

Artificially Intelligent Foraging

Submitted by Daniel Chalk, to the University of Exeter as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Biosciences, December 2009.

This thesis is available for Library use on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

(signature)

Abstract

Bumble bees (*bombus spp.*) are significant pollinators of many plants, and are particularly attracted to mass-flowering crops such as Oilseed Rape (*Brassica Napus*), which they cross-pollinate. *B. napus* is both wind and insect-pollinated, and whilst it has been found that wind is its most significant pollen vector, the influence of bumble bee pollination could be non-trivial when bee densities are large. Therefore, the assessment of pollinator-mediated cross-pollination events could be important when considering containment strategies of genetically modified (GM) crops, such as GM varieties of *B. napus*, but requires a landscape-scale understanding of pollinator movements, which is currently unknown for bumble bees.

I developed an *in silico* model, entitled HARVEST, which simulates the foraging and consequential inter-patch movements of bumble bees. The model is based on principles from Reinforcement Learning and Individual Based Modelling, and uses a Linear Operator Learning Rule to guide agent learning. The model incorporates one or more agents, or bees, that learn by ‘trial-and-error’, with a gradual preference shown for patch choice actions that provide increased rewards.

To validate the model, I verified its ability to replicate certain iconic patterns of bee-mediated gene flow, and assessed its accuracy in predicting the flower visits and inter-patch movement frequencies of real bees in a small-scale system. The model successfully replicated the iconic patterns, but failed to accurately predict outputs from the real system. It did, however, qualitatively replicate the high levels of inter-patch traffic found in the real small-scale system, and its quantitative discrepancies could likely be explained by inaccurate parameterisations. I also found that HARVEST bees are extremely efficient foragers, which agrees with evidence of powerful learning capabilities and risk-aversion in real bumble bees.

When applying the model to the landscape-scale, HARVEST predicts that overall levels of bee-mediated gene flow are extremely low. Nonetheless, I identified an effective containment strategy in which a ‘shield’ comprised of sacrificed crops is placed between GM and conventional crop populations. This strategy could be useful for scenarios in which the tolerance for GM seed set is exceptionally low.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank both of my supervisors, Dr. James Cresswell and Prof. Richard Everson, for their unwavering support and guidance throughout the project, both on a professional and a personal level. I thank the BBSRC (Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council) for funding this project. I am grateful for the support of the university's Biosciences Glasshouse Technician, James Chidlow, for helping to set up the empirical studies I conducted, and to all of the students who assisted with the empirical observations (Abul Al-Azad, Timothy Paulden, Barry Evans, Rebecca Watson, David Hannaford and Ossama Elmenyawy). I would also like to acknowledge my late parents, who offered me an extraordinary amount of love and support when I was growing up, inspiring me to strive to succeed throughout my life; I dedicate this thesis in memory of them both.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
Table of Contents	4
List of Figures	9
List of Tables	13
List of Equations	14
List of Parameters	15
Definitions	16
Abbreviations	17
Chapter One : Bumble Bees – Landscape-Scale Foragers and Pollen Vectors	18
1.1 Foraging	18
1.1.1 Foraging behaviour	18
1.1.2 The influence of foraging behaviours in ecological systems	20
1.2 The study of animal behaviour	21
1.2.1 Studying animal behaviour empirically	21
1.2.2 Studying animal behaviour theoretically	22
1.3 A contemporary application : GM containment and bee-mediated cross-pollination in crops	25
1.3.1 Bees, foraging and pollination of plants	25
1.3.2 GM crops – cross-pollination and containment	27
1.3.3 How to determine the threat to GM containment posed by bee-mediated cross-pollination?	28
1.3.4 Predicting pollinator mediated gene flow theoretically : the E-Psi-b model	30
1.4 The assumption of optimality	32
1.4.1 An economics-based analysis of bumble bee movements	32
1.4.2 Optimal Foraging Theory	33
1.4.3 Possible criticisms of the assumption of optimality	34
1.4.4 The foraging ‘problem’ for bumble bees	37
1.5 Why we cannot use existing approaches	37
1.5.1 Why we cannot use the ‘Ideal Free Distribution’ theory	37
1.5.2 Why we cannot use the Marginal Value Theorem	38
1.5.3 Why we cannot use the Threshold Departure Rule (and other ‘rules of thumb’)	39
1.5.4 Why we cannot use Job Search theory	40
1.5.5 Why we cannot use HOOFS	41

