

Modelling the Safety and Surveillance of the AI Race

The Anh Han^{1,*}, Luís Moniz Pereira², Francisco C. Santos^{3,4}, Tom Lenaerts^{4,5}

July 26, 2019

¹ School of Computing and Digital Technologies, Teesside University, Middlesbrough, UK TS1 3BA

² NOVA Laboratory for Computer Science and Informatics (NOVA LINCS), Universidade Nova de Lisboa, 2829-516 Caparica, Portugal

³INESC-ID and Instituto Superior Tecnico, Universidade de Lisboa

⁴ Université Libre de Bruxelles, Boulevard du Triomphe CP212, Brussels, Belgium

⁵ Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Boulevard de la Plaine 2, 1050 Ixelles, Belgium

Abstract

Innovation, creativity, and competition are some of the fundamental underlying forces driving the advances in Artificial Intelligence (AI). This race for technological supremacy creates a complex ecology of choices that may lead to negative consequences, in particular, when ethical and safety procedures are underestimated or even ignored. Here we resort to a novel game theoretical framework to describe the ongoing AI bidding war, also allowing for the identification of procedures on how to influence this race to achieve desirable outcomes. By exploring the similarities between the ongoing competition in AI and evolutionary systems, we show that the timelines in which AI supremacy can be achieved play a crucial role for the evolution of safety prone behaviour and whether influencing procedures are required. When this supremacy can be achieved in a short term (near AI), the significant advantage gained from winning a race leads to the dominance of those who completely ignore the safety precautions to gain extra speed, rendering of the presence of reciprocal behavior irrelevant. On the other hand, when such a supremacy is a distant future, reciprocating on others' safety behaviour provides in itself an efficient solution, even when monitoring of unsafe development is hard. Our results suggest under what conditions AI safety behaviour requires additional supporting procedures and provide a basic framework to model them.

Keywords: AI race modelling, emergence, cooperation, evolutionary game theory.

1 Introduction

Interest in Artificial intelligence (AI) has exploded in academia and businesses in the last few years. This excitement is, on one hand, due to a series of superhuman performances^{9,10,32,33} which have been exhibited. Although mostly successful in highly specialised tasks, exceeding human ability and precision, these AI success stories appear often in the imagination of the general public as Hollywood-like Artificial General Intelligence (AGI), able to perform a broad set of intellectual tasks while continuously improving itself. Large scale surveys show that AI researchers expect that AI systems will eventually reach and then exceed human-level performance in many of the surveyed tasks, although the timelines are quite diverse^{16,34}. On the other hand, the excitement is promoted by business leaders as they anticipate important gains from turning their previously idle data into active assets within business plans²⁹. All these (un)announced business and political ambitions indicate that an AI race or bidding war has been triggered^{1,2,11}, where stake-holders in private and public sectors are competing to be the first to cross the finish line and hence the leader in the development and deployment of powerful, transformative AI^{3,6,7,11}.

Irrespectively of the anticipated benefits, many actors have urged for due diligence as i) these AI systems can also be employed for more nefarious activities, e.g. espionage and cyberterrorism³⁶ and ii) when trying to be the first/best then some ethical consequences as well as safety procedures may be underestimated or even ignored^{3,11}, notwithstanding the issue that certain claims about achieving AGI may be overly optimistic or just oversold. These concerns are highlighted by the many letters of scientists against the use of AI in military applications^{26,27} and the proclamations on ethical use of AI in the world^{12,30,35}.

While potential AI disaster scenarios are many^{3,28,34}, the uncertainties in accurately predicting these risks and outcomes are high⁴. As insufficient data is available, the essential approach

25 to clearly grasp what can be expected is to create models, i.e. dynamic descriptions of the
26 key features (of parts thereof) of this race in order to understand what outcomes are possible
27 under certain conditions and what crucial factors play an essential role. The Future of Life In-
28 stitute (FLI) as well as other similar institutes have therefore launched open calls for projects
29 to foster research on the topic of AI safety and the exploration of the AI race dynamics we are
30 currently witnessing. This manuscript provides a baseline model established within one of the
31 FLI awarded projects in 2018, discussing under what conditions unsafe versus safe AI develop-
32 ments may lead to disastrous outcomes, in races involving two or many more participants. This
33 baseline model resorts to the framework of evolutionary game theory^{19,31} to study the dynamics
34 and emergent behaviours within an AI development race.

35 Concretely, the model assumes that in order to achieve AI supremacy (AIS) in a domain X , a
36 number of development steps or rounds (W) are required. Distinct values of W capture different
37 regimes of AIS: in the limit of small W , AIS can be expected to happen in the near future (*near*
38 *AIS regime*) while when W is large, AIS will only be achieved far away in time (*distant AIS*
39 *regime*). Large-scale surveys and analysis of AI experts on their beliefs and predictions about
40 progress in AI suggest that the perceived timeline for AIS is highly diverse across domains and
41 regions^{4,16}. Because this is a race, each participant acts by herself during each step in order to
42 reach the target and differs in the speed (s) with which they can complete each of the subtasks
43 at each round. A fast participant will, therefore, reap benefits (b) at each step, winning the
44 ultimate prize (B) once it carries out the final step achieving AIS in the domain X . If multiple
45 participants reach the end of intermediate steps or the final target at the same time they share the
46 benefits b and B . Yet, one can also assume that higher s also implies that some ethical/safety
47 procedures might be ignored. It takes time and effort to comply to precautionary requirements
48 or acquire ethical approvals. Following a safe development process is thus not only more costly
49 (c), it also results in a slower development speed. One can therefore consider that participants in

50 the AI race that act safely (SAFE) pay a cost $c > 0$, which is not paid by participants that ignore
 51 ethical/safety procedures (UNSAFE) and ii) the speed of development of UNSAFE participants
 52 is faster ($s > 1$), compared to the speed of SAFE participants being normalised to $s = 1$. So
 53 essentially a SAFE player needs W rounds to complete the task, whereas an UNSAFE player
 54 will only need W/s . Yet, UNSAFE strategists may suffer a disaster, which is assumed here to
 55 increase with the number of times the safety requirements have been skirted. The probability
 56 that disaster occurs is denoted by p_r and assumed to increase linearly with the frequency the
 57 participant violates the safety precautions. For example, if a participant always plays SAFE
 58 then $p_r = 0$, while the participant that only follows it half of the time has a total probability
 59 of $p_r/2$ over all rounds. Moreover, if some sort of institutional or peer monitoring comes into
 60 place, we assume that with some probability p_{fo} those playing UNSAFE might be found out and
 61 disclosed concerning their unsafe development and their products will therefore not be used,
 62 leading to 0 benefit for the current round.

