Unveiling the Complexity of Food Webs: A Comprehensive Overview of Definitions, Scales, and Mechanisms

Tanya Strydom [1]; Jennifer A. Dunne [2]; Timothée Poisot [3,4]; Andrew P. Beckerman [1]

Abstract: Food webs are a useful abstraction and representation of the feeding links between species in a community and are used to infer many ecosystem level processes. However, the different theories, mechanisms, and criteria that underpin how a food web is defined, and ultimately, constructed means that not all food webs are representing the same ecological process at the same scale. Here we present a synthesis of the different assumptions, scales, and mechanisms that are used to define the different ecological networks , leading to a revision of definitions for different types of networks. Additionally we explicitly link the different network representations to the broader methodological approaches (models) that are used to construct them. In explicitly outlining the assumptions, scales, and mechanisms of network inference allows for a formal categorisation of how to use networks to answer key ecological and conservation questions as wel as defining clear guidelines to prevent unintentional misuse or misinterpretation.

At the heart of modern biodiversity science are a set of concepts and theories about biodiversity, stability, and function (Loreau & de Mazancourt, 2013). These relate to the abundance, distribution, and services that biodiversity provides, and how biodiversity – as an interconnected set of species – responds to multiple stressors. Documenting interactions between and among species is thus one of the fundamental building blocks of community ecology, providing a powerful abstraction and platform for mathematical and statistical modelling of biodiversity in order to make predictions, mitigate threats, and manage services (Windsor et al., 2023). Such network representations of biodiversity are increasingly argued to be an asset to understanding and predicting the abundance, distribution, dynamics, and services provided by multiple species facing multiple stressors. However, there is a growing discourse around limitations to the interpretation and applied use of networks (Blüthgen, 2010; Dormann, 2023), primarily as the result of shortcomings regarding their conceptualisation (Blüthgen & Staab, 2024).

Because an 'interaction network' can be defined and conceptualised in many ways, each method will be embed different assumptions about the determinants of interactions, and characterise patterns and process at different scales, which will ultimately influence the nature and scope of inference (Proulx et al., 2005). The different ways in which a network can be represented is the result of *how* the network is constructed, which represents an intersection of the data used to construct the network and the underlying theory as to what drives the occurrence of interactions between species. Although there have been extensive discussions as to the the challenges relating to the scale and nature of data collection/observation (*e.g.,* Blüthgen & Staab, 2024; Brimacombe et al., 2023; Moulatlet et al., 2024; Polis, 1991; Pringle & Hutchinson, 2020; Saberski et al., 2024) we still lack a clear framework as to how different data sources result in networks that are fundamentally different Section 1.3.

In this perspective we aim to provide an overview of the different **food web** representations, particularly how these relate to the terminology used to define a food web, and how this is influenced by both the processes that determine interactions Section 2, as well as how this relates to the way in which we construct the resulting networks Section 3. This allows us to deliver an overview of fundamental questions in ecology that we think can benefit from network thinking and a proposal that such thinking can accelerate our capacity to predict the impact of multiple stressors on biodiverse communities. Specifically, we finish this perspective with an overview of fundamental questions in ecology that we think can benefit from network thinking and a proposal that such thinking can accelerate our capacity to predict the impact of change on biodiverse communities.

1 Setting the Scene: The Not So Basics of Nodes and Edges

Defining a food web seems simple; it is the representation of feeding interactions (edges) between species (nodes) in the form of a network. However, the definition of 'edges' and 'nodes', as well as the levels of organization at which they are aggregated can take many forms Moulatlet et al. (2024), ultimately encoding a series of assumptions and criteria within a network. An awareness of variance in the way a food web can be defined is critical as a network (or its adjacency matrix) is both the 'object' from which inferences are made (*e.g.,* the interactions between species, or how the structure influences ecosystem level processes) as well as the 'product' of either the data collection (Brimacombe et al., 2023) a prediction process (Banville et al., 2024), or both, and is an object form which downstream (*e.g.,* responses to stressors, dynamics or mapping structure to ecosystem level processes). One thus needs to be aware of both the criteria that define nodes and edges and the scale of the processes or mechanisms that define the collecting of species together.

1.1 How do we define a node?

Although this may seem an elementary question in the context of food webs — a node *should* represent a (taxonomic) species, the reality is that nodes can often represent non-taxonomic units such as trophic species (Williams & Martinez, 2000; *e.g.,* Yodzis, 1982), feeding guild (*e.g.,* García-Callejas et al., 2023), or segregation of species by life stages (*e.g.,* Clegg et al., 2018). Practical implications of how we are aggregating the nodes is that the resolution may not always be 'pixel perfect', and may even vary within a single network. Such granularity and variation can limit the ability to make (taxonomic) species specific inferences (*e.g.,* does species a eat species b?), and affect downstream inference made from networks, including estimates of complexity and structure (Beckerman et al., 2006; Clegg et al., 2018). There may also be value in having nodes that represent an aggregation of species, as the distribution of the links between them may be more meaningful in terms of understanding energy flow and distribution within the system.

1.2 What is captured by an edge?

At its core, links within food webs can be thought of as a representation of either feeding links between species (be that realised or potential (Dunne, 2006; Pringle, 2020)), or fluxes within a system *e.g.,* energy transfer or material flow as the result of the feeding links between species (Lindeman, 1942). These correspond with different 'currencies' (the feasibility of links or the energy that is moving between nodes). How these links are specified will influence the resulting structure of the network. For example, taking a food web that consists of links representing all *potential* feeding links for a community will be meaningless if one is interested in understanding the flow of energy through the network as the links are not environmentally/energetically

constrained. In addition to the various ways of defining the links between species pairs there are also a myriad of ways in which the links themselves can be quantified. Links between species are often treated as being present or absent (*i.e.,* binary) but it is also possible to use probabilities (Banville et al., 2024; which quantifies how likely an interaction is to occur, Poisot, Cirtwill, et al., 2016) or continuous measurements (which quantifies the strength of of an interaction, Berlow et al., 2004).

1.3 Network representations

Networks can be thought of to fall into two different 'types'; namely metawebs; traditionally defined as all of the *potential* interactions for a specific species pool (Dunne, 2006), and realised networks; which is the subset of interactions in a metaweb that are *realised* for a specific community at a given time and place. The fundamental differences between these two network representations are the spatial scale at which they are constructed, and the associated processes that are assumed to drive pattern at these scales.

