

# A mathematical model of food system security

Conor Goold<sup>1</sup> and et al.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

---

**Abstract.** Global food security is threatened by various endogeneous and exogeneous, biotic and abiotic factors, including a rising human population, higher population densities, price volatility and climate change. Perturbations to the global food system have a direct effect on the security and resilience national-level food systems. These effects are felt, in different ways, by both producers, processors and consumers. Various mathematical and computational models exist to understand food systems' responses to shocks and stresses, but most models are tailored to making predictions of specific food systems and are large, high-dimensional models that make uncovering general theoretical food system insights problematic. Here, we present a stylised mathematical model of a national-level food system that incorporates dynamic interactions between domestic production of a food commodity, international trade, domestic demand and consumption, and food commodity price. The model's simplicity allows predicting when domestic production is sustainable when international trade flows are present. Sustainability of domestic production depends on a critical ratio of *i*) profitability of domestic production to *ii*) the strength of international trade weighted by the production capacity of domestic production (e.g. capital growth rate and depreciation rates). When the critical ratio exceeds 1, meaning domestic production is sustainable, international imports will either be required to supplement domestic production to meet demand, or domestic production will be profitable enough to produce a surplus of inventory that can be exported. We use the dynamic food systems model to infer the critical parameter values from data from the UK pig industry [...maybe other examples...].

---

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Materials and methods</b>	<b>4</b>
30	2.1 Theoretical model . . . . .	4
	2.2 Data sources & parameter estimation . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>9</b>
	3.1 Model analysis . . . . .	9
	3.1.1 Without international trade . . . . .	9
35	3.1.2 With international trade . . . . .	10
	3.2 Application to UK pig industry . . . . .	12
<b>4</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>13</b>
	4.1 Limitations . . . . .	13

## 1 Introduction

Food security is defined as “when all people at all times have physical and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and preferences for an active and healthy life” (FAO. 1996). The realisation of food security depends on the three pillars of access, utilisation and availability (Maxwell 1996; Barrett 2010), and therefore is an outcome of coupled agricultural, ecological and sociological systems (Hammond and Dubé 2012; Ericksen 2008; Ingram 2011). In recent years, the resilience of food security has become a priority area of research (e.g. Nyström et al. 2019; Tendall et al. 2015; Béné et al. 2016; Seekell et al. 2017) as biotic and abiotic, endogeneous and exogeneous demands on food systems grow, including the deleterious effects food systems have on their own environments (Springmann et al. 2018; Strzepek and Boehlert 2010). The challenge of food security is for food systems to expand their production capacities while both remaining resilient to unpredictable perturbations and limiting their effects on the environment (Ericksen et al. 2010).

Food system research is inherently transdisciplinary (Drimie and McLachlan 2013; Hammond and Dubé 2012), of which one strand is computational and mathematical modelling. The utility of quantitative modelling is the ability to build and perturb realistic ‘systems models’ of food systems to project important outcomes, such as food production levels, farmer profitability, environmental degradation, food waste, and consumer behaviour (e.g. Springmann et al. 2018; Marchand et al. 2016; Sampedro et al. 2020; Suweis et al. 2015; Scalco et al. 2019; Allen and Prosperi 2016). The difficulty in modelling food systems is their complexity, frequently resulting in large models with tens to hundreds of parameters

and variables, which are challenging to analyse and even more challenging to statistically estimate from noisy real-world data. In contrast, a handful of authors have used relatively simple, theoretical models that are more amenable to formal analysis, and have fewer parameters to estimate from data sources, to understand the activities of food systems. For example, Suweis et al. (2015) link population dynamics to food availability and international trade using a generalised logistic model. Tu, Suweis, and D’Odorico (2019) recently reported that the global food system is approaching a critical point delimiting collapse into an unsustainable regime by condensing the multi-dimensional global food trade network into a bistable one-dimensional system (using the framework of Gao, Barzel, and Barabási 2016). Simple models of coupled ecological, economic and agricultural processes have also been investigated. For instance, Ngonghala et al. (2017) explain the emergence of poverty traps, which have direct effects on individual’s access to food, by coupling differential equations of human poverty, human disease, and economic growth.

Simplified models of complex systems elicit causal explanations and generate hypotheses of how systems work (Smaldino 2017; Smaldino 2019; Otto and Rosales 2020). Such *stylised* models are staples of scientific disciplines such as ecology (May 1973), evolutionary biology (Boyd et al. 2003), epidemiology (Kermack and McKendrick 1927), economics (Nerlove 1958), and physics (Strogatz 1994). Food systems research, however, lacks such foundational models. A potential candidate is research on commodity production cycles that has developed models to couple agricultural production, supply chains, consumer demand, price and human decision-making, such as Meadows (1971). These approaches have inspired systems dynamics modelling of general commodity and business cycles (Sterman 2000). However, applications of systems dynamics models of commodity cycles are frequently high dimensional, encoding multiple modes of behaviour that are not easily amenable to standard mathematical analysis. Gaining greater theoretical insight into the dynamics of food systems and food security would be aided by simpler models of coupled agri-food systems.

