

# Using bipartite to describe and plot two-mode networks in *R*

Carsten F. Dormann  
Biometry & Environmental System Analysis  
University of Freiburg, Germany

April 30, 2019

## Abstract

This vignette introduces the bipartite package to newbees. It describes its intention and, in separate sections, the use of the most important functions.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Introduction for ecologists . . . . .	2
1.2	Introduction for non-ecologists . . . . .	2
1.3	Introduction continued for both, ecologists and non-ecologists . . . . .	2
<b>2</b>	<b>What other network packages are out there in the <i>R</i>-universe?</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Preparing data for analysis</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Visualising bipartite networks</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Computing indices</b>	<b>7</b>
5.1	Network-level indices . . . . .	7
5.2	Group-level indices . . . . .	8
5.3	Link-level indices . . . . .	9
5.4	Species-level (= node-level) indices . . . . .	10
5.5	Which index to choose? . . . . .	11
5.5.1	Index redundancy: do different indices tell the same thing? . . . . .	12
5.5.2	Variations on the same theme: which index of a group of similar ones should I choose? . . . . .	15
<b>6</b>	<b>Null models</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1	Why null models? . . . . .	15
6.2	Justifying conservative null models . . . . .	16
6.3	Using null models to test for significant tests in data . . . . .	17
<b>7</b>	<b>Modularity</b>	<b>19</b>
7.1	Using modularity to identify species with important roles in the network . . .	21
<b>8</b>	<b>Analyses beyond bipartite</b>	<b>21</b>
8.1	Plotting pretty bipartites . . . . .	21
8.1.1	<b>bipartiteD3</b> . . . . .	22
8.1.2	<b>igraph</b> . . . . .	22
8.1.3	<b>ggbipart</b> . . . . .	22
8.1.4	<b>multigraph</b> . . . . .	22

8.2	Analysing the structure of bipartite networks . . . . .	22
8.2.1	<b>bmotif</b> . . . . .	22
8.2.2	<b>dynsbm</b> . . . . .	22
8.3	Multi-layer networks . . . . .	22
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>Index</b>	<b>27</b>

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Introduction for ecologists

Many interactions between species are between distinct groups, such as pollinators and flowers, or herbivores and plants, or parasitoids and their hosts, or predators and their prey. When no information on interactions *within* groups is known, we have the case of a *bipartite* (a.k.a. “two-mode”) network. In constrast, if every species could interact with every other, and we have (necessarily incomplete) information on these interactions, we have the case of a “unipartite” or “one-mode” network (think: food web).

### 1.2 Introduction for non-ecologists

In mathematics, there is a field called “graph theory”, which describes/analyses/formalises “graphs” and the operations among them. A graph consists of *nodes* and *edges* (which are the links between nodes). A node can be something like an airport with edges being the flights between them; a power grid of power plants and energy consumers, with the power lines being the edges; a list of industry “leaders” and the edges representing financial ties between them; or, e.g. in ecology, a list of species, with edges representing trophic relationships, i.e. who eats whom.

When the nodes are grouped into two distinct sets, with no (known or quantified) interactions *within* a set, then we call it a bipartite network (“two parts”, a.k.a. “two-mode” network). In our examples these could be airports of different continents (and no intracontinental flights are in our data base); power plants and energy consumers; industry executives and companies (where an executive can sit in the board of different companies); or pollinators and plants.

### 1.3 Introduction continued for both, ecologists and non-ecologists

This vignette tries to illustrate and explain a package that deals almost exclusively with *bipartite* networks!

The typical tasks we want to carry out are

1. visualise the network;
2. compute network indices to summarise its structure;
3. statistically test for differences between networks;
4. statistically test for differences between observed and random networks.

**bipartite** aims to facilitate this steps. This vignette aims to facilitate the use of **bipartite**. We shall try to predominantly use the technical terms (“node” and “edges”), but our examples will be from the ecological realm, where nodes are (typcially) species, and edges are typically called “links”, which in fact are observed (or assumed) ecological interactions (such as pollination, predation, dispersal). Apologies for shifting between these two for easier access!

Also, as ecologists we are not “graph theoreticians” or mathematicians. Often, in the ecological literature, mathematical terms are used to elevate the status of the author, at no benefit

to the analysis or to the reader. We are hesitant to use pretend-mathematics, at the risk of sounding daft to a person familiar with graph theory.

Of course, we don't mind if this documented would be cited, e.g. as Dormann (2019). Alternatively, you can always cite our work on this subject, inevitably also using (some functionality of) **bipartite** (Dormann *et al.*, 2008, 2009; Dormann, 2011; Dormann & Strauß, 2014; Dormann *et al.*, 2017; Dormann & Blüthgen, 2017)!

## 2 *What other network packages are out there in the R-universe?*

Before going through what **bipartite** offers, we shall briefly list what other packages in this direction can do for you:<sup>1</sup>

There are several open-source packages devoted to the analysis of networks and food webs, but only few addressing bipartite networks explicitly. Of these, **bipartite** provides the most extensive set of features, both for plotting, computing indices, and for null models. For the sake of completeness, here are some other *R* packages we are aware of for handling bipartite networks (in alphabetical order):

**AnnotationDbi** for handling bimap and annotation maps;

**biGraph** discontinued and archived;

**bipartiteD3** interactive visualisation of bipartite networks;<sup>2</sup>

**bmotif** for counting “motifs” in bipartite networks;

**econullnet** seems to be largely a wrapper for **bipartite**;

**igraph** provides functionalities for one-mode networks, quite a bit of plotting options, too;

**HiveR** for fancy “hive” plots;

**latentnet**

**sna** provides many traditional one-mode metrics, from a “social network analysis” perspective; in a way the bigger brother of **bipartite**;

**statnet** a set of largely one-mode network packages, includes **ergm**, **networksis**, **statnet.common**, **tergm**;

**tnet** , some functions of which were lifted to **bipartite** (thanks to Tore for allowing that!);

**vegan** for various analyses of a community matrix, including null models and nestedness computations;

**WGCNA** designed for gene assays, has a small set of indices and options overlapping with those of **bipartite**;

## 3 *Preparing data for analysis*

Most functions in **bipartite** require the same type of input structure: an adjacency matrix of what-interacts-with-what, for short called “web”. Raw data often start as tables of individual observations, e.g. one column containing the name of the species in the first level, another column the name of the species in the other level with which it interacts. Occasionally a third column records the number of interactions for this pair, or a weight. Also, several networks may be included into this table, so another column would provide a web-ID (e.g. a name of the site or

---

<sup>1</sup> This is like a mini-CRAN-task view.

<sup>2</sup> And no, this is not a typo, it is “D3”, which apparently is a JavaScript library for “data-driven documentation”

the web itself). The function `frame2webs` is a little convenience function to convert such tables into one or more webs. Its output is a list or an array of webs in the appropriate format for further analysis.<sup>3</sup>

Most other packages (*R* or otherwise) are based on one-mode representations of networks. The typical input file would be a so-called edge list, simply listing in two columns (plus an optional weights column) what interacts with what (see below). The function `as.one.mode` transforms bipartite “webs” into edge lists to be used e.g. in Pajek or by `sna` or `tnet`. Notice that there are different projections from bipartite (two-mode) to one-mode (as detailed in the help to `as.one.mode`).<sup>4</sup>

Now, before any further talk, let’s start by loading the package:

```
library(bipartite)
```

```
Warning: package 'network' was built under R version 3.5.2
```

## 4 Visualising bipartite networks

A useful first step in the analysis of bipartite networks is to plot it. To do so, **bipartite** offers two main functions, `plotweb` and `visweb`. They produce a bipartite graph (e.g. Fig. 1 top) and a prettified version of the adjacency matrix (Fig. 1 bottom), respectively (Motten, 1982). Both offer a wide range of options to change sizes, colours and placement of labels. Please run example code for these functions to get a feeling for their abilities (and hopefully you’re impressed).<sup>5</sup>

```
par(xpd=T)
plotweb(motten1982)
visweb(motten1982)
```

If these options are still not sufficient, and you want more customisation, such as side-by-side plotting of several networks, please check out the **bipartiteD3**, which provides the power of the “D3” library of JavaScript.<sup>6</sup> Note that D3 makes *interactive* figures, so on mouse-over the figures change. While not a feature useful for publication in the current standard, it adds 21st century appeal to such graphs.

The function `plotPAC` visualises (Fig. 2) a very special idea: the potential for apparent competition (Morris *et al.*, 2005). The idea is that every parasitoid emerging from a host can attack another species. Thus, the more individuals emerge from a host, the larger is the potential for these to reduce the competition between hosts, as long as they choose their prey equiprobable. Pretty as it may be, its current value is highest for host-parasitoid networks, so the plot employing a pollination network is for illustration only.

```
plotPAC(PAC(motten1982), outby=0.9)
```

We can also visualise communities within the network by computing its modularity and then plotting the result, using the functions `computeModules` and `plotModuleWeb`, respectively (Fig. 3).

```
mod <- computeModules(motten1982)
plotModuleWeb(mod)
```

To visualise either level separately projected into one-mode mode, we have to employ a different package, for example `sna` (Butts,




Figure 2: A PAC plot of the Motten 1982 pollination network. Lines connect plants potentially visited next by a pollinator. Line width is proportional to probability, which is very similar in this example. See help of `plotPAC` for details on plotting and meaning.