A metaweb provides insight as to the viability (feasibility) of an interaction between two species occurring, and captures some measure of the viability/feasibility of an interaction occurring between two species based on 1) the complementarity of their traits (a *global metaweb*) and 2) can be further refined by their co-occurrence (a *regional metaweb*). Metawebs thus provide a means to identify links that are not ecologically plausible, *i.e.,* forbidden links (Jordano, 2016b), or provide an idea of the *complete* diet of a species (Strydom et al., 2023).

In contrast realised networks are relatively localised in space and time, and the links between species are contingent on both the co-occurrence of species, the role of the environment, and mechanisms of diet choice. Fundamentally this means that the presence/absence of a link is the result of the 'behaviour' of the species.

Ultimately this means that a metaweb and a realised network are different; links that are absent in a metaweb can (conceptually although not always practically) be treated as being truly absent, however links that are absent in a realised network cannot be considered to be truly absent but rather as absent due to the broader environmental/community context. Importantly, a realised network is *not* simply the downscaling of a metaweb to a smaller scale (*e.g.,* moving from the country to the 1x1 km^2 scale based on fine-scale species co-occurrence) but rather represents a shift towards capturing the dynamic, higher level, processes that determine the *realisation* of an interaction, *i.e.,* the definition of an edges shifts from being determined by interaction feasibility to that of energetic choices/consequences. Thus, different network representations are determined and constrained by different sets of assumptions as to what the processes are that determine the presence/absence of an interaction between two species and will result in networks that are structurally different even if they contain the same species (Caron et al., 2024).

2 From Nodes and Edges to Process and Constraints

In the previous section we discussed how the nuances in defining a network (in terms of nodes, edges, and representation as a network) are broadly capturing different processes. Here we expand this discussion, introducing five core constraints that determine the links among species Figure 1. The scale at which they operate leads to clear articulation of global metawebs as networks of all possible interactions for a collection of species, regional metawebs as networks representing all possible interactions of co-occurring species and realised networks representing interactions that occur and are framed by some kind of energetic constraint. We further develop these concepts in Section 3, where we will contextualise these process within the different bodies of theory as well as the set of tools and data required to construct the appropriate network, which will ultimately determine the context in which the resulting network is used Section 4.

The five core constraints we propose are evolutionary compatibility, co-occurrence, abundance, diet choice, and non-trophic interactions. In the following sections, we present details about how the constraints are defined, the scale at which they operate and how they deliver a network.

<center>[Figure 1 about here.]</center>

2.1 Processes that determine the feasibility of an interaction

Here we will look at processes that 'act' at the species pair of interest, that is the *possibility* of an interaction being present/absent is assessed at the pairwise level and one is left with a 'list' of interactions that are present/absent. Although it is possible to build a network (*i.e.,* metaweb) from this information it is important to be aware that the structure of this network is not constrained by real-world dynamics or conditions (*i.e.,* the community context), and so just because species are able to interact does not mean that they will (Poisot et al., 2015).

Evolutionary compatibility

This constraint is defined by shared (co)evolutionary history between consumers and resources (Dalla Riva & Stouffer, 2016; Gómez et al., 2010; Segar et al., 2020) which, in the more proximal sense, is manifested as 'trait complementarity' between two species (Benadi et al., 2022). In this body of theory, one species (the consumer) has the 'correct' (multivariate) set of traits that allow it to chase, capture, kill, and consume the other species (the resource) and interactions that are not compatible are defined as forbidden links (Jordano, 2016b); *i.e.,* not physically possible and will *always* be absent within a network.

Networks arising from this constraint can be binary (possible vs forbidden) or probabilistic (Banville et al.,

<center>4</center>

2024), *e.g.,* the metaweb constructed by Strydom et al. (2022) uses probabilities to quantify their confidence with regards to the possibility of a specific interaction existing between two species. A network constructed on the basis of evolutionary compatibility is conceptually aligned with a 'global metaweb', and gives us information as to the feasibility of links between species despite the fact that they do not co-occur as shown in 1.

(Co)occurrence

The co-occurrence of species in both time and space is a fundamental requirement for an interaction between two species to occur (at least in terms of feeding links). Although co-occurrence data alone is insufficient for building an accurate and ecologically meaningful representation of *feeding links* (Blanchet et al., 2020), it is still a critical process that determines the realisation of a feeding link and allows us to spatially constrain a global metaweb based on local communities (Dansereau et al., 2024), in the context of Figure 1 this would be the metawebs for regions one and two.

2.2 Processes that modify the behaviour (preference) of species

Here we will showcase three processes that will ultimately influence the realisation of an interaction between species and form the conceptual basis for realised networks. As we show in Figure 1 a 'truly realised' network is the product of different facets of both the properties of the community (**abundance** and **non-trophic interactions**) as well as the individual (**profitability**). This represents a contextual shift where the presence (realisation) of an interaction is no longer constrained to evaluating the viability between a *pair* of species but rather takes into consideration information about the community and the individual (Quintero et al., 2024), and as discussed in Section 1.3, links are now *constrained* by consumer choice.

Abundance

The most basic abundance constraint linked to foraging biology is the principle that organisms feeding randomly will consume resources in proportion to their abundance (Stephens & Krebs, 1986), and interactions are not necessarily contingent on there being any **compatibility** between them (E. Canard et al., 2012; Momal et al., 2020; Pomeranz et al., 2019). However, a more ecologically sound assumption would be that the abundance of different prey species will influence the distribution of links in a network (Vázquez et al., 2009), by influencing which prey are targeted or preferred by the predator, as abundance influences factors such as the likelihood of two species (individuals) meeting (Banville et al., 2024; Poisot et al., 2015). Thus, if abundance data are combined with a derived metaweb, there is a rule-set that defines the distribution and potentially strength (preference via abundance) of links and thus delivers structure.

Profitability

Ultimately, consumer choice is underpinned by the energetic cost-benefit (profitability) of trying to find, catch, kill, and consume a resource (where a consumer will optimise energy intake while minimising handling and search time (energy cost)). Although energetic constrains can be invoked in a myriad of ways (Cherif et al., 2024; *e.g.,* Pawar et al., 2012; Portalier et al., 2019) profitability represents a well described within both optimal foraging (Pyke, 1984) and metabolic theory (Brown et al., 2004), making it a good 'umbrella concept' for capturing the energetic cost of interactions.

Non-trophic interactions

Perhaps not as intuitive when thinking about the processes that determine feeding links is non-trophic interactions (Ings et al., 2009), specifically accounting for their ability to modify either the realisation or strength of trophic interactions (Golubski & Abrams, 2011; Kamaru et al., 2024; Pilosof et al., 2017; Staniczenko et al., 2010). Non-trophic interactions can modify interactions either 'directly' *e.g.,* predator *a* outcompetes predator *b* or 'indirectly' *e.g.,* mutualistic/facilitative interactions will alter the fine-scale distribution and abundance of species as well as their persistence (Buche et al., 2024; Kéfi et al., 2012, 2015).