63 Let us consider a population of size Z in which players engage in a pairwise or N-player
 64 race, where they can choose to consistently follow safety precautions (denoted by **AS**, the SAFE
 65 players) or completely ignore them (denoted by **AU**, the UNSAFE players). Additionally, we
 66 assume that, upon realising that UNSAFE players ignore safety precautions to gain a greater
 67 development speed leading to the winning of the prize B (and a larger share of the intermediate
 68 benefit in each round, b , especially in the regime of hard monitoring or low p_{fo}), SAFE players
 69 might adopt the same course of actions to avoid further disadvantage. It is indeed observed
 70 that competing countries or companies might engage in such a safety-cutting corner behaviour
 71 in deploying unsafe AI to avoid falling behind². We therefore consider, in line with previous
 72 literature of repeated games^{5,31}, an alternative strategy (denoted by **CS**, the conditionally safe
 73 strategy), which plays SAFE in the first round and then adopts the move its co-player used
 74 in the previous round. This so-called direct reciprocity strategy has been shown to promote

75 cooperation in the context of repeated social dilemmas, outperforming consistently defective
 76 individuals^{5,31}. In the following, we will examine, across different regimes of the AIS, under
 77 which conditions (for instance, regarding the disaster probability), safety behaviour should to
 78 be promoted or externally enforced. Similarly, we shall address when one should omit the
 79 safety precautions for a larger social welfare and when the benefits gained in doing so exceeds
 80 the disaster risk. Moreover, given the first-mover advantage of UNSAFE players in the race
 81 to AI supremacy (i.e., acquire B), we will examine whether (and under what regime of the
 82 AIS) conditional behaviours can still act as a promoting mechanism to achieve safety when
 83 required, or otherwise other mechanisms are needed. For the sake of presentation, we start by
 84 describing the pairwise race model and go on to describe the general N -player ($N \geq 2$) race
 85 results afterwards.

86 **2 Results**

87 We calculate the long-term frequency of each possible behavioural composition of the popula-
 88 tion, the so-called stationary distribution (cf. Methods). The stochastic evolutionary dynamics
 89 of the population occurs in the presence of errors, both in terms of errors of imitation and of be-
 90 havioural mutations, the latter representing an open exploration of the possible strategies^{19,31}.
 91 Figure 1 shows the frequencies of the three strategies AS, AU and CS across a spectrum of
 92 regimes of AIS: i) near AIS: in this regime, AIS will be achieved after a limited number of
 93 development steps, making the ultimate prize of winning the race B highly significant (i.e.
 94 $B/W \gg b$); ii) distant AIS (very large W): in this regime, AIS will not be achieved in a
 95 foreseeable future, making the ultimate prize of winning the race B insignificant compared to
 96 the cost and benefit at each step of the race (i.e. $B/W \ll b, c$). We observe that in the near
 97 AIS regime, AU dominates the population whenever the probability that an AI disaster occurs




Figure 1. Different regimes of AIS: when W is small (near AIS) vs when W is large (distant AIS). Panels (a) and (b) show the frequency of each strategy in a population of AS, AU and CS ($p_r = 0.75$). In the near AIS regime, AU dominates the population, while AS and CS outperform AU in the distant AIS regime. This observation is valid for sufficiently small p_r , see panel (c) ($p_{fo} = 0.1$). For a high risk probability of disaster occurring due to ignoring safety precautions (high p_r), AU has a low frequency in both regimes. Parameters: $c = 1$, $b = 4$, $W = 100$, $B = 10000$, $\beta = 0.01$, population size, $Z = 100$.

98 due to unsafe development (p_r) is not too high (Figure 1c; in panels a and b, $p_r = 0.75$). In
 99 the distant AI regime, all strategies are present in the population, where AS and CS are slightly
 100 more frequent (Figure 1a-b). When an AI disaster is more likely to occur due to unsafe devel-
 101 opments (i.e. large p_r , see Figure 1c), AU has a low frequency in both regimes. Moreover, AU
 102 frequency increases much more dramatically from high risk to low risk in the near AIS regime,
 103 compared to the distant AIS one (also see SI Figure 9 for other values of p_{fo}). It implies that
 104 more efforts and care are needed in the near AIS regime, since that can dramatically change the
 105 safety outcome of the race. Below we elaborate on each regime of AIS in greater detail.

106 **Near AIS regime: speedy development overcomes the risk**

107 First of all, we describe the conditions under which a population of individuals closely fol-
 108 lowing safety precautions actually has a greater social welfare or average payoff than that of a

109 population of players never following safety precautions, that is, when $\Pi_{AS,AS} > \Pi_{AU,AU}$. In
 110 the near AIS regime, it is equivalent to (see SI for the proof)

$$p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{s}. \quad (1)$$

111 That is, when the risk probability of AI disaster occurring due to the omission of safety precau-
 112 tions is large enough compared to the gain of a greater development speed by doing so, safety
 113 development is the preferred collective outcome for the population. On the other hand, when
 114 this risk is shallow compared to the gain of omitting safety precautions, UNSAFE is the more
 115 beneficial collective outcome. It would be detrimental however, to prevent this outcome from
 116 emerging (i.e. over-regulation of AI development).

117 On the other hand, we found that both the safety complying strategies, AS and CS, are
 118 preferred over AU by natural selection (i.e. see risk-dominance analysis in SI) when

$$p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{3s}. \quad (2)$$

119 Thus, the two boundary conditions in Equations 1 and 2 divide the parameter space s - p_r into
 120 three regions, see Figure 2a: **(I)** when $p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{3s}$: safety development is both the preferred
 121 collective outcome and selected by evolution (see Figure 2b for an example: for $s = 1.5$ the
 122 condition becomes $p_r > 0.78$); **(II)** when $1 - \frac{1}{3s} > p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{s}$: although it is more desirable
 123 to ensure safety development as the collective outcome, natural selection/social learning would
 124 nevertheless drive the population to the state where safety precaution is mostly ignored (see
 125 Figure 2c for an example: for $s = 1.5$ the condition becomes $0.78 > p_r > 0.33$); **(III)** when
 126 $p_r < 1 - \frac{1}{s}$, unsafe development is both the preferred collective outcome and the one selected
 127 by evolution. Numerical results (cf. Methods below) in Figure 2 confirm this division of the
 128 regions. In SI, we show that these observations are also robust for other intensities of selection,




Figure 2. Near AIG regime. (a) Frequency of AU as a function of the speed gained, s , and the probability of AI disaster occurring, p_r , when ignoring safety. In general, we observe that when the risk probability is small, AU is dominant. The larger s is, AU dominates for a larger range. Region (II): The two solid lines inside the plots indicate the boundaries $p_r \in [1 - 1/s, 1 - 1/(3s)]$ where safety development is the preferred collective outcome but unsafe development is selected by evolution. Regions (I) and (III) indicate where safe (resp., unsafe) development is both the preferred collective outcome and the one selected by evolution. Panels (b) ($p_r = 0.9$) and (c) ($p_r = 0.75$): transition probabilities and stationary distribution in a population of AS, AU, and CS, with $s = 1.5$. AU dominates in panel (c), corresponding to region (II), while AS and CS dominate in panel (b), corresponding to region (I). We only show the stronger directions. Parameters: $c = 1$, $b = 4$, $W = 100$, $p_{fo} = 0.5$, $B = 10000$, $\beta = 0.01$, population size, $Z = 100$.

