

# Methods for Reconstructing Paleo Food Webs

Tanya Strydom <sup>1</sup>; Andrew P. Beckerman <sup>1</sup>

**Abstract:** TODO.

**Keywords:** food web, network construction

<sub>1</sub> **1 Why build paleo food webs?**

- <sub>2</sub> • Because its interesting?
- <sub>3</sub> • Value in using hindcasting to aid in forecasting. *e.g.*, the Toarcian ms (Dunhill et al., 2024) shows how
- <sub>4</sub> we can use these paleo communities to understand trophic-level responses to extinctions.

<sub>5</sub> **2 How do we do it?**

- <sub>6</sub> • There is an evolving body of work that focuses on developing tools specifically for the task of predicting
- <sub>7</sub> food webs.
- <sub>8</sub> • There are a handful that have been developed specifically in the context of paleo settings *e.g.*, TODO
- <sub>9</sub> but we can also talk about those that might have been developed/tested in contemporary settings but
- <sub>10</sub> still have applicability in paleo ones.
- <sub>11</sub> • Different underlying theory though
- <sub>12</sub> – Focus here on the idea of different ‘currencies’ but also aggregations - energy vs compatibility.
- <sub>13</sub> • Insert brief overview of the different methods as they pertain to approach (so the T4T triangle)
- <sub>14</sub> • Challenges we face (even in contemporary settings)?
- <sub>15</sub> – keep high level - I think the argument here should fall more in the data trade offs...

<sub>16</sub> **3 Understanding how networks are different**

<sub>17</sub> It is important to be aware that networks can be configured in different ways depending on how the inter-

<sub>18</sub> actions are defined (Strydom, in prep). Basically we have metawebs, which represent *potential* interactions,

<sub>19</sub> and realised networks, which represent the subset of potential that are realised as a result of community and

<sub>20</sub> environmental context.

<sub>21</sub> **4 Challenges specific to paleo communities/networks**

<sub>22</sub> Although there are a suite of tools and methods that have been developed to predict species interactions and

<sub>23</sub> networks they will not all be suitable for the prediction of paleo communities. Some of these include the fact

<sub>24</sub> that the fossil record is incomplete/preservation is biased [REF] which means that we have an incomplete

<sub>25</sub> picture of the entire community. Fossils are 2D and only represent specific ‘parts’ of an individual (hard and

26 bone-y bits), this means we don't have a complete picture of the physical traits of species *e.g.*, no body mass  
27 (but yes size), behaviours, or ability to construct well resolved phylogenetic trees the deeper we go back in  
28 time. Also owing to the patchy nature of fossils one often has to aggregate over large spatial scales, and also  
29 fossils are preserved in 2D so no *real* idea of spatial arrangements, compounded that fossils aren't necessarily  
30 conserved/found 'in situ' but can be moved (*e.g.*, alluvial deposits). Methodologically speaking some tools  
31 that 'learn' from contemporary communities (*e.g.*, Strydom et al. (2023), Caron et al. (2022)) will become  
32 'worse' the further one goes back in time since species then look very different from now but can still be  
33 useful for 'recent' communities (*e.g.*, Fricke et al. (2022)). Something about the intersectionality of the data  
34 we don't have for paleo communities and the data we need for some of the different modelling approaches.

## 35 5 Dataset Overview

- 36 • Species  
37 • Time/space  
38 • And probably some other paleo things that will be relevant...

## 39 6 Methods

### 40 6.1 Models

Table 1: A summary of the different families of tools that can be used to generate paleo food webs.

Model	Predicts	Notes
Allometric diet breadth model	Realised network	
Body size ratio model	Metaweb (?)	
Niche model	Structural network	Is not species specific - cannot apply species metadata
Paleo food web inference model	Realised network (if downsampling)	

41 **6.1.1 Paleo food web inference model**

42 The Paleo food web inference model (PFIM; Shaw et al. (2024)) uses a series of rules for a set of trait  
43 categories (such as habitat and body size) to determine if an interaction can feasibly occur between a species  
44 pair. If all conditions are met for the different rule classes then an interaction is deemed to be feasible. The  
45 original work put forward in Shaw et al. (2024) also includes a ‘downsampling’ step developed by Roopnarine  
46 (2006) that uses a power law, defined by the link distribution, to ‘prune’ down some of the links. It is worth  
47 mentioning that this approach is similar to that developed by Roopnarine (2017) with the exception that  
48 Shaw does not specifically bin species into guilds, and so we choose to use the method developed by Shaw  
49 since both methods should produce extremely similar networks as they are built on the same underlying  
50 philosophy.