3 Linking theory to network construction: a case for models

The suite of different network representations Section 1.3 that we have at our disposal allow us to isolate and operate within one (or a few) of the constraints discussed in Section 2, and have an influence on the way we construct networks, specifically in terms of the development of different models. The act of constructing a 'real world' network through the empirical collection of interaction data is both costly and challenging to execute (Jordano, 2016a, 2016b), thus we often turn to models to either predict networks (be that the interaction between two species, or network structure (Strydom, Catchen, et al., 2021)), identify missing interactions (gap fill) within an existing empirical dataset (*e.g.,* Biton et al., 2024; Dallas et al., 2017; Stock, 2021). In the context of this discussion food web models are also a valuable to that will allow us to better understand the different constraints determining interactions (Song & Levine, 2024; Stouffer, 2019), allowing us to interrogate, generate, and reflect upon different ecological theories.

Here we will present the broader bodies of theory that have underpinned the development of different food web models, specifically in terms of understanding what drives the presence of interactions between species. Broadly we can think of interactions being 'stochastic', determined by the feasibility of traits (*sensu* Section 2.1), and more broadly the behaviour and dynamics of biological systems (*sensu* Section 2.2). Each of these categories have their own set of accompanying theories and modelling approaches that have been

¹⁷⁹ developed within them and mapping these out is beneficial for two reasons 1) it is critical that the 'correct'
¹⁸⁰ network (and thus underlying models and assumptions) are used if we truly want to understand how differ-
¹⁸¹ ent processes determine interactions (Estay et al., 2023; Moulatlet et al., 2024; Saberski et al., 2024; Saravia
¹⁸² et al., 2022) and constructively move the field forward, and 2) provide guidance as to the identifying the
¹⁸³ appropriate networks for different research questions (Petchey et al., 2011, see also Section 4 and Box 1).

ℹ Box 1 - Why we need to aggregate networks at different scales: A hypothetical case study

Although it might seem most prudent to be predicting, constructing, and defining networks that are the closest representation of reality there are pros and cons of constructing both realised networks as well as metawebs. Let us take for example a community that experiences a degree of species turnover between seasons. In this community we expect species to be either present or absent depending on the season (*i.e.,* changes in co-occurrence) as well as some species exhibiting seasonal shifts in their diets (be that due to changes in species occurrence or predator choice). If one were to construct a metaweb that disregards these season shifts (*i.e.,* a global metaweb) it is clear that these finer nuances would be lost. It is of course possible to construct either smaller metawebs for the different seasonal communities (thereby capturing the changes in community diversity), or realised networks for each season (to capture diet or ecosystem process shifts *e.g.,* Schwarz et al. (2020)). However, these small-scale networks lack the context of the bigger picture that is available at the metaweb - that is it gives us a more holistic idea of the entire diet range of a specific species, which is important when one needs to make conservation-based/applied decisions (*e.g.,* conserving the entire diet of a species and not just seasonal prey items) as well as providing information on interactions that may be possible regardless of the environmental/community context (species may have the capacity to consume certain prey items but do not do so due to local conditions). With this is mind let us see how the different network aggregations can be used:

1. A 'global' metaweb: Knowledge of the entire diet breadth of a species is valuable especially in terms of understanding how a species will respond to changes in the community - *e.g.* invasions/rewilding scenarios (where does the new species 'fit' within the network?) as well as potential capacity to shift its diet. There is also the argument that a metaweb will allow us to identify species that act as links across the landscape.

2. A seasonal metaweb: Knowledge at the finer scale is also valuable to understand and provide insight on the differences in diets between seasons (and identify key species within the network in different environments).

¹⁸⁴

3. A realised network: Provide insight as to the different network configurations for a given time and place, which is a better approximation of the energy flows/ecosystem processes as they are occurring (that is the *structure* of the network is also meaningful). A realised network will also allow one to detect more nuanced shifts diet - *i.e.,* not only changes in links due to species turnover between seasons.

3.1   Stochastic networks

Within stochastic networks the assumption is that the interactions between species occurs irrespective of the identity of the species (*i.e.,* species have no agency) and links are *randomly* distributed throughout the network. Alternatively it can be assumed that interactions are still independent of a species' trait but are rater driven by its abundance, *sensu* neutral theory (Hubbell, 2001).

Practically there is little support that networks are truly stochastic, however null models (Bascompte et al., 2003; *e.g.,* Fortuna & Bascompte, 2006) are often used as a 'null hypothesis' that can be used to ask questions about deviations in observed network structure (*e.g.,* Banville et al., 2023; Strydom, Dalla Riva, et al., 2021). Conversely, neutral models (E. F. Canard et al., 2014; Krishna et al., 2008), and by extension processes, are most likely relevant at local scales (Pomeranz et al., 2019), *i.e.,* should be considered to play a role when constructing realised networks but are superseded by trait-based processes at a metaweb scale.

3.2   Feasibility networks (metawebs)

Metawebs (depending on the aggregation) can help us develop our understanding of the intersection of species interactions and their co-occurrence (Gravel et al., 2019; *sensu* a fusion of the the Eltonian (interactions) and Grinnellian (environmental) niches, Soberón, 2007). Whereby a *global metaweb* presents an approximation of the fundamental Eltonian niche of a species (*i.e.,* its relation to its food source), whereas as *regional metawebs* represent an intersection of Elton and Grinnell. As discussed in Section 2.1 the feasibility of an interaction is typically assessed on a pairwise basis, and is often assessed based on the idea that interactions are governed by a set of 'feeding rules' (Morales-Castilla et al., 2015), and are broadly elucidated in two different ways; *mechanistic models*, (Dunne et al., 2008; Roopnarine, 2017; *e.g.,* Shaw et al., 2024) and *pattern finding models* (Caron et al., 2022; Cirtwill et al., 2019; Desjardins-Proulx et al., 2017; Eklöf et al., 2013; Llewelyn et al., 2023; Pichler et al., 2020; Strydom et al., 2022; *e.g.,* Strydom et al., 2023). The fundamental difference between these two model groups is that *mechanistic models* rely on expert knowledge and make explicit assumptions on trait-feeding relationships, whereas the *pattern finding models* are dependent on existing interaction datasets from feeding rules can be elucidated. It perhaps also bears repeating that these models

are often only presenting a list of feasible interactions and that the rresulting netowrk is 'unstructured', as it is uconstrained by any processes or conditions that generate structure. While these networks can be imprinted with external definitions of trophic position and guild identity to deliver hypothetical structure, this structure is not an emergent property of the links and species pairs (Caron et al., 2024).