129 see Figure 7.

130 In regions **(I)** and **(III)**, the preferred collective outcomes are selected by evolution. In the
131 latter, a significant speed gained by unsafe development actually compensates for the risk due
132 to ignoring safety precautions: taking risks (AI innovation) is better off because of high gain.
133 Region **(II)** is the most important one to study as additional mechanisms are needed to promote
134 safety behaviour against the unsafe one.

135 Note that the boundaries established in Equations 1 and 2 are applicable for both CS and AS
136 when playing against AU. Thus, similar results are obtained if we consider a population of just
137 two strategies AS and AU (see SI, Figure 8). Adding CS does not change the overall outcome
138 and conditions for safety development to be selected.

139 In short, we have seen that in the near AIS regime, conditionally safe behaviours cannot
140 overcome the speedy development advantage gained by completely ignoring the safety precau-
141 tions. This points to the fact that external interference such as institution incentives need to be
142 established, in order to effectively regulate safety behaviour in this regime. Moreover, sufficient
143 care needs to be put in place to avoid over-regulation preventing a beneficial extra-speedy de-
144 velopment (in region **(III)**). It is noteworthy that our this result is robust when we consider the
145 AI race with among N teams (for all $N \geq 2$, see SI). The main difference when increasing the
146 group size is that the upper bound of region **(II)** would increase. That is, unsafe behaviour is
147 selected by natural selection for a larger range of the parameter space $s-p_r$. The reason is, the
148 larger the group size, the greater the chance that there is at least one AU player in the group
149 (with other AS and CS players), who would then win the development race.




Figure 3. Distant AIS regime. (a) Frequency of AU as a function of the probability of unsafe development being found out, p_{fo} , and the probability of AI disaster occurring p_r , when the number of development steps to reach AIS is very large ($W = 10^6$). AU has a low frequency whenever p_{fo} or p_r are sufficiently high. (b-c): transition probabilities and stationary distribution ($p_r = 0.75$). Against AU, AS performs better than CS when p_{fo} is large, which is reversed when p_{fo} is small. Parameters: $c = 1$, $b = 4$, $s = 1.5$, $B = 10000$, $\beta = 0.01$, population size, $Z = 100$.

150 **Distant AIS regime: conditional behaviour prevails even under weak mon-**
 151 **itoring**

152 When AIS is unachievable in the short term, the effect of increasing p_r (from low to high risk)
 153 on the frequency of safe and unsafe behaviours is less dramatic than in the near AIS regime,
 154 see Figure 3. In general, all strategies are present, where the frequency of AU decreases as a
 155 function of p_{fo} and p_r . In contrast to the near AIS regime, the conditionally safe strategy, CS,
 156 contributes significantly to enhancing the safety behaviour outcome. Indeed, CS outperforms
 157 AS when the probability of uncovering an unsafe development in each round p_{fo} is small (which
 158 is reversed for larger p_{fo}) (see Figure 1a-b; see also SI Figure 6). That is, when monitoring
 159 of unsafe development is highly efficient (i.e. large p_{fo}), it is best to follow closely the safety
 160 precautions to avoid AI disaster by all means, even when facing unsafe opponents. However,
 161 when this monitoring is not efficient, acting conditionally provides the more efficient solution to

162 prevent unsafe behaviour as it can avoid being disadvantageous after the first round. These ob-
 163 servations can also be studied analytically (see SI). Namely, we derive conditions under which
 164 AS and CS are selected over AU by natural selection, as well as when safety behaviour is the
 165 preferred collective outcome than the unsafe one (see SI, Figure 4). For a greater efficiency of
 166 monitoring (the larger p_{fo}) or a lower speed gained by omitting safety precaution (the smaller
 167 s), we show that a lower threshold for the disaster risk p_r is required for those conditions to
 168 hold. Moreover, this threshold for AS is higher than that for CS when p_{fo} is small, which is
 169 reversed when it is large. As shown in the SI, all these observations remain valid if, instead of
 170 pairwise interactions, we consider a general N -team AI race.

171 **3 Discussion**

172 Our results suggest that it is significantly more challenging to achieve safety behaviour in the
 173 regime where AI supremacy is achievable within a limited number of development steps (near
 174 AIS) than when it is only feasible at a distant future (distant AIS). In the former regime, the
 175 extra development speed gained by ignoring safety precautions gives the unsafe players the
 176 first-mover advantage that could not be overcome by a conditionally safe strategy (CS). To
 177 the contrary, in the latter regime, such a conditional strategy provides an efficient pathway to
 178 achieve safety behavior, especially when the monitoring of unsafe development is difficult.

179 Our results thus point out that it is essential to provide in the near AIS regime the necessary
 180 supporting mechanisms (such as suitable rewards and sanctions)^{17,34} to control the speed of
 181 AI development of rogue teams, in order to drive the AI development dynamics towards more
 182 beneficial directions and outcomes. Without such mechanisms, the unconditional unsafe players
 183 (AU) would always win the race against any other strategies that play SAFE at any development
 184 round (such as CS players in our analysis, which only does so only in the first round), achieving

185 a significant payoff advantage. On the other hand, in the distant AIS regime, because reciprocal
186 behaviour by itself is sufficient to ensure high levels of beneficial safe behaviour, less effort
187 would be needed to ensure sustainable AI systems. This observation is in line with the response
188 to the risk of AGI by many researchers that 'no action needed' because AGI development will
189 take a long time or will not be possible at all^{8,13} (see also a survey of responses in ref.³⁴).

190 Moreover, our results imply that by advertising that AGI is about to arrive might lead to an
191 acceleration of the AI race, and to a decrease of safety precautions. In other words, our results
192 thus support the argument that the rhetoric and framing of the AI development race and how
193 close it is to achieve the AGI might strongly influence the dynamics and outcome of the AI
194 race^{6,11}.