In this paper, we develop and analyse a stylised model of a food system inspired by the systems dynamics modelling of Meadows (1971) and Sterman 2000, but simple enough to offer general theoretical results. To limit our scope, we focus on modelling a national-level food system, where the effects of international trade on domestic production is examined. Like the stylised models used to understand the causal processes in evolution, epidemics, and ecological interactions, our approach necessarily ignores many important features of real food systems. Nonetheless, the simplicity of our model allows us to elucidate the precise conditions under which different stable modes of behaviour important to food security emerge in our system.

We apply our theoretical model to the case of the UK pig industry. Historically, pig industries have been of much interest to economists and agronomists as one of the first investigations into business or ‘pork’ cycles (Haldane 1934; Coase and Fowler 1935; Ezekiel 1938; Harlow 1960; Meadows 1971; Zawadzka 2010; Parker and Shonkwiler 2014; Sterman

2000). Business cycles reflect the oscillations between commodity prices and supply, which have been posited to be the result of both endogeneous (e.g. Nerlove 1958) and exogeneous mechanisms (e.g. see Gouel 2012). In the last 20 years, the size of the UK pig industry has decreased markedly due to a combination of legislative, epidemiological, and trade-related issues (Taylor 2006; Dawson 2009). For example, in 1997, the UK breeding herd comprised around 800,000 sows, and domestic production exceeded imports. Following the ban on sow gestation crates in 1999, as well as disease outbreaks in the early 2000s, imports of pig meat increased by 50% (DEFRA 2020a), exceeding domestic production. While domestic production currently accounts for around 60-65% of total supply (DEFRA 2020a), the UK pig industry is still at risk from high costs of production (Executive 2011) and ‘opportunistic dealing’ within the pork supply chain favouring cheaper imports (Bowman et al. 2013). The sustainability of the UK pig industry is, thus, a prime concern for UK food security. As well as insights into the sustainability of the UK pig industry, we illustrate limitations of our stylised model for modelling real-world data sources.

## 2 Materials and methods


### 2.1 Theoretical model

Our food system model is composed as a system of coupled ordinary differential equations, with the state variables of capital, inventory, consumer demand, and price. The general structure of our model is presented in Figure 1, and Table 1 provides the exact variable parameter definitions. Capital represents a raw component used to gauge the viability of the domestic industry, which could represent, for instance, the number of animals in the breeding herd for meat industries (e.g. Meadows 1971), the number of paddy fields in rice supply chains (e.g. Chung 2018), or infrastructure or equipment in neoclassical economic growth models (Ngonghala et al. 2017). Inventory is the stock of processed food commodity being investigated. Customer demand represents the amount of inventory demanded per time unit by the population of consumers. The commodity price represents the price received by producers per unit of commodity produced, and is taken to be directly proportional to the price presented to consumers (i.e. we do not account for retail mark-ups on price). While many of the mechanisms in supply chain functioning may be represented as a discrete-time system, we assume the aggregate behaviour of the national-level food system is adequately approximated in continuous time by a system of differential equations.

Capital changes according to the equation:

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = aC\left(\frac{P}{b} - 1\right) - eC \quad , \quad C(0) = C_0 \quad (1)$$

with initial condition at  $t = 0$ ,  $C_0$ . The parameter  $a$  is the rate of capital change (increase or decrease) depending on the price to production cost ( $b$ ) ratio. Capital depreciates at a



**Figure 1:** The general structure of the theoretical complex food system model. Blue circles denote the rates of change of the four state variables (capital, inventory, demand and price). Solid arrows indicate the different flows into and out of each state variable as generic functions of the model state variables and parameters. Dashed arrows show dependencies between different state variables and flows.

per-capital rate  $e$ , which can be interpreted as the inverse of the average life-time of capital  
 135 (see supplementary materials for derivation).

Inventory changes according to:

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = fgC - wI - \frac{I}{sD + I}D + k(h - fgC) \quad , \quad I(0) = I_0 \quad (2)$$

The first term represents the amount of inventory generated by domestic capital per time unit (i.e. domestic production), where  $f$  is a production rate, and  $g$  is a conversion factor representing the amount of inventory units produced per unit of capital. Inventory is wasted  
 140 at rate  $w$ . The third term denotes the rate of inventory consumption by consumers, which is a non-linear Holling type-II/Michaelis-Menten function asymptoting at  $I$  for  $D \gg I$ . The function  $I/(sD + I)$  can be interpreted as the proportion of the demand that can be satisfied with the current inventory level. The parameter  $s$  is the ‘reference coverage’: the number of time units-worth of inventory processors desire to have in-stock. Perishable food  
 145 commodities (e.g. meat) will have a lower reference coverage, whereas less perishable items (e.g. rice, flour) can be stored for longer periods and, therefore, processors can control stock levels by increasing  $s$ , lowering the proportion of demanded units satisfied.

