

# Methods for Reconstructing Paleo Food Webs

Tanya Strydom <sup>1</sup>; Baran Karapunar <sup>2</sup>; Andrew P. Beckerman <sup>1</sup>; Alexander Dunhill <sup>2</sup>

**Abstract:** Food webs represent the feeding relationships between species and can help infer ecosystem-level processes. Alongside the development of food web theory, methods for constructing food webs have been developed to infer species interactions when empirical data is lacking. Food web construction methods are diverse, each utilising different approaches to infer species interactions —such as the use of traits to infer mechanistic relationships vs using gut content as a proxy for species diets. These methods have distinct theories, mechanisms, and data requirements. In paleoecology, where direct evidence of feeding interactions are rare, food web construction methods are especially valuable and affords us the opportunity to make inferences about paleo communities beyond simply a record of species composition. However, the limitations of paleontological data (e.g., information of species traits is limited to that which can be preserved) restrict which methods can reliably be used. By considering both ecological theory and the constraints of what can be derived from the fossil record, we identify the methods best suited for the construction of paleo food webs. Specifically, we focus on how these methods differ in the networks they produce and what these networks can reveal about species interactions. In doing so we hope to clarify the ecological nuances of network prediction and help prevent the accidental misuse or misinterpretation of paleo food webs.

**Keywords:** food web, network construction

1 There has been a growing interest in understanding community responses to environmental changes across  
2 deep time events as a means to help understand current and future biodiversity changes (Dillon et al., 2022;  
3 Kiessling et al., 2019). Species interactions and the resulting networks have gained popularity in contemporary  
4 settings as a means to help us to understand aspects of community composition and biodiversity (eg Thuiller  
5 et al. (2024) and ??) and so it is perhaps unsurprising that there has been a growing interest in using paleo  
6 food webs in a similar manner (*e.g.*, Dunhill et al., 2024 looked at...; Hao et al., 2025 looked at...; Yeakel et al.,  
7 2014 looked at...). However, one of the core challenges and limitations of being able to effectively *use* food  
8 webs is the challenge of *creating* them (Jordano, 2016), although this is a challenge within contemporary  
9 settings it is compounded in paleo contexts where, in the absence of being able to observe interactions, we  
10 are dependent on the fossil record (and the inherent limitation it imposes) to infer interactions. As a way to  
11 address the challenges with recording species interactions there has been the development of a large number  
12 of models and tools that can be used to infer either species interactions (see *e.g.*, Morales-Castilla et al., 2015;  
13 Pichler & Hartig, 2023; Strydom et al., 2021 for broader reviews) or networks (see *e.g.*, Allesina et al., 2008).  
14 Although there has been the development of models and tools that are specific for inferring paleo food webs  
15 (Fricke et al., 2022; Roopnarine, 2006; *e.g.*, Shaw et al., 2024), it should be noted that these models only  
16 occupy a subset of the broader family of approaches that are used to predict networks, as they typically only  
17 focus on assessing the feasibility of interactions between species. Being able to construct only one ‘type’ of  
18 network means that we are limited in the scope of questions that we can appropriately answer with those  
19 networks [see Strydom in prep; Gauzens et al. (2025)]. However, there is scope that models and tools that  
20 have been developed in contemporary settings have the potential to be used for paleo settings (*e.g.*, Yeakel et  
21 al., 2014), which opens the door for researchers to ask a broader and more complete range of questions about  
22 community responses to environmental change.

23 Here we aim to provide an overview of the different models that can be used to construct food webs using  
24 paleo data. Specifically we focus on identifying a suite of models that are appropriate for use with paleo data  
25 that can feasibly be constructed within the limitations that are imposed by fossil data while still spanning the  
26 larger network space. Additionally we use the data from Dunhill et al. (2024) as a case study to understand  
27 how different models recover different networks, both in terms of structure as well as pairwise interactions and  
28 establish if there are consequences for using networks that are constructed using different models in terms of  
29 making inferences about the behaviour of the system by looking at how the model type influences what we  
30 infer to be the dominant driver of extinctions across a mass extinction event.