51 **6.1.1.1 Defining organism ecologies, feeding interactions and trophic guilds**

52 This is currently verbatim from the Dunhill ms...

53 Modes of life were defined for each fossil species based on the ecological traits defined in the Bambach  
54 ecospace model (Bambach et al., 2007). Ecological traits were assigned based on interpretations from the  
55 published literature which are largely based on functional morphology and information from extant relatives.  
56 Information on the body size of each species was also recorded by summarising mean specimen sizes from the  
57 section into a categorical classification. The following ecological characteristics were recorded for each fossil  
58 species; motility (fast, slow, facultative, non-motile), tiering (pelagic, erect, surficial, semi-infaunal, shallow  
59 infaunal, deep infaunal), feeding (predator, suspension feeder, deposit feeder, mining, grazer), and size:  
60 gigantic (>500 mm), very large (>300–500 mm), large (>100–300 mm), medium (>50–100 mm), small (>10–  
61 50 mm), tiny ( 10 mm). Size categories are defined by the longest axis of the fossil, estimates of tracemaker  
62 size from trace fossils based on literature accounts, or by extrapolating the total length for belemnites from  
63 the preserved guard using established approaches<sup>78,79</sup>.

64 **6.1.2 Allometric diet breadth model**

65 The Allometric diet breadth model (ADBM; Petchey et al. (2008)) is rooted in feeding theory and allocates  
66 the links between species based on energetics, which predicts the diet of a consumer based on energy intake.  
67 This means that the model is focused on predicting not only the number of links in a network but also the  
68 arrangement of these links based on the diet breadth of a species, where the diet ( $K$ ) is defined as follows:

$$K = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{ij} E_i}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_{ij} H_{ij}} \quad (1)$$

69 where  $\lambda_{ij}$  is the handling time, which is the product of the attack rate  $A_i$  and resource density  $N_i$ ,  $E_i$  is the  
 70 energy content of the resource and  $H_{ij}$  is the ratio handling time, with the relationship being dependent on  
 71 the ratio of predator and prey body mass as follows:

$$H_{ij} = \frac{h}{b - \frac{M_i}{M_j}} \text{ if } \frac{M_i}{M_j} < b$$

72 or

$$H_{ij} = \infty \geq b$$

73 Refer to Petchey et al. (2008) for more details as to how these different terms are parametrised.

#### 74 6.1.3 Body size ratio model

75 The body size ratio model (Rohr et al., 2010) determines feeding interactions using the ratio between consumer  
 76 and resource body sizes - which supposedly stems from niche theory (still trying to reconcile that myself).  
 77 The probability of a link existing between a consumer and resource (in its most basic form) is defined as  
 78 follows:

$$P_{ij} = \frac{p}{1 + p}$$

79 where

$$p = \exp[\alpha + \beta \log(\frac{M_i}{M_j}) + \gamma \log^2(\frac{M_i}{M_j})] \quad (2)$$

80 The original latent-trait model developed by Rohr et al. (2010) also included an additional latent trait term  
 81  $v_i \delta f_j$  however for simplicity we will use Equation 2 as per Yeakel et al. (2014) Based on Rohr et al. (2010) it  
 82 is possible to estimate the parameters  $\alpha$ ,  $\delta$ , and  $\gamma$  using a GLM but we will use the parameters from Yeakel  
 83 et al. (2014), which was ‘trained’ on the Serengeti food web data and are as follows:  $\alpha = 1.41$ ,  $\delta = 3.75$ , and  
 84  $\gamma = 1.87$ .