The final term in equation 2 represents international trade, and its formulation can communicate different dynamics between domestic producers, processors and retailers. We retain simplicity by assuming that trade is proportional to the difference between reference demand ( $h$ ) and current domestic production ( $fgC$ ). When  $h > fgC$ , inventory is imported, and when  $h < fgC$ , inventory is exported. Because actual demand is a function of both  $h$  and price, processors adapt their trade levels to the demand expected if all else were equal (e.g. the current commodity is just as attractive as competing substitute items). In some industries, such as the UK pig industry, cheaper international imports lower the domestic commodity price (Agricultural and Board 2015), and thus processors can import more items when demand drops below the reference demand level and domestic production is insufficient. The parameter  $k$  controls the proportion of the difference between the reference demand and current domestic production that can be imported/exported. This is a placeholder for more complex mechanisms that could influence the volumes of trade (e.g. see Tu, Suweis, and D’Odorico 2019), such as the effects of trade tariffs, or the costs of production of commodities in trade partner countries.

The instantaneous rate of change in demand is modelled as a simple function of reference demand and the commodity price to reference price ratio:

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = m \left( h \frac{q}{p} - D \right) \quad , \quad D(0) = D_0 \quad (3)$$

The parameter  $m$  controls the time-responsiveness of demand. The reference price  $q$  is typically interpreted as the price of substitute items (Sterman 2000) or could represent customer’s willingness to pay. In any case, when the current price exceeds the reference price, demand falls, and vice versa.

Many models exist for describing the price of commodities (e.g. see Legrand 2019 or De Goede, Gremmen, and Blom-Zandstra 2013 for some examples), and we adopt a relatively simple formulation here that has the rate of change of price depend only on the coverage:

$$\frac{dP}{dt} = rP \left( \frac{sD}{I} - 1 \right) \quad , \quad P(0) = P_0 \quad (4)$$

The coverage is a dimensionless quantity representing the amount of inventory needed to sustain current demand for  $s$  time periods divided by the current inventory level. At rate given by  $r$ , the price increases when the coverage exceeds one,  $sD/I > 1$ , and decreases when coverage falls below 1.

To make our model more generalisable, we non-dimensionalise the system of equations above (see supplementary materials for non-dimensionalisation) using the dimensionless quantities in Table 2, which reduces the number of parameters from 12 to 8. The non-dimensionalised system of equations is:

$$\frac{dv}{d\tau} = v \left( \alpha z - 1 \right) - \beta v \quad (5)$$

Symbol	Definition	Units
<i>Variables</i>		
$C$	Capital	$[C]$
$I$	Inventory	$[I]$
$D$	Demand	$[It^{-1}]$
$P$	Price	$[PI^{-1}]$
$t$	Time	$[t]$
<i>Parameters</i>		
$a$	Capital growth rate	$[t^{-1}]$
$b$	Cost of capital production	$[PI-1]$
$e$	Capital depreciation rate	$[t^{-1}]$
$f$	Capital production rate	$[t^{-1}]$
$g$	Capital conversion factor	$[IC^{-1}]$
$w$	Inventory waste rate	$[t^{-1}]$
$s$	Reference coverage	$[t]$
$k$	Maximum trade proportion	$[-]$
$h$	Reference demand	$[It^{-1}]$
$m$	Demand response rate	$[t^{-1}]$
$q$	Reference price	$[PI^{-1}]$
$r$	Price growth rate	$[t^{-1}]$

**Table 1:** Symbols, definitions and their units for the complex food system model.

$$\frac{dx}{d\tau} = \delta v - \omega x - \gamma \frac{xy}{y+x} + \kappa(\gamma - \delta v) \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{dy}{d\tau} = \mu(z^{-1} - y) \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{dz}{d\tau} = \rho z \left( \frac{y}{x} - 1 \right) \quad (8)$$

180 where  $\{v, x, y, z\}$  now represent the dimensionless state variables,  $\tau$  is rescaled time, and the dimensionless parameter groups are denoted by Greek letters.

## 2.2 Data sources & parameter estimation

A range of data is collected on the UK pig industry, but raw time series data is only available for certain variables and time frames. To fit our theoretical model, we focused on monthly  
185 data over a period of 5 years from 2015 to 2020, which covers the available data for prices per kilogram of deadweight (the ‘pig price’). Monthly pig prices were accessed through the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) webpage (DEFRA 2020c), along with the June and December surveys of the size of breeding herd (DEFRA 2020b). Monthly data for the inventory of pