

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

Tanya Strydom <sup>1</sup>; Jennifer A. Dunne <sup>2</sup>; Timothée Poisot <sup>3,4</sup>; Andrew P. Beckerman <sup>1</sup>

**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. Here we present a synthesis of the different assumptions, scales and mechanisms that are used to define different ecological networks ranging from metawebs (an inventory of all potential interactions) to fully realised networks (interactions that occur within a given community over a certain timescale). Illuminating the assumptions, scales, and mechanisms of network inference allows a formal categorisation of how to use networks to answer key ecological and conservation questions and defines guidelines to prevent unintentional misuse or misinterpretation.

**Keywords:** food web, network construction, scientific ignorance

1 At the heart of modern biodiversity science are a set of concepts and theories about biodiversity, stability  
2 and function. These relate to the abundance, distribution and services that biodiversity provides, and  
3 how biodiversity – as an interconnected set of species – responds to multiple stressors. The interaction  
4 between species is one of the fundamental building blocks of ecological communities, providing a powerful  
5 abstraction that can help quantify, conceptualise, and understand biodiversity dynamics, and ultimately,  
6 make predictions, mitigate change, and manage services (Windsor et al., 2023). Such network representations  
7 of biodiversity (including within species diversity) are increasingly argued to be an asset to predictive ecology,  
8 climate change mitigation and resource management, with the argument that characterising biodiversity in a  
9 network will afford a deeper capacity to understand and predict the abundance, distribution, dynamics and  
10 services provided by multiple species facing multiple stressors. However, there is a growing discourse around  
11 limitations to the interpretation and applied use of networks (Blüthgen, 2010; Dormann, 2023), primarily as  
12 the result of shortcomings regarding the conceptualisation of networks (Blüthgen & Staab, 2024).

13 A ‘network’ can be defined and conceptualised in a myriad of ways, which means that different networks  
14 will be embedding different processes (or determinants) of interactions, ultimately influencing the patterns  
15 and mechanisms that are inferred (Brimacombe et al., 2023; Proulx et al., 2005). The different ways in  
16 which a network can be represented is the result of *how* the network is constructed, which itself rests on two  
17 pillars: the data used to construct the network and the underlying theory as to what drives the interactions  
18 between species. The latter represents an expression of mechanism and process that gives rise to the patterns  
19 that emerge from collating interactions among species, and will ultimately inform which data are deemed  
20 important in the determination of interactions occurring. Each of these pillars carries with it a set of practical,  
21 semantic and conceptual constraints that not only influence progress in making network ecology more valuable  
22 and potentially predictive, but help define the spatial, temporal, and evolutionary scale of assumptions we  
23 make and the predictions we might generate from different network representations.

24 In this perspective we aim to provide an overview of the different **food web** representations, particularly  
25 how these relate to the terminology used to define a network, and how this influenced by both the processes  
26 that determine networks as well as how this relates to the way in which we construct networks. The provision  
27 of this detail ultimately leads to a set of insights and conclusions about whether, when, and under what  
28 conditions network representations of biodiversity can contribute to the advancement of ecological theory and  
29 generate value in predictive ecology. Specifically, we finish this perspective with an overview of fundamental  
30 questions in ecology that we think can benefit from network thinking and a proposal that such thinking can  
31 accelerate our capacity to predict the impact of multiple stressors on biodiverse communities.

## **32 1 Setting the Scene: The Not So Basics of Nodes and Edges**

33 Defining a food web seems simple; it is the representation of the interactions (edges) between species (nodes)  
34 in the form of a network, however the definition of ‘edges’ and ‘nodes’, as well as the scale at which they  
35 are aggregated can take many forms (Poisot, Stouffer, et al., 2016), which ultimately encodes a series of  
36 assumptions and criteria within a network. An awareness of variance in the way a food web can be defined  
37 is critical as a network (or its adjacency matrix) is both the ‘object’ from which inferences are made (*e.g.*,  
38 the interactions between species, or how the structure influences ecosystem level processes) as well as the  
39 ‘product’ of either the data collection (Brimacombe et al., 2023) or prediction process (Banville et al., 2024).  
40 One thus needs to be aware of both the criteria that is used to define nodes and edges, and what processes  
41 or mechanisms the aggregation of the two represents, as this will determine what the network can be used  
42 for.

### **43 1.1 How do we define a node?**

44 Although this may seem an elementary question in the context of food webs — a node *should* represent a  
45 (taxonomic) species, the reality is that nodes can often represent an aggregation of different species - so called  
46 ‘trophic species’ (Williams & Martinez, 2000; Yodzis, 1982) or segregation of species by life stages (Clegg  
47 et al., 2018). Practical implications of how we are aggregating the nodes is that the resolution may not  
48 always be ‘pixel perfect’, which limits the ability to make (taxonomic) species specific inferences *e.g.*, does  
49 species *a* eat species *b*, however there is value in having nodes that represent an aggregation of species, as  
50 the distribution of the links between them are more meaningful in terms of understanding energy flow and  
51 distribution within the system.

### **52 1.2 What is captured by an edge?**

53 At its core, links within food webs can be thought of as a representation of either feeding links between species  
54 - be that realised (Pringle, 2020) or potential (Dunne, 2006), alternative links can represent fluxes within the  
55 system *e.g.*, energy transfer or material flow as the result of the feeding links between species (Lindeman,  
56 1942). Fundamentally this means that the links within a network represent different ‘currencies’ (either the  
57 feasibility of a link existing between two species or the energy that is moving through the system) and how the  
58 links within a network are specified will influence the resulting structure of the network. For example taking  
59 a food web that consists of links representing all *potential* feeding links for a community (*i.e.*, a metaweb)  
60 will be meaningless if one is interested in understanding the flow of energy through the network as the links  
61 within a metaweb do not represent environmental/energetic constraints, making them poor representations

of which interactions are *realised* in a specific location (Caron et al., 2024). 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 an interaction, Berlow et al., 2004).

### 1.3 Network representations

Broadly, 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 difference between these two different network representations is that a metaweb provides insight as to the viability of an interaction between two species occurring and is 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 highly localised and links between species are contingent on both the co-occurrence of species as well as the influence of the environment, and population and community dynamics on predator choice. In the context of definitions and semantics the links that are represented by a metaweb and a realised network are different; links that are absent in a metaweb can 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<sup>2</sup> scale based on fine-scale species co-occurrence) but represents a shift towards capturing the 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 as well as the resulting network structure.