1.6	Learning	42
1.6.1	Towards a learning-based approach	42
1.6.2	Learning and memory in bees	43
1.7	Existing learning approaches	44
1.7.1	Why we cannot use an existing learning-based IBM approach	44
1.7.2	Why we cannot use the Bayesian approach	45
1.7.3	A promising solution - Reinforcement Learning	46
1.8	Summary	48
Chapter Two : HARVEST – An AI Foraging Model		50
2.1	Introduction	50
2.2	Economically motivated foraging among patches	51
2.3	Reinforcement Learning	51
2.4	Formulating the first principles of bumble bee behaviour	52
2.5	HARVEST	54
2.5.1	Description of the model	54
2.5.2	Measuring foraging performance	63
2.5.3	Calculating bee-mediated gene flow	64
2.6	Validation of performance	65
2.7	A contemporaneous application of the RL approach by others	68
2.8	Summary	69
Chapter Three : Paper – A reinforcement learning solution to economically-motivated patch choice : application to landscape-scale bumble bee foraging		71
Chapter Four : Recreation of Iconic Patterns of Bee-Mediated Gene Flow by HARVEST		99
4.1	Introduction	99
4.2	Investigation (i):Patch scale optimisation of ‘Memory Parameter’, β	100
4.2.1	Introduction to Investigation (i)	100
4.2.2	Methods	101
4.2.3	Results	102
4.2.4	Discussion	103
4.3	Investigation (ii): Landscape-scale optimisation of the ‘Memory Parameter’, β	105
4.3.1	Methods	105
4.3.2	Results	107
4.3.3	Discussion	107
4.4	Investigation (iii): Iconic Pattern 1 : Increasing inter-patch distance decreases gene flow levels	108
4.4.1	Introduction to Investigation (iii)	108

4.4.2	Methods	111
4.4.2.1	Patch Classifications	111
4.4.2.2	The ‘Spatially-Explicit’ Landscape	111
4.4.2.3	Solving the E-Psi-b model	112
4.4.2.4	General Parameterisations (Consistent for all Experiments)	112
4.4.2.5	Experiment IP1.1	115
4.4.2.6	Experiment IP1.2	116
4.4.2.7	Experiment IP1.3	116
4.4.3	Results	118
4.4.3.1	Experiment IP1.1	118
4.4.3.2	Experiment IP1.2	120
4.4.3.3	Experiment IP1.3	122
4.5	Investigation (iv): Iconic Pattern 2 : Increasing sink patch size decreases gene flow levels	123
4.5.1	Introduction to Investigation (iv)	123
4.5.2	Methods	125
4.5.2.1	Experiment IP2.1	127
4.5.2.2	Experiment IP2.2	128
4.5.2.3	Experiment IP2.3	129
4.5.3	Results	130
4.5.3.1	Experiment IP2.1	130
4.5.3.2	Experiment IP2.2	131
4.5.3.3	Experiment IP2.3	132
4.6	Discussion of Iconic Pattern Replication	133
4.7	Summary	136
Chapter Five : An Empirical Test of HARVEST		137
5.1	Introduction	137
5.2	Methods	138
5.2.1	The foraging landscape	138
5.2.2	Data capture	138
5.2.3	Quantifications of key parameters	141
5.2.4	Nectar production	142
5.2.5	Bee foraging rate	142
5.2.6	Parameterization of the model	143
5.2.7	Implementation of HARVEST	146
5.3	Results	147
5.3.1	Empirical study results	147

5.3.2	Model results	151
5.4	Sensitivity analysis of results to variation in the number of simulated bees	154
5.4.1	Sensitivity analysis of results to variation in bee abundance	154
5.4.2	Sensitivity analysis of results to variation in nectar Replenishment rate	155
5.5	Discussion	157
5.5.1	Insights into bee foraging behaviour	157
5.5.2	Prediction of observed foraging movements	158
5.5.2.1	Patch-to-patch movements, overall traffic (SWIPT) and traplining	158
5.5.2.2	Residence and arrival rates	159
5.5.3	Traplining	159
5.6	HARVEST vs observations – overall comments	160
Chapter Six : Landscape-Scale Bee-Mediated Gene Flow and Containment		162
6.1	Introduction	162
6.2	Parameterisation of the model for the landscape-scale	163
6.3	Investigation (i) : Landscape-scale behavioural exploration	166
6.3.1	Methods	166
6.3.1.1	Experiment LS1.1	166
6.3.1.2	Experiment LS1.2	166
6.3.2	Results	167
6.3.2.1	Experiment LS1.1	167
6.3.2.2	Experiment LS1.2	168
6.3.3	Discussion	169
6.3.3.1	Finding (a) : why does SWIPT increase with decreasing variability in Q?	169
6.3.3.2	Finding (b) : why does SWIPT increase with increasing L?	170
6.3.3.3	Consequences for gene flow	171
6.4	Investigation (ii) : The Sacrificial Shield as a strategy for gene containment	172
6.4.1	Introduction to Investigation (ii)	172
6.4.2	Methods	173
6.4.2.1	General Methods	173
6.4.2.2	Experiment LS2.1	173
6.4.2.3	Experiment LS2.2	174
6.4.2.4	Experiment LS2.3	175