<sup>31</sup> **1 Constructing paleo webs**

<sup>32</sup> **2 Challenges specific to building paleo networks**

<sup>33</sup> Although there has been a push for the development of tools and methods that allow us to predict species  
<sup>34</sup> interactions and networks they will not all be suitable for the prediction of paleo communities. This is  
<sup>35</sup> primarily due to limitations that we are faced with in terms of the information that can be inferred from  
<sup>36</sup> the fossil record (such as species traits, abundances, and assemblages), which is needed as input data for the  
<sup>37</sup> different models. The limited information available from the fossil record is compounded by the incomplete  
<sup>38</sup> and biased preservation of species [REF], which part of a species is preserved (part vs whole), the ambiguity of  
<sup>39</sup> the ‘true’ community composition [were communities conserved *in situ* or were they there owing to geological  
<sup>40</sup> processes?; REF], as well as the availability/accessibility of different rock layers (and thus the completeness of  
<sup>41</sup> data we might have for a specific era in time). Additionally there is an increasing degree of ‘fuzziness’ around  
<sup>42</sup> the ecology and life histories of species the further one moves back in geological time [REF]. This is not to say  
<sup>43</sup> that because we have imperfect data we should not be attempting to construct paleo food webs but rather  
<sup>44</sup> that we need to be aware of what the uncertainties are and how these might impact the assumptions that we  
<sup>45</sup> need to make when constructing a network (as well as how this will intersect with the intended end use of  
<sup>46</sup> the network). This will allow us to best identify an approach that minimises the assumption and potential  
<sup>47</sup> uncertainties within the data while still constructing a suitable network. This includes thinking about both  
<sup>48</sup> assumptions you are making about the actual data *e.g.*, trying to extrapolate body size from fossil data but  
<sup>49</sup> also assumptions across time *e.g.*, assuming modern trait-feeding modes are the same or that assumptions  
<sup>50</sup> about network structure will hold across deep time.

<sup>51</sup> **2.1 Understanding the approaches to network construction**

<sup>52</sup> Broadly we can think about network construction as being nested within two different schools of thought (and  
<sup>53</sup> thus methodological approaches, Figure 1), models that focus on assessing the *mechanistic* feasibility of an  
<sup>54</sup> interaction being able to occur between two species or models that are more closely married to specific bodies  
<sup>55</sup> of ecological *theory* - such as niche theory or foraging ecology. The former of which will construct ‘metawebs’  
<sup>56</sup> and the latter ‘realised networks’ [Strydom et al in prep]. Models that have specifically been developed  
<sup>57</sup> in the paleo space tend to be mechanistic in nature in that they focus on using a trait-based approach to  
<sup>58</sup> formalise feeding interactions (*e.g.*, Shaw et al. (2024); Roopnarine (2006)), are assembled by expert opinion  
<sup>59</sup> (*e.g.* Dunne et al. (2014)), or make assumptions based on the evolutionary signals of interactions (*e.g.*,  
60 Fricke et al. (2022)). Thus paleo models typically only construct metawebs, and there is the need for the

61 intentional adoption of theoretical models if we want to realise the full potential of questions and information  
 62 that we can glean from the fossil record. However, there is an argument that the fundamental ‘currencies of  
 63 life’ to have remained constant - *e.g.*, the energetic constraints of foraging or foraging niches, meaning that  
 64 theoretical models that have been developed and tested on contemporary food webs should still hold for paleo  
 65 communities.

66 [Figure 1 about here.]

67 Here we present six different models (Table 1) that can be used to construct food webs for both this specific  
 68 community but are also broadly suited to paleo network prediction. These models span all facets of the  
 69 network representation space (metaweb, realised, and structural network) and are suitable for an array of  
 70 different paleo communities as the data requirements fall within the limitations set by the fossil record.

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

Model family	Assumptions	Data needs	‘Limitation’	Network type	Key reference
random	Links are randomly distributed within a network	richness, number of links	parameter assumptions, species agnostic	structural network	Erdős & Rényi (1959)
niche	Networks are interval, species can be ordered on a ‘niche axis’	richness, connectance	parameter assumptions, species agnostic	structural network	Williams & Martinez (2008)
allometric diet breadth model (ADBM)	Interactions are determined by energetic costs (foraging ecology)	body mass, biomass (abundance)	does not account for forbidden links in terms of trait compatibility, assumptions on body size and biomass (abundance) from fossil data	theoretical network	Petchey et al. (2008)

Model family	Assumptions	Data needs	'Limitation'	Network type	Key reference
l-matrix	Interactions inferred using allometric rules (ratio of body sizes between predator and prey), with links being constrained by a Ricker function	body mass, number of producer species	does not account for forbidden links in terms of trait compatibility, assumptions on body size from fossil data, assumptions as to the number of producer species	theoretical network	Schneider et al. (2016)
paleo food web inference model (PFIM)	Interactions can be inferred by a mechanistic framework/relationships	feeding traits for taxa, mechanistic feeding rules	Assumption made as to the feeding mechanisms, need to elucidate traits (although this is a way smaller issue)	mechanistic web	Shaw et al. (2024)

Model family	Assumptions	Data needs	'Limitation'	Network type	Key reference
body size ratio model	Interactions inferred using allometric rules (ratio of body sizes between predator and prey). Logit of the linking probability used to further constrain links to an 'optimal size range' for prey.	body mass	does not account for forbidden links in terms of evolutionary compatibility, assumptions on body size from fossil data	theoretical network	Rohr et al. (2010)

### 71 3 Case study: Toarcian mass extinction event

#### 72 3.1 Dataset overview

##### 73 3.1.1 Species occurrence

74 Here we use the fossil occurrence data over an interval extends from the upper Pliensbachian (~185 Ma) to  
 75 the upper Toarcian (~175 Ma) of the Cleveland Basin (see Dunhill et al., 2024 for a more comprehensive  
 76 overview). The data set consists of a subset of four broad time periods (pre-extinction, post-extinction, early  
 77 recovery, and late recovery). The assemblages are treated as communities of interacting organisms. Something  
 78 about the total number of taxa as well as numbers per a time period? Probably also make a comment that  
 79 this is a 'deep time' community we are looking at.