195 In the current models we assume that an AI disaster might occur only when a true AI or AGI
196 has been achieved, i.e. after the W development steps have been completed. However, it might
197 be the case that some smaller scaled disasters might occur before that milestone, especially
198 when it is not clear whether and when AGI will or has been achieved, and there might even
199 be false beliefs regarding its presence. What is more, parties may release over simplistic AI but
200 deliberately advertise more than it can achieve, thereby leading to unforeseen usage disasters.
201 We will analyse these scenarios in future works.

202 Last but not least, it is noteworthy that despite focusing on AI development race in this
203 paper, our results are generally applicable to any kind of racing situations such as technological
204 innovation problems where there is a significant advantage to be achieved when reaching a
205 target first.

206 4 Methods

207 **AI race model definition.** The AI development race is modeled as a repeated two-player
 208 game, consisting of W development rounds. In each round, the players can collect benefits from
 209 their intermediate AI products, depending on whether they choose to play SAFE or UNSAFE.
 210 Assuming a fixed benefit, b , from the AI market, teams will share this benefit proportionally
 211 to their development speed. Moreover, we assume that with some probability p_{fo} those playing
 212 UNSAFE might be found out about their unsafe development and their products won't be used,
 213 leading to 0 benefit. Thus, in each round of the race, we can write the payoff matrix as follows
 214 (with respect to the row player)

$$\pi = \begin{array}{cc} & \begin{array}{c} \text{SAFE} \\ \text{UNSAFE} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{SAFE} \\ \text{UNSAFE} \end{array} & \begin{pmatrix} -c + \frac{b}{2} & -c + (1 - p_{fo})\frac{b}{s+1} + p_{fo}b \\ (1 - p_{fo})\frac{sb}{s+1} & (1 - p_{fo}^2)\frac{b}{2} \end{pmatrix} \end{array}. \quad (3)$$

215 For instance, when two SAFE players interact, each needs to pay the cost c and they share the
 216 benefit b . When a SAFE player interacts with an UNSAFE one the SAFE player pays a cost c
 217 and obtains the full benefit b in case the UNSAFE co-player is found out (with probability p_{fo}),
 218 and obtains a small part of the benefit $b/(s+1)$ otherwise (i.e. with probability $1 - p_{fo}$). When
 219 playing with a SAFE player, the UNSAFE does not have to pay any cost and obtains a larger
 220 share $bs/(s+1)$ when not found out. Finally, when an UNSAFE player interacts with another
 221 UNSAFE, it obtains the shared benefit $b/2$ when both are not found out and the full benefit b
 222 when it is not found out while the co-player is found out, and 0 otherwise. The payoff is thus:
 223 $(1 - p_{fo}) [(1 - p_{fo})(b/2) + p_{fo}b] = (1 - p_{fo}^2)\frac{b}{2}$. The payoff matrix defining averaged payoffs

224 for the three strategies reads

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \Pi = \begin{array}{ccc}
 & AS & AU & CS \\
 AS & \left(\begin{array}{c} \frac{B}{2W} + \pi_{11} \\ (1 - p_r) \left(\frac{sB}{W} + \pi_{21} \right) \\ \frac{B}{2W} + \pi_{11} \end{array} \right. & \begin{array}{c} \pi_{12} \\ (1 - p_r) \left(\frac{sB}{2W} + \pi_{22} \right) \\ \frac{s}{W} \left(\pi_{12} + \left(\frac{W}{s} - 1 \right) \pi_{22} \right) \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \frac{B}{2W} + \pi_{11} \\ (1 - p_r) \left[\frac{sB}{W} + \frac{s}{W} \left(\pi_{21} + \left(\frac{W}{s} - 1 \right) \pi_{22} \right) \right] \\ \frac{B}{2W} + \pi_{11} \end{array} \\
 AU & & & \\
 CS & & &
 \end{array}
 \end{array}
 \right). \tag{4}
 \end{array}$$

225

226 **Evolutionary Dynamics in Finite Populations.** We adopt here Evolutionary Game The-
 227 ory (EGT) methods for finite populations to derive analytical results and numerical observa-
 228 tions^{20,23,24}. In a repeated games, players' average payoff over all the game rounds (see the
 229 payoff matrix in Equation 4) represents their *fitness* or social *success*, and evolutionary dy-
 230 namics is shaped by social learning^{19,31}, whereby the most successful players will tend to be
 231 imitated more often by the other players. In the current work, social learning is modeled us-
 232 ing the so-called pairwise comparison rule³⁷, assuming that a player A with fitness f_A adopts
 233 the strategy of another player B with fitness f_B with probability given by the Fermi function,
 234 $(1 + e^{-\beta(f_B - f_A)})^{-1}$, where β conveniently describes the selection intensity ($\beta = 0$ represents
 235 neutral drift while $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ represents increasingly deterministic selection). For convenience of
 236 numerical computations, but without affecting analytical results, we assume here small muta-
 237 tion limit^{14,20,24}. As such, at most two strategies are present in the population simultaneously,
 238 and the behavioural dynamics can thus be described by a Markov Chain, where each state rep-
 239 represents a homogeneous population and the transition probabilities between any two states are
 240 given by the fixation probability of a single mutant^{14,20,24}. The resulting Markov Chain has a
 241 stationary distribution, which describes the average time the population spends in an end state.
 242 In two-player game, the average payoffs in a population of k A players and $(Z - k)$ B players

243 can be given as below (recall that Z is the population size), respectively,

$$P_A(k) = \frac{(k-1)\Pi_{A,A} + (Z-k)\Pi_{A,B}}{Z-1}, \quad P_B(k) = \frac{k\Pi_{B,A} + (Z-k-1)\Pi_{B,B}}{Z-1}. \quad (5)$$

244 The fixation probability that a single mutant A taking over a whole population with $(Z-1)$ B
245 players is as follows^{22,24,37}

$$\rho_{B,A} = \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{Z-1} \prod_{j=1}^i \frac{T^-(j)}{T^+(j)} \right)^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

246 where $T^\pm(k) = \frac{Z-k}{Z} \frac{k}{Z} [1 + e^{\mp\beta[P_A(k)-P_B(k)]}]^{-1}$ describes the probability to change the number
247 of A players by \pm one in a time step. Specifically, when $\beta = 0$, $\rho_{B,A} = 1/Z$, representing the
248 transition probability at neural limit.