6.4.2.5	Experiment LS2.4	176
6.4.3	Results	177
6.4.3.1	Experiment LS2.1	177
6.4.3.2	Experiment LS2.2	178
6.4.3.3	Experiment LS2.3	179
6.4.3.4	Experiment LS2.4	180
6.4.4	Discussion	180
6.5	Summary	183
Chapter Seven : Implications and Further Work		185
7.1	Introduction	185
7.2	Implications	185
7.2.1	Gene flow levels in landscapes	185
7.2.2	Containment strategies	186
7.2.3	Iconic patterns	187
7.2.4	Efficient foraging despite incomplete information	188
7.2.5	Foraging behaviour at the small scale	188
7.2.6	Critical evaluation of the model's predictions	189
7.3	Suggestions for further Work	191
7.3.1	Incorporation of systematic foraging and traplining	191
7.3.2	Incorporation of continuous nectar distributions	193
7.3.3	Specifying spatially-explicit flowers within patches	194
7.4	General Summary	195
Appendix A : Transition Matrix Extraction – Worked Example		196
Appendix B : Redundancy of the Non-Greedy Exploration Parameter		199
Appendix C : HARVEST Simulation Screenshots		202
Appendix D : HARVEST Code Listing		208
Bibliography		285

List of Figures

Figure	Description	Page
1.1	Key components of the E-Psi-b model.	31
2.1	Flow Chart showing the foraging process of a bee within the HARVEST model.	61
2.2	Percentage of a bee's encounters with full flowers in a patch with varying patch qualities compared to the expected percentage of full flower encounters after 1000 foraging bouts of foraging activity.	66
2.3	System-wide inter-patch traffic (SWIPT) with variable C and L.	68
C3 (figure 1)	The cumulative number of unique fields visited by a bee (y-axis) vs. the number of time steps elapsed (x-axis).	93
C3 (figure 2)	Mean number of field-to-field transitions per bee per foraging bout (y-axis) vs. variation in quality among fields, G^* , (x-axis) for various sizes of landscape.	94
C3 (figure 3)	Mean number of field-to-field transitions per bee per bout (y-axis) vs. landscape richness (x-axis).	95
C3 (figure 4)	Contour plot showing the impact on foraging performance levels of resource variability, G^* , (expressed as the range between the highest and lowest quality fields) and bee capacity (or landscape richness).	96
C3 (figure 5)	(a) Mean proportion of flowers (or seed set) of a gene flow-sink field completely fertilized by incoming pollen (y-axis) vs. variation in quality among fields, G^* (x-axis). (b) Mean probability of arriving in the sink field from a source field, E (y-axis) vs. variation in quality among fields, G^* (x-axis). (c) Mean number of flowers pollinated by bees during a Visit to the sink field, b, (y-axis) vs. variation in quality among fields, G^* (x-axis).	97
C3 (figure 6)	Landscape-scale mean foraging performance per bee per foraging bout ($E(x)$) per trial with varying β and varying landscape reward variability.	98
4.1	Mean foraging performance per bee per foraging bout per trial in small-scale landscapes, with varying β , varying landscape size (number of patches) and varying economic richness.	102
4.2	Mean inter-patch traffic per bee per foraging bout per trial in a landscape with six patches, varying β and varying economic richness (1 : 1 rich : poor replenishment frequency ratio, up to 4 : 1).	103
4.3	Landscape-scale mean foraging performance per bee per foraging bout ($P(x)$) per trial with varying β and varying landscape reward variability.	107
4.4	Examples of the iconic gene-flow distance relationship.	109