##### 80 3.1.2 Defining modes of life (traits)

81 We used the modes of life (traits) as identified in Dunhill et al. (2024), who defined four traits: motility (fast,  
 82 slow, facultative, non-motile), tiering (pelagic, erect, surficial, semi-infaunal, shallow infaunal, deep infaunal),  
 83 feeding (predator, suspension feeder, deposit feeder, mining, grazer), and size: gigantic (>500 mm), very large

84 ( $>300\text{--}500$  mm), large ( $>100\text{--}300$  mm), medium ( $>50\text{--}100$  mm), small ( $>10\text{--}50$  mm), tiny ( $10$  mm), for each  
85 fossil species based on the ecological traits defined in the Bambach ecospace model (Bambach et al., 2007).

86 **3.1.3 Constructing networks**

87 For each paleo community (time bin) we constructed **100** networks for each model (so  $6 * 100$ ) networks.  
88 These networks were simplified so as to remove any disconnected species. In total 2 400 networks were  
89 constructed. When a quantitative measure of body size is needed (ADBM, body size ratio, and l-matrix) we  
90 drew a body mass for each species from a uniform distribution, with ranges being defined by the different  
91 size classes *e.g.*, a species classed as ‘very large’ would have a body mass drawn from  $U(300, 500)$ . This was  
92 repeated for each run in order to add variation to the networks constructed, however the same body sizes were  
93 kept consistent for the relevant models *i.e.*, an ADBM and l-matrix network from the same replicate have  
94 the same bodysizes. For both the random and niche model the desired connectance was randomly selected  
95 between the range 0.07 - 0.15 for each replicate but kept consistent for both models. For each network we  
96 calculated the properties listed in Table 2

97 **3.2 Models capture different network structure but in unexpected ways**

98 Broadly when we talk about quantifying the structure of a network we are interesting in capturing some aspect  
99 of how the links are distributed between nodes, or alternatively about properties of the nodes. Structure  
100 is useful as it is gives information as to how the interactions between species are distributed within the  
101 community, informing us on *e.g.*, energy flows and fluxes [REF], propagation of stress [REF], and something  
102 about trophic levels [REF]. We are also able to glean information on interaction strategies between smaller  
103 interacting units in the bigger community in the form of motifs (Milo et al., 2002; Stouffer et al., 2007).  
104 Motifs allow us to identify *e.g.*, the prevalence of competition, as well as smaller chains within the network.  
105 Node-level properties look at the the number of links coming in to (prey) or out of (predators) a node and are  
106 informative of diet specialisation.

Table 2: Network properties used for analysis.

Metric	Definition	Scale	Reference (for maths), can make footnotes probs
Richness	Number of nodes in the network	Macro	

Metric	Definition	Scale	Reference (for maths), can make footnotes probs
Links	Normalized standard deviation of links (number of consumers plus resources per taxon)	Micro	
Connectance	$L/S^2$ , where $S$ is the number of species and $L$ the number of links	Macro	
Max trophic level	Prey-weighted trophic level averaged across taxa	Macro	Williams & Martinez (2004)
Diameter	Diameter can also be measured as the average of the distances between each pair of nodes in the network	Macro	Delmas et al. (2018)
Complexity	SVD complexity of a network, defined as the Pielou entropy of its singular values	Macro	Strydom et al. (2021)
Redundancy	$(L - (S - 1))/S$ , where $S$ is the number of species and $L$ the number of links. Indicates the number of edges beyond what is needed for a minimum-connected tree	Macro	
S1	Number of linear chains, normalised	Meso	Milo et al. (2002); Stouffer et al. (2007)
S2	Number of omnivory motifs, normalised	Meso	Milo et al. (2002); Stouffer et al. (2007)

Metric	Definition	Scale	Reference (for maths), can make footnotes probs
S4	Number of apparent competition motifs, normalised	Meso	Milo et al. (2002); Stouffer et al. (2007)
S5	Number of direct competition motifs, normalised	Meso	Milo et al. (2002); Stouffer et al. (2007)
Generality	Normalized standard deviation of generality of a species standardized by $L/S$	Micro	Williams & Martinez (2000)
Vulnerability	Normalized standard deviation of vulnerability of a species standardized by $L/S$	Micro	Williams & Martinez (2000)