249 Having obtained the fixation probabilities between any two states of a Markov chain, we
250 can now describe its stationary distribution^{14,20}. Namely, considering a set of s strategies,
251 $\{1, \dots, s\}$, their stationary distribution is given by the normalised eigenvector associated with
252 the eigenvalue 1 of the transposed of a matrix $M = \{T_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^s$, where $T_{ij,j \neq i} = \rho_{ji}/(s-1)$ and
253 $T_{ii} = 1 - \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^s T_{ij}$.

254 **Risk-dominant conditions.** We can determine which selection direction is more probable: an
255 A mutant fixating in a homogeneous population of individuals playing B or a B mutant fixating
256 in a homogeneous population of individuals playing A. When the first is more likely than the
257 latter, A is said to be *risk-dominant* against B^{15,21,25}, which holds for any intensity of selection
258 and in the limit of large N when

$$\pi_{A,A} + \pi_{A,B} > \pi_{B,A} + \pi_{B,B}. \quad (7)$$

259 **5 Acknowledgements**

260 This work is supported by Future of Life Institute (grant RFP2-154). L. M. P. acknowledges
 261 support from FCT/MEC NOVA LINCS PEst UID/CEC/04516/2019. F. C. S. acknowledges
 262 support from FCT Portugal (grants PTDC/EEI-SII/5081/2014, PTDC/MAT/STA/3358/2014).

263 **References**

- 264 1. AI-Roadmap-Institute. Report from the ai race avoidance workshop, tokyo. 2017.
- 265 2. Peter Apps. Are China, Russia winning the AI arms race?, January 2019. [Reuters;
 266 Online posted 15-January-2019].
- 267 3. Stuart Armstrong, Nick Bostrom, and Carl Shulman. Racing to the precipice: a model
 268 of artificial intelligence development. *AI & society*, 31(2):201–206, 2016.
- 269 4. Stuart Armstrong, Kaj Sotala, and Seán S Ó hÉigartaigh. The errors, insights and
 270 lessons of famous ai predictions—and what they mean for the future. *Journal of Experi-*
 271 *mental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence*, 26(3):317–342, 2014.
- 272 5. Robert Axelrod. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. Basic Books, ISBN 0-465-02122-2,
 273 1984.
- 274 6. Seth D Baum. On the promotion of safe and socially beneficial artificial intelligence. *AI*
 275 *& SOCIETY*, 32(4):543–551, 2017.
- 276 7. Nick Bostrom. Strategic implications of openness in ai development. *Global Policy*,
 277 8(2):135–148, 2017.
- 278 8. Rodney Brooks. I, rodney brooks, am a robot. *IEEE Spectrum*, 45(6):68–71, 2008.

- 279 9. Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Superhuman ai for heads-up no-limit poker: Li-
280 bratus beats top professionals. *Science*, 359(6374):418–424, 2018.
- 281 10. Noam Brown and Tuomas Sandholm. Superhuman ai for multiplayer poker. *Science*,
282 page eaay2400, 2019.
- 283 11. Stephen Cave and Seán ÓhÉigeartaigh. An ai race for strategic advantage: Rhetoric
284 and risks. In *AAAI/ACM Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Ethics and Society*, pages
285 36–40, 2018.
- 286 12. Montreal Declaration. The montreal declaration for the responsible development of ar-
287 tificial intelligence launched. [https://www.canasean.com/the-montreal-declaration-for-](https://www.canasean.com/the-montreal-declaration-for-the-responsible-development-of-artificial-intelligence-launched/)
288 [the-responsible-development-of-artificial-intelligence-launched/](https://www.canasean.com/the-montreal-declaration-for-the-responsible-development-of-artificial-intelligence-launched/), 2018.
- 289 13. David Deutsch. *The beginning of infinity: Explanations that transform the world*. Pen-
290 guin UK, 2011.
- 291 14. D. Fudenberg and L. A. Imhof. Imitation processes with small mutations. *Journal of*
292 *Economic Theory*, 131:251–262, 2005.
- 293 15. Chaitanya S. Gokhale and Arne Traulsen. Evolutionary games in the multiverse. *Proc.*
294 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 107(12):5500–5504, March 2010.
- 295 16. Katja Grace, John Salvatier, Allan Dafoe, Baobao Zhang, and Owain Evans. When
296 will AI exceed human performance? Evidence from AI experts. *Journal of Artificial*
297 *Intelligence Research*, 62:729–754, 2018.
- 298 17. The Anh Han, Luís Moniz Pereira, and Tom Lenaerts. Modelling and Influencing the
299 AI Bidding War: A Research Agenda. In *AAAI/ACM conference AI, Ethics and Society*,
300 2019.

- 301 18. C. Hauert, A. Traulsen, H. Brandt, M. A. Nowak, and K. Sigmund. Via freedom to
302 coercion: The emergence of costly punishment. *Science*, 316:1905–1907, 2007.
- 303 19. J. Hofbauer and K. Sigmund. *Evolutionary Games and Population Dynamics*. Cam-
304 bridge University Press, 1998.
- 305 20. L. A. Imhof, D. Fudenberg, and Martin A. Nowak. Evolutionary cycles of cooperation
306 and defection. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 102:10797–10800, 2005.
- 307 21. M. Kandori, G. J. Mailath, and R. Rob. Learning, mutation, and long run equilibria in
308 games. *Econometrica*, 61:29–56, 1993.
- 309 22. S. Karlin and H. E. Taylor. *A First Course in Stochastic Processes*. Academic Press,
310 New York, 1975.
- 311 23. M. A. Nowak. *Evolutionary Dynamics: Exploring the Equations of Life*. Harvard Uni-
312 versity Press, Cambridge, MA, 2006.
- 313 24. M. A. Nowak, A. Sasaki, C. Taylor, and D. Fudenberg. Emergence of cooperation and
314 evolutionary stability in finite populations. *Nature*, 428:646–650, 2004.
- 315 25. Martin A. Nowak. Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 314(5805):1560,
316 2006.
- 317 26. Future of Life Institute. Autonomous Weapons: An Open Letter from AI & Robotics
318 Researchers. Technical report, Future of Life Institute, Cambridge, MA, 2015.
- 319 27. Future of Life Institute. Lethal autonomous weapons pledge.
320 <https://futureoflife.org/lethal-autonomous-weapons-pledge/>, 2019.

