)=0$ ) is given by

$$x^* = \frac{Kr}{c_0 r + K n_c (1 + R_2)}.$$
(6)

How does this strategy change with relatedness  $R_2$ ? How does this strategy compare to the effort  $x_{MSY}$  that leads to maximum sustainable yield?

## **Exercise 2: Risk-sensitive foraging**

In this exercise, we investigate the evolution of risk-sensitive foraging using computer simulations to explicitly consider the randomness in foraging outcome. We consider a population of fixed size N where individuals can be in either of two conditions: high (e.g. well provisioned) or low (poorly provisioned). We assume this is determined at birth, with each individual being in high condition with probability p and low conditions p and low con

$$f_{\rm H}(\pi_i) = 3\log(1+\pi_i) \tag{7}$$

if in high condition, and

$$f_{\mathcal{L}}(\pi_i) = \frac{1}{2} \Big( \exp(\pi_i) - 1 \Big), \tag{8}$$

if in low condition. Adults die and offspring compete to become the adults of the next generation.

We model the evolution of risk-taking behaviour by considering the evolution of two traits:  $x_{\rm H}$  and  $x_{\rm L}$ , the probability of choosing the risky strategy when in a high and low condition, respectively. We assume both these strategies are genetically encoded and evolve by mutations of weak effects.

a. Assume that the expected payoff is  $\pi_0=1$ , and that the probability of successfully foraging under the risky strategy is a=0.5. Complete the table below that associates payoff and fecundity according to condition with numerical values.

Payoff, $\pi_i$	Low condition	High condition
	$f_{ m L}$	$f_{ m H}$
0		
1		
2		

- b. Based on the table you completed, how do you think  $x_{\rm H}$  and  $x_{\rm L}$  are going to evolve?
- c. Test your predictions using the individual-based simulation program that implements the life cycle described above and that is available on the course website (lab-mullon.github.io/SAF).