- <sup>107</sup> In terms of wanting to assess and compare across the different models it is beneficial to approach this task  
<sup>108</sup> by thinking about the different aspects of the network as well as interactions that are being predicted by  
<sup>109</sup> the different models across different ‘scales’ of organisation within the network, namely macro (the entire  
<sup>110</sup> network), meso (smaller interacting units within the network), and micro (species-level attributes). Although  
<sup>111</sup> there are a myriad of possible ways to ‘measure’ and analyse ecological networks (Delmas et al., 2018) we  
<sup>112</sup> have selected those outlined in Table 2 as they span different scales within the network and have been shown  
<sup>113</sup> to be informative of different ecological processes.
- <sup>114</sup> Here we used a Multivariate Analysis Of Variance (MANOVA) to assess the differences between networks  
<sup>115</sup> generated by different models based on the combined information of the multiple structural network measures.  
<sup>116</sup> Model defined as `network structure values ~ model` additionally we used a Linear Discriminant Analysis  
<sup>117</sup> (LDA) to determine if different models produced networks with differing structure. In order to do the  
<sup>118</sup> MANOVA and LDA we had to create within model variation for the different networks, with the exception of  
<sup>119</sup> the PFIM model all models have some inherent variation. In order to generate variation within the PFIM  
<sup>120</sup> metawebs we applied a *minimal* degree of downsampling following the protocol described in Roopnarine

121 (2017). This downsampling approach uses a power law distribution to essentially ‘prune’ links from the most  
122 generalist species (See SUPP MATT for a more detailed overview).

123 The multivariate effect of model was statistically significant, Pillai’s Trace = 3.89,  $F(45, 11, 950) = 925.64$ ,  
124  $p < .001$ , indicating systematic differences across multiple ecological or network properties simultaneously.  
125 Follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed that model type had significant effects on all nine dependent variables  
126 Table 3, show that the network structure differed markedly across the model types on every measured  
127 dimension. Model type accounts for the vast majority of variance in most network metrics (66%–92%),  
128 indicating profound differences in structure between models. The only exception is trophic level ( $\eta^2 = .19$ ),  
129 which still shows a large effect but is much smaller relative to the other metrics.

Table 3: Manova/univariate ANOVA results.

Metric	$F(df = 5, 2394)$	df	partial $\eta^2$
Connectance	2717.8	5	0.85
Complexity	2356.6	5	0.83
Max trophic level	108.86	5	0.19
Generality	5646	5	0.92
Vulnerability	3266.9	5	0.87
S1	1968.5	5	0.80
S2	1527.5	5	0.76
S4	940.79	5	0.66
S5	1919.4	5	0.80

130 Post-hoc pairwise comparisons using Tukey-adjusted estimated marginal means further clarified the differences  
131 among models. The PFIM differed significantly from all other models (all  $p < 0.001$ ). The niche and random  
132 models are similar to each other, and the adbM and lmatrix were also similar to each other Figure 2. This  
133 although there are clear structural difference between the models as a whole we still broadly see the grouping  
134 between the theoretical models (ADBM, l-matrix), structural models (Niche and Random), and a metaweb  
135 (PFIM). Although the bodymass ratio model deviates from this neat grouping it is perhaps not as surprising  
136 since this simplified version of the bodymass ratio model is strongly rooted in the niche-based processes that  
137 are also assumed in the Niche model and so it having some overlap with the other structural models is not  
138 that surprising.

139 [Figure 2 about here.]

<sup>140</sup> From the LDA the first two discriminant functions explained 72% and 18% of the variance, respectively.  
<sup>141</sup> Wilks' indicated that the discriminant functions significantly differentiated among models ( $\lambda = 0.12$ ,  $\chi^2 = 1024$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). The LDA plot Figure 3 shows clear separation of the pfim model from the others along LD1, with adbm and lmatrix clustering closely together, and niche and random occupying intermediate positions.  
<sup>144</sup> Classification accuracy was 85%, confirming that the combination of dependent variables reliably distinguishes  
<sup>145</sup> model types.

<sup>146</sup> [Figure 3 about here.]

<sup>147</sup> The implications of the above results is that it is clear that different models will recover different structures -  
<sup>148</sup> across all structural measures and highlight how model selection has the potential to strongly shape ecological  
<sup>149</sup> inferences. Using a model that overestimates connectivity could exaggerate our inferences about redundancy  
<sup>150</sup> or disturbance risk, while overly sparse models could underestimate network complexity and functional links.  
<sup>151</sup> Therefore, the choice of model should align with the specific ecological question *e.g.*, in interest in exploring  
<sup>152</sup> *potential* redundancy, robustness, versus trying to understand *realistic* energy flow pathways. Ideally we  
<sup>153</sup> should couple our analyses with sensitivity analyses to assess how conclusions depend on model assumptions.  
<sup>154</sup> It also means that we cannot compare inferences made using different models but any generalisations  
<sup>155</sup> about observed patterns should be standardised across network model *type* at minimum. That is two say it  
<sup>156</sup> may not be completely illogical to make comparisons between two metawebs, however it would be unwise to  
<sup>157</sup> compare a metaweb to a theoretical network.

<sup>158</sup> These structural differences have consequences for predicting species persistence, stability, and  
<sup>159</sup> ecosystem functioning. For example, metrics like generality and vulnerability influence top-down  
<sup>160</sup> and bottom-up control, affecting how energy and biomass flow through trophic levels (Dunne et  
<sup>161</sup> al., 2002). Similarly, connectance and trophic coherence influence stability and resilience; more  
<sup>162</sup> coherent networks tend to resist perturbations, whereas very dense, highly connected webs may  
<sup>163</sup> either buffer or amplify disturbances depending on interaction strengths (Johnson et al., 2014).