## 2 From Nodes and Edges to Scale, Context, and Process

The interplay between network representation and network (node and edge) definition is primarily governed by the process(es) that determine the interaction between species, however these processes are also scale and context dependent. Here we start by introducing the five core processes that determine either the feasibility

92 or the realisation of interactions, namely: evolutionary compatibility, co-occurrence, abundance, predator  
93 choice, and non-trophic interactions; while simultaneously contextualising them within, and linking them  
94 to the different network representations Figure 1. We can think of the different network representations  
95 to be conceptually analogous to the fundamental and realised niche, whereby the metaweb represents the  
96 ‘fundamental diet niche’ of a species and a realised network represents the ‘realised diet’ of a species. Of  
97 course these processes do not function in a vacuum and do interact with/influence one another, but it is still  
98 beneficial to present them in a categorical manner as these different processes are often the underpinning  
99 logic in the development of prediction/network models, the criteria for data collection in the field, and the  
100 scale of organisation for which they are relevant (species, population, or community).

101 [Figure 1 about here.]

## 102 2.1 The processes that determine species interactions

### 103 Evolutionary compatibility

104 There is compelling evidence that an interaction occurring between two species is the result of their shared  
105 (co)evolutionary history (Dalla Riva & Stouffer, 2016; Gómez et al., 2010; Segar et al., 2020) which, in the  
106 more proximal sense, is manifested as the ‘trait complementarity’ between two species (Benadi et al., 2022),  
107 whereby one species (the predator) has the ‘correct’ set of traits that allow it to chase, capture, kill, and  
108 consume the other species (the prey). For species pairs where this condition is not met the link is deemed  
109 to be forbidden (Jordano, 2016b); *i.e.*, not physically possible and will always be absent within a network.  
110 A network constructed on the basis of evolutionary compatible links is most closely aligned with a metaweb,  
111 although it would not be required that the species co-occur (as shown in Figure 1), and arguably makes for  
112 a good approximation of the ‘Eltonian niche’ of species (Soberón, 2007). Finally, one should be aware that  
113 it is possible to represent evolutionary compatible interactions as either binary (possible vs forbidden) or as  
114 a probability (Banville et al., 2024), where the probability represents how likely the interaction between two  
115 species is to be possible.

### 116 (Co)occurrence

117 Although the outright assumption that because two species are co-occurring it must mean that they are  
118 interacting is flawed (Blanchet et al., 2020), it is of course impossible for two species to interact (at least in  
119 terms of feeding links) if they are not co-occurring in time and space. Thus, although co-occurrence data  
120 alone is insufficient to build an accurate and ecologically meaningful representation of *feeding links* it is still  
121 a critical process that determines the realisation of feeding links and allows us to constrain a global metaweb

122 to only consider ‘realised’ communities (Dansereau et al., 2024) and an understanding of the intersection of  
123 species interactions and their co-occurrence is meaningful when one is operating in the space of trying to  
124 determine the distribution of a species (Higino et al., 2023; Pollock et al., 2014), representing something of  
125 a fusion of the the Grinnellian and Eltonian niches (Gravel et al., 2019).

126 **Abundance**

127 The abundance of different the species within the community is thought to influence the realisation of feeding  
128 links primarily in two ways. Firstly there is the argument that that structure of networks (and the interactions  
129 that they are composed of) are driven *only* by the abundance of the different species and that interactions  
130 are not contingent on there being any compatibility (trait matching) between them, *sensu* neutral processes  
131 (Canard et al., 2012; Momal et al., 2020). However, a more ecologically sound assumption would be that  
132 the abundance of different prey species will influence the distribution of links in a network (Vázquez et al.,  
133 2009), be influencing which prey are targeted or preferred by the predator as abundance influences factors  
134 such as the likelihood of two species (individuals) meeting (Banville et al., 2024; Poisot et al., 2015), or in  
135 the dynamic sense will influence the persistence of viable populations.

136 **Profitability (predator choice)**

137 Ultimately, predator choice is underpinned by the energetic cost-benefit (profitability) of trying to catch, kill,  
138 and consume prey (where a predator will optimise energy while minimising handling and search time), and  
139 is well described within both optimal foraging (Pyke, 1984) and metabolic theory (Brown et al., 2004). The  
140 energetic cost of feeding is itself can be deconstructed as the energy content as well as the density (abundance)  
141 of prey (as this influences search time) and how these will influence which links are realised Figure 1, with an  
142 argument that body size represents a key trait that may capture and influence these processes (White et al.,  
143 2007; Yodzis & Innes, 1992). Additional work on on understanding the energetic cost that the environment  
144 imposes on an individual (Cherif et al., 2024) as well as the way a predator uses the landscape to search for  
145 prey (Pawar et al., 2012) is bringing us closer to accounting for the energetic cost of realising feeding links.

146 **Non-trophic interactions**

147 Perhaps not as intuitive when thinking about the processes that determine feeding links (trophic interac-  
148 tions) is thinking about the role of the ability of non-trophic interactions to modify either the realisation or  
149 strength of trophic interactions (Golubski & Abrams, 2011; Pilosof et al., 2017). Non-trophic interactions  
150 can modify interactions either ‘directly’ e.g., predator *a* outcompetes predator *b* or ‘indirectly’ e.g., mutu-  
151 alistic/facilitative interactions will alter the fine-scale distribution and abundance of species as well as their  
152 persistence (Buche et al., 2024; Kéfi et al., 2012, 2015). The ‘unobservable’ nature of non-trophic interactions

153 makes them a challenge to quantify, however their importance in network dynamics (Staniczenko et al., 2010)  
154 as well as cascading effects [e.g., Kamaru et al. (2024)] should not be overlooked.

## 155 2.2 Contextualising the processes that determine species interactions

156 It should be self evident that the different processes discussed above are all ultimately going to influence the  
157 realisation of interactions as well as the structure of a network, however they are acting at different scales  
158 of organisation. Both the **co-occurrence** and the **evolutionary compatibility** are valid at the scale of  
159 the species pair of interest, that is the *possibility* of an interaction being present/absent is assessed at the  
160 pairwise level and one is left with a ‘list’ of interactions that are present/absent. Although it is possible  
161 to build a network (*i.e.*, metaweb) from this information it is important to be aware that the structure of  
162 this network is not constrained by real-world dynamics or conditions, and so just because species are able to  
163 interact does not mean that they will (Poisot et al., 2015). In order to construct a network who’s structure is  
164 a closer approximation of reality (localised interactions) one needs to take into consideration the properties  
165 of the community as a whole and information about the individuals it is comprised of (Quintero et al., 2024),  
166 which requires more data at the community scale, such as the abundance of species.