4.5	Summary of landscape configurations used for investigation (iii).	115
4.6	Experimental configuration and results for experiment IP1.1 testing for iconic pattern 1.	118
4.7	Experimental configuration and results for experiment IP1.2 testing for iconic pattern 1.	120
4.8	Experimental configuration and results for experiment IP1.3 testing for iconic pattern 1.	122
4.9	An example of the typical pattern of the patch-size gene-flow relationship.	123
4.10	Summary of landscape configurations used for investigation (iv).	127
4.11	Experimental configuration and results for experiment IP2.1 testing for iconic pattern 2.	130
4.12	Experimental configuration and results for experiment IP2.2 testing for iconic pattern 2.	131
4.13	Gene flow levels from source to sink with increasing size of sink and varying rate of replenishment.	133
5.1	Mean nectar production rates (microlitres h ⁻¹) in flowers of droughted ('D') and watered ('W') individuals of <i>B. napus</i> under glasshouse conditions.	142
5.2	The frequency of total successive patch visits for during a single foraging bout on the array in the sample observation session.	147
5.3	Mean patch residence (in seconds), arrival rates, and overall bee effort, comparing homogenous and variable landscapes, and W and D patches.	148
5.4	Frequency of specific inter-patch movements made by real bees in the final observation session of the empirical study.	150
5.5	Mean patch residence (in flower visits), arrival rates, and overall bee effort, comparing empirical data and model predictions.	151
5.6	Mean number of consecutive patches visited by bees upon visiting the array.	152
5.7	Frequency of specific inter-patch movements made by HARVEST bees in a sample homogenous trial.	153
5.8	Frequency of specific inter-patch movements made by HARVEST bees in a sample variable trial.	154
5.9	Residence and arrival results for the empirical comparison that include HARVEST's simulation of just a single bee foraging in the grid.	155
5.10	Mean patch residence per bee with varying replenishment intervals tested in a homogenous landscape system in the model.	156

5.11	Mean total patch visits per bee (arrival data) with varying replenishment intervals tested in a homogenous landscape system in the model.	157
6.1	Illustration of how the landscape configuration is altered with each incremental increase of landscape size tested.	166
6.2	a) The mean number of flowers visited per bee per field, with varying landscape size L. b) The mean number of inter-patch movements per bee per 8 hour foraging trial, with varying landscape size L. c) Mean foraging efficiency per bee per foraging bout, with varying landscape size L.	167
6.3	a) The mean number of flowers visited per bee per field, with varying range in field qualities. b) The mean number of inter-patch movements per bee per 8 hour foraging trial, with varying range in field qualities. c) Mean foraging efficiency per bee per foraging bout, with varying range in field qualities.	168
6.4	Configuration of the landscape and the shield in Sacrificial Shield Experiment LS2.1.	173
6.5	Configuration of the landscape and the shield in Sacrificial Shield Experiment LS2.2.	174
6.6	Configuration of the landscape and the shield in Sacrificial Shield Experiment LS2.3.	175
6.7	Configuration of the landscape and the shield in Sacrificial Shield Experiment LS2.4.	176
6.8	Gene flow, expressed as the percentage of GM pollen deposited by bees in the Conventional county, with varying grades of prominence of the shield.	177
6.9	Gene flow, expressed as the percentage of GM pollen deposited by bees in the Conventional county, with varying distance of the shield from the GM county.	178
6.10	Gene flow, expressed as the percentage of GM pollen deposited by bees in the Conventional county, with varying distance between the GM and Conventional counties.	179
6.11	Gene flow, expressed as the percentage of GM pollen deposited by bees in the Conventional county, with varying quality of the fields in the shield.	180
B1	Mean foraging performance per bee with varying values of ϵ and β .	200
C1	Main configuration window of HARVEST.	202
C2	Window that provides ability to specify precise patch sizes for each	203

	patch in the landscape.	
C3	Window that provides ability to specify exact coordinates for patches within the landscape, rather than using the default matrix-style configuration.	203
C4	Screen capture of HARVEST when the simulation is running.	204
C5	Main results window.	204
C6	Window allowing read-only access to the transition matrix file.	205
C7	Window showing breakdown of residence and visit numbers to each individual patch in the landscape.	205
C8	Window showing report of how often bees that returned to the nest became 'naive' via the Ω parameter.	206
C9	Window that allows the user to watch the movements that bees made within the landscape in the simulation.	207