### <sup>164</sup> 3.3 Some networks don't share any interactions and some share a lot

<sup>165</sup> In addition to wanting to measure network structure researchers may also be interested in understanding  
<sup>166</sup> aspects about the diets and predators of *specific* species in a community. In this instance the interest should  
<sup>167</sup> be in understanding how the pairwise links predicted between species pairs differ between models. Here we  
<sup>168</sup> look at the interaction turnover both within and between the different models (Poisot et al., 2012). This can  
<sup>169</sup> be thought of as the equivalent of species  $\beta$  turnover and tells us which interactions are 'conserved' (shared)  
<sup>170</sup> across the networks but only between species pairs that are shared - *i.e.*, this turnover is only driven by

171 interaction and not species turnover. Here we only compared networks that we constructed for the same  
172 period (as our interest is only in between model differences) and excluded the random and niche networks  
173 from consideration as these two models are essentially species agnostic.

174 Across the four network models, turnover in species interactions varied substantially, revealing clear differences  
175 in how each model approaches determining the presence of links between species pairs Figure 4. The log-  
176 ratio model consistently showed high turnover relative to all other approaches, indicating that it produces  
177 interaction pairs that are the most distinct from other models. In contrast the ADBM and l-matrix exhibited  
178 the lowest turnover and suggests strong agreement between how pairwise interactions are determined. This is  
179 unsurprising given the underlying inference mechanisms of the models. The PFIM displays an intermediate  
180 turnover, aligning most closely with log-ratio and least with ADBM and l-matrix. Although this result is  
181 unsurprising as the mechanisms that determine interactions in ADBM and l-matrix (a single trait (bodysize) +  
182 parameterisation of links by ecological theory) is very different from the PFIM model that makes assumptions  
183 on a trait-based, mechanistic hierarchy. Taken together, these results demonstrate that model choice strongly  
184 influences inferred pairwise interactions.

185 [Figure 4 about here.]

186 In terms of how model choice will influence our inference - this will have the biggest consequence when thinking  
187 about diet related questions. In Figure 4 we can see that the ADBM and PFIM are recovering (almost) totally  
188 different pairwise links and so will have very different answers when we want to start interrogating the specific  
189 interactions that may be established by a specific species within the network. Pragmatically when it comes to  
190 deciding which model is the most appropriate choice when it comes to diet-based questions it makes sense to  
191 contextualise this in the feasible vs realised interaction spectrum. Specifically that from a ‘philosophical’ basis  
192 if you are asking questions about possible diets of species then it makes sense to use models that fall firmly in  
193 the ‘feasible’ space *e.g.*, PFIM model or even something like the Fricke et al. (2022) model.

### 194 3.4 Model choice changes the narrative

195 As shown in both Figure 3 and Figure 4 different models do indeed create networks that look different despite  
196 being created using the same species pool (or at least richness in the case of the Niche and Random models).  
197 As we have alluded to multiple times these underlying differences could have consequences on inferences that  
198 we make about the behaviour of the system. Here we will look at how model choice alters the inference we  
199 make about the underlying mechanisms that were driving extinctions in the Toarcian extinction event. Here  
200 we again we use we followed the approach outlined in Dunhill et al. (2024) when simulating extinctions as  
201 well as assessing which extinction mechanism results in a simulated network most closely match the real post

202 extinction network. Extinction simulations were only run on the pre extinction networks whereby species  
203 were removed until they reached the ‘target richness’, which is the richness of the post extinction community.

204 **TODO** The whole shebang about the different extinction simulation scenarios?

205 Extinctions were simulated using different plausible mechanisms based on species traits (size, motility), their  
206 position within the network (generality, vulnerability), as well as randomly. Each network was subjected  
207 to **50** extinction runs for each extinction mechanism. The extinctions themselves were cascading in nature  
208 meaning that after the target species was removed all species that no longer had any prey were also deemed  
209 as extinct (secondary extinction), checking for secondary extinctions was then repeated until there were no  
210 longer any species without prey. This represents one extinction event and only then would the proceeding  
211 target species be removed from the network and cascading extinctions assessed again. Note that for extinction  
212 simulations which use the network position of a species to determine extinction order we follow the protocol  
213 from Curtsdotter et al. (2011) and reassess the vulnerability/generality of each species after each extinction  
214 event to ‘redetermine’ the extinction order based on their position in the newly generated network.

215 **TODO** not sure if we also want to unpack/showcase robustness  $R_{50}$  (Jonsson et al., 2015)

216 [Figure 5 about here.]

