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Abstract

TODO

Blah blah blah [1]

*“It is incumbent on network ecologists to establish clearly the independence and uniqueness of the descriptive metrics used.”* - [2]
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| Table 1: An informative caption about the different network properties   | Label | Definition | “Function” | Reference (for maths), can make footnotes probs | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Basal | Percentage of basal taxa, defined as species who have a vulnerability of zero |  |  | | Connectance | , where is the number of species and the number of links |  |  | | Cannibal | Percentage of species that are cannibals |  |  | | ChLen | Mean food chain length, averaged over all species (where a food chain is defined as a continuous path from a ‘basal’ to a ‘top’ species) |  |  | | ChSD | Standard deviation of ChLen |  |  | | ChNum | log number of food chains |  |  | | Clust | mean clustering coefficient (probability that two taxa linked to the same taxon are also linked) |  | **TODO** | | GenSD | Normalized standard deviation of generality of a species standardized by |  | [3] | | Herbivore | Percentage of herbivores plus detritivores (taxa that feed only on basal taxa) |  |  | | Intermediate | Percentage of intermediate taxa (with both consumers and resources) |  |  | | LinkSD | Normalized standard deviation of links (number of consumers plus resources per taxon) |  |  | | Loop | Percentage of taxa in loops (food chains in which a taxon occurs twice) |  |  | | L/S | links per species |  |  | | MaxSim | Mean of the maximum trophic similarity of each taxon to other taxa, the number of predators and prey shared by a pair of species divided by their total number of predators and prey |  | **TODO** | | Omnivory | Percentage of omnivores (taxa that feed on 2 taxa with different trophic levels) |  |  | | Path | characteristic path length, the mean shortest food chain length between species pairs |  |  | | Richness | Number of nodes in the network |  |  | | TL | Prey-weighted trophic level averaged across taxa |  | [4] | | Top | Percentage of top taxa (taxa without consumers) |  |  | | VulSD | Normalized standard deviation of vulnerability of a species standardized by |  |  | | Links | The number of links in the network |  |  | | Diameter | Diameter can also be measured as the average of the distances between each pair of nodes in the network |  | [5] | |  | Spectral radius is a a conceptual analog to nestedness (and more appropriate for unipartite networks). It is defined as the absolute value of the largest real part of the eigenvalues of the *undirected* adjacency matrix |  | [6] | | Complexity | SVD complexity of a network, defined as the Pielou entropy of its singular values | Something about structural v behavioural complexity being captured | [7] | | Centrality | Centrality is a measure of how ‘influential’ a species is, under various definitions of ‘influence’… | Centrality can help in quantifying the importance of species in a network |  | | S1 | Number of linear chains |  | [8] [9] | | S2 | Number of omnivory motifs |  | [8] [9] | | S4 | Number of apparent competition motifs |  | [8] [9] | | S5 | Number of direct competition motifs |  | [8] [9] | | Intervality |  |  | **TODO** [10] | |
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| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2: Here is a table showing the correlation of the different network properties with the first three dimensions of the PCA   | Property | PCA 1 (42%) | PCA 2 (24%) | PCA 3 (11%) | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | richness | 0.63 | 0.49 | 0.18 | | connectance | -0.92 | -0.08 | 0.14 | | distance | 0 | **0.83** | 0.29 | | basal | 0.47 | -0.04 | 0.66 | | top | **0.8** | -0.24 | -0.50 | | intermediate | -0.9 | 0.2 | -0.10 | | herbivory | 0.64 | -0.02 | 0.49 | | omnivory | -0.88 | 0.29 | -0.32 | | cannibal | -0.85 | -0.12 | 0.00 | | l\_S | -0.5 | 0.27 | 0.38 | | GenSD | 0.64 | 0.18 | 0.59 | | VulSD | **0.86** | -0.14 | -0.38 | | TL | -0.25 | **0.86** | -0.09 | | ChLen | 0.45 | 0.61 | 0.06 | | ChSD | 0 | **0.86** | -0.29 | | ChNum | **0.9** | 0.02 | -0.29 | | path | -0.04 | **0.92** | -0.17 | | LinkSD | **0.85** | 0.17 | -0.25 | | loops | 0.17 | **0.79** | -0.08 | |

Source: [Article Notebook](https://BecksLab.github.io/ms_feature_selection/index.qmd.html)
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