## 167 3 Network construction is nuanced

168 The act of constructing a ‘real world’ network will ultimately be delimited by its intended use, however the  
169 reality is that the empirical collection of interaction data is both costly and challenging to execute (Jordano,  
170 2016a, 2016b), especially if one wants to capture *all* aspects of the processes discussed in Section 2 (owing  
171 to the different time and spatial scales they may be operating at). Thus we often turn to models to either  
172 predict networks (be that the interaction between two species, or network structure (Strydom et al., 2021)),  
173 or as a means to identify missing interactions (gap fill) within an existing empirical dataset (Biton et al.,  
174 2024; Dallas et al., 2017; Stock, 2021), and so for the purpose of this discussion network construction will be  
175 synonymous with using a model as a means to represent or predict a network. That is not to say that there is  
176 no need for empirical data collection but rather that using a model for food web prediction (or reconstruction)  
177 is a more feasible approach as it allows us to make inferences about interactions that are not happening in  
178 the ‘observable now’ (Strydom et al., 2021), with the added benefit that one is able to build some uncertainty  
179 into the resulting network (Banville et al., 2024). Additionally different models have different underlying  
180 philosophies that allow us to capture one or a few of the processes discussed in Section 2, and although the  
181 delimits and defines what inferences can be made from the resulting network it also allows us to isolate and  
182 understand how different processes determine interactions (Song & Levine, 2024; Stouffer, 2019). Here we will

introduce the three different types of network representations (metawebs, realised networks, and structural networks), how they link back to (and encode) the different processes determining interactions Figure 1, and broadly discuss some of the modelling approaches that are used to construct these different network types. This is paralleled by a hypothetical case study (Box 1) where we showcase the utility/applicability of the different network representations in the context of trying to understand the feeding dynamics of a seasonal community.

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

note I am using a figure for layout experimentation purposes

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 ('global metaweb') these details would be lost and it would be valuable 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). 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 in mind let us see how the different network aggregations can be used

[Figure 2 about here.]

189

### 190 3.1 Models that predict metawebs (feasible interactions)

This is perhaps the most developed group of models; with a variety of approaches having been developed that typically determine the feasibility of an interaction using the trait compatibility between predator and prey (*i.e.* their evolutionary compatibility) to determine 'feeding rules' (Morales-Castilla et al., 2015). These feeding rules are broadly elucidated in two different ways; mechanistic feeding rules can be explicitly defined

and applied to a community (Dunne et al., 2008; Roopnarine, 2017; *e.g.*, Shaw et al., 2024) or they are inferred from a community for which there are interaction data and the ‘rules’ are then applied to a different community (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 datasets from which to elucidate feeding rules. These models are useful for determining all feasible interactions for a specific community, and owing to the availability of empirical interaction datasets (Gray et al., 2015; *e.g.*, Poelen et al., 2014; Poisot, Baiser, et al., 2016), as well as the development of model testing/benchmarking tools (Poisot, 2023), means that these models can be validated and (with relative confidence) be used 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 (Fricke et al., 2022; Yeakel et al., 2014) or future, novel community assemblages. Importantly metawebs are inherently ‘static’ in the sense that they are *not* able to capture dynamic processes (since the notion of feasibility is all or nothing), however they provide a bigger picture context (*e.g.*, understanding the *entire* diet breadth of a species) and often require little data to construct.

### 3.2 Models that predict realised networks (realised interactions)

In order to construct realised networks models need to incorporate *both* the feasibility of interactions (*i.e.*, determine the entire diet breadth of a species) as well as then determine which interactions are realised (*i.e.*, incorporate the ‘cost’ of interactions). As far as we are aware there is no model that explicitly accounts for both of these ‘rules’ (although see Olivier et al. (2019)) and rather *only* account for processes that determine the realisation of an interaction (*i.e.*, abundance, predator choice, or non-trophic interactions). Although the use of allometry *i.e.*, body size (Beckerman et al., 2006; *e.g.*, Valdovinos et al., 2023) may represent a first step in capturing ‘evolutionary compatibility’ alongside more energy (predator choice) driven processes we still need to account for other traits that determine feeding compatibility (*e.g.*, Van De Walle et al., 2023 show how incorporating prey defensive properties alongside body size improves predictions). In terms of constructing realised networks, diet models (Beckerman et al., 2006; Petchey et al., 2008) have been used to construct networks based on both predator choice (as determined by the handling time, energy content, and predator attack rate) as well as abundance (prey density) and progress has also been made in understanding the compartmentation of energy in networks and how this influences energy acquisition (Krause et al., 2003;

226 Wootton et al., 2023). As realised networks are build on the concept of dynamic processes (the abundance  
227 of species will always be in flux) these networks are valuable for understanding the behaviour of networks  
228 over time or their response to change (Curtsdotter et al., 2019; Delmas et al., 2017; Lajaaiti et al., 2024).  
229 However, they are ‘costly’ to construct (requiring data about the entire community as it is the behaviour of  
230 the system that determines the behaviour of the part) and also lack the larger diet niche context afforded by  
231 metawebs.

### 232 3.3 Models that predict structure (interaction agnostic)

233 Although we identify mechanisms that determine species interactions in Section 2 not all models that are used  
234 to predict networks explicitly operate at the ‘process’ level, but rather represent the *structure* of a network  
235 based on a series of *a priori* assumptions as to the distribution of links between species (typically trophic  
236 not taxonomic species). These models operate by parametrising an aspect of the network structure, (*e.g.*,  
237 the niche model (Williams & Martinez, 2000) makes an assumption as to the expected connectance of the  
238 network, although see Allesina & Pascual (2009) for a parameter-free model) or alternatively uses structural  
239 features of an exiting *realised* network (*e.g.*, stochastic block model, Xie et al. (2017)). Importantly these  
240 structural models do not make species specific predictions (they are usually species agnostic and treat nodes  
241 as trophic species) and so cannot be used to determine if an interaction is either possible *or* realised between  
242 two species (*i.e.*, one cannot use these models to determine if species *a* eats species *b*). Although this means  
243 this suite of models are unsuitable as tools for predicting species-specific interactions, they have been shown  
244 to be sufficient tools to predict the structure of networks (Williams & Martinez, 2008), and provide a data-  
245 light (the models often only require species richness) but assumption heavy (the resulting network structure  
246 is determined by an assumption of network structure) way to construct a network.

## 247 4 Making Progress with Networks

### 248 4.1 Further development of models and tools

249 There has been a suite of models that have been developed to predict feeding links, however we are lacking  
250 in tools that are explicitly taking into consideration estimating both the feasibility as well as realisation of  
251 links, *i.e.*, both interactions and structure simultaneously (Strydom et al., 2021). This could be addressed  
252 either through the development of tools that do both (predict both interactions and structure), or to develop  
253 an ensemble modelling approach (Becker et al., 2022; Terry & Lewis, 2020) or tools that will allow for the  
254 downsampling of metawebs into realised networks (*e.g.*, Roopnarine, 2006). Additionally although realised

networks are more closely aligned with capturing interaction strength we lack models that allow us to quantify this (Strydom et al., 2021; Wells & O’Hara, 2013). In addition to the more intentional development of models we also need to consider the validation of these models, there have been developments and discussions for assessing how well a model recovers pairwise interactions (Poisot, 2023; Strydom et al., 2021), although the rate of false-negatives that may be present in the testing data still present a challenge (Catchen et al., 2023), and we still lack clear set of guidelines for benchmarking the ability of models to recover structure (Allesina et al., 2008).

## 4.2 At what scale should we be predicting and using networks?

We lack an understanding of which processes drive interactions at different scales (Saravia et al., 2022), as well as to what the appropriate level of aggregation for a ‘network’ is (Estay et al., 2023). Thus we need an understanding of not only how time and scale influence the interpretation of networks (Blüthgen & Staab, 2021; Morales & Vázquez, 2008), but how this is in turn influenced by the type of networks used. Which presents a challenge both in deciding what the appropriate spatial and time scales are for constructing not only a network but also which type of network representation. Space influences both network properties (Galiana et al., 2018), as well as dynamics (Fortin et al., 2021; Rooney et al., 2008), and time has implications when it comes to accounting for seasonal turnover in communities (Brimacombe et al., 2021; Laender et al., 2010) as well as thinking about co-occurrence, particularly the records are used to determine it (Brimacombe et al., 2024). Although multilayer networks may allow us to encode the nuances of space and time (Hutchinson et al., 2019) we still need to understand the implications of *e.g.*, constructing networks that are not at ecologically but rather politically relevant scales (Strydom et al., 2022) and what the implications of this disconnect may be.

## 5 The future value of networks

developing a dictionary of use... that helps navigate between the levels and assumptions

It should be clear that there is a high degree of interrelatedness and overlap between the way a network is constructed (modelled or predicted) and the process(es) it captures, 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 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

284 stifled the ‘productive use’ of networks beyond inventorying the interactions between species. Although,  
285 progress with using networks as a means to address questions within larger bodies of ecological theory *e.g.*,  
286 invasion biology (Hui & Richardson, 2019) and co-existence theory (García-Callejas et al., 2023), has been  
287 made we still need to have a discussion on what the appropriate network representation for the task at hand  
288 would be. This is highlighted in Box 1, and underscores that we need to evaluate exactly what process a  
289 specific network representation captures as well as its suitability for the question of interest.

290 **5.1 How will novel communities interact?**

291 Here we can talk about the effects of range shifts and invasions and how this will result in new/novel  
292 community assemblages. And then also the intentional changes of species compositions through rewilding.

293 **5.2 How will changes in the community influence ecosystem processes?**

294 Linking to dynamic networks and how this lets us build spatially/temporally explicit networks which can be  
295 used to infer form and function. Also bring in the discussion on the suitable aggregation (and the fact that  
296 we don’t know)

297 **5.3 How do species persist/co-exist?**

298 Specific sub points to consider here is persistence, especially persistence to perturbation. Again, dynamic  
299 networks and network/community assembly and finally extinctions (Dunhill et al., 2024).

300 [Figure 3 about here.]

Table 1: An informative table

Question (broad)	Question (specific)	Network representation
Species invasions	What species will the invading species interact with?	Regional metaweb but need to derive information from a global metaweb since these are interactions that are ‘novel’
Species invasions	How does the invading species alter network dynamics and function?	Realised network (after having moved through the global metaweb to understand which interactions are feasible)

Question (broad)	Question (specific)	Network representation
Range shifts and novel communities	Under global change how will novel community assemblages interact?	Global metaweb, need context of broader community
Extinctions	Cascading effect of the loss of a species from the network	Regional metaweb - need to account for entire diet, a realised network will exclude the entire diet but will allow to elucidate the final structure
Species/community persistence	Dynamics over time. Stability/resilience. How does a change in pop A affect pop B?	Realised networks - but dynamic!
Synthetic networks	Creating ecologically plausible communities for synthetic analyses	Structural networks - data light!
Practical use	What is both attainable (data constraints) but also of practical use to 'real world' decision making. So moving from theory to applied	??Regional metawebs??

## 301 References

- 302 Allesina, S., Alonso, D., & Pascual, M. (2008). A General Model for Food Web Structure. *Science*, 320(5876),  
 303 658–661. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1156269>
- 304 Allesina, S., & Pascual, M. (2009). Food web models: A plea for groups. *Ecology Letters*, 12(7), 652–662.  
 305 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01321.x>
- 306 Banville, F., Strydom, T., Blyth, P., Brimacombe, C., Catchen, M. D., Dansereau, G., Higino, G., Malpas,  
 307 T., Mayall, H., Norman, K., Gravel, D., & Poisot, T. (2024). *Deciphering probabilistic species interaction*  
 308 *networks*. EcoEvoRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.32942/X28G8Z>
- 309 Becker, D. J., Albery, G. F., Sjodin, A. R., Poisot, T., Bergner, L. M., Chen, B., Cohen, L. E., Dallas, T.  
 310 A., Eskew, E. A., Fagre, A. C., Farrell, M. J., Guth, S., Han, B. A., Simmons, N. B., Stock, M., Teeling,  
 311 E. C., & Carlson, C. J. (2022). Optimising predictive models to prioritise viral discovery in zoonotic  
 312 reservoirs. *The Lancet Microbe*, 3(8), e625–e637. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247\(21\)00245-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-5247(21)00245-7)
- 313 Beckerman, A. P., Petchey, O. L., & Warren, P. H. (2006). Foraging biology predicts food web complexity.  
 314 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(37), 13745–13749. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas>.