<sup>3</sup>`webs2array` can also make an array of previously separate webs, padding non-overlapping species with zeros.

<sup>4</sup>The function `sortweb` allows a sorting of the matrix by marginal totals or by user defined sequences. This may indeed be a handy function when customising the plotting later on. The example networks in **bipartite** are typically sorted in decreasing order.

<sup>5</sup>The additional function `plotweb2` is still a bit experimental but allows to combine several bipartite plots into a stack of tripartite, quadripartite, pentapartite etc. graphs. See the examples in the function page for illustration.

<sup>6</sup>The package explicitly links to “our” **bipartite**, although I think it is largely independent of it, and actually very nice!



2013). We can do the projection on the fly, though. For networks with even a moderate number of species, such plots can become rather obtuse and uninformative (Fig. 4 top).

```
par(mfrow=c(1,2), xpd=T)
gplot(as.one.mode(motten1982, project="higher"),
      label=colnames(motten1982), gmode="graph",
      label.cex=0.6, vertex.cex=2)
gplot(as.one.mode(motten1982, project="lower"),
      label=rownames(motten1982), gmode="graph",
      label.cex=0.6, vertex.cex=2, vertex.col="green")
```




Figure 4: Plots of one-mode projections of Motten's (1982) pollination network. Pollinators in red (*top*), plants in green (*bottom*). Note that these plots are point-symmetrically variable, hence every plot will look somewhat different.

## 5 Computing indices

Network indices are primarily that: metrics to quantify an aspect of the network. Each may have a justification, a purpose, but the information in a matrix is only finite. As a consequence, network indices are highly correlated. There is thus no point in computing all indices in the book; rather should we consider very carefully what we want to test with the data and select one (or a few) indices to do so.

The **bipartite**-package offers itself to data dredging: with one function one can compute dozens of indices, certainly some of them will be significantly correlated with whatever we want to test. While analyses are commonly carried out in this way, this is obviously statistically inappropriate. Two issues are important here. One is that of multiple testing, and there are dozens of publications covering this issue. The other is an attempt to formalise one's expectation. Null models are one way to do so, in particular one's expectation of what a pattern is like in the *absence* of a process. This technical details of this topic are covered further below (section 6.3).

Indices (currently) come at the following hierarchical levels:

1. network-level (a single value, per index, for the entire network);
2. group-level (a value, per index, for each of the two groups);
3. link-level (a value, per index, for each edge = link);
4. node-level (a value, per index, for each node = species); and
5. species-level (a value, per index, for each species).

### 5.1 Network-level indices

This set of indices is computed for the entire network. They are called using the function **networklevel**, which additionally (and conveniently) makes available all indices from the group level, too. Those restricted to the network-level are:

1. **connectance**, also called 'standardised number of species combinations' in biogeographic analyses (Gotelli & Graves, 1996; Dunne *et al.*, 2002);
2. **web asymmetry**, the balance of the number of species in the two levels (Blüthgen *et al.*, 2007);
3. **links per species**;
4. **number of compartments**;
5. **compartment diversity** (Tylianakis *et al.*, 2007);
6. **cluster coefficient**, which will compute both the network-wide binary, one-mode-based cluster coefficient as well as those for each level,
7. **nestedness**, with the returned value indicating the 'temperature' of the matrix, which is low (0) for a perfectly nested matrix (Rodríguez-Gironés & Santamaría, 2006);
8. **weighted nestedness**, or more specifically 'weighted interaction nestedness estimator' (WINE), with 1 indicating perfect nestedness (thus exactly opposite to the previous index) (Galeano *et al.*, 2009);
9. **weighted NODF**, as an alternative measure of quantitative nestedness, automatically correcting for matrix filling and also indicating nestedness by values towards 1 (Almeida-Neto & Ulrich, 2011);

10. **interaction strength asymmetry** (Blüthgen *et al.*, 2007) (or alternatively **ISA** or **dependence asymmetry** Bascompte *et al.*, 2003), which quantify whether specialised species interacts with generalised ones in the other level (or vice versa);
11. **specialisation asymmetry** (or alternatively **SA**), following the same idea as the previous, but this being based on species specialisation in  $d'$ ;
12. **linkage density**, marginal totals-weighted diversity of interactions per species (Bersier *et al.*, 2002);
13. **Fisher alpha**, diversity index based on fitting a Fisher-series (Fisher *et al.*, 1943);
14. **interaction evenness** quantifies how balanced the distribution of interactions is across species, based on Shannon's diversity (Tylianakis *et al.*, 2007);
15. **Alatalo interaction evenness**, as an alternative measure of interaction evenness, attempting to overcome some of the shortcomings of the previous, Shannon's, version (Alatalo, 1981; Müller *et al.*, 1999);
16. **Shannon diversity**;
17. **H2**, network-wide specialisation index  $H'_2$  (Blüthgen *et al.*, 2006).

Similarly to the previous sets of indices, several options are available to fine-tune those in **networklevel**:

```
networklevel(bezerra2009, index=c("ISA", "weighted NODF", "Fisher alpha"), SAMethod="log")
```

<b>weighted NODF</b>	<b>interaction strength asymmetry</b>
5.717160e+01	8.842823e-05
<b>Fisher alpha</b>	
8.793400e+00	

## 5.2 Group-level indices

Indices that can be computed for each group separately are collected in the function **grouplevel**.<sup>7</sup> Quite a few of these indices are aggregates from the species level (e.g. by averaging species' degrees), in which case the mean is weighted by the number of observations of each species, thus giving more weight to species for which information is more reliable.<sup>8</sup> Others are biogeographic indices which change their value when the matrix is inverted (i.e. when a group changes from "species" to "islands"). The following indices are implemented:

1. **number of species** in the respective trophic level;
2. **mean number of links**;
3. **mean number of shared partners** (Roberts & Stone, 1990; Stone & Roberts, 1992);
4. **cluster coefficient**, which supposedly informs us whether a network has 'small world' properties (Watts & Strogatz, 1998);
5. **weighted cluster coefficient**, which takes into account the number of interactions and is a properly derived bipartite version of the previous one-mode cluster coefficient above (Opsahl, 2010);
6. **togetherness** as the mean number of co-occurrences across all pairwise species combinations (Stone & Roberts, 1992);

<sup>7</sup>If network-level indices are also desired, all indices in **grouplevel** are also accessible through **networklevel**, see below.

<sup>8</sup>The weighting can be switched off by stating **weighted=FALSE**.



7. **C score**, or ‘checkerboardness’, which averages the number of instances of 01/10-patterns (i.e. exclusive occurrences) for all pairwise species combinations (Stone & Roberts, 1990);
8. **V ratio**, the variance ratio of species numbers to interaction numbers within species of a level (Schluter, 1984);
9. **discrepancy**, the number of links one would have to move to achieve perfect nestedness (Brualdi & Sanderson, 1999);
10. **degree distribution**, fitting an exponential function and (truncated) power laws (Jordano *et al.*, 2003);
11. **extinction slope**, with different options for the extinction sequence (Mommott *et al.*, 2004);
12. **robustness**, the area under the extinction curve (Burgos *et al.*, 2007);
13. **niche overlap**, with options for distance metrics (Pielou, 1972; Hurlbert, 1978);
14. **generality** (for the higher trophic level) or **vulnerability** (for the lower one) (Bersier *et al.*, 2002);
15. **partner diversity**, simply the mean Shannon diversity of interactions of each species in a level;
16. **effective partners** as before, but as the exponent of the base to which Shannon was computed (typically  $e$  or 2) (Jost, 2006);
17. **fd** (or alternatively **functional diversity**), which is similar to niche overlap but computed as branch length of a cluster diagram of dissimilarity of resource use (Devoto *et al.*, 2012).

As in the case of species-level indices, some allow for normalisation (between 0 and 1), others for different basis to the logarithm or similar tuning. A typical call to `grouplevel` will thus comprise the list of desired indices<sup>9</sup> and their options, as well as the level(s) for which the computation shall be carried out:

```
grouplevel(bezerra2009, level="both", index=c("mean number of links", "weighted
cluster coefficient", "effective partners", "niche overlap"), dist="bray")
```

mean.number.of.links.HL	mean.number.of.links.LL	niche.overlap.HL
9.9502551	7.0975057	0.2824538
niche.overlap.LL	generality.HL	vulnerability.LL
0.4795595	8.0590841	5.6963672

The LL and HL behind each index indicate that it was computed for the lower and higher level, respectively. A relatively comprehensive comparison of network-level indices (Dormann *et al.*, 2009), including some at the group level, has shown substantial redundancy among these indices, and few of them have a sound theoretical basis.

### 5.3 Link-level indices

At the moment, only few indices have been investigated at the level of the individual link (i.e. the cell of a network matrix):

1. dependence (i.e. the relevance of each species for the other level: Bascompte *et al.*, 2006) one matrix for each level;
2. endpoint degree (i.e. product of degrees of species linked by this cell: Barrat *et al.*, 2004).

<sup>9</sup>Or alternatively the argument `index="ALL"`.

It is employed by simply applying it to the network under consideration and selecting the index desired:

```
str(linklevel(bezerra2009, index=c("dependence", "endpoint")))
```

```
List of 3
 $ HL dependence: num [1:13, 1:13] 0.193 0.131 0.056 0.108 0.105 ...
  ..- attr(*, "dimnames")=List of 2
  .. ..$ : chr [1:13] "Diplopterys.pubipetala" "Byrsonima.gardnerana" "Banisteriopsis.muri
  .. ..$ : chr [1:13] "Centris.aenea" "Centris.fuscata" "Centris.caxiensis" "Centris.tarsa
 $ LL dependence: num [1:13, 1:13] 0.2415 0.2238 0.0997 0.2474 0.2632 ...
  ..- attr(*, "dimnames")=List of 2
  .. ..$ : chr [1:13] "Diplopterys.pubipetala" "Byrsonima.gardnerana" "Banisteriopsis.muri
  .. ..$ : chr [1:13] "Centris.aenea" "Centris.fuscata" "Centris.caxiensis" "Centris.tarsa
 $ endpoint      : num [1:13, 1:13] 117 78 156 104 91 65 52 26 52 52 ...
  ..- attr(*, "dimnames")=List of 2
  .. ..$ : chr [1:13] "Diplopterys.pubipetala" "Byrsonima.gardnerana" "Banisteriopsis.muri
  .. ..$ : chr [1:13] "Centris.aenea" "Centris.fuscata" "Centris.caxiensis" "Centris.tarsa
```

This function is so rudimentary, and its output so disproportionately voluminous, that it is not worth going into further details here and use `str` to only show the structure of the output.

## 5.4 Species-level (= node-level) indices

The (growing) list of indices computable for each species in the network comprises (the index name to be used in the call is given in `typewriter` font):

1. `degree`, i.e. the number of links of each species,
2. `normalised degree` for a normalised version of degree (Martín González *et al.*, 2010),
3. `species strength` as sum of dependencies for each species (Bascompte *et al.*, 2006),
4. `nestedrank` as rank in a nested matrix (Alarcón *et al.*, 2008),
5. `interaction` for interaction push/pull (a version of dependence asymmetry), (Vázquez *et al.*, 2007),
6. `PDI` for Paired Differences Index (Poisot *et al.*, 2011b,a),
7. `resource range` for Schoener's index of unused resources (Schoener, 1989),
8. `species specificity` (or coefficient of variation of interactions) (Julliard *et al.*, 2006; Poisot *et al.*, 2012),
9. `PSI` for pollination service index (or pollinator support index, depending on the trophic level),<sup>10</sup>
10. `NS` for node specialisation index (Dalsgaard *et al.*, 2008),
11. `betweenness` for betweenness (Borgatti & Everett, 1997),
12. `closeness` (both automatically also return their weighted counterparts proposed by Tore Opsahl in package `tnet`),
13. `Fisher` for Fisher's alpha as a measure of diversity (Fisher *et al.*, 1943),
14. `diversity` for Shannon diversity of interactions of that species,
15. `effective partners` for the effective number of interacting partners (Bersier *et al.*, 2002),
16. `proportional generality` for a quantitative version of normalised degree,<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup>devised by the author with Nico Blüthgen and Bernd Gruber

<sup>11</sup>devised by Jochen Fründ

17. **proportional similarity** as specialisation measured as similarity between use and availability (Feinsinger *et al.*, 1981),
18. **d** for Blüthgen’s discrimination/selectivity index  $d'$  (Blüthgen *et al.*, 2006).

Some of them allow for normalisation (between 0 and 1), others for different basis to the logarithm or similar tuning. A typical call to `specieslevel` will thus comprise the list of desired indices<sup>12</sup> and their options, as well as the level(s) for which the computation shall be carried out:

```
specieslevel(bezerra2009, level="lower", index=c("normalised degree", "PDI",
"effective partners"), PDI.normalise=F)
```

	normalised.degree	PDI	effective.partners
Diplopterys.pubipetala	0.6923077	1010.0000	7.437631
Byrsonima.gardnerana	0.4615385	1939.6667	3.819660
Banisteriopsis.muricata	0.9230769	657.0000	9.191488
Heteropterys.sp1	0.6153846	570.3333	6.278285
Heteropterys.sp2	0.5384615	567.3333	5.865968
Dicella.bracteosa	0.3846154	429.0000	4.582040
Carolus.chasei	0.3076923	513.6667	3.751208
Stigmaphyllon.paralias	0.1538462	774.0000	1.944388
Banisteriopsis.stellaris	0.3076923	245.6667	3.787887
Banisteriopsis.schizoptera	0.3076923	189.0000	3.822392
Stigmaphyllon.auriculatum	0.3076923	204.3333	3.687447
Stigmaphyllon.ciliatum	0.2307692	238.0000	2.937197
Janusia.anisandra	0.2307692	220.3333	2.813322

A relatively comprehensive comparison of species-level indices of specialisation (Dormann, 2011) has shown substantial redundancy among these indices, and only few of them have a sound theoretical basis Poisot *et al.* (2012).

## 5.5 Which index to choose?

Different indices were invented (“developed”) for different purposes. However, for most indices, it has not been demonstrated that they actually achieve what their inventor had in mind. Most commonly indices quantify a specific pattern which may have come about by a whole variety of different causes. Take, for example, connectance, i.e. the proportion of possible links actually recorded. Low connectance may be caused by high specialisation or by low sampling intensity. The same holds true for a species’ degree, which (typically) increases with sampling effort as well as generalisation. For the choice of an index this means that we cannot solely rely on what the inventor has proposed this index to be good for, but we have to keep in mind that it may actually quantify several other things, too.

Apart from the different levels at which an index can quantify a network pattern (from the individual link to the entire network, as covered in sections 5.3–5.1), indices can be divided into those for binary and those for weighted data (called here binary and weighted indices, respectively). Binary indices only use the information of whether a link exists, while weighted indices additionally account for how strong a link is, as judged from the actual value in a network matrix.

Binary indices, by definition, use less information. It does not follow that they are thus more robust! In fact, Blüthgen (2010) argues the opposite, since only a weighted index can tell whether an observed value indicates specialisation or not.<sup>13</sup>

This, if two indices are available to quantify the same idea, one binary and one quantitative, one should generally choose the quantitative one. Rather than species degree, we should use species strength or linkage density. Table 5.5 depicts some such binary-quantitative index pairs.

<sup>12</sup>Or alternatively the argument `index="ALL"`.

<sup>13</sup>Imagine two species, one with entries (1, 1), the other with entries (1, 100). A binary index would not be able to tell between them, while a quantitative would expose the second as far more specialised.

Table 1: Binary-quantitative pairs of network indices. Note: Most quantitative indices can also be computed on binary networks. That does not make them a quantitative measure!

	binary	quantitative
network level	connectance	$H'_2$
	links per species	linkage density
	nestedness	weighted NODF, wine
group level	mean number of partners	effective number of partners
species level	degree	species strength, effective number of partners

In a nutshell: Quantitative indices make use of more information in the data. They are generally more advisable, although most of them also are strongly affected by sampling issues.