85 **6.1.4 Niche model**

86 The niche model (Williams & Martinez, 2000) introduces the idea that species interactions are based on the  
87 ‘feeding niche’ of a species. Broadly, all species are randomly assigned a ‘feeding niche’ range and all species  
88 that fall in this range can be consumed by that species (thereby allowing for cannibalism). The niche of each  
89 species is randomly assigned and the range of each species’ niche is (in part) constrained by the specified  
90 connectance of the network. The niche model has also been modified, although it appears that adding to  
91 the ‘complexity’ of the niche model does not improve on its ability to generate a more ecologically ‘correct’  
92 network (Williams & Martinez, 2008).

93 **6.2 Assessing model performance**

94 blah blah

95 **7 Results**

96 **7.1 Comparing predicted networks**

97 [Figure 1 about here.]

98 **7.2 Comparing inference**

99 **7.3 Extinctions**

100 [Figure 2 about here.]

101 [Figure 3 about here.]

102 **References**

103 Bambach, R. K., Bush, A. M., & Erwin, D. H. (2007). Autecology and the Filling of Ecospace: Key Metazoan  
104 Radiations. *Palaeontology*, 50(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4983.2006.00611.x>

105 Caron, D., Maiorano, L., Thuiller, W., & Pollock, L. J. (2022). Addressing the Eltonian shortfall with  
106 trait-based interaction models. *Ecology Letters*, 25(4), 889–899. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13966>

107 Dunhill, A. M., Zarzyczny, K., Shaw, J. O., Atkinson, J. W., Little, C. T. S., & Beckerman, A. P. (2024).  
108 Extinction cascades, community collapse, and recovery across a Mesozoic hyperthermal event. *Nature  
Communications*, 15(1), 8599. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-53000-2>

- 110 Fricke, E. C., Hsieh, C., Middleton, O., Gorczynski, D., Cappello, C. D., Sanisidro, O., Rowan, J., Svenning,  
111 J.-C., & Beaudrot, L. (2022). Collapse of terrestrial mammal food webs since the Late Pleistocene.  
112 *Science*, 377(6609), 1008–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn4012>
- 113 Petchey, O. L., Beckerman, A. P., Riede, J. O., & Warren, P. H. (2008). Size, foraging, and food web  
114 structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(11), 4191–4196. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0710672105>
- 115 Rohr, R., Scherer, H., Kehrli, P., Mazza, C., & Bersier, L.-F. (2010). Modeling food webs: Exploring  
116 unexplained structure using latent traits. *The American Naturalist*, 176(2), 170–177. <https://doi.org/10.1086/653667>
- 119 Roopnarine, P. D. (2006). Extinction cascades and catastrophe in ancient food webs. *Paleobiology*, 32(1),  
120 1–19. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4096814>
- 121 Roopnarine, P. D. (2017). *Ecological Modelling of Paleocommunity Food Webs* (pp. 201–226). University of  
122 Chicago Press.
- 123 Shaw, J. O., Dunhill, A. M., Beckerman, A. P., Dunne, J. A., & Hull, P. M. (2024). *A framework for  
124 reconstructing ancient food webs using functional trait data* (p. 2024.01.30.578036). bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.30.578036>
- 126 Strydom, T., Bouskila, S., Banville, F., Barros, C., Caron, D., Farrell, M. J., Fortin, M.-J., Mercier, B.,  
127 Pollock, L. J., Runghen, R., Dalla Riva, G. V., & Poisot, T. (2023). Graph embedding and transfer  
128 learning can help predict potential species interaction networks despite data limitations. *Methods in  
129 Ecology and Evolution*, 14(12), 2917–2930. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14228>
- 130 Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2000). Simple rules yield complex food webs. *Nature*, 404(6774), 180–183.  
131 <https://doi.org/10.1038/35004572>
- 132 Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2008). Success and its limits among structural models of complex food  
133 webs. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77(3), 512–519. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01362.x>
- 134 Yeakel, J. D., Pires, M. M., Rudolf, L., Dominy, N. J., Koch, P. L., Guimarães, P. R., & Gross, T. (2014).  
135 Collapse of an ecological network in ancient egypt. *PNAS*, 111(40), 14472–14477. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1408471111>




Figure 1: stuff




Figure 2: Dashed line indicates the (mean) extinction simulation results (post value, start values are those estimated by the relevant model)




Figure 3: Dark line indicates ‘real’ extinction simulation results the lighter lines show each model individually, which is also denoted by the linetype