- 315 0603039103
- 316 Benadi, G., Dormann, C. F., Fründ, J., Stephan, R., & Vázquez, D. P. (2022). Quantitative Prediction of  
317 Interactions in Bipartite Networks Based on Traits, Abundances, and Phylogeny. *The American Naturalist*,  
318 199(6), 841–854. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714420>
- 319 Berlow, E. L., Brose, U., & Martinez, N. D. (2008). The “Goldilocks factor” in food webs. *Proceedings of  
320 the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(11), 4079–4080. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0800967105>
- 321 Berlow, E. L., Neutel, A.-M., Cohen, J. E., de Ruiter, P. C., Ebenman, B., Emmerson, M., Fox, J. W., Jansen,  
322 V. A. A., Iwan Jones, J., Kokkoris, G. D., Logofet, D. O., McKane, A. J., Montoya, J. M., & Petchey, O.  
323 (2004). Interaction strengths in food webs: Issues and opportunities. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 73(3),  
324 585–598. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8790.2004.00833.x>
- 325 Biton, B., Puzis, R., & Pilosof, S. (2024). *Inductive link prediction boosts data availability and enables  
326 cross-community link prediction in ecological networks*.
- 327 Blanchet, F. G., Cazelles, K., & Gravel, D. (2020). Co-occurrence is not evidence of ecological interactions.  
328 *Ecology Letters*, 23(7), 1050–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13525>
- 329 Blüthgen, N. (2010). Why network analysis is often disconnected from community ecology: A critique and an  
330 ecologist’s guide. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 11(3), 185–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baee.2010.01.001>
- 331 Blüthgen, N., & Staab, M. (2021). Ecology: Mammals, interaction networks and the relevance of scale.  
332 *Current Biology*, 31(13), R850–R853. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.05.032>
- 333 Blüthgen, N., & Staab, M. (2024). A Critical Evaluation of Network Approaches for Studying Species  
334 Interactions. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 55(1), 65–88. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-102722-021904>
- 336 Brimacombe, C., Bodner, K., & Fortin, M.-J. (2021). Inferred seasonal interaction rewiring of a freshwater  
337 stream fish network. *Ecography*, 44(2), 219–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.05452>
- 338 Brimacombe, C., Bodner, K., & Fortin, M.-J. (2024). *Applying a method before its proof-of-concept: A  
339 cautionary tale using inferred food webs*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.22076.65927>
- 340 Brimacombe, C., Bodner, K., Michalska-Smith, M., Poisot, T., & Fortin, M.-J. (2023). Shortcomings  
341 of reusing species interaction networks created by different sets of researchers. *PLOS Biology*, 21(4),  
342 e3002068. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002068>
- 343 Brown, J. H., Gillooly, J. F., Allen, A. P., Savage, V. M., & West, G. B. (2004). Toward a Metabolic Theory  
344 of Ecology. *Ecology*, 85(7), 1771–1789. <https://doi.org/10.1890/03-9000>
- 345 Buche, L., Bartomeus, I., & Godoy, O. (2024). Multitrophic Higher-Order Interactions Modulate Species  
346 Persistence. *The American Naturalist*, 203(4), 458–472. <https://doi.org/10.1086/729222>
- 347 Canard, E., Mouquet, N., Marescot, L., Gaston, K. J., Gravel, D., & Mouillot, D. (2012). Emergence of

- 348 Structural Patterns in Neutral Trophic Networks. *PLOS ONE*, 7(8), e38295. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0038295>
- 349
- 350 Caron, D., Brose, U., Lurgi, M., Blanchet, F. G., Gravel, D., & Pollock, L. J. (2024). Trait-matching models  
351 predict pairwise interactions across regions, not food web properties. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*,  
352 33(4), e13807. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13807>
- 353 Caron, D., Maiorano, L., Thuiller, W., & Pollock, L. J. (2022). Addressing the Eltonian shortfall with  
354 trait-based interaction models. *Ecology Letters*, 25(4), 889–899. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13966>
- 355 Catchen, M. D., Poisot, T., Pollock, L. J., & Gonzalez, A. (2023). *The missing link: Discerning true from  
356 false negatives when sampling species interaction networks.*
- 357 Cherif, M., Brose, U., Hirt, M. R., Ryser, R., Silve, V., Albert, G., Arnott, R., Berti, E., Cirtwill, A.,  
358 Dyer, A., Gauzens, B., Gupta, A., Ho, H.-C., Portalier, S. M. J., Wain, D., & Wootton, K. (2024). The  
359 environment to the rescue: Can physics help predict predator-prey interactions? *Biological Reviews*,  
360 n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.13105>
- 361 Cirtwill, A. R., Ekklf, A., Roslin, T., Wootton, K., & Gravel, D. (2019). A quantitative framework for  
362 investigating the reliability of empirical network construction. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10(6),  
363 902–911. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13180>
- 364 Clegg, T., Ali, M., & Beckerman, A. P. (2018). The impact of intraspecific variation on food web structure.  
365 *Ecology*, 99(12), 2712–2720. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2523>
- 366 Curtsdotter, A., Banks, H. T., Banks, J. E., Jonsson, M., Jonsson, T., Laubmeier, A. N., Traugott, M., &  
367 Bommarco, R. (2019). Ecosystem function in predator-prey food webs—confronting dynamic models with  
368 empirical data. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 88(2), 196–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12892>
- 369 Dalla Riva, G. V., & Stouffer, D. B. (2016). Exploring the evolutionary signature of food webs' backbones  
370 using functional traits. *Oikos*, 125(4), 446–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.02305>
- 371 Dallas, T., Park, A. W., & Drake, J. M. (2017). Predicting cryptic links in host-parasite networks. *PLOS  
372 Computational Biology*, 13(5), e1005557. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005557>
- 373 Dansereau, G., Barros, C., & Poisot, T. (2024). Spatially explicit predictions of food web structure from  
374 regional-level data. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 379(1909).  
375 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2023.0166>
- 376 Delmas, E., Besson, M., Brice, M.-H., Burkle, L. A., Riva, G. V. D., Fortin, M.-J., Gravel, D., Guimarães,  
377 P. R., Hembry, D. H., Newman, E. A., Olesen, J. M., Pires, M. M., Yeakel, J. D., & Poisot, T. (2019).  
378 Analysing ecological networks of species interactions. *Biological Reviews*, 94(1), 16–36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12433>
- 379
- 380 Delmas, E., Brose, U., Gravel, D., Stouffer, D. B., & Poisot, T. (2017). Simulations of biomass dynamics in