Feasibility networks are useful for determining all feasible interactions for a specific community, and the models that have been developed in this context have the potential to allow us to construct first draft networks for communities for which we have no interaction data (Strydom et al., 2022), and are valuable not only in data poor regions but also for predicting interactions for 'unobservable' communities *e.g.,* prehistoric networks (Dunhill et al., 2024; Fricke et al., 2022; Yeakel et al., 2014) or future, novel community assemblages. Conceptually this is particularly valuable if we want to understand interactions between novel communitites, as well as the rewiring capacity of species. Additionally, an understanding of the role of interactions between species has allowed us to better determine the distribution of a species by accounting not only for the role of the environment but also the role of species interactions (Higino et al., 2023; Pollock et al., 2014).

3.3 'Behavioural' networks

Ultimately realised networks and capture some aspect of how the behavior of a species determines if a link is realised or not and can be modelled in two ways; models that predict realised interactions (whereby he behaiour of a secies is modelled *i.e.,* its diet choice), and models that predict the structure of realised networks (whereby the behvaiour of the system is modelled and assumptions are made with regards to the structure of a network). In terms predicting interactions current models are rooted in feeding theory and allocate the links between species based on energy *e.g.,* diet models (Beckerman et al., 2006; Petchey et al., 2008) have been used construct networks based on both profitability (as determined by the handling time, energy content, and predator attack rate) as well as abundance (prey density), and modular models (Krause et al., 2003; Wootton et al., 2023) are based on the compartmentation and aquisition of energy for species at different trophic levels. Models that determine structure are based on the idea that networks follow a trophic hierarchy and that network structure can be determined by distributing interactions along single dimension [the "niche axis"; Allesina et al. (2008)], while parametrising an aspect of the network structure (although see Allesina & Pascual, 2009 for a parameter-free model).

As behavioural networks are are build on the concept of dynamic processes (*e.g.,* the abundance of species will always be in flux) these networks are valuable for understanding the behaviour of networks over time, or their response to change (Curtsdotter et al., 2019; Delmas et al., 2017; Lajaaiti et al., 2024). However, they are 'costly' to construct (requiring data about the entire community, as it is the behaviour of the system

9

that determines the behaviour of the part) and also lack the larger diet niche context afforded by metawebs. Structural models provide a data-light (the models often only require species richness) but assumption heavy (the resulting network structure is determined by an assumption of network structure) alternative, however they do not make species specific predictions and so cannot be used to determine if an interaction is either possible *or* realised between two species (*i.e.,* one cannot use these models to determine if species *a* eats species *b*). Although this means this suite of models are unsuitable as tools for predicting species-specific interactions, they have been shown to be sufficient tools to predict the structure of networks (Williams & Martinez, 2008), and are useful in synthetic simulations.

4 Making Progress with Networks

It should be clear that there is a high degree of interrelatedness and overlap between the way in which a network is constructed and the process(es) that it captures Figure 1, these are encoded (embedded) within the network representation and ultimately influences how the network can and should be used (Berlow et al., 2008; Petchey et al., 2011), with different network representations (and models) yielding different interpretations of processes (Keyes et al., 2024).

It is probably both this nuance as well as a lack of clear boundaries and guidelines as to the links between network form and function (although see Delmas et al., 2019) that has stifled the 'productive use' of networks beyond the inventorying the interactions between species. Although progress with using networks as a means to address questions within larger bodies of ecological theory *e.g.,* invasion biology (Hui & Richardson, 2019) and co-existence theory (García-Callejas et al., 2023) has been made we still lack explicit guidelines as to what the appropriate network representation for the task at hand would be, and as highlighted in Box 1, underscores the need to evaluate exactly what process a specific network representation captures as well as its suitability for the question of interest. Below we present a mapping of what we believe are some of the key questions for which interaction networks can be used to the different networks representations that are most suitable, as well as highlight some of the methodological challenges that still need to be improved upon.

4.1 Making use of the different network representations

Methodological challenges

1. Tools that allow us to estimate both the feasibility as well as realisation of links: Currently most approaches to modelling relaised networks fail to explicitly account for any form of evolutionary constraint (although see Van De Walle et al., 2023) and we need to develop either an ensemble modelling approach

(Becker et al., 2022; Terry & Lewis, 2020) or tools that will allow for the downsampling of metawebs into realised networks (*e.g.,* Roopnarine, 2006).

2. Modelling interaction strength: Although realised networks are more closely aligned with *explicitly* capturing interaction strength we lack models that allow us to quantify this (Strydom, Catchen, et al., 2021; Wells & O'Hara, 2013).

3. How do we validate our predictions?: Progress has been made to assess how well a model recovers pairwise interactions (Poisot, 2023; Strydom, Catchen, et al., 2021), but we still lack clear set of guidelines for benchmarking the ability of models to recover structure (Allesina et al., 2008)

Theory challenges

1. Core Theory Advancement: Do the decades of insights arrived at for stability-diversity-productivity relationships with tri-trophic or diamond shaped models hold for complex communities (10's-100s) (Danet et al., 2024); How will spatial and temporal variation in climate and productivity drive change in complex ecosystems. Necessary to move to predicting changes in biodiversity per se, ecosystem functions and identifying sensitive and robust species and portions of communities.

2. How will novel communities interact? How will range shifts and invasions result in new/novel community assemblages. And then also the intentional changes of species compositions through rewilding.

3. Does rewiring happen and does it deliver robustness? Specific sub points to consider here is persistence, especially persistence to perturbation. Again, dynamic networks and network/community assembly and finally extinctions (Dunhill et al., 2024).

4. When do invasive species enhance or decimate communities? When do reintroductions work? (Wooster et al., 2024)

5. Are there temperature threshold to community collapse

6. Can socioeconomic networks combined with biological networks drive understanding of externalities?

7. Can paleoecological data from deep time hyperthermal events provide sufficient insight into the targets, pace and recovery times from rapid climate events?

[Figure 2 about here.]

5 Concluding remarks

Having a clear understanding of the interplay between network representations and the processes that they are capable of encoding is critical if we are to understand exactly which networks can be used to answer which questions. As we highlight in Box 1 the different network representations have different potential uses and

it should be clear that there is no 'best' network representation but rather a network representation that is best suited to its intended purpose. In providing a formalisation regards to the assumptions and mechanisms that need to be explicitly taken into consideration when deciding to use (and construct) networks we hope to prevent the unintentional misuse or misinterpretation of networks as well as provide a starting point from which we can develop a better framework for the applied use of networks to answer questions that are not only pressing within the field but also within broader biodiversity science.