### 5.5.1 Index redundancy: do different indices tell the same thing?

To visualise the similarity and possible redundancy of the different indices, they are computed for the networks in **bipartite** and summarised through a principal component analysis (see Fig. 5).

```
web.names <- data(package="bipartite")$results[,3]
data(list=web.names) #loads all webs
# the next step takes around 10 minutes:
netw.indic.webs <- t(sapply(web.names, function(x) networklevel(get(x),
  index="ALLBUTDD")))
```

```
PCA.out <- prcomp(netw.indic.webs[, -5], scale.=T)
biplot(PCA.out, xpd=T, las=1)
```

```
summary(PCA.out)
```

```
Importance of components:
      PC1      PC2      PC3      PC4      PC5      PC6
Standard deviation  4.2780 3.6461 2.09732 1.84163 1.32612 1.09350
Proportion of Variance 0.3979 0.2890 0.09562 0.07373 0.03823 0.02599
Cumulative Proportion 0.3979 0.6869 0.78248 0.85621 0.89444 0.92044
      PC7      PC8      PC9      PC10      PC11      PC12
Standard deviation  1.0375 0.81058 0.64158 0.62560 0.56960 0.49217
Proportion of Variance 0.0234 0.01428 0.00895 0.00851 0.00705 0.00527
Cumulative Proportion 0.9438 0.95812 0.96707 0.97558 0.98263 0.98789
      PC13      PC14      PC15      PC16      PC17      PC18
Standard deviation  0.43179 0.36230 0.26591 0.25249 0.2254 0.18080
Proportion of Variance 0.00405 0.00285 0.00154 0.00139 0.0011 0.00071
Cumulative Proportion 0.99195 0.99480 0.99634 0.99772 0.9988 0.99954
      PC19      PC20      PC21
Standard deviation  0.11401 0.09049 7.038e-16
Proportion of Variance 0.00028 0.00018 0.000e+00
Cumulative Proportion 0.99982 1.00000 1.000e+00
```

Apparently 40, 30 and 10% of the variation in indices can be partitioned to the first three axes. We can now investigate which indices load on the few axes:

```
round(PCA.out$rotation[, 1:4], 3)
```

```
      PC1      PC2      PC3      PC4
connectance      0.177  0.147 -0.044  0.025
web asymmetry    -0.137 -0.098 -0.298  0.063
links per species  0.189 -0.087 -0.020  0.183
number of compartments -0.147  0.005  0.167 -0.051
cluster coefficient  0.169  0.128  0.005  0.119
nestedness       -0.020  0.196 -0.004  0.305
weighted nestedness  0.066 -0.108 -0.170 -0.399
weighted NODF      0.193  0.068 -0.138 -0.182
interaction strength asymmetry -0.172  0.080 -0.178 -0.028
```

specialisation asymmetry	0.021	0.109	0.337	-0.096
linkage density	0.049	-0.258	-0.058	-0.038
Fisher alpha	-0.041	-0.246	0.045	-0.053
Shannon diversity	0.073	-0.251	0.011	0.082
interaction evenness	0.179	-0.078	0.012	0.102
Alatalo interaction evenness	0.076	0.159	0.143	-0.045
H2	-0.191	0.089	0.091	0.037
number.of.species.HL	-0.048	-0.249	0.026	-0.062
number.of.species.LL	-0.020	-0.256	0.121	-0.038
mean.number.of.partners.shared.in.HL	0.191	-0.032	-0.177	0.189
mean.number.of.partners.shared.in.LL	0.218	0.042	-0.049	-0.042
cluster.coefficient.HL	0.189	0.093	-0.001	-0.036
cluster.coefficient.LL	0.155	0.085	-0.285	-0.009
weighted.cluster.coefficient.HL	0.150	-0.122	-0.189	0.162
weighted.cluster.coefficient.LL	0.212	-0.040	0.035	0.145
niche.overlap.HL	0.045	0.142	-0.287	-0.272
niche.overlap.LL	0.202	0.035	0.062	-0.195
togetherness.HL	0.023	0.181	-0.283	-0.032
togetherness.LL	0.216	0.052	0.087	-0.041
C.score.HL	-0.162	-0.123	0.217	0.147
C.score.LL	-0.216	-0.020	0.038	0.026
V.ratio.HL	0.177	-0.121	0.121	-0.101
V.ratio.LL	-0.048	-0.238	-0.151	-0.113
discrepancy.HL	-0.041	-0.251	0.059	-0.042
discrepancy.LL	-0.039	-0.252	0.062	-0.037
extinction.slope.HL	0.216	-0.006	0.063	0.131
extinction.slope.LL	0.120	-0.061	0.035	0.326
robustness.HL	0.214	-0.020	0.059	0.148
robustness.LL	0.150	-0.084	-0.114	0.254
functional.diversity.HL	0.162	0.003	0.027	-0.257
functional.diversity.LL	0.163	-0.003	0.029	-0.259
partner.diversity.HL	0.198	-0.078	0.183	-0.028
partner.diversity.LL	0.061	-0.222	-0.212	0.082
effective.partners.HL	0.187	-0.079	0.206	-0.101
effective.partners.LL	-0.003	-0.256	-0.125	-0.011
generality.HL	0.187	-0.079	0.206	-0.101
vulnerability.LL	-0.003	-0.256	-0.125	-0.011

As we can see, there are quite a few indices on the first axis with a loading of around 0.2 (links per species, weighted NODF, H2, mean number of partners shared; weighted cluster coefficient, niche overlap, togetherness, C-score (all lower level); extinction slope, robustness, partner diversity (all higher level)).

Also the PCA biplot (Fig. 5) is not very helpful, since the many indices pointing “southwards” are unreadably overlapping.

Alternatively, we might want to depict the correlation between different indices by means of a cluster analysis (Fig. 6).

```
library(Hmisc)
plot(varclus(netw.indic.webs), cex=0.8)
abline(h=0.5, lty=2, col="grey")
```

It picks out a slightly different structure, with the PC1 being distributed over more than one cluster (towards the left, with extinction.slope.HL but also towards the centre, with weighted NODF). In either case it becomes clear that many indices are of limited originality. However, there are some branches ending above the dashed line, indicating that they add a new element to the description of the network. Some are trivial, such as the number of species in the lower level, others less so (specialisation asymmetry, extinction slope LL, niche overlap HL, (weighted) nestedness).

It should become clear that there is no need to compute all indices a software can offer, and that some clusters seem to measure the same latent property, even it is unclear what that property is. Curiously, higher and lower level indices are always intermixed. There seems to be always an effect onto the other level, so that some indices pick up a signal in one level, but





others the same signal in the other.<sup>14</sup>

The 22 pollination networks, on which both PCA and cluster are based, are most certainly not representative of bipartite networks in general. The simulations of Dormann *et al.* (2009) for a wider range of sizes and linkage densities show a qualitatively similar picture, though: indices are overlapping into clusters.<sup>15</sup>

### 5.5.2 Variations on on the same theme: which index of a group of similar ones should I choose?

Different indices were developed for different aims. Some are very reasonable, logically sound, thoughtful and even productive (in the sense of “shown to be doing what they are supposed to do”), others aren’t. Each index should be understood when being used, based on the literature introducing it and any later study refining, comparing or criticising/appraising it. There is no easy way to decide the question “Which is the right index for me?”

That said, there are a few guiding considerations that seem plausible to me:

1. Quantitative indices use more information than binary ones; preferably use the former.
2. Indices developed for bipartite networks are likely to be closer, theoretically, to the structure of the data than one-mode indices working on projections of bipartite networks.
3. Indices that came out positively in comparisons have proven their worth more than fresh-off-the-press indices.
4. If two or more indices seem barely distinguishable, do **not** choose the one easiest to interpret! This would be a logical fault, since their similarity indicates clearly that they are affected by “something” and we don’t know what that something is, yet. But interpreting an effect as the being caused by what is most convenient to interpret is most certainly wrong (Shermer, 2012).<sup>16</sup>

The last point in particular seems rather little helpful. Imagine the two index values “functional diversity” for the higher and lower trophic level, which are near-identical in Fig. 6. This indicates that the *network*, rather than each level, contains the information which these two indices describe. In this particular case, we may want to consider using neither index, or using any of them but interpreting it *as if it represented both level*.

Thus, in a nutshell, there is no easy answer and there is no way around knowing the index and the literature about it and its friends.

## 6 Null models

### 6.1 Why null models?

When a network is structured according to some measure (e.g. nestedness), what does that mean? It could mean that ecological processes leading to nestedness are at play. Or it could mean that a sampling effect makes nestedness an inevitable consequence. Or, finally, it could be a mixture of both. Furthering our understanding of nature is not aided by the reporting of spurious relationships resulting from sampling effects, hence a formal description of what the network would look like without the ecological process would be a useful comparison. That is what a null model aims to provide (Gotelli & Graves, 1996).

In ecology, null models are common only in some fields, particularly in biogeography (Gotelli & Graves, 1996; Hausdorf & Hennig, 2007), but also in network analyses (Dormann *et al.*,

<sup>14</sup>That should be the case for extinction slopes and robustness, which measures the response of one level to extinctions in the other. But is difficult to see why the cluster coefficient for the higher level should be correlated with togetherness in the lower. *Post hoc*, it is always possible to find a reason, but *a priori* this is not expected.

<sup>15</sup>We could similarly say that there is a substantial redundancy in network indices, evident from the analysis where we condense 92% of variation in 40 odd indices onto six axes.

<sup>16</sup>Of the many, many biases that can creep into scientific explorations, this is one. We could call it the “parsimony bias” as a special case of the “selection bias” (Shermer, 2012).

2009; Joppa *et al.*, 2009; Blüthgen *et al.*, 2008; Vázquez & Aizen, 2006, 2003; Vázquez *et al.*, 2009). With respect to particular bipartite indices, some studies rejected the current nestedness paradigm using abundance-based null models, for observed (Kallimanis *et al.*, 2009; Moore & Swihart, 2007; Santamaría & Rodríguez-Gironés, 2007), as well as for simulated networks (Krishna *et al.*, 2008).

Null models extend much beyond ecology and were probably first used in physics. Latapy *et al.* (2008) use them to investigate degree distributions in non-ecological bipartite networks. Using another network example, the module detection algorithm proposed by Newman & Girvan (2004) also uses a null model to define a “group” (or module or community) within a network: there are more links within than between groups. The null model then is a random network with as many links between as within groups (Guimerà *et al.*, 2005). In its quantitative version, the null model is constructed from proportionally probable interactions by differently abundant participants (Barber *et al.*, 2004). The specific null model used above is underlying most current implementations of contingency table tests such as  $\chi^2$  or Fisher’s signed rank test (Patefield, 1981).

In conclusion, null models are established approaches in physics as well as ecology to correct for statistical artefacts and to establish an expectation in the absence of the hypothesised structuring mechanism.

## 6.2 Justifying conservative null models

The interactions observed in a network are the result of a dynamic interaction between species at two levels. If we use null models to represent the outcome of these interactions (the abundances of the participants), we seem to be over-correcting. How can we possibly find a pattern, if we use this pattern as a null model? Is an abundance-based null model not a circular argument? Here I argue when it is not, and if circularity would sneak in, why it would still be better to over-correct. I shall focus on pollination networks, and every network analyst has to decide in how far this reasoning can be applied to his/her system.

Plant persistence in a site depends to some extent on them being pollinated, and pollinator population dynamics is affected by the amount of nectar and pollen they collect from the flowers they visit. However, plant growth and population dynamics are also affected by nutrient and light availability, save sites for seed germination, herbivory and fungal pathogens, mycorrhisation and environmental disturbances; and similar constraints exist for pollinators. It is thus difficult, if not impossible, to say how much of the observed abundance of a species (plant or pollinator) is caused by the specific plant-pollinator interaction and hence the structure of the network. To the extent that abundances are determined by the pollination interaction we may indeed introduce collinearity. To date, there are no data to estimate the proportion of population growth controlled by mutualistic interactions of either plants or pollinators. We can only guess based on observations such as strong nest-site limitation in solitary bees (Steffan-Dewenter & Schiele, 2008), relatively high parasitism rates of pollinators (Klein *et al.*, 2002), strong nutrient limitations of plant population dynamics (Ghazoul, 2005) and grazing pressure (Crawley, 1987; de Mazancourt & Loreau, 2000) that they are probably not dominating population dynamics. On the other hand, clear (but rare) examples of co-evolution indicate that such a strong mutual dependence may indeed occur (Waser *et al.*, 1996; Waser & Ollerton, 2006).

Secondly, the observed interactions are not necessarily reflecting abundance of flowers or pollinators, but rather their attractiveness (e.g. due to scent, colouration or nectar production) and activity (e.g. daily period of foraging, phenology through the season, temperature- dependence of foraging activity), respectively. Hence by using observed sums of observed interactions, one does not correct for abundance, but for attractiveness and activity, respectively.

Third, the null model uses marginal totals, i.e. summed across all links of a species. If a pollinator was specialised on a single plant species, the null model would scatter these interactions across all and hence correctly identify a miss-match between observed and null model. If, on the other hand, a pollinator was generalised, then the scattering of interactions across all plant species would also yield a similar picture and generalisation would correctly be inferred.



Finally, even if the null model used would introduce some amount of circularity and thus “over-correction”, we have to balance this against “over-detection”. Finding specialisation in an uncorrected approach will incur high levels of type I error (i.e. detecting a pattern that is actually not there). A null model insures against this type of error. We can thus be sure that a pattern that “survives” the null model test is no statistical artefact. Since it has been shown repeatedly that sampling intensity and “natural” differences in abundance will cause such artefacts (Dormann *et al.*, 2009; Blüthgen, 2010; Joppa *et al.*, 2009; Blüthgen *et al.*, 2008), they must be addressed. Ignoring them will lead to misinterpretation and over-reporting of spurious network structure. After correction for expectation based on abundances, we can start understanding ecology (Vázquez *et al.*, 2007).

In conclusion, circularity is unlikely to substantially impair null models for pollination networks. The risk of reporting non-existent network structure and further speculation of network stability due to this spurious network structure is a problem that requires a correction, even if circularity was present.

### 6.3 Using null models to test for significant tests in data

Once you have settled on a null model, there are fundamentally two different approaches to use such null models in statistical significance testing: corrected indices and null modelling the entire analysis. Let us look at them in turn, starting with the seemingly easier option.

**Corrected indices and  $z$ -scores** Imagine we computed the index  $I$  for a network. We now want to know whether this value is anything special, given the abundances of the species.<sup>17</sup> So we build, say, 1000 null models<sup>18</sup> and compute our index  $I$  for each of them. We can visualise the distribution of null-model  $I$ -values relative to our observed index value (Dormann *et al.*, 2009).

```
data(Safariland)
Iobs <- nestednodf(Safariland)$statistic[3]
nulls <- nullmodel(web=Safariland, N=1000, method='r2d') # takes a while!
Inulls <- sapply(nulls, function(x) nestednodf(x)$statistic[3])
plot(density(Inulls), xlim=c(0, 100), lwd=2, main="NODF")
abline(v=Iobs, col="red", lwd=2)
```

All that is fine for a single network, but no option if we want to analyse dozens or hundreds of networks. We thus have to summarise this figure in a value. The simplest, most obvious but generally not best solution would be to subtract the null model mean from the observed, so that  $I_{\text{corrected}} = \Delta I = I_{\text{observed}} - \bar{I}_{\text{nulls}}$ . The reason why this  $\Delta I$  is not ideal is that the null model distribution is likely to vary from network to network. Thus, a difference of, say, 20 may be a lot for pointy distributed null models such as the one in Fig. 7, but only little for null model values spreading over the entire  $x$ -axis.

The better, and more established approach, would be to compute  $z$ -scores (= standard scores or normal scores) for each network, which express the difference in terms of standard deviations of the null distribution:

$$z_I = \frac{I_{\text{observed}} - \bar{I}_{\text{nulls}}}{\sigma_{I_{\text{nulls}}}}.$$

We can now analyse the  $z$ -scores instead of the original  $I_{\text{obs}}$ -values.

$z$ -scores have one major disadvantage for several of the network indices presented earlier: the standard deviation becomes an unsuitable measure of spread as the values approach an upper or lower bound. Imagine our network index  $I$  is bound between 0 and 1 (as many are). If the null models have values above, say, 0.9, the upper bound is so close that the distribution will be skewed and the standard deviation biased too low. This may lead to inflated  $z$ -scores. So whenever you observe values close to either bound, beware of distorted  $z$ -scores.

<sup>17</sup>Thereby we justify the use of the Patefield algorithm as null model. But the approach is independent of which null model we use.

<sup>18</sup>E.g. using `nulls <- nullmodel(web=Safariland, N=1000, method='r2d')`




Figure 7: Observed and null-modelled nestedness (computed as NODF) for the network ‘Safariland’. Note that values of 100 indicate perfect nestedness. Thus, null models are much *less* nested than the observed network. (That is typically the case (Dormann et al. 2009), although often no null models are computed for comparison, making interpretation challenging.)

**Null-model the entire analysis** The alternative approach is to carry out the intended analysis on the observed index values  $I$  and then, in a second step, repeat it with one realisation of a null model per network. Next, repeat this second step several thousand times (for good measure) and store the statistics you are interested in (say  $F$ -values in an ANOVA or slopes in a regression). Instead of using the  $p$ -values from the analysis of the observed values, compare observed and null-modelled statistics and count the proportion of values exceeding the observed and use those as  $p$ -value. To anyone with any experience in resampling analysis or bootstrapping this is standard procedure (Efron & Tibshirani, 1993; Manly, 1997).

As an example, we can use a question addressed in Vázquez & Simberloff (2003), where the authors investigate whether cattle grazing affects the network structure of pollination networks in four replicated sites in Argentina. As response we haphazardly choose linkage density.

```
weblist <- lapply(c("Safariland", "vazarr", "vazllao", "vazcer", "vazmasc",
                  "vazmasnc", "vazquec", "vazquenc"), get)
# Write a function to compute the desired statistic, e.g. the difference
# between grazed and ungrazed:
meandiff <- function(webs){
  obs <- sapply(webs, networklevel, index="linkage density")
  mean(obs[1:4] - obs[5:8])
}
(observed <- meandiff(weblist))
```

```
[1] -0.2481145
```

Now generate a null model and repeat:

```
nulllist <- lapply(weblist, nullmodel, N=1, method="r2d")
meandiff(weblist)
```

```
[1] -0.2481145
```

Repeat this procedure, say, 5000 times:<sup>19</sup>

<sup>19</sup>For didactic purposes, we use an inelegant but easy to understand `for`-loop here. In productive mode we would instead use `sapply` or `replicate`, which would make the code more compact, but in this case not faster.




Figure 8: Distribution of mean differences in linkage density of pollination networks in grazed and ungrazed meadows, correcting for differences in species numbers and observation intensity through the use of null models ( $N = 5000$ ). Observed difference is shown as vertical line. The observed difference is significantly ( $P < 0.001$ ) different from null model expectations.

```
res <- 1:5000
for (i in 1:5000){ # takes a few minutes !!
  nulllist <- sapply(weblist, nullmodel, N=1, method="r2d")
  res[i] <- meandiff(nulllist)
}
```

Finally, we can depict the results in a histogram (Fig. 8), with observed as vertical line, and compute the  $p$ -value based on the 5000 null models:

```
hist(res, xlim=c(-0.3, 0.3), border="white", col="grey")
abline(v=observed, col="red", lwd=2)
# compute p-value as proportion smaller or than observed
sum(res < observed)/length(res) * 2 # *2 for two-tailed test
```

The idea here is to compute a statistic of interest, in this case the mean difference between some network index for the two treatments, and then use the null model to compute expectations. In the above example, we would apparently expect no difference (which is intuitive); additionally we also get an idea of how much variability we can expect (the distribution of the null model-based mean differences in linkage density). Thus, in this example, the difference in linkage density of pollination networks from grazed *vs* ungrazed pastures is highly significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

## 7 Modularity

Aggregated sets of interacting species are called ‘modules’. Their defining feature is that *within*-module interactions are more prevalent than *between*-module interactions (Newman, 2003; Newman & Girvan, 2004; Fortunato, 2010). In other words, modules are link-rich clusters of species in a community. What causes such modules and whether they actually teach us something is discussed at length by Dormann *et al.* (2017).

The package **bipartite** offers an algorithm (QuaBiMo, described in technical detail in Dormann & Strauss, 2014) to detect modules in bipartite networks, taking into account the quantitative nature of links. The algorithm has become outdated after a vastly improved approach was published by (Beckett, 2016), which is also now the default algorithm used in **bipartite**’s `computeModules` function.




Figure 9: A simulated 3-compartment network in random sequence (left), as sorted by a correspondence analysis (centre) and by the modularity algorithm with default settings (right).




Figure 10: Interaction matrix featuring nested modules for the data of Memmott (1999). Darker squares indicate more observed interactions. Coloured boxes delineate the seven modules. (Note that results may vary between runs.) In the central module yellow Asteraceae feature heavily, while a possible ecological cause pattern for the other modules is less apparent.

Typically, however, correspondence analysis will not be able to identify modules sufficiently well, even if modules are actually compartments (i.e. perfectly separated: Fig. 9 left, centre). The algorithm used in **bipartite** can do so, at least in principle (Fig. 9 right).<sup>20</sup>

QuaBiMo can be invoked recursively (we are working on doing the same for Beckett), searching for modules within modules (Fig. 10, bottom). While such nested modules become ever smaller and are thus ever faster to detect, there are plenty of them and hence nesting will typically dramatically prolong computing time during the search for patterns (Memmott, 1999).

Modularity  $Q$  is likely to be correlated with other network metric, as specialisation of module members is the prime reason for the existence of modules. Across the 22 quantitative pollination networks of the NCEAS “interaction webs” data base,  $Q$  was evidently highly positively correlated with complementary specialisation  $H'_2$  (Fig. 11). Ecologically, the correlation with specialisation makes good sense. Modules only exist because some




Figure 11: Modularity ( $Q$ ) is highly correlated with specialisation  $H'_2$  across 22 pollination networks. Names refer to network data sets in

<sup>20</sup>As a note on terminology: If modules are perfectly separated, with no species interacting with species in another module, they are called “compartments” and will be visible as clearly separated blocks of interacting species. It is relatively straightforward to implement a recursive compartment detection function, but compartments are too much black-and-white compared to modules and often only occur in ecological networks because sampling was rather incomplete or very different habitats were sampled.

species do not interact with some others, i.e. because they are specialised. An overall low degree of specialisation is equivalent to random interactions, which will yield no modules.

Furthermore, the absolute value of  $Q$  is, like all network indices (Dormann *et al.*, 2009), dependent on network size (i.e. the number of species) as well as the number of links and the total number of interactions observed (Thébault, 2013). We would thus recommend a null model comparison (Vázquez & Aizen, 2003; Blüthgen *et al.*, 2008; Dormann *et al.*, 2009) to correct the observed value of  $Q$  by null model expectation (e.g. by standardising them to  $z$ -scores:  $z_Q = \frac{Q_{\text{observed}} - \bar{Q}_{\text{null}}}{\sigma_{Q_{\text{null}}}}$ ). Modularity  $Q$  is in itself

not an index of an ecological feature. It is merely a measure of how well links and interactions can be separated into different modules. Large networks, with many species and links, allow for more combinations of species-in-modules, leading to higher values of  $Q$ , as Allesina & Pascual (2009) pointed out for any grouping algorithm.

### 7.1 Using modularity to identifying species with important roles in the network

Guimerà *et al.* (2005) and Olesen *et al.* (2007) propose to compute standardised connection and participation values, called  $c$  and  $z$ , for each species to describe their role in networks, where  $c$  refers to the between-modules connectivity (called “participation coefficient”  $P$  Guimerà *et al.*, 2005) and  $z$  refers to within-module degrees. Originally, both are computed based on the number of links, but a weighted version based on species strength is implemented, too. Guimerà *et al.* (2005) suggest critical values (only for the binary approach) of  $c$  and  $z$  of 0.625 and 2.5, respectively. Species exceeding both of these values are called “hubs” because they link different modules, combining high between- with high within-module connectivity.

In the case of the pollination network of Fig. 10,  $c$ -values range between 0 and 0.78 (with 23 of 79 pollinators and 13 of 25 plant species exceeding the threshold of 0.625);  $z$ -values range between  $-1.21$  and  $5.00$  (with two pollinators but no plant species exceeding the value of 2.5: Fig. 12). Put together, only the syrphid *Syrpitta pipiens* (and hawkbit *Leontodon hispidus* almost) exceeded both thresholds and would thus be called a “hub species”. As can be seen in Fig. 10, this syrphid is relatively rare but clearly not randomly distributed over the six modules, thus linking three highest-level modules. In contrast, *Leontodon hispidus* is a common plant species, visited by many different pollinators, and it actually links almost all modules.

To objectively define this threshold one could run null models of the original network and employ 95% quantiles as critical  $c$ - and  $z$ -values. For the pollinators in the network of Fig. 10 these would be  $0.67 (\pm 0.039)$  and  $1.45 (\pm 0.220)$ , respectively, based on 100 null models (for plants:  $c_{\text{critical}} = 0.72 \pm 0.036$  and  $z_{\text{critical}} = 1.78 \pm 0.297$ ; Fig. 12 left). While for plant species this has little effect (except for moving *Leontodon hispidus* across the threshold), three more pollinators would become hub species (the common hoverfly *Episyrphus balteatus*, the tachinid fly *Eriothis rufomaculata* and undetermined fly “Diptera spec.22”).

## 8 Analyses beyond *bipartite*

Of course, there are many different packages that analyse one or the other aspect of networks, and some even of bipartite networks (listed in the introduction of this vignette). Some of them we find particularly interesting or useful or innovative, and here we quickly show some of them at work.

### 8.1 Plotting pretty bipartites

The plotting functions provided by **bipartite** are somewhat rudimentary. We’re happy with them, and they are surprisingly flexible already, but our graphical skills (and intentions) are




Figure 12: Connection ( $c$ ) and participation ( $z$ ) values for pollinators (left) and plants (right) in the network of Memmott (1999). Dashed black lines indicate critical values according to Olesen et al. (2007), those in grey 95% quantiles from 100 null models (see text).

limited. Other people have developed plotting functions/solutions, which we shall briefly (and probably incompletely) show here.<sup>21</sup>

### 8.1.1 *bipartiteD3*

### 8.1.2 *igraph*

<https://kateto.net/netscix2016.html>; <https://rpubs.com/pjmurphy/317838>; [https://igraph.org/r/doc/layout\\_as\\_bipartite.html](https://igraph.org/r/doc/layout_as_bipartite.html)

### 8.1.3 *ggbipart*

There is the package **ggbipart**, on github.<sup>22</sup>

```
library(devtools)
install_github(rep="pedroj/bipartite_plots")
```

### 8.1.4 *multigraph*

See <https://stackoverflow.com/questions/31366066/how-to-plot-a-bipartite-graph-in-r>

## 8.2 *Analysing the structure of bipartite networks*

### 8.2.1 *bmotif*

### 8.2.2 *dynsbm*

## 8.3 *Multi-layer networks*

This somewhat cryptic term refers to networks that are defined by different types of links, for example because links change over time (dynamic links) or because they depend on other networks (Pilosof *et al.*, 2017). The mathematical description and analysis of such multilayer networks can be rather complex (Aleta & Moreno, 2019), and in ecology typically only relatively

<sup>21</sup>Partly based on this question on SO: <https://stackoverflow.com/questions/31366066/how-to-plot-a-bipartite-graph-in-r>

<sup>22</sup>See also [https://pedroj.github.io/bipartite\\_plots/](https://pedroj.github.io/bipartite_plots/) for more code examples.

simple types of multilayer networks are investigated; probably the most common being multi-level networks and temporally or spatially resolved networks.