- 381 community food webs. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 8(7), 881–886. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12713>
- 382
- 383 Desjardins-Proulx, P., Laigle, I., Poisot, T., & Gravel, D. (2017). Ecological interactions and the Netflix  
384 problem. *PeerJ*, 5, e3644. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.3644>
- 385 Dormann, C. F. (2023). The rise, and possible fall, of network ecology. In *Defining Agroecology – A Festschrift  
386 for Teja Tscharntke* (pp. 143–159.). Tredition.
- 387 Dunhill, A. M., Zarzyczny, K., Shaw, J. O., Atkinson, J. W., Little, C. T. S., & Beckerman, A. P. (2024).  
388 Extinction cascades, community collapse, and recovery across a Mesozoic hyperthermal event. *Nature  
389 Communications*, 15(1), 8599. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-53000-2>
- 390 Dunne, J. A. (2006). The Network Structure of Food Webs. In J. A. Dunne & M. Pascual (Eds.), *Ecological  
391 networks: Linking structure and dynamics* (pp. 27–86). Oxford University Press.
- 392 Dunne, J. A., Williams, R. J., Martinez, N. D., Wood, R. A., & Erwin, D. H. (2008). Compilation and  
393 Network Analyses of Cambrian Food Webs. *PLOS Biology*, 6(4), e102. [https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060102](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.<br/>394 pbio.0060102)
- 395 Eklöf, A., Tang, S., & Allesina, S. (2013). Secondary extinctions in food webs: A Bayesian network approach.  
396 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4(8), 760–770. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12062>
- 397 Estay, S. A., Fortin, M.-J., & López, D. N. (2023). Editorial: Patterns and processes in ecological networks  
398 over space. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 11.
- 399 Fortin, M.-J., Dale, M. R. T., & Brimacombe, C. (2021). Network ecology in dynamic landscapes. *Proceedings  
400 of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 288(1949), rspb.2020.1889, 20201889. [https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.1889](https://doi.org/10.1098/<br/>401 rspb.2020.1889)
- 402 Fricke, E. C., Hsieh, C., Middleton, O., Gorczynski, D., Cappello, C. D., Sanisidro, O., Rowan, J., Svenning,  
403 J.-C., & Beaudrot, L. (2022). Collapse of terrestrial mammal food webs since the Late Pleistocene.  
404 *Science*, 377(6609), 1008–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn4012>
- 405 Galiana, N., Lurgi, M., Claramunt-López, B., Fortin, M.-J., Leroux, S., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., & Montoya,  
406 J. M. (2018). The spatial scaling of species interaction networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2(5),  
407 782–790. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0517-3>
- 408 García-Callejas, D., Godoy, O., Buche, L., Hurtado, M., Lanuza, J. B., Allen-Perkins, A., & Bartomeus, I.  
409 (2023). Non-random interactions within and across guilds shape the potential to coexist in multi-trophic  
410 ecological communities. *Ecology Letters*, 26(6), 831–842. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14206>
- 411 Golubski, A. J., & Abrams, P. A. (2011). Modifying modifiers: What happens when interspecific interactions  
412 interact? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 80(5), 1097–1108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01852.x>

- 414 Gómez, J. M., Verdú, M., & Perfectti, F. (2010). Ecological interactions are evolutionarily conserved across  
415 the entire tree of life. *Nature*, 465(7300), 918–921. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09113>
- 416 Gravel, D., Baiser, B., Dunne, J. A., Kopelke, J.-P., Martinez, N. D., Nyman, T., Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B.,  
417 Tylianakis, J. M., Wood, S. A., & Roslin, T. (2019). Bringing Elton and Grinnell together: A quantitative  
418 framework to represent the biogeography of ecological interaction networks. *Ecography*, 42(3), 401–415.  
419 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.04006>
- 420 Gray, C., Figueroa, D. H., Hudson, L. N., Ma, A., Perkins, D., & Woodward, G. (2015). Joining the dots:  
421 An automated method for constructing food webs from compendia of published interactions. *Food Webs*,  
422 5, 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fooweb.2015.09.001>
- 423 Higino, G. T., Banville, F., Dansereau, G., Muñoz, N. R. F., Windsor, F., & Poisot, T. (2023). Mismatch  
424 between IUCN range maps and species interactions data illustrated using the Serengeti food web. *PeerJ*,  
425 11, e14620. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.14620>
- 426 Hui, C., & Richardson, D. M. (2019). How to Invade an Ecological Network. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*,  
427 34(2), 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.11.003>
- 428 Hutchinson, M. C., Bramon Mora, B., Pilosof, S., Barner, A. K., Kéfi, S., Thébault, E., Jordano, P., &  
429 Stouffer, D. B. (2019). Seeing the forest for the trees: Putting multilayer networks to work for community  
430 ecology. *Functional Ecology*, 33(2), 206–217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13237>
- 431 Jordano, P. (2016a). Chasing Ecological Interactions. *PLOS Biology*, 14(9), e1002559. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002559>
- 432 Jordano, P. (2016b). Sampling networks of ecological interactions. *Functional Ecology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12763>
- 433 Kamaru, D. N., Palmer, T. M., Riginos, C., Ford, A. T., Belnap, J., Chira, R. M., Githaiga, J. M., Gituku,  
434 B. C., Hays, B. R., Kavwele, C. M., Kibungei, A. K., Lamb, C. T., Maiyo, N. J., Milligan, P. D., Mutisya,  
435 S., Ng'wenyo, C. C., Ongutu, M., Pietrek, A. G., Wildt, B. T., & Goheen, J. R. (2024). Disruption of  
436 an ant-plant mutualism shapes interactions between lions and their primary prey. *Science*, 383(6681),  
437 433–438. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adg1464>
- 438 Kéfi, S., Berlow, E. L., Wieters, E. A., Joppa, L. N., Wood, S. A., Brose, U., & Navarrete, S. A. (2015).  
439 Network structure beyond food webs: Mapping non-trophic and trophic interactions on Chilean rocky  
440 shores. *Ecology*, 96(1), 291–303. <https://doi.org/10.1890/13-1424.1>
- 441 Kéfi, S., Berlow, E. L., Wieters, E. A., Navarrete, S. A., Petchey, O. L., Wood, S. A., Boit, A., Joppa, L. N.,  
442 Lafferty, K. D., Williams, R. J., Martinez, N. D., Menge, B. A., Blanchette, C. A., Iles, A. C., & Brose,  
443 U. (2012). More than a meal... integrating non-feeding interactions into food webs: More than a meal ....  
444 *Ecology Letters*, 15(4), 291–300. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01732.x>

- 447 Keyes, A. A., Barner, A. K., & Dee, L. E. (2024). Synthesising the Relationships Between Food Web Structure  
448 and Robustness. *Ecology Letters*, 27(10), e14533. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14533>
- 449 Krause, A. E., Frank, K. A., Mason, D. M., Ulanowicz, R. E., & Taylor, W. W. (2003). Compartments  
450 revealed in food-web structure. *Nature*, 426(6964), 282–285. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02115>
- 451 Laender, F. D., Oevelen, D. V., Soetaert, K., & Middelburg, J. J. (2010). Carbon transfer in a herbivore-  
452 and microbial loop-dominated pelagic food webs in the southern Barents Sea during spring and summer.  
453 *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 398, 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08335>
- 454 Lajaaiti, I., Bonnici, I., Kéfi, S., Mayall, H., Danet, A., Beckerman, A. P., Malpas, T., & Delmas, E. (2024).  
455 *EcologicalNetworksDynamics.jl* A Julia package to simulate the temporal dynamics of complex ecological  
456 networks (p. 2024.03.20.585899). bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.03.20.585899>
- 457 Lindeman, R. L. (1942). The Trophic-Dynamic Aspect of Ecology. *Ecology*, 23(4), 399–417. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1930126>
- 458 Llewelyn, J., Strona, G., Dickman, C. R., Greenville, A. C., Wardle, G. M., Lee, M. S. Y., Doherty, S.,  
459 Shabani, F., Saltré, F., & Bradshaw, C. J. A. (2023). Predicting predator–prey interactions in terrestrial  
460 endotherms using random forest. *Ecography*, 2023(9), e06619. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.06619>
- 461 Momal, R., Robin, S., & Ambroise, C. (2020). Tree-based inference of species interaction networks from  
462 abundance data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 11(5), 621–632. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13380>
- 463 Morales, J. M., & Vázquez, D. P. (2008). The effect of space in plant–animal mutualistic networks: Insights  
464 from a simulation study. *Oikos*, 117(9), 1362–1370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2008.16737.x>
- 465 Morales-Castilla, I., Matias, M. G., Gravel, D., & Araújo, M. B. (2015). Inferring biotic interactions from  
466 proxies. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(6), 347–356. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.03.014>
- 467 Olivier, P., Frelat, R., Bonsdorff, E., Kortsch, S., Kröncke, I., Möllmann, C., Neumann, H., Sell, A. F., &  
468 Nordström, M. C. (2019). Exploring the temporal variability of a food web using long-term biomonitoring  
469 data. *Ecography*, 42(12), 2107–2121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.04461>
- 470 Pawar, S., Dell, A. I., & Savage, V. M. (2012). Dimensionality of consumer search space drives trophic  
471 interaction strengths. *Nature*, 486(7404), 485–489. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11131>
- 472 Petchey, O. L., Beckerman, A. P., Riede, J. O., & Warren, P. H. (2008). Size, foraging, and food web  
473 structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(11), 4191–4196. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0710672105>
- 474 Petchey, O. L., Beckerman, A. P., Riede, J. O., & Warren, P. H. (2011). Fit, efficiency, and biology: Some  
475 thoughts on judging food web models. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 279(1), 169–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2011.03.019>
- 476
- 477
- 478
- 479

- 480 Pichler, M., Boreux, V., Klein, A.-M., Schleuning, M., & Hartig, F. (2020). Machine learning algorithms  
481 to infer trait-matching and predict species interactions in ecological networks. *Methods in Ecology and*  
482 *Evolution*, 11(2), 281–293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13329>
- 483 Pilosof, S., Porter, M. A., Pascual, M., & Kéfi, S. (2017). The multilayer nature of ecological networks.  
484 *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1(4), 101. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0101>
- 485 Poelen, J. H., Simons, J. D., & Mungall, C. J. (2014). Global biotic interactions: An open infrastructure to  
486 share and analyze species-interaction datasets. *Ecological Informatics*, 24, 148–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2014.08.005>
- 488 Poisot, T. (2023). Guidelines for the prediction of species interactions through binary classification. *Methods*  
489 *in Ecology and Evolution*, 14(5), 1333–1345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14071>
- 490 Poisot, T., Baiser, B., Dunne, J., Kéfi, S., Massol, F., Mouquet, N., Romanuk, T. N., Stouffer, D. B., Wood, S.  
491 A., & Gravel, D. (2016). Mangal – making ecological network analysis simple. *Ecoigraphy*, 39(4), 384–390.  
492 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.00976>
- 493 Poisot, T., Cirtwill, A., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., Fortin, M.-J., & Stouffer, D. (2016). The structure of  
494 probabilistic networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(3), 303–312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12180>
- 495 Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., & Gravel, D. (2015). Beyond species: Why ecological interaction networks vary  
496 through space and time. *Oikos*, 124(3), 243–251. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01719>
- 497 Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., & Kéfi, S. (2016). Describe, understand and predict: Why do we need networks  
498 in ecology? *Functional Ecology*, 30(12), 1878–1882. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48582345>
- 499 Pollock, L. J., Tingley, R., Morris, W. K., Golding, N., O’Hara, R. B., Parris, K. M., Vesk, P. A., &  
500 McCarthy, M. A. (2014). Understanding co-occurrence by modelling species simultaneously with a Joint  
501 Species Distribution Model (JSDM). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 5(5), 397–406. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12180>
- 503 Pringle, R. M. (2020). Untangling Food Webs. In *Unsolved Problems in Ecology* (pp. 225–238). Princeton  
504 University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691195322-020>
- 505 Proulx, S. R., Promislow, D. E. L., & Phillips, P. C. (2005). Network thinking in ecology and evolution.  
506 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 20(6), 345–353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2005.04.004>
- 507 Pyke, G. (1984). Optimal Foraging Theory: A Critical Review. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and*  
508 *Systematic*, 15, 523–575. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.15.1.523>
- 509 Quintero, E., Arroyo-Correa, B., Isla, J., Rodríguez-Sánchez, F., & Jordano, P. (2024). *Downscaling mu-*  
510 *tualistic networks from species to individuals reveals consistent interaction niches and roles within plant*  
511 *populations* (p. 2024.02.02.578595). bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.02.578595>
- 512 Rooney, N., McCann, K. S., & Moore, J. C. (2008). A landscape theory for food web architecture. *Ecology*