### 217 3.4.1 Trends over time

218 Generalized additive mixed modelling showed strong differences in both the magnitude and temporal dynamics  
219 of network structure across models. Model results indicated that both parametric and smooth terms  
220 significantly influenced network metrics across models, with some exceptions. For connectance, all parametric  
221 coefficients were negative except the intercept, and most smooth terms showed highly significant effects  
222 ( $p < 0.05$ ), except for the Niche ( $p = 0.48$ ) and Random ( $p = 0.016$ ) models. Complexity and generality  
223 similarly exhibited significant parametric and smooth effects, whereas for vulnerability, the smooth term the  
224 Random model was non-significant ( $p = 0.73$ ). Trophic level effects varied among models: modellmatrix  
225 had a non-significant parametric effect ( $p = 0.89$ ), while others were strongly significant. Across the motifs  
226 (S1, S2, S4, S5), most parametric and smooth effects were significant ( $p < 0.05$ ), though a few, such as the  
227 intercepts of S1 and S5 were non-significant. Overall, these results indicate model- and metric-specific variation  
228 in both baseline (parametric) and temporal (smooth) effects, highlighting the importance of model structure  
229 in influences the observed temporal trends.

230 **3.4.2 Inferred extinction drivers**

231 In order to determine which extinction mechanism creates a network most similar to the post extinction  
232 network we use a derivative of Gupta et al. (2022) true skill statistic (TSS, see Equation 1), where a score  
233 below zero indicates that the simulated extinction performs no better than random, and a score of one  
234 indicates a perfect match between real and simulated. Here we calculated both a node-level TSS as well as  
235 link-level TSS, by parsing out the TSS into two components we are able to assess if differences between real  
236 and simulated networks are due to node-level (the wrong species being removed) or link-level (the wrong links  
237 be recovered) mismatches. Because the extinction simulations do not allow for the origination of species, we  
238 only retained species that were present in both the pre and post extinciton community and so any node-level  
239 mismatches between real and simulated networks was due to the wrong species being removed and not because  
240 new species were not.

$$TSS = \frac{TruePositive}{TruePositive + FalseNegative} + \frac{TrueNegative}{TrueNegative + FalsePositive} - 1 \quad (1)$$

241 [Figure 6 about here.]

242 When looking at the node-level TSS scores (Figure 6 panel 2) we see that in general the signal of the extinction  
243 mechanism is maintained across the different models - this is perhaps most striking when we look at the  
244 two tiering mechanisms. However as these mechanisms are determined by the property of the node it is not  
245 surprising that we see a similar signal as the species are being removed in the exact same order. The metrics  
246 that are of most interest is those that are determined by network-driven node properties (vulnerability and  
247 generality). Here we can see some variation between the models, however on balance they still have the same  
248 general signal. The link-level TSS scores (Figure 6 panel 1) do not show the same signal within extinction  
249 mechanism. We see that the random and PFIM models have high TSS scores (*i.e.*, have a ‘good fit’), however  
250 in the case of the PFIM this is to be expected as the links are deterministic and so if you have the same two  
251 species pools you will recover the same links. The ‘stochastic’ element of the theoretical models (ADBM,  
252 l-matrix, and log-ratio) means that they create a degree of ‘noise’ at the link-level and thus they are probably  
253 inappropriate to use for the type of extinction mechanism question we are asking here - specifically does the  
254 real and the simulated netowrk look the same. Link-level TSS is perhaps also not an appropriate approach  
255 to determine the ‘best fit’ extinction mechanism if used in isolation and we advoacte that the node-level  
256 TSS score (or alterniatvely some measure of  $\beta$  diversity is used). FInally, if we were to focus only on node  
257 level TSS we do not observe any strong differences between the models and it suggests that node-level driven  
258 (topological) extinction processes are insensitive to model type.

<sup>259</sup> **4 Discussion (need a catchier heading)**

<sup>260</sup> I want this section to be more about contextualising model choice within the bigger research question discussion  
<sup>261</sup> - i.e. mapping question and model choice more tightly...

<sup>262</sup> Points to discuss:

- <sup>263</sup> • Guidelines - as a box? Can we give something concrete?? Something like Figure 7  
<sup>264</sup> • How to we synthesise these results? As in should we give clear directives or is it enough to do a bit  
<sup>265</sup> more handwaving and have the bigger message be that model choice matters?

<sup>266</sup> [Figure 7 about here.]

<sup>267</sup> **References**

- <sup>268</sup> Allesina, S., Alonso, D., & Pascual, M. (2008). A general model for food web structure. *Science*, 320(5876),  
<sup>269</sup> 658–661. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1156269>
- <sup>270</sup> Bambach, R. K., Bush, A. M., & Erwin, D. H. (2007). Autecology and the Filling of Ecospace: Key Metazoan  
<sup>271</sup> Radiations. *Palaeontology*, 50(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4983.2006.00611.x>
- <sup>272</sup> Curtsdotter, A., Binzer, A., Brose, U., De Castro, F., Ebenman, B., Eklöf, A., Riede, J. O., Thierry, A., & Rall,  
<sup>273</sup> B. C. (2011). Robustness to secondary extinctions: Comparing trait-based sequential deletions in static and  
<sup>274</sup> dynamic food webs. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 12(7), 571–580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2011.09.008>
- <sup>275</sup> Delmas, E., Besson, M., Brice, M.-H., Burkle, L. A., Dalla Riva, G. V., Fortin, M.-J., Gravel, D., Guimarães, P.  
<sup>276</sup> R., Hembry, D. H., Newman, E. A., Olesen, J. M., Pires, M. M., Yeakel, J. D., & Poisot, T. (2018). Analysing  
<sup>277</sup> ecological networks of species interactions. *Biological Reviews*, 112540. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12433>
- <sup>278</sup> Dillon, E. M., Pier, J. Q., Smith, J. A., Raja, N. B., Dimitrijević, D., Austin, E. L., Cybulski, J. D., De  
<sup>279</sup> Entrambasaguas, J., Durham, S. R., Grether, C. M., Haldar, H. S., Kocáková, K., Lin, C.-H., Mazzini, I.,  
<sup>280</sup> Mychajliw, A. M., Ollendorf, A. L., Pimiento, C., Regalado Fernández, O. R., Smith, I. E., & Dietl, G. P.  
<sup>281</sup> (2022). What is conservation paleobiology? Tracking 20 years of research and development. *Frontiers in  
282* *Ecology and Evolution*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2022.1031483>
- <sup>283</sup> Dunhill, A. M., Zarzyczny, K., Shaw, J. O., Atkinson, J. W., Little, C. T. S., & Beckerman, A. P. (2024).  
<sup>284</sup> Extinction cascades, community collapse, and recovery across a Mesozoic hyperthermal event. *Nature  
285* *Communications*, 15(1), 8599. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-53000-2>
- <sup>286</sup> Dunne, J. A., Labandeira, C. C., & Williams, R. J. (2014). Highly resolved early eocene food webs show  
<sup>287</sup> development of modern trophic structure after the end-cretaceous extinction. *Proceedings of the Royal*

- 288      *Society B: Biological Sciences*, 281(1782), 20133280. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.3280>
- 289      Erdős, P., & Rényi, A. (1959). On random graphs. i. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*, 6(3-4), 290–297.  
290      <https://doi.org/10.5486/pmd.1959.6.3-4.12>
- 291      Fricke, E. C., Hsieh, C., Middleton, O., Gorczynski, D., Cappello, C. D., Sanisidro, O., Rowan, J., Svenning,  
292      J.-C., & Beaudrot, L. (2022). Collapse of terrestrial mammal food webs since the Late Pleistocene. *Science*,  
293      377(6609), 1008–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn4012>
- 294      Gauzens, B., Thouvenot, L., Srivastava, D. S., Kratina, P., Romero, G. Q., Berti, E., O’Gorman, E. J.,  
295      González, A. L., Dézerald, O., Eisenhauer, N., Pires, M., Ryser, R., Farjalla, V. F., Rogy, P., Brose, U.,  
296      Petermann, J. S., Geslin, B., & Hines, J. (2025). Tailoring interaction network types to answer different  
297      ecological questions. *Nature Reviews Biodiversity*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44358-025-00056-7>
- 298      Gupta, A., Furrer, R., & Petchey, O. L. (2022). Simultaneously estimating food web connectance and structure  
299      with uncertainty. *Ecology and Evolution*, 12(3), e8643. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.8643>
- 300      Hao, X., Holyoak, M., Zhang, Z., & Yan, C. (2025). Global Projection of Terrestrial Vertebrate Food  
301      Webs Under Future Climate and Land-Use Changes. *Global Change Biology*, 31(2), e70061. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.70061>
- 302      Jonsson, T., Berg, S., Pimenov, A., Palmer, C., & Emmerson, M. (2015). The reliability of R50 as a  
303      measure of vulnerability of food webs to sequential species deletions. *Oikos*, 124(4), 446–457. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01588>
- 304      Jordano, P. (2016). Chasing Ecological Interactions. *PLOS Biology*, 14(9), e1002559. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002559>
- 305      Kiessling, W., Raja, N. B., Roden, V. J., Turvey, S. T., & Saupe, E. E. (2019). Addressing priority questions  
306      of conservation science with palaeontological data. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:  
307      Biological Sciences*, 374(1788), 20190222. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0222>
- 308      Milo, R., Shen-Orr, S., Itzkovitz, S., Kashtan, N., Chklovskii, D., & Alon, U. (2002). Network motifs: Simple  
309      building blocks of complex networks. *Science*, 298(5594), 824–827. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.298.5594.824>
- 310      Morales-Castilla, I., Matias, M. G., Gravel, D., & Araújo, M. B. (2015). Inferring biotic interactions from  
311      proxies. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(6), 347–356. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.03.014>
- 312      Petchey, O. L., Beckerman, A. P., Riede, J. O., & Warren, P. H. (2008). Size, foraging, and food web structure.  
313      *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(11), 4191–4196. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0710672105>
- 314      Pichler, M., & Hartig, F. (2023). Machine learning and deep learning—A review for ecologists. *Methods in  
315      Ecology and Evolution*, 14(4), 994–1016. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14061>

- 321 Poisot, T., Canard, E., Mouquet, N., & Hochberg, M. E. (2012). A comparative study of ecological  
322 specialization estimators. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 3(3), 537–544. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-  
323 210x.2011.00174.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210x.2011.00174.x)
- 324 Rohr, R., Scherer, H., Kehrli, P., Mazza, C., & Bersier, L.-F. (2010). Modeling food webs: Exploring  
325 unexplained structure using latent traits. *The American Naturalist*, 176(2), 170–177. [https://doi.org/10.  
326 1086/653667](https://doi.org/10.1086/653667)
- 327 Roopnarine, P. D. (2006). Extinction cascades and catastrophe in ancient food webs. *Paleobiology*, 32(1),  
328 1–19. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4096814>
- 329 Roopnarine, P. D. (2017). *Ecological Modelling of Paleocommunity Food Webs* (pp. 201–226). University of  
330 Chicago Press.
- 331 Schneider, F. D., Brose, U., Rall, B. C., & Guill, C. (2016). Animal diversity and ecosystem functioning in  
332 dynamic food webs. *Nature Communications*, 7(1), 12718. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12718>
- 333 Shaw, J. O., Dunhill, A. M., Beckerman, A. P., Dunne, J. A., & Hull, P. M. (2024). *A framework for  
334 reconstructing ancient food webs using functional trait data* (p. 2024.01.30.578036). bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.30.578036>
- 335 Stouffer, D. B., Camacho, J., Jiang, W., & Nunes Amaral, L. A. (2007). Evidence for the existence of a robust  
336 pattern of prey selection in food webs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 274(1621),  
337 1931–1940. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.0571>
- 338 Strydom, T., Catchen, M. D., Banville, F., Caron, D., Dansereau, G., Desjardins-Proulx, P., Forero-Muñoz,  
339 N. R., Higino, G., Mercier, B., Gonzalez, A., Gravel, D., Pollock, L., & Poisot, T. (2021). A roadmap  
340 towards predicting species interaction networks (across space and time). *Philosophical Transactions of the  
341 Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 376(1837), 20210063. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0063>
- 342 Thuiller, W., Calderón-Sanou, I., Chalmandrier, L., Gaüzère, P., O'Connor, L. M. J., Ohlmann, M., Poggiato,  
343 G., & Münkemüller, T. (2024). Navigating the integration of biotic interactions in biogeography. *Journal  
344 of Biogeography*, 51(4), 550–559. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14734>
- 345 Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2000). Simple rules yield complex food webs. *Nature*, 404(6774), 180–183.  
346 <https://doi.org/10.1038/35004572>
- 347 Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2004). Stabilization of chaotic and non-permanent food-web dynamics.  
348 *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter*, 38(2), 297–303. [https://doi.org/10.1140/epjb/e2004-  
349 00122-1](https://doi.org/10.1140/epjb/e2004-00122-1)
- 350 Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2008). Success and its limits among structural models of complex food  
351 webs. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77(3), 512–519. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01362.x>
- 352 Yeakel, J. D., Pires, M. M., Rudolf, L., Dominy, N. J., Koch, P. L., Guimarães, P. R., & Gross, T.  
353

<sup>354</sup> (2014). Collapse of an ecological network in ancient egypt. *PNAS*, *111*(40), 14472–14477. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1408471111>




Figure 1: This obviously needs work but a variation on this to try and articulate the different approaches and broadly how they may differ.




Figure 2: Estimated marginal means (EMMs) of ecological network metrics across six model types with 95% confidence intervals. Bars represent the predicted values for each model, and error bars indicate the 95% confidence limits. Letters above each bar denote Tukey-adjusted pairwise significance: models sharing the same letter are not significantly different, while models with different letters are significantly different ( $p < 0.05$ ). The plot reveals three tiers of model performance, with pfim consistently higher, log ratio, niche, and random at intermediate levels, and adb and lmatrix lower, consistent with the MANOVA and post-hoc analyses.




Figure 3: Linear discriminant analysis (LDA) of ecological network metrics for six model types. The first two discriminant functions (LD1 and LD2) explain 72% and 18% of the variance, respectively. Each point represents a replicate, and ellipses indicate 95% confidence regions for each model. The PFIM model is strongly separated along LD1, reflecting the highest values of network metrics, while adbmm and lmatrix cluster closely together, indicating similar, lower metric values. The niche and random models occupy intermediate positions. Classification accuracy of the LDA was 85%, demonstrating that the combination of dependent variables effectively discriminates among model types.




Figure 4: Pairwise beta turnover in species interactions among four ecological network models (adbm, lmatrix, log-ratio, and pfim). Each cell represents the mean turnover value between a pair of models, with warmer colors indicating greater dissimilarity in inferred interactions. The diagonal is omitted. High turnover values (yellow) indicate strong disagreement in network structure between models, whereas lower values (blue–purple) indicate greater similarity.




Figure 5: stuff... Recreation of the figure from Dunhill 2024. I think it makes sense to split and divide into the below sections (depending on potential figure limitations of target journal)




Figure 6: stuff... TSS scores. Link and node level turnover. ‘warm’ colours indicate worse than random. Blue equals perfect




Figure 7: TODO.