References

Allesina, S., Alonso, D., & Pascual, M. (2008). A General Model for Food Web Structure. *Science*, *320*(5876), 658–661. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1156269

Allesina, S., & Pascual, M. (2009). Food web models: A plea for groups. *Ecology Letters*, *12*(7), 652–662. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01321.x

Banville, F., Gravel, D., & Poisot, T. (2023). What constrains food webs? A maximum entropy framework for predicting their structure with minimal biases. *PLOS Computational Biology*, *19*(9), e1011458. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1011458

Banville, F., Strydom, T., Blyth, P., Brimacombe, C., Catchen, M. D., Dansereau, G., Higino, G., Malpas, T., Mayall, H., Norman, K., Gravel, D., & Poisot, T. (2024). *Deciphering probabilistic species interaction networks*. EcoEvoRxiv. https://doi.org/10.32942/X28G8Z

Bascompte, J., Jordano, P., Melian, C. J., & Olesen, J. M. (2003). The nested assembly of plant-animal mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *100*(16), 9383–9387. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1633576100

Becker, D. J., Albery, G. F., Sjodin, A. R., Poisot, T., Bergner, L. M., Chen, B., Cohen, L. E., Dallas, T. A., Eskew, E. A., Fagre, A. C., Farrell, M. J., Guth, S., Han, B. A., Simmons, N. B., Stock, M., Teeling, E. C., & Carlson, C. J. (2022). Optimising predictive models to prioritise viral discovery in zoonotic reservoirs. *The Lancet Microbe*, *3*(8), e625–e637. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(21)00245-7

Beckerman, A. P., Petchey, O. L., & Warren, P. H. (2006). Foraging biology predicts food web complexity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *103*(37), 13745–13749. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0603039103

Benadi, G., Dormann, C. F., Fründ, J., Stephan, R., & Vázquez, D. P. (2022). Quantitative Prediction of Interactions in Bipartite Networks Based on Traits, Abundances, and Phylogeny. *The American Naturalist*, *199*(6), 841–854. https://doi.org/10.1086/714420

Berlow, E. L., Brose, U., & Martinez, N. D. (2008). The "Goldilocks factor" in food webs. *Proceedings of*

the National Academy of Sciences, *105*(11), 4079–4080. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0800967105

Berlow, E. L., Neutel, A.-M., Cohen, J. E., de Ruiter, P. C., Ebenman, B., Emmerson, M., Fox, J. W., Jansen, V. A. A., Iwan Jones, J., Kokkoris, G. D., Logofet, D. O., McKane, A. J., Montoya, J. M., & Petchey, O. (2004). Interaction strengths in food webs: Issues and opportunities. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *73*(3), 585–598. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8790.2004.00833.x

Biton, B., Puzis, R., & Pilosof, S. (2024). *Inductive link prediction boosts data availability and enables cross-community link prediction in ecological networks.*

Blanchet, F. G., Cazelles, K., & Gravel, D. (2020). Co-occurrence is not evidence of ecological interactions. *Ecology Letters*, *23*(7), 1050–1063. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13525

Blüthgen, N. (2010). Why network analysis is often disconnected from community ecology: A critique and an ecologist's guide. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, *11*(3), 185–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2010.01.001

Blüthgen, N., & Staab, M. (2024). A Critical Evaluation of Network Approaches for Studying Species Interactions. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *55*(1), 65–88. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102722-021904

Brimacombe, C., Bodner, K., Michalska-Smith, M., Poisot, T., & Fortin, M.-J. (2023). Shortcomings of reusing species interaction networks created by different sets of researchers. *PLOS Biology*, *21*(4), e3002068. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002068

Brown, J. H., Gillooly, J. F., Allen, A. P., Savage, V. M., & West, G. B. (2004). Toward a Metabolic Theory of Ecology. *Ecology*, *85*(7), 1771–1789. https://doi.org/10.1890/03-9000

Buche, L., Bartomeus, I., & Godoy, O. (2024). Multitrophic Higher-Order Interactions Modulate Species Persistence. *The American Naturalist*, *203*(4), 458–472. https://doi.org/10.1086/729222

Canard, E. F., Mouquet, N., Mouillot, D., Stanko, M., Miklisova, D., & Gravel, D. (2014). Empirical Evaluation of Neutral Interactions in Host-Parasite Networks. *The American Naturalist*, *183*(4), 468–479. https://doi.org/10.1086/675363

Canard, E., Mouquet, N., Marescot, L., Gaston, K. J., Gravel, D., & Mouillot, D. (2012). Emergence of Structural Patterns in Neutral Trophic Networks. *PLOS ONE*, *7*(8), e38295. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0038295

Caron, D., Brose, U., Lurgi, M., Blanchet, F. G., Gravel, D., & Pollock, L. J. (2024). Trait-matching models predict pairwise interactions across regions, not food web properties. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, *33*(4), e13807. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13807

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

Cherif, M., Brose, U., Hirt, M. R., Ryser, R., Silve, V., Albert, G., Arnott, R., Berti, E., Cirtwill, A.,

Dyer, A., Gauzens, B., Gupta, A., Ho, H.-C., Portalier, S. M. J., Wain, D., & Wootton, K. (2024). The environment to the rescue: Can physics help predict predator–prey interactions? *Biological Reviews*, *138*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.13105

Cirtwill, A. R., Eklf, A., Roslin, T., Wootton, K., & Gravel, D. (2019). A quantitative framework for investigating the reliability of empirical network construction. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *10*(6), 902–911. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13180

Clegg, T., Ali, M., & Beckerman, A. P. (2018). The impact of intraspecific variation on food web structure. *Ecology*, *99*(12), 2712–2720. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2523

Curtsdotter, A., Banks, H. T., Banks, J. E., Jonsson, M., Jonsson, T., Laubmeier, A. N., Traugott, M., & Bommarco, R. (2019). Ecosystem function in predator–prey food webs—confronting dynamic models with empirical data. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *88*(2), 196–210. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12892

Dalla Riva, G. V., & Stouffer, D. B. (2016). Exploring the evolutionary signature of food webs' backbones using functional traits. *Oikos*, *125*(4), 446–456. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.02305

Dallas, T., Park, A. W., & Drake, J. M. (2017). Predicting cryptic links in host-parasite networks. *PLOS Computational Biology*, *13*(5), e1005557. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005557

Danet, A., Kéfi, S., Johnson, T. F., & Beckerman, A. P. (2024). *Response diversity is a major driver of temporal stability in complex food webs* (p. 2024.08.29.610288). bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.29.610288

Dansereau, G., Barros, C., & Poisot, T. (2024). Spatially explicit predictions of food web structure from regional-level data. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *379*(1909). https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2023.0166

Delmas, E., Besson, M., Brice, M.-H., Burkle, L. A., Riva, G. V. D., Fortin, M.-J., Gravel, D., Guimarães, P. R., Hembry, D. H., Newman, E. A., Olesen, J. M., Pires, M. M., Yeakel, J. D., & Poisot, T. (2019). Analysing ecological networks of species interactions. *Biological Reviews*, *94*(1), 16–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12433

Delmas, E., Brose, U., Gravel, D., Stouffer, D. B., & Poisot, T. (2017). Simulations of biomass dynamics in community food webs. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *8*(7), 881–886. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12713

Desjardins-Proulx, P., Laigle, I., Poisot, T., & Gravel, D. (2017). Ecological interactions and the Netflix problem. *PeerJ*, *5*, e3644. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.3644

Dormann, C. F. (2023). The rise, and possible fall, of network ecology. In *Defining Agroecology – A Festschrift for Teja Tscharntke* (pp. 143–159.). Tredition.

Dunhill, A. M., Zarzyczny, K., Shaw, J. O., Atkinson, J. W., Little, C. T. S., & Beckerman, A. P. (2024).

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

Dunne, J. A. (2006). The Network Structure of Food Webs. In J. A. Dunne & M. Pascual (Eds.), *Ecological networks: Linking structure and dynamics* (pp. 27–86). Oxford University Press.

Dunne, J. A., Williams, R. J., Martinez, N. D., Wood, R. A., & Erwin, D. H. (2008). Compilation and Network Analyses of Cambrian Food Webs. *PLOS Biology*, *6*(4), e102. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060102

Eklöf, A., Tang, S., & Allesina, S. (2013). Secondary extinctions in food webs: A Bayesian network approach. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *4*(8), 760–770. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12062

Estay, S. A., Fortin, M.-J., & López, D. N. (2023). Editorial: Patterns and processes in ecological networks over space. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, *11*.

Fortuna, M. A., & Bascompte, J. (2006). Habitat loss and the structure of plant-animal mutualistic networks: Mutualistic networks and habitat loss. *Ecology Letters*, *9*(3), 281–286. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00868.x

Fricke, E. C., Hsieh, C., Middleton, O., Gorczynski, D., Cappello, C. D., Sanisidro, O., Rowan, J., Svenning, J.-C., & Beaudrot, L. (2022). Collapse of terrestrial mammal food webs since the Late Pleistocene. *Science*, *377*(6609), 1008–1011. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn4012

García-Callejas, D., Godoy, O., Buche, L., Hurtado, M., Lanuza, J. B., Allen-Perkins, A., & Bartomeus, I. (2023). Non-random interactions within and across guilds shape the potential to coexist in multi-trophic ecological communities. *Ecology Letters*, *26*(6), 831–842. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14206

Golubski, A. J., & Abrams, P. A. (2011). Modifying modifiers: What happens when interspecific interactions interact? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *80*(5), 1097–1108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01852.x

Gómez, J. M., Verdú, M., & Perfectti, F. (2010). Ecological interactions are evolutionarily conserved across the entire tree of life. *Nature*, *465*(7300), 918–921. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09113

Gravel, D., Baiser, B., Dunne, J. A., Kopelke, J.-P., Martinez, N. D., Nyman, T., Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., Tylianakis, J. M., Wood, S. A., & Roslin, T. (2019). Bringing Elton and Grinnell together: A quantitative framework to represent the biogeography of ecological interaction networks. *Ecography*, *42*(3), 401–415. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.04006

Higino, G. T., Banville, F., Dansereau, G., Muñoz, N. R. F., Windsor, F., & Poisot, T. (2023). Mismatch between IUCN range maps and species interactions data illustrated using the Serengeti food web. *PeerJ*, *11*, e14620. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.14620

Hubbell, S. P. (2001). *The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography (MPB-32)*. Princeton

University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7rj8w

Hui, C., & Richardson, D. M. (2019). How to Invade an Ecological Network. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *34*(2), 121–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.11.003

Ings, T. C., Montoya, J. M., Bascompte, J., Blüthgen, N., Brown, L., Dormann, C. F., Edwards, F., Figueroa, D., Jacob, U., Jones, J. I., Lauridsen, R. B., Ledger, M. E., Lewis, H. M., Olesen, J. M., van Veen, F. J. F., Warren, P. H., & Woodward, G. (2009). Ecological networks–beyond food webs. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, *78*(1), 253–269. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01460.x

Jordano, P. (2016a). Chasing Ecological Interactions. *PLOS Biology*, *14*(9), e1002559. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002559

Jordano, P. (2016b). Sampling networks of ecological interactions. *Functional Ecology*. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12763

Kamaru, D. N., Palmer, T. M., Riginos, C., Ford, A. T., Belnap, J., Chira, R. M., Githaiga, J. M., Gituku, B. C., Hays, B. R., Kavwele, C. M., Kibungei, A. K., Lamb, C. T., Maiyo, N. J., Milligan, P. D., Mutisya, S., Ng'weno, C. C., Ogutu, M., Pietrek, A. G., Wildt, B. T., & Goheen, J. R. (2024). Disruption of an ant-plant mutualism shapes interactions between lions and their primary prey. *Science*, *383*(6681), 433–438. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adg1464

Kéfi, S., Berlow, E. L., Wieters, E. A., Joppa, L. N., Wood, S. A., Brose, U., & Navarrete, S. A. (2015). Network structure beyond food webs: Mapping non-trophic and trophic interactions on Chilean rocky shores. *Ecology*, *96*(1), 291–303. https://doi.org/10.1890/13-1424.1

Kéfi, S., Berlow, E. L., Wieters, E. A., Navarrete, S. A., Petchey, O. L., Wood, S. A., Boit, A., Joppa, L. N., Lafferty, K. D., Williams, R. J., Martinez, N. D., Menge, B. A., Blanchette, C. A., Iles, A. C., & Brose, U. (2012). More than a meal… integrating non-feeding interactions into food webs: More than a meal …. *Ecology Letters*, *15*(4), 291–300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01732.x

Keyes, A. A., Barner, A. K., & Dee, L. E. (2024). Synthesising the Relationships Between Food Web Structure and Robustness. *Ecology Letters*, *27*(10), e14533. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14533

Krause, A. E., Frank, K. A., Mason, D. M., Ulanowicz, R. E., & Taylor, W. W. (2003). Compartments revealed in food-web structure. *Nature*, *426*(6964), 282–285. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02115

Krishna, A., Guimarães Jr, P. R., Jordano, P., & Bascompte, J. (2008). A neutral-niche theory of nestedness in mutualistic networks. *Oikos*, *117*(11), 1609–1618. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2008.16540.x

Lajaaiti, I., Bonnici, I., Kéfi, S., Mayall, H., Danet, A., Beckerman, A. P., Malpas, T., & Delmas, E. (2024). *EcologicalNetworksDynamics.jl A Julia package to simulate the temporal dynamics of complex ecological networks* (p. 2024.03.20.585899). bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.20.585899

Lindeman, R. L. (1942). The Trophic-Dynamic Aspect of Ecology. *Ecology*, *23*(4), 399–417. https://doi.org/

10.2307/1930126

Llewelyn, J., Strona, G., Dickman, C. R., Greenville, A. C., Wardle, G. M., Lee, M. S. Y., Doherty, S., Shabani, F., Saltré, F., & Bradshaw, C. J. A. (2023). Predicting predator–prey interactions in terrestrial endotherms using random forest. *Ecography*, *2023*(9), e06619. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.06619

Loreau, M., & de Mazancourt, C. (2013). Biodiversity and ecosystem stability: A synthesis of underlying mechanisms. *Ecology Letters*, *16*(s1), 106–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12073

Momal, R., Robin, S., & Ambroise, C. (2020). Tree-based inference of species interaction networks from abundance data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *11*(5), 621–632. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13380

Morales-Castilla, I., Matias, M. G., Gravel, D., & Araújo, M. B. (2015). Inferring biotic interactions from proxies. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *30*(6), 347–356. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.03.014

Moulatlet, G., Luna, P., Dattilo, W., & Villalobos, F. (2024). *The scaling of trophic specialization in interaction networks across levels of organization*. Authorea. https://doi.org/10.22541/au.172977303.33335171/v1

Pawar, S., Dell, A. I., & Savage, V. M. (2012). Dimensionality of consumer search space drives trophic interaction strengths. *Nature*, *486*(7404), 485–489. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11131

Petchey, O. L., Beckerman, A. P., Riede, J. O., & Warren, P. H. (2008). Size, foraging, and food web structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *105*(11), 4191–4196. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0710672105

Petchey, O. L., Beckerman, A. P., Riede, J. O., & Warren, P. H. (2011). Fit, efficiency, and biology: Some thoughts on judging food web models. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *279*(1), 169–171. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2011.03.019

Pichler, M., Boreux, V., Klein, A.-M., Schleuning, M., & Hartig, F. (2020). Machine learning algorithms to infer trait-matching and predict species interactions in ecological networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *11*(2), 281–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13329

Pilosof, S., Porter, M. A., Pascual, M., & Kéfi, S. (2017). The multilayer nature of ecological networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, *1*(4), 101. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0101

Poisot, T. (2023). Guidelines for the prediction of species interactions through binary classification. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *14*(5), 1333–1345. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14071

Poisot, T., Cirtwill, A., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., Fortin, M.-J., & Stouffer, D. (2016). The structure of probabilistic networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *7*(3), 303–312. https://doi.org/10

Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., & Gravel, D. (2015). Beyond species: Why ecological interaction networks vary through space and time. *Oikos*, *124*(3), 243–251. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01719

Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., & Kéfi, S. (2016). Describe, understand and predict: Why do we need networks in ecology? *Functional Ecology*, *30*(12), 1878–1882. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48582345

Polis, G. A. (1991). Complex Trophic Interactions in Deserts: An Empirical Critique of Food-Web Theory. *The American Naturalist*, *138*(1), 123–155. https://doi.org/10.1086/285208

Pollock, L. J., Tingley, R., Morris, W. K., Golding, N., O'Hara, R. B., Parris, K. M., Vesk, P. A., & McCarthy, M. A. (2014). Understanding co-occurrence by modelling species simultaneously with a Joint Species Distribution Model (JSDM). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *5*(5), 397–406. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12180

Pomeranz, J. P. F., Thompson, R. M., Poisot, T., & Harding, J. S. (2019). Inferring predator–prey interactions in food webs. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *10*(3), 356–367. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13125

Portalier, S. M. J., Fussmann, G. F., Loreau, M., & Cherif, M. (2019). The mechanics of predator–prey interactions: First principles of physics predict predator–prey size ratios. *Functional Ecology*, *33*(2), 323–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13254

Pringle, R. M. (2020). Untangling Food Webs. In *Unsolved Problems in Ecology* (pp. 225–238). Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691195322-020

Pringle, R. M., & Hutchinson, M. C. (2020). Resolving Food-Web Structure. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, *51*(Volume 51, 2020), 55–80. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110218-024908

Proulx, S. R., Promislow, D. E. L., & Phillips, P. C. (2005). Network thinking in ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *20*(6), 345–353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2005.04.004

Pyke, G. (1984). Optimal Foraging Theory: A Critical Review. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematic*, *15*, 523–575. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.15.1.523

Quintero, E., Arroyo-Correa, B., Isla, J., Rodríguez-Sánchez, F., & Jordano, P. (2024). *Downscaling mutualistic networks from species to individuals reveals consistent interaction niches and roles within plant populations* (p. 2024.02.02.578595). bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.02.578595

Roopnarine, P. D. (2006). Extinction Cascades and Catastrophe in Ancient Food Webs. *Paleobiology*, *32*(1), 1–19. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4096814

Roopnarine, P. D. (2017). Ecological Modelling of Paleocommunity Food Webs. In *Conservation Paleobiology: Using the Past to Manage for the Future* (pp. 201–226). University of Chicago Press.