- 321 28. Dennis Pamlin and Stuart Armstrong. Global challenges: 12 risks that threaten human
322 civilization. *Global Challenges Foundation, Stockholm, 2015.*
- 323 29. PwC. Sizing the prize: What's the real value of ai for your business and how can you
324 capitalise? Technical report, PwC, London, United Kingdom, 2017.
- 325 30. Stuart Russell, S Hauert, R Altman, and M Veloso. Ethics of artificial intelligence.
326 *Nature*, 521(7553):415–416, 2015.
- 327 31. Karl Sigmund. *The Calculus of Selfishness*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- 328 32. David Silver, Thomas Hubert, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Matthew Lai,
329 Arthur Guez, Marc Lanctot, Laurent Sifre, Dhharshan Kumaran, Thore Graepel, et al.
330 A general reinforcement learning algorithm that masters chess, shogi, and go through
331 self-play. *Science*, 362(6419):1140–1144, 2018.
- 332 33. David Silver, Julian Schrittwieser, Karen Simonyan, Ioannis Antonoglou, Aja Huang,
333 Arthur Guez, Thomas Hubert, Lucas Baker, Matthew Lai, Adrian Bolton, et al. Master-
334 ing the game of go without human knowledge. *Nature*, 550(7676):354, 2017.
- 335 34. Kaj Sotala and Roman V Yampolskiy. Responses to catastrophic agi risk: a survey.
336 *Physica Scripta*, 90(1):018001, 2014.
- 337 35. Luc Steels and Ramon Lopez de Mantaras. The barcelona declaration for the proper
338 development and usage of artificial intelligence in europe. *AI Communications*,
339 (Preprint):1–10, 2018.
- 340 36. Mariarosaria Taddeo and Luciano Floridi. Regulate artificial intelligence to avert cyber
341 arms race. *Nature*, 556(7701):296–298, 2018.

- 342 37. A. Traulsen, M. A. Nowak, and J. M. Pacheco. Stochastic dynamics of invasion and
343 fixation. *Phys. Rev. E*, 74:11909, 2006.

344 6 Supporting Information (SI)

345 6.1 Analytical conditions for viability of safety behaviour

346 6.1.1 When safety behaviour is the preferred collective outcome

347 We derive analytical condition for which a population of players always following safety pre-
 348 cautions has a greater social welfare or average payoff than that of a population of players never
 349 following safety precautions, that is, $\Pi_{AS,AS} > \Pi_{AU,AU}$:

$$\frac{B}{2W} + \pi_{11} > (1 - p_r) \left(\frac{sB}{2W} + \pi_{21} \right). \quad (8)$$

350 Following the definitions of different AIS regimes in the main texts, we simplify this condition
 351 for the two regimes. First, in the **near AI regime** where $B/W \gg b$, Equation 8 is equivalent to

352

$$p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{s}. \quad (9)$$

353 Now, in the **distant AIS regime** where $W \rightarrow \infty$ (i.e. $B/W \ll c$), Equation 8 is equivalent to:

$$\pi_{11} > (1 - p_r)\pi_{21}. \quad (10)$$

354 which is equivalent to

$$p_{fo} > 1 - \frac{(b - 2c)(s + 1)}{2sb(1 - p_r)}. \quad (11)$$

355 or equivalently

$$p_r > 1 - \frac{(b - 2c)(s + 1)}{2sb(1 - p_{fo})}. \quad (12)$$

356 **6.1.2 When safety behaviour is selected by evolution**

357 We now derive conditions for which AS and CS are risk-dominant against AU, which are the
358 case if and only if, respectively,

$$\frac{B}{2W} + \pi_{11} + \pi_{12} > (1 - p_r) \left(\frac{3sB}{2W} + \pi_{21} + \pi_{22} \right). \quad (13)$$

359

$$\frac{s}{W} \left(\pi_{12} + \left(\frac{W}{s} - 1 \right) \pi_{22} \right) + \frac{B}{2W} + \pi_{11} > (1 - p_r) \left[\frac{sB}{2W} + \frac{sB}{W} + \frac{s}{W} \left(\pi_{21} + \left(\frac{W}{s} - 1 \right) \pi_{22} \right) + \pi_{22} \right]. \quad (14)$$

360 In the **near AI regime** where $B/W \gg b$, both equations are simplified to

$$p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{3s}. \quad (15)$$

361 On the other hand, in the **distant AIS regime** where $W \rightarrow \infty$ (i.e. $B/W \ll c$), they are
362 simplified to, respectively

$$\pi_{11} + \pi_{12} > (1 - p_r)(\pi_{21} + \pi_{22}). \quad (16)$$

363

$$\pi_{11} > (1 - 2p_r)\pi_{22}. \quad (17)$$

364 which are equivalent to, respectively

$$p_r > \frac{4c(1 + s) - b(2 + p_{fo}^2 + (-2 + p_{fo}(4 + p_{fo}))s)}{b(1 - p_{fo})(1 + p_{fo} + (3 + p_{fo})s)} \quad (18)$$

$$p_r > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{b - 2c}{2b(1 - p_{fo}^2)}. \quad (19)$$

365 Thus, for safety behaviour to be both selected and the preferred outcome, all the p_r must satisfy
 366 all the Eqs (19), (18) and (12).

It is clear to see that the left hand sides of Eqs (19) and (12) are decreasing functions of p_{fo} whenever $b \geq 2c$. We now show that it is also the case for the left hand side of Eq 18. Indeed, its first order derivative by p_{fo} gives

$$-\frac{2(1+s) [b(4s + p_{fo}^2 s + p_{fo}(3+s)) - 4c(p_{fo} + s + p_{fo}s)]}{b(1-p_{fo})^2(1+p_{fo}+3s+p_{fo}s)^2}$$

which is negative whenever $b \geq 2c$ because

$$(4s + p_{fo}^2 s + p_{fo}(3+s)) - 2(p_{fo} + s + p_{fo}s) = 2s + p_{fo}^2 s + p - p_{fo}s > 0$$

367 In short, we have shown that for $b \geq c$, the larger p_{fo} the easier the conditions for the safety
 368 behaviour to be both selected and the preferred outcome. Figure 4 validates these observations
 369 numerically. Similarly, we also can show that these conditions are harder to achieve the larger
 370 s is.

371 Thus, the hardest conditions are obtained when $p_{fo} = 0$, which is equivalent to

$$p_r > \max\left\{1 - \frac{(b-2c)(s+1)}{2sb}, \frac{4c(s+1) + 2b(s-1)}{b(1+3s)}, \frac{c}{b}\right\}. \quad (20)$$

372 It is easily seen that the right hand side is greater than 1 iff $b < 2c$, i.e. this condition would
 373 not be achieved (since $p_r \leq 1$) in that case. Assuming $b \geq 2c$, since $\frac{4c(s+1) + 2b(s-1)}{b(1+3s)} > 1 -$




Figure 4. Distant AIS regime ($W = 10^6$). The lines (panel a) and curves (panel c) indicate the conditions above which safety behavior is the preferred collective outcome (black ones) and when AS and CS are risk-dominant against AU (green and blue ones, respectively). The threshold for AS is greater than that for CS when p_{fo} is small, which is reversed when p_{fo} is large. (b-d) Frequency of AU as a function of p_r and p_{fo} (panel b; $s = 1.5$) or s (panel d; $p_{fo} = 0$), respectively. Parameters: $c = 1$, $b = 4$, $B = 10000$, $\beta = 0.01$, population size, $Z = 100$.