While statistically and mathematically a lot of things are conceivable, few ideas actually resonate with ecologists (i.e. in the application). One idea is that networks evolve and hence change dynamically. Another is that any observed bipartite network is actually embedded in many other networks, e.g. a plant-pollinator-network may continue “into the ground” as plant-mycorrhiza networks, “into the sky” as pollinator-parasite network, and “sideways” as plant-herbivore network (Pocock *et al.*, 2012).

Currently, **bipartite** does not support any such analysis (apart from a pathetic function `npartite` and `plotweb2` for plotting stacked bipartite networks).

## Conclusions

The analysis of bipartite networks has seen a recent explosion of applications in ecology. The R-package **bipartite** aims at providing a user-friendly set of function to aid the visualisation and analysis of such networks. This vignette hopefully illustrated some of the challenges and solutions to such analyses. The main take-home-message it aims to convey is that there are considerable interpretational strings attached, and that the analysis of bipartite networks is not as straightforward as one might have initially hoped.

Feedback, improvements, corrections and additions are welcomed!

The Rnw source of this document is at <https://github.com/biometry/bipartite/bipartite/vignettes/Intro2bipartite.Rnw>.

## Bibliography

- Alarcón, R., Waser, N.M. & Ollerton, J. (2008) Year-to-year variation in the topology of a plant-pollinator interaction network. *Oikos*, **117**, 1796–1807. 10.1111/j.0030-1299.2008.16987.x. 10
- Alatalo, R.V. (1981) Problems in the measurement of evenness in ecology. *Oikos*, **37**, 199–204. 8
- Aleta, A. & Moreno, Y. (2019) Multilayer networks in a nutshell. *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics*, **10**, 45–62. ArXiv: 1804.03488. 22
- Allesina, S. & Pascual, M. (2009) Food web models: a plea for groups. *Ecology Letters*, **12**, 652–662. 21
- Almeida-Neto, M. & Ulrich, W. (2011) A straightforward computational approach for measuring nestedness using quantitative matrices. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, **26**, 173–178. 7
- Barber, K.R., Leeds-Harrison, P.B., Lawson, C.S. & Gowing, D.J.G. (2004) Soil aeration status in a lowland wet grassland. *Hydrological Processes*, **18**, 329–341. 16
- Barrat, A., Barthélemy, M., Pastor-Satorras, R. & Vespignani, A. (2004) The architecture of complex weighted networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, **101**, 3747–52. 9
- Bascompte, J., Jordano, P., Melián, C.J. & Olesen, J.M. (2003) The nested assembly of plant–animal mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, **100**, 9383–9387. 8
- Bascompte, J., Jordano, P. & Olesen, J.M. (2006) Asymmetric coevolutionary networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance. *Science*, **312**, 431–433. 9, 10
- Beckett, S.J. (2016) Improved community detection in weighted bipartite networks. *Royal Society open science*, **3**, 140536–140536. 19
- Bersier, L.F., Banasek-Richter, C. & Cattin, M.F. (2002) Quantitative descriptors of food-web matrices. *Ecology*, **83**, 2394–2407. 8, 9, 10
- Blüthgen, N. (2010) Why network analysis is often disconnected from community ecology: A critique and an ecologist’s guide. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, **11**, 185–195. 11, 17
- Blüthgen, N., Fründ, J., Vázquez, D.P. & Menzel, F. (2008) What do interaction network metrics tell us about specialization and biological traits? *Ecology*, **89**, 3387–99. 16, 17, 21
- Blüthgen, N., Menzel, F. & Blüthgen, N. (2006) Measuring specialization in species interaction networks. *BMC Ecology*, **6**, 9. 8, 11
- Blüthgen, N., Menzel, F., Hovestadt, T., Fiala, B. & Blüthgen, N. (2007) Specialization, constraints, and conflicting interests in mutualistic networks. *Current Biology*, **17**, 341–346. 7, 8



- Borgatti, S.P. & Everett, M.G. (1997) Network analysis of 2-mode data. *Social Networks*, **19**, 243–269. 10
- Brualdi, R.A. & Sanderson, J.G. (1999) Nested species subsets, gaps, and discrepancy. *Oecologia*, **119**, 256–264. 9
- Burgos, E., Ceva, H., Perazzo, R.P.J., Devoto, M., Medan, D., Zimmermann, M. & Delbue, A.M. (2007) Why nestedness in mutualistic networks? *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **249**, 307–313. 9
- Butts, C.T. (2013) *sna: Tools for Social Network Analysis*. R package version 2.2-2. 4
- Crawley, M.J. (1987) *Herbivory: The Dynamics of Animal Plant Interactions*. University of California Press, San Diego, USA. 16
- Dalsgaard, B., Martín González, A.M., Olesen, J.M., Timmermann, A., Andersen, L.H. & Ollerton, J. (2008) Pollination networks and functional specialization: a test using lesser antillean plant-hummingbird assemblages. *Oikos*, **117**, 789–793. 10
- de Mazancourt, C. & Loreau, M. (2000) Effect of herbivory and plant species replacement on primary production. *The American Naturalist*, **155**, 735–754. 16
- Devoto, M., Bailey, S., Craze, P. & Memmott, J. (2012) Understanding and planning ecological restoration of plant-pollinator networks. *Ecology Letters*, **15**, 319–328. 9
- Dormann, C.F. (2011) How to be a specialist? quantifying specialisation in pollination networks. *Network Biology*, **1**, 1–20. 3, 11
- Dormann, C.F. (2019) Bipartite vignette. *github*. 3
- Dormann, C.F., Blüthgen, N., Fründ, J. & Gruber, B. (2009) Indices, graphs and null models: Analyzing bipartite ecological networks. *The Open Ecology Journal*, **2**, 7–24. 3, 9, 15, 17, 21
- Dormann, C.F. & Blüthgen, N. (2017) *Food webs versus interaction networks: principles, pitfalls and perspectives*, p. 1–11. Cambridge University Press. 3
- Dormann, C.F., Fründ, J. & Gruber, B. (2008) Introducing the bipartite package: Analysing ecological networks. *R News*, **8**, 8–11. 3
- Dormann, C.F., Fründ, J. & Schaefer, H.M. (2017) Identifying causes of patterns in ecological networks: Opportunities and limitations. *Annual Reviews in Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, **48**, 559–84. 3, 19
- Dormann, C.F. & Strauß, R. (2014) A method for detecting modules in quantitative bipartite networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **5**, 90–98. 3, 19
- Dunne, J.A., Williams, R.J. & Martinez, N.D. (2002) Food-web structure and network theory: The role of connectance and size. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, **99**, 12917–22. 7
- Efron, B. & Tibshirani, R.J. (1993) *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman & Hall, London. 18
- Feinsinger, P., Spears, E.E. & Poole, R.W. (1981) A simple measure of niche breadth. *Ecology*, **62**, 27–32. 11
- Fisher, R., Corbet, A. & Williams, C. (1943) The relation between the number of species and the number of individuals in a random sample of animal population. 12, 42–58. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **12**, 42–58. 8, 10
- Fortunato, S. (2010) Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports*, **486**, 75–174. 19
- Galeano, J., Pastor, J.M. & Iriando, J.M. (2009) Weighted-interaction nestedness estimator (wine): A new estimator to calculate over frequency matrices. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, **24**, 1342–1346. 7
- Ghazoul, J. (2005) Buzziness as usual? questioning the global pollination crisis. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **20**, 367–73. 16
- Gotelli, N.J. & Graves, G.R. (1996) *Null Models in Ecology*. Smithsonian Institution Press. 7, 15
- Guimerà, R., Mossa, S., Turtshi, A. & Amaral, L.A.N. (2005) The worldwide air transportation network: Anomalous centrality, community structure, and cities' global roles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **102**, 7794–9. 16, 21
- Hausdorf, B. & Hennig, C. (2007) Null model tests of clustering of species, negative co-occurrence patterns and nestedness in meta-communities. *Oikos*, **116**, 818–828. 15
- Hurlbert, S.H. (1978) Measurement of niche overlap and some relatives. *Ecology*, **59**, 67–77. 9
- Joppa, L.N., Bascompte, J., Montoya, J.M., Solé, R.V., Sanderson, J. & Pimm, S.L. (2009) Reciprocal specialization in ecological networks. *Ecology Letters*, **12**, 961–969. 16, 17
- Jordano, P., Bascompte, J. & Olesen, J.M. (2003) Invariant properties in coevolutionary networks of plant-animal interactions. *Ecology Letters*, **6**, 69–81. 9
- Jost, L. (2006) Entropy and diversity. *Oikos*, **113**, 363–375. 9
- Julliard, R., Clavel, J., Devictor, V., Jiguet, F. & Couvet, D. (2006) Spatial segregation of specialists and generalists in bird communities. *Ecology Letters*, **9**, 1237–1244. 10
- Kallimanis, A., Petanidou, T., Tzanopoulos, J., Pantis, J. & Sgardelis, S. (2009) Do plant-pollinator interaction networks result from stochastic processes? *Ecological Modelling*, **220**, 684–693. 16