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
2.1	Summary of parameters used by the model	62
4.1	Summary of parameterisation for investigation (iii)	114
4.2	Summary of parameterisation for investigation (iv)	126
5.1	Average number of open flowers per patch on each day of the Empirical study, along with the type of patch (W or D) to which the flower count relates	141
5.2	Summary of parameterisation for the model's replication of the empirical experiment	146
6.1	Summary of general parameterisation for landscape-scale experiments	165

List of Equations

Equation	Description	Page
1.1	E-Psi-b model of pollinator-mediated gene flow	31
2.1	HARVEST Linear Operator Learning Rule	57
2.2	HARVEST action-value calculation	59
2.3	HARVEST foraging efficiency calculation	63
2.4	E-Psi-b model, re-written in terms of HARVEST parameters	64
C3 (eq 1)	Rate of gain equation	77
C3 (eq 2)	HARVEST action-value calculation	78
C3 (eq 3)	HARVEST Linear Operator Learning Rule	78
C3 (eq 4)	E-Psi-b model	81
C3 (eq 5)	Approximate highest rate of gene flow calculation	81
5.1	Replenishment interval estimation assuming systematic foraging	144
5.2	Estimation of simultaneous bee visitors in empirical study	145

List of Parameters

Parameter	Identifier
ξ	Proportion of sink patch's seed with source patch paternity mediated by cross-pollination
E	Fraction of pollinators arriving at sink from source
Ψ	Number of fruits fully fertilised in sink with source pollen by each pollinator in a sink visit
b	Total sink fruits fertilised by each pollinator in a sink visit
B	Number of bees in the grid
B_E	Estimated number of bees in the grid
L	Number of patches in landscape
Q	Initial quality of patches
Q(i)	Actual quality of patch i
q(i)	Estimated quality of patch i
β	Sensitivity to individual flower sample
s(i)	Value of the reward from latest sample in patch i
v(i, j)	Action-value for visiting patch j when currently in patch i
C	Bee's nectar carrying capacity
c	Bee's remaining nectar carrying capacity
h	Flower handling time
t(i, j)	Flight time between patches i and j
F_i	Number of flowers in patch i
I_i	Replenishment interval for patch i
P(x)	Bee's foraging efficiency in foraging bout x
G(x)	Elapsed time on the global clock since foraging bout x began
R_{full}	Reward (in nectar units) offered by a full flower
R_{empty}	Reward (in nectar units) offered by an empty flower
T	Total time spent observing in empirical study
T_B	Total time (in seconds) spent actively observing bee activity in empirical study
a	Proportion of array observed during an empirical study session

Definitions

Dry (D) Patch	A patch of flowers that is droughted
Floral Catchment	The set of patches representing the surrounding landscape external to the sink and source populations.
HARVEST	H arvesting A nimal R einforced V alues and E stimates. A Reinforcement Learning-based foraging model.
Omniscient Bee	A HARVEST bee that is always aware of the true quality of patches in the landscape
Performance	The quantified foraging efficiency of a HARVEST bee, expressed in terms of the amount of resource gathered divided by the time taken to do so
Sacrificial Shield	An array of resource sites whose genetic purity is sacrificed to preserve the genetic purity of another population.
SWIPT	System-wide inter-patch traffic. A measure of the level of movement by bees on average within the foraging system.
Wet (W) Patch	A patch of flowers that is kept healthy by being regularly watered

Abbreviations

%	Percentage
μ	Micro
AI	Artificial Intelligence
ANN	Artificial Neural Network
<i>B. napus</i>	<i>Brassica napus</i>
BL	<i>Bombus lapidaries</i>
BP	<i>Bombus pratorum</i>
BT	<i>Bombus terrestris</i>
D	Dry
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
EU	European Union
GM	Genetically Modified
h	Hours
HARVEST	Harvesting Animal Reinforced Values and Estimates
HOOFS	Hierarchical Object Oriented Foraging Simulator
IBM	Individual Based Model
IFD	Ideal Free Distribution
IP	Iconic Pattern
JST	Job Search Theory
km	Kilometre
l	Litre
LS	Landscape-Scale
m	Metre
MVT	Marginal Value Theorem
OFT	Optimal Foraging Theory
PMF	Plant Molecular Pharming
RL	Reinforcement Learning
RNEI	Rate of Net Energetic Intake
s	Seconds
S.E.	Standard Error
SS	Sacrificial Shield
t.u.	Time Unit
TDR	Threshold Departure Rule
W	Wet