Figure 5. Distant AGI regime. Frequency of AU when there is no monitoring ($p_{fo} = 0$), for varying p_r and s , for $\beta = 0.01$ (left panel) and $\beta = 0.1$ (right panel). The solid lines indicate the conditions for varying p_{fo} , so that if p_r is above the lines safety behavior is the preferred collective outcome (black line), AS and CS are risk-dominant against AU (green and blue lines, respectively). When there is no monitoring or weak monitoring, CS is more efficient than AS in dealing with AU (green line is always below blue line). Parameters: $c = 1$, $b = 4$, $B = 10000$, $W = 10^6$, population size, $Z = 100$.




Figure 6. Distant AIS regime. Frequency of AU, AS and CS as a function of the probability of unsafe development being found out, p_{fo} , and the probability of AI disaster occurring p_r , when the number of development steps to reach AIS is very large ($W = 10^6$). AU has a low frequency whenever p_{fo} or p_r are sufficiently high. AS performs best when p_{fo} is large. Parameters: $c = 1$, $b = 4$, $s = 1.5$, $B = 10000$, $\beta = 0.01$, population size, $Z = 100$.

374 $\frac{(b-2c)(s+1)}{2sb} > \frac{c}{b}$, it can be further simplified to

$$p_r > \frac{4c(s+1) + 2b(s-1)}{b(1+3s)} \quad (21)$$

375 which is the condition for AS to be risk-dominant against AU (see Figure 4 for an example
376 when $s = 1.5$).




Figure 7. Frequency of AU in a population of three strategies, AS, AU, and CS, as a function of the speed gained when ignoring safety, s , and the risk probability p_r . In general, we observe that when the risk probability is small, AU is dominant. Also, the larger B and s , AU dominates for a larger range. The two solid lines inside the plots indicate the boundaries $p_r \in [1 - 1/(3s), 1 - 1/s]$ where safety development is preferred but non-safety development is preferable (risk-dominant against CS and AS). The observations are valid for varying the selection intensities: $\beta = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1$ for panels (a), (b) and (c), respectively. Other parameters: $c = 1, b = 4, W = 100, p_{fo} = 0.5, B = 10000$, population size, $Z = 100$.

377 6.2 Multiplayer AI race

378 In this section we describe the N-team model of the AI race, extending the two-team model in
 379 the main text. We then describe the Methods used for analysing multi-player games.

380 6.2.1 N-player AI Race definition

381 The AI development race is modeled as a repeated N -player game, consisting of W develop-
 382 ment rounds. In each round, the players can collect benefits from their intermediate AI products,
 383 depending on whether they choose to play SAFE or UNSAFE. Assuming a fixed benefit, b , from
 384 the AI market, teams will share this benefit proportionally to their development speed. More-
 385 over, we assume that with some probability p_{fo} those playing UNSAFE might be found out




Figure 8. Frequency of AU in a population of two strategies, AS and AU, as a function of the speed gained when ignoring safety, s , and the risk probability p_r . In general, we observe that when the risk probability is small, AU is dominant. Also, the larger B and s , AU dominates for a larger range. The two solid lines inside the plots indicate the boundaries $p_r \in [1 - 1/(3s), 1 - 1/s]$ where safety development is preferred but non-safety development is preferable (risk-dominant against CS and AS). The observations are valid for varying the selection intensities: $\beta = 0.001, 0.01, 0.1$ for panels (a), (b) and (c), respectively. Other parameters: $c = 1, b = 4, W = 100, p_{fo} = 0.5, B = 10000$, population size, $Z = 100$.




Figure 9. Different regimes of AIS: when W is small (near AIS) vs when W is large (distant AIS). Frequency of AU for different p_{fo} . Parameters: $c = 1, b = 4, W = 100, B = 10000, \beta = 0.01$, population size, $Z = 100$.

386 ¹about their unsafe development and their products won't be used, leading to 0 benefit.

387 In a group of where k players choosing SAFE and $(N - k)$ choosing UNSAFE, the payoffs
 388 for players adopting SAFE and UNSAFE in each round of the race are, respectively

$$\pi(k)_{SAFE} = \begin{cases} -c + (1 - p_{fo})\frac{b}{k+s(N-k)} + p_{fo}\frac{b}{k} & \text{if } 1 \leq k < N \\ c + \frac{b}{N} & \text{if } k = N \end{cases}$$

$$\pi(k)_{UNSAFE} = (1 - p_{fo})\frac{sb}{k + s(N - k)} \text{ for } 0 \leq k < N$$

389 We consider a well-mixed, finite population of size Z , where players repeatedly interact
 390 with each other in the AI development process, using one of the following three strategies :

- 391 • AS (always complies with safety precaution)
- 392 • AU (never complies with safety precaution)
- 393 • CS (conditionally safe, plays SAFE in the first round; then plays SAFE if everyone in the
 394 group plays SAFE in the previous round and plays UNSAFE otherwise)

395 The average payoffs for the repeated games (k denotes the number of AS or CS when playing
 396 with AU)

$$\Pi_{AS,AU}(k) = \begin{cases} \pi(k)_{SAFE} & \text{if } 1 \leq k < N \\ \frac{B}{NW} + \pi(k)_{SAFE} & \text{if } k = N \end{cases}$$

$$\Pi_{AU,AS}(k) = p \left(\frac{sB}{W(N - k)} + \pi(k)_{UNSAFE} \right) \text{ for } 0 \leq k < N$$

¹For simplicity of calculation, we assume that all the UNSAFE players will be found out or not together, e.g. whenever investigation is done then they are found out; otherwise they are not.




Figure 10. Different regimes of AGI: near AI (small W) vs distant AGI (large W). Frequency of AS, AU and CS in a population of the three strategies in co-presence. Other parameters: $c = 1$, $b = 4$, $W = 100$, $s = 1.5$, $p_r = 0.75$, $B = 10000$, $N = 5$, $Z = 100$, $\beta = 0.1$.

$$\Pi_{CS,AU}(k) = \begin{cases} \frac{s}{W} \left(\pi(k)_{SAFE} + \left(\frac{W}{s} - 1 \right) \pi(0)_{UNSAFE} \right) & \text{if } 1 \leq k < N \\ \frac{B}{NW} + \pi(k)_{SAFE} & \text{if } k = N \end{cases}$$

$$\Pi_{AU,CS}(k) = p \left[\frac{sB}{W(N-k)} + \frac{s}{W} \left(\pi(k)_{UNSAFE} + \left(\frac{W}{s} - 1 \right) \pi(0)_{UNSAFE} \right) \right] \text{ for } 0 \leq k < N$$

397 6.2.2 Evolutionary dynamics for different AIS regimes in multiplayer game

398 In Figures 11 and 10 we show that the results for multi-player games are qualitatively the same
399 as in two-player game, across different regimes of AIS (i.e. varying W).

400 6.2.3 Near AIS regime: multiplayer games conditions

Condition for $\Pi_{AS,AU}(N) > \Pi_{AU,AU}(0)$, ensuring that a population of players always following safety precautions has a greater social welfare or average payoff than that of a population of




Figure 11. Different regimes of AGI: near AI (small W) vs distant AGI (large W). Frequency AU in a population of the three strategies AS, AU and CS in co-presence, as a function of p_r and W . Other parameters: $c = 1$, $b = 4$, $W = 100$, $s = 1.5$, $p_r = 0.75$, $B = 10000$, $N = 5$, $Z = 100$, $\beta = 0.1$.

players never following safety precautions:

$$\frac{B}{NW} + \pi(N)_{SAFE} > (1 - p_r) \left(\frac{sB}{NW} + \pi(0)_{UNSAFE} \right).$$

401 Assuming that $B \gg b$, it is equivalent to:

$$p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{s}. \quad (22)$$

402 On the other hand, AS is risk-dominant against both AU iff

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \pi(k)_{AU,AS} < \sum_{k=1}^N \pi(k)_{AS,AU} \quad (23)$$

403 For $B \gg b$, it is equivalent to

$$p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{(NH_N)s}. \quad (24)$$

404 where $H_N = \sum_{i=1}^N 1/i$. The same condition is obtained for CS to be risk-dominant against AU.

405 Thus, the two boundary conditions in Equations 22 and 24 divide the parameter space s - p_r
 406 into three regions, see Figure 12a: **(I)** when $p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{(NH_N)s}$: safety development is both
 407 the preferred collective outcome and selected by evolution (see Figure 12b for an example: for
 408 $s = 1.5$ the condition becomes $p_r > 0.94$); **(II)** when $1 - \frac{1}{(NH_N)s} > p_r > 1 - \frac{1}{s}$: although it is
 409 more desirable to ensure safety development as the collective outcome, natural selection/social
 410 learning would drive the population to the state where safety precaution is mostly ignored (see
 411 Figure 12c for an example: for $s = 1.5$ the condition becomes $0.94 > p_r > 0.33$); **(III)**
 412 when $p_r < 1 - \frac{1}{s}$, unsafe development is both the preferred collective outcome and selected
 413 by evolution. Numerical results (cf. Methods below) in Figure 12 confirm this division of the
 414 regions.




Figure 12. Dotted lines indicate the condition in Equation 24 for different values of group size N . The solid black line indicates the condition in 22. The larger N the larger the region II and smaller the region I. In panels (b), (c): $N = 5$. Other parameters: $c = 1, b = 4, W = 100, s = 1.5, p_{fo} = 0.5, B = 10000, Z = 100$.




Figure 13. Frequency of AU as a function of the speed gained, s , and the probability of AI disaster occurring p_r , when ignoring safety. Other parameters: $c = 1, b = 4, W = 100, s = 1.5, p_{fo} = 0.5, B = 10000, Z = 100$.

415 We observed that, the larger s is, the greater the threshold for p_r . Moreover, a larger group
 416 size leads to a larger region (II) – AU is selected for a larger range of the parameter space s - p_r .
 417 The reason is that, the larger the group size, the greater the chance that there is at least one AU
 418 player in the group (with other AS/CS players), who would win the development race.

419 6.2.4 Methods: Payoffs over group samplings

In finite populations, the groups engaging in a N -player game are given by multivariate hypergeometric sampling. For transition between two pure states (small mutation), this reduces to sampling (without replacement) from a hypergeometric distribution^{18,31}. Namely, in a population of size Z with x individuals of type i and $Z - x$ individuals of type j , the probability to select k individuals of type i and $N - k$ individuals of type j in N trials is¹⁸

$$H(k, N, x, Z) = \frac{\binom{x}{k} \binom{Z-x}{N-k}}{\binom{Z}{N}}.$$

420 Recall that $\Pi_{ij}(k)$ and $\Pi_{ji}(k)$ (see the section above) denote the payoff of a strategist of type i
 421 and j , respectively, when the random sampling consists of k players of type i and $N - k$ players
 422 of type j (as derived above). Hence, in a population of x i -strategists and $(Z - x)$ j -strategists,

423 the average payoffs to i and j strategists are^{18,31}:

$$\begin{aligned}
 P_{ij}(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} H(k, N-1, x-1, Z-1) \Pi_{ij}(k+1) \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{\binom{x-1}{k} \binom{Z-x}{N-1-k}}{\binom{Z-1}{N-1}} \Pi_{ij}(k+1), \\
 P_{ji}(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} H(k, N-1, x, Z-1) \Pi_{ji}(k) \\
 &= \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{\binom{x}{k} \binom{Z-1-x}{N-1-k}}{\binom{Z-1}{N-1}} \Pi_{ji}(k).
 \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

424 Now, the probability to change the number k of agents using strategy i by ± 1 in each time step
 425 can be written as

$$T^{\pm}(k) = \frac{Z-k}{Z} \frac{k}{Z} [1 + e^{\mp\beta[P_{ij}(k) - P_{ji}(k)]}]^{-1}, \tag{26}$$

426 with T^+ corresponding to an increase from k to $k+1$ and T^- corresponding to the opposite.

427 Fixation probability and stationary distribution are calculated in the same way as in two-
 428 player games.

429 Risk-dominance condition

430 An important analytical criteria to determine the evolutionary viability of a given strategy is
 431 whether it is risk-dominant with respect to other strategies^{15,25}. Namely, one considers which
 432 selection direction is more probable: an i mutant fixating in a homogeneous population of
 433 agents playing j or a j mutant fixating in a homogeneous population of agents playing i . When
 434 the first is more likely than the latter, i is said to be *risk-dominant* against j ¹⁵, which holds for

435 any intensity of selection and in the limit of large population size Z when

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \Pi_{ij}(k) \geq \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \Pi_{ji}(k). \quad (27)$$