- 513      Letters, 11(8), 867–881. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01193.x>
- 514      Roopnarine, P. D. (2006). Extinction Cascades and Catastrophe in Ancient Food Webs. *Paleobiology*, 32(1),  
515      1–19. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4096814>
- 516      Roopnarine, P. D. (2017). Ecological Modelling of Paleocommunity Food Webs. In *Conservation Paleobiology:*  
517      *Using the Past to Manage for the Future* (pp. 201–226). University of Chicago Press.
- 518      Saravia, L. A., Marina, T. I., Kristensen, N. P., De Troch, M., & Momo, F. R. (2022). Ecological network  
519      assembly: How the regional metaweb influences local food webs. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 91(3),  
520      630–642. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13652>
- 521      Segar, S. T., Fayle, T. M., Srivastava, D. S., Lewinsohn, T. M., Lewis, O. T., Novotny, V., Kitching, R. L.,  
522      & Maunsell, S. C. (2020). The Role of Evolution in Shaping Ecological Networks. *Trends in Ecology &*  
523      *Evolution*, 35(5), 454–466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.01.004>
- 524      Shaw, J. O., Dunhill, A. M., Beckerman, A. P., Dunne, J. A., & Hull, P. M. (2024). *A framework for*  
525      *reconstructing ancient food webs using functional trait data* (p. 2024.01.30.578036). bioRxiv. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.01.30.578036>
- 527      Soberón, J. (2007). Grinnellian and Eltonian niches and geographic distributions of species. *Ecology Letters*,  
528      10(12), 1115–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01107.x>
- 529      Song, C., & Levine, J. M. (2024). *Rigorous (in)validation of ecological models* (p. 2024.09.19.613075). bioRxiv.  
530      <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.613075>
- 531      Staniczenko, P. P. A., Lewis, O. T., Jones, N. S., & Reed-Tsochas, F. (2010). Structural dynamics and  
532      robustness of food webs. *Ecology Letters*, 13(7), 891–899. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01485.x>
- 534      Stock, M. (2021). Pairwise learning for predicting pollination interactions based on traits and phylogeny.  
535      *Ecological Modelling*, 14.
- 536      Stouffer, D. B. (2019). All ecological models are wrong, but some are useful. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,  
537      88(2), 192–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12949>
- 538      Strydom, T., Bouskila, S., Banville, F., Barros, C., Caron, D., Farrell, M. J., Fortin, M.-J., Hemming, V.,  
539      Mercier, B., Pollock, L. J., Runghen, R., Dalla Riva, G. V., & Poisot, T. (2022). Food web reconstruction  
540      through phylogenetic transfer of low-rank network representation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*,  
541      13(12), 2838–2849. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13835>
- 542      Strydom, T., Bouskila, S., Banville, F., Barros, C., Caron, D., Farrell, M. J., Fortin, M.-J., Mercier, B.,  
543      Pollock, L. J., Runghen, R., Dalla Riva, G. V., & Poisot, T. (2023). Graph embedding and transfer  
544      learning can help predict potential species interaction networks despite data limitations. *Methods in*  
545      *Ecology and Evolution*, 14(12), 2917–2930. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14228>

- 546 Strydom, T., Catchen, M. D., Banville, F., Caron, D., Dansereau, G., Desjardins-Proulx, P., Forero-Muñoz,  
547 N. R., Higino, G., Mercier, B., Gonzalez, A., Gravel, D., Pollock, L., & Poisot, T. (2021). A roadmap  
548 towards predicting species interaction networks (across space and time). *Philosophical Transactions of*  
549 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 376(1837), 20210063. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0063>
- 550 Terry, J. C. D., & Lewis, O. T. (2020). Finding missing links in interaction networks. *Ecology*, 101(7), e03047.  
551 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.3047>
- 552 Valdovinos, F. S., Hale, K. R. S., Dritz, S., Glaum, P. R., McCann, K. S., Simon, S. M., Thébault, E., Wetzel,  
553 W. C., Wootton, K. L., & Yeakel, J. D. (2023). A bioenergetic framework for aboveground terrestrial  
554 food webs. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 38(3), 301–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2022.11.004>
- 555 Van De Walle, R., Logghe, G., Haas, N., Massol, F., Vandegehuchte, M. L., & Bonte, D. (2023). Arthro-  
556 pod food webs predicted from body size ratios are improved by incorporating prey defensive properties.  
557 *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 92(4), 913–924. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13905>
- 558 Vázquez, D. P., Blüthgen, N., Cagnolo, L., & Chacoff, N. P. (2009). Uniting pattern and process in plant–  
559 animal mutualistic networks: A review. *Annals of Botany*, 103(9), 1445–1457. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcp057>
- 560 Wells, K., & O'Hara, R. B. (2013). Species interactions: Estimating per-individual interaction strength and  
561 covariates before simplifying data into per-species ecological networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*,  
562 4(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210x.2012.00249.x>
- 563 White, E. P., Ernest, S. K. M., Kerkhoff, A. J., & Enquist, B. J. (2007). Relationships between body size  
564 and abundance in ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22(6), 323–330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.03.007>
- 565 Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2000). Simple rules yield complex food webs. *Nature*, 404(6774), 180–183.  
566 <https://doi.org/10.1038/35004572>
- 567 Williams, R. J., & Martinez, N. D. (2008). Success and its limits among structural models of complex food  
568 webs. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 77(3), 512–519. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2008.01362.x>
- 569 Windsor, F. M., van den Hoogen, J., Crowther, T. W., & Evans, D. M. (2023). Using ecological networks  
570 to answer questions in global biogeography and ecology. *Journal of Biogeography*, 50(1), 57–69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14447>
- 571 Wootton, K. L., Curtsdotter, A., Roslin, T., Bommarco, R., & Jonsson, T. (2023). Towards a modular theory  
572 of trophic interactions. *Functional Ecology*, 37(1), 26–43. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13954>
- 573 Xie, J.-R., Zhang, P., Zhang, H.-F., & Wang, B.-H. (2017). Completeness of Community Structure in  
574 Networks. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 5269. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-05585-6>
- 575 Yeakel, J. D., Pires, M. M., Rudolf, L., Dominy, N. J., Koch, P. L., Guimarães, P. R., & Gross, T. (2014).

- 579 Collapse of an ecological network in Ancient Egypt. *PNAS*, 111(40), 14472–14477. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1408471111>
- 580
- 581 Yodzis, P. (1982). The Compartmentation of Real and Assembled Ecosystems. *The American Naturalist*,  
582 120(5), 551–570. <https://doi.org/10.1086/284013>
- 583 Yodzis, P., & Innes, S. (1992). Body Size and Consumer-Resource Dynamics. *The American Naturalist*,  
584 139(6), 1151–1175. <https://doi.org/10.1086/285380>





Figure 1: Aligning the various processes that determine interactions with the different network representations. First we start with a ‘global metaweb’ this network which captures all possible interactions for an arbitrary collection of species, we can further refine this network by taking in to consideration the co-occurrence of these 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 (pink) or region two (orange). These regional metawebs to capture all possible interactions, however it only considers species that co-occur. However even within a region we do not expect 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 network realisations 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, maximising energy gain, or indirect/higher order interactions.






### 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 exercises (where does the new species 'fit' within the network?) as well as potential capacity to shift its diet. Although this might make sense across space and not time but certain species act as links across the landscape.



### 2. Seasonal metawebs

- Knowledge at the finer scale is also valuable to understand/identify that there are in fact differences between the seasons
- Information of seasonal diet of species



### 3. Seasonal (reutilised networks)

Dynamics are useful because they are a representation of the different configurations/energy flows/ecosystem processes. Also to detect more nuanced shifts in diet - \*e.g.,\* seasonal diet shifts.

- Structurally informative
- can be @ even finer scale & time / space

Figure 2




Figure 3: An attempt to try and visualise a way to map the different scales of network representations to the way in which we can interrogate/ask questions about them?