

Figure 1 displays a 5x4 grid of plots showing LABIND5 relative triangular fitnesses. The rows represent different fitness metrics: $\log(T)$, $\log(T^2/T_0)$, $\log(T^2/T_0^2)$, $\log(S/(\Delta Y))$, and $\log(S/(\Delta Y)/T)$. The columns represent different stimulus value differences: ΔY , $\Delta Y/T$, $\Delta Y/T^2$, and $\Delta Y/T^3$. Each plot shows the relationship between $\log(T)$ and $\log(T_0)$ for various parameter sets (A₀, A₁, A₂, A₃, A₄, A₅, A₆, A₇, A₈, A₉, A₁₀, A₁₁, A₁₂, A₁₃, A₁₄, A₁₅, A₁₆, A₁₇, A₁₈, A₁₉, A₂₀, A₂₁, A₂₂, A₂₃, A₂₄, A₂₅, A₂₆, A₂₇, A₂₈, A₂₉, A₃₀, A₃₁, A₃₂, A₃₃, A₃₄, A₃₅, A₃₆, A₃₇, A₃₈, A₃₉, A₄₀, A₄₁, A₄₂, A₄₃, A₄₄, A₄₅, A₄₆, A₄₇, A₄₈, A₄₉, A₅₀, A₅₁, A₅₂, A₅₃, A₅₄, A₅₅, A₅₆, A₅₇, A₅₈, A₅₉, A₆₀, A₆₁, A₆₂, A₆₃, A₆₄, A₆₅, A₆₆, A₆₇, A₆₈, A₆₉, A₇₀, A₇₁, A₇₂, A₇₃, A₇₄, A₇₅, A₇₆, A₇₇, A₇₈, A₇₉, A₈₀, A₈₁, A₈₂, A₈₃, A₈₄, A₈₅, A₈₆, A₈₇, A₈₈, A₈₉, A₉₀, A₉₁, A₉₂, A₉₃, A₉₄, A₉₅, A₉₆, A₉₇, A₉₈, A₉₉, A₁₀₀). The plots show that the fitnesses are generally increasing with $\log(T)$ and $\log(T_0)$, and that the relative fitnesses are more stable than the absolute fitnesses. The plots also show that the fitnesses are more sensitive to changes in the stimulus value difference than to changes in the stimulus value itself.

TUB material: code=rha4ta