- Klein, A.M., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Tschardtke, T. (2002) Predator–prey ratios on cocoa along a land-use gradient in indonesia. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, **11**, 683–693. 16
- Krishna, A., Guimarães Jr, P.R., Jordano, P. & Bascompte, J. (2008) A neutral-niche theory of nestedness in mutualistic networks. *Oikos*, **117**, 1609–1618. 16
- Latapy, M., Magnien, C. & Vecchio, N.D. (2008) Basic notions for the analysis of large two-mode networks. *Social Networks*, **30**, 31–48. 16
- Manly, B.F. (1997) *Randomization, Bootstrap and Monte Carlo Methods in Biology*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, New York, 2nd edition. 18
- Martín González, A.M., Dalsgaard, B. & Olesen, J.M. (2010) Centrality measures and the importance of generalist species in pollination networks. *Ecological Complexity*, **7**, 36–47. 10
- Memmott, J. (1999) The structure of a plant–pollinator food web. *Ecology Letters*, **2**, 276–280. 20
- Memmott, J., Waser, N.M. & Price, M.V. (2004) Tolerance of pollination networks to species extinctions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society London B*, **271**, 2605–11. 9
- Moore, J.E. & Swihart, R.K. (2007) Toward ecologically explicit null models of nestedness. *Oecologia*, **152**, 763–77. 16
- Morris, R.J., Lewis, O.T. & Godfray, H.C.J. (2005) Apparent competition and insect community structure: towards a spatial perspective. *Annales Zoologici Fennici*, **42**, 449–462. 4
- Motten, A.F. (1982) *Pollination Ecology of the Spring Wildflower Community in the Deciduous Forests of Piedmont North Carolina*. PhD thesis, Duke University. 4
- Müller, C.B., Adriaanse, I.C.T., Belshaw, R. & Godfray, H.C.J. (1999) The structure of an aphid–parasitoid community. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **68**, 346–370. 8
- Newman, M.E.J. (2003) The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM Review*, **45**, 167–256. 19
- Newman, M.E.J. & Girvan, M. (2004) Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*, **69**, 1–15. 16, 19
- Olesen, J.M., Bascompte, J., Dupont, Y.L. & Jordano, P. (2007) The modularity of pollination networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, **104**, 19891–19896. 21
- Opsahl, T. (2010) Triadic closure in two-mode networks: redefining the global and local cluster coefficient. *arXiv*, p. 1006.0887v2. 8
- Patefield, W.M. (1981) Algorithm as159. an efficient method of generating  $r \times c$  tables with given row and column totals. *Applied Statistics*, **30**, 91–97. 16
- Pielou, E.C. (1972)  $2^k$  contingency tables in ecology. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **34**, 337–352. 9
- Pilosof, S., Porter, M.A., Pascual, M. & Kéfi, S. (2017) The multilayer nature of ecological networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, **1**, 0101–0101. 22
- Pocock, M.J.O., Evans, D.M. & Memmott, J. (2012) The robustness and restoration of a network of ecological networks. *Science*, **335**, 973–977. 23
- Poisot, T., Bever, J.D., Nemri, A., Thrall, P.H. & Hochberg, M.E. (2011a) A conceptual framework for the evolution of ecological specialisation. *Ecology Letters*, **14**, 841–851. 10
- Poisot, T., Canard, E., Mouquet, N. & Hochberg, M.E. (2012) A comparative study of ecological specialization estimators. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 537–544. 10, 11
- Poisot, T., Lepennetier, G., Martinez, E., Ramsayer, J. & Hochberg, M.E. (2011b) Resource availability affects the structure of a natural bacteria–bacteriophage community. *Biology Letters*, **7**, 201–4. 10
- Roberts, A. & Stone, L. (1990) Island-sharing by archipelago species. *Oecologia*, **83**, 560–567. 8
- Rodríguez-Gironés, M.A. & Santamaría, L. (2006) A new algorithm to calculate the nestedness temperature of presence-absence matrices. *Journal of Biogeography*, **33**, 924–935. 7
- Santamaría, L. & Rodríguez-Gironés, M.A. (2007) Linkage rules for plant–pollinator networks: trait complementarity or exploitation barriers? *PLoS Biology*, **5**, e31. 16
- Schluter, D. (1984) A variance test for detecting species associations, with some example applications. *Ecology*, **65**, 998–1005. 9
- Schoener, T. (1989) Food webs from the small to the large. *Ecology*, **70**, 1559–1589. 10
- Shermer, M. (2012) *The Believing Brain: From Ghosts and Gods to Politics and Conspiracies – How We Construct Beliefs and Reinforce Them as Truths*. St. Martin’s Griffin, New York. 15
- Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Schiele, S. (2008) Do resources or natural enemies drive bee population dynamics in fragmented habitats? *Ecology*, **89**, 1375–1387. 16
- Stone, L. & Roberts, A. (1990) The checkerboard score and species distributions. *Oecologia*, **85**, 74–79. 9
- Stone, L. & Roberts, A. (1992) Competitive exclusion, or species aggregation? an aid in deciding. *Oecologia*, **91**, 419–424. 8
- Thébault, E. (2013) Identifying compartments in presence-absence matrices and bipartite networks: insights into modularity measures. *Journal of Biogeography*, **40**, 759–768. 21
- Tylianakis, J.M., Tschardtke, T. & Lewis, O.T. (2007) Habitat modification alters the structure of tropical

- host-parasitoid food webs. *Nature*, **445**, 202–5. 7, 8
- Vázquez, D.P. & Aizen, M.A. (2003) Null model analyses of specialization in plant–pollinator interactions. *Ecology*, **84**, 2493–2501. 16, 21
- Vázquez, D.P. & Aizen, M.A. (2006) Community-wide patterns of specialization in plant–pollinator interactions revealed by null models. N.M. Waser & J. Ollerton, eds., *Plant-Pollinator Interactions: From Specialization to Generalization*, pp. 200–219. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 16
- Vázquez, D.P., Blüthgen, N., Cagnolo, L. & Chacoff, N.P. (2009) Uniting pattern and process in plant–animal mutualistic networks: a review. *Annals of Botany*, **103**, 1445–57. 16
- Vázquez, D.P. & Simberloff, D. (2003) Changes in interaction biodiversity induced by an introduced ungulate. *Ecology Letters*, **6**, 1077–1083. 18
- Vázquez, D.P., Melián, C.J., Williams, N.M., Blüthgen, N., Krasnov, B.R. & Poulin, R. (2007) Species abundance and asymmetric interaction strength in ecological networks. *Oikos*, **116**, 1120–1127. 10, 17
- Waser, N.M., Chittka, L., Price, M.V., Williams, N.M. & Ollerton, J. (1996) Generalization in pollination systems, and why it matters. *Ecology*, **77**, 1043–1060. 16
- Waser, N.M. & Ollerton, J. (2006) *Plant-Pollinator Interactions: From Specialization to Generalization*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 16
- Watts, D.J. & Strogatz, S.H. (1998) Collective dynamics of ‘small-world’ networks. *Nature*, **393**, 440–442. 8

## *Index*

adjacency matrix, 3  
Alatalo interaction evenness, 8  
as.one.mode, 4  
  
betweenness, 10  
  
C score, 9  
circularity, 16  
closeness, 10  
connectance, 7  
  
discrepancy, 9  
  
Fisher's alpha, 10  
for-loop, 18  
frame2webs, 4  
functional diversity, 9  
  
generality, 9  
grouplevel, 8  
  
nestedrank, 10  
networklevel, 7  
node specialisation index, 10  
normal score, 17  
null model, 15  
nullmodel, 18  
  
Paired Differences Index, 10  
plotPAC, 4  
plotweb, 4  
pollination service index, 10  
  
resampling analysis, 18  
resource range, 10  
  
sortweb, 4  
standard score, 17  
  
V ratio, 9  
visweb, 4  
vulnerability, 9  
  
webs2array, 4  
  
z-score, 17