Saberski, E., Lorimer, T., Carpenter, D., Deyle, E., Merz, E., Park, J., Pao, G. M., & Sugihara, G. (2024). The impact of data resolution on dynamic causal inference in multiscale ecological networks. *Communications Biology*, *7*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-024-07054-z

Saravia, L. A., Marina, T. I., Kristensen, N. P., De Troch, M., & Momo, F. R. (2022). Ecological network assembly: How the regional metaweb influences local food webs. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *91*(3), 630–642. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13652

Schwarz, B., Vázquez, D. P., CaraDonna, P. J., Knight, T. M., Benadi, G., Dormann, C. F., Gauzens, B., Motivans, E., Resasco, J., Blüthgen, N., Burkle, L. A., Fang, Q., Kaiser-Bunbury, C. N., Alarcón, R., Bain, J. A., Chacoff, N. P., Huang, S.-Q., LeBuhn, G., MacLeod, M., … Fründ, J. (2020). Temporal scale-dependence of plant–pollinator networks. *Oikos*, *129*(9), 1289–1302. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.07303

Segar, S. T., Fayle, T. M., Srivastava, D. S., Lewinsohn, T. M., Lewis, O. T., Novotny, V., Kitching, R. L., & Maunsell, S. C. (2020). The Role of Evolution in Shaping Ecological Networks. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *35*(5), 454–466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.01.004

Shaw, J. O., Dunhill, A. M., Beckerman, A. P., Dunne, J. A., & Hull, P. M. (2024). *A framework for reconstructing ancient food webs using functional trait data* (p. 2024.01.30.578036). bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.30.578036

Soberón, J. (2007). Grinnellian and Eltonian niches and geographic distributions of species. *Ecology Letters*, *10*(12), 1115–1123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01107.x

Song, C., & Levine, J. M. (2024). *Rigorous (in)validation of ecological models* (p. 2024.09.19.613075). bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.613075

Staniczenko, P. P. A., Lewis, O. T., Jones, N. S., & Reed-Tsochas, F. (2010). Structural dynamics and robustness of food webs. *Ecology Letters*, *13*(7), 891–899. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01485.x

Stephens, D. W., & Krebs, J. R. (1986). *Foraging Theory* (Vol. 1). Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvs32s6b

Stock, M. (2021). Pairwise learning for predicting pollination interactions based on traits and phylogeny. *Ecological Modelling*, 14.

Stouffer, D. B. (2019). All ecological models are wrong, but some are useful. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *88*(2), 192–195. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12949

Strydom, T., Bouskila, S., Banville, F., Barros, C., Caron, D., Farrell, M. J., Fortin, M.-J., Hemming, V., Mercier, B., Pollock, L. J., Runghen, R., Dalla Riva, G. V., & Poisot, T. (2022). Food web reconstruction through phylogenetic transfer of low-rank network representation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *13*(12), 2838–2849. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13835

Strydom, T., Bouskila, S., Banville, F., Barros, C., Caron, D., Farrell, M. J., Fortin, M.-J., Mercier, B., Pollock, L. J., Runghen, R., Dalla Riva, G. V., & Poisot, T. (2023). Graph embedding and transfer learning can help predict potential species interaction networks despite data limitations. *Methods in*

563   *Ecology and Evolution*, *14*(12), 2917–2930. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14228

564   Strydom, T., Catchen, M. D., Banville, F., Caron, D., Dansereau, G., Desjardins-Proulx, P., Forero-Muñoz,

565   N. R., Higino, G., Mercier, B., Gonzalez, A., Gravel, D., Pollock, L., & Poisot, T. (2021). A roadmap

566   towards predicting species interaction networks (across space and time). *Philosophical Transactions of*

567   *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *376*(1837), 20210063. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0063

568   Strydom, T., Dalla Riva, G. V., & Poisot, T. (2021). SVD Entropy Reveals the High Complexity of Ecological

569   Networks. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, *9.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2021.623141

570   Terry, J. C. D., & Lewis, O. T. (2020). Finding missing links in interaction networks. *Ecology*, *101*(7), e03047.

571   https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3047

572   Van De Walle, R., Logghe, G., Haas, N., Massol, F., Vandegehuchte, M. L., & Bonte, D. (2023). Arthro-

573   pod food webs predicted from body size ratios are improved by incorporating prey defensive properties.

574   *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *92*(4), 913–924. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13905

575   Vázquez, D. P., Blüthgen, N., Cagnolo, L., & Chacoff, N. P. (2009). Uniting pattern and process in plant–

576   animal mutualistic networks: A review. *Annals of Botany*, *103*(9), 1445–1457. https://doi.org/10.1093/

577   aob/mcp057

578   Wells, K., & O'Hara, R. B. (2013). Species interactions: Estimating per-individual interaction strength and

579   covariates before simplifying data into per-species ecological networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*,

580   *4*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00249.x

581   Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2000). Simple rules yield complex food webs. *Nature*, *404*(6774), 180–183.

582   https://doi.org/10.1038/35004572

583   Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2008). Success and its limits among structural models of complex food

584   webs. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *77*(3), 512–519. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01362.x

585   Windsor, F. M., van den Hoogen, J., Crowther, T. W., & Evans, D. M. (2023). Using ecological networks

586   to answer questions in global biogeography and ecology. *Journal of Biogeography*, *50*(1), 57–69. https:

587   //doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14447

588   Wooster, E. I. F., Middleton, O. S., Wallach, A. D., Ramp, D., Sanisidro, O., Harris, V. K., Rowan, J.,

589   Schowanek, S. D., Gordon, C. E., Svenning, J.-C., Davis, M., Scharlemann, J. P. W., Nimmo, D. G.,

590   Lundgren, E. J., & Sandom, C. J. (2024). Australia's recently established predators restore complexity

591   to food webs simplified by extinction. *Current Biology*, *34*(22), 5164–5172.e2. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.

592   cub.2024.09.049

593   Wootton, K. L., Curtsdotter, A., Roslin, T., Bommarco, R., & Jonsson, T. (2023). Towards a modular theory

594   of trophic interactions. *Functional Ecology*, *37*(1), 26–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13954

595   Yeakel, J. D., Pires, M. M., Rudolf, L., Dominy, N. J., Koch, P. L., Guimarães, P. R., & Gross, T. (2014).

Collapse of an ecological network in Ancient Egypt. *PNAS*, *111*(40), 14472–14477. https://doi.org/10.
1073/pnas.1408471111

Yodzis, P. (1982). The Compartmentation of Real and Assembled Ecosystems. *The American Naturalist*,
*120*(5), 551–570. https://doi.org/10.1086/284013

Figure 1: Aligning the various processes that determine interactions (right column) with the different network representations (left column). First we start with a **global metaweb** this network captures all possible interactions for a collection of species in the global context. However within the global environment different species occur in different regions (region one = yellow and region 2 = orange), and it is possible to construct two different metawebs (**regional metawebs**) for each region by taking accounting for the co-occurrence patterns of the difference species - as shown here we have two regions with some species (blue) that are found in both regions and others endemic to either region one (yellow) or region two (orange). However even within a region we do not expect that all interactions to be realised but rather that there are multiple configurations of the regional metaweb over both space and time. The 'state' of the different **realised networks** are ultimately influenced not just by the co-occurrence of a species pair but rather the larger community context such as the abundance of different species, maximisation of energy gain, or indirect/higher order interactions.

Figure 2: Here we highlight some of the outstanding questions in both network as well as general ecology, as well as some of the outstanding methodological challenges with regards to constructing food webs (shown in orange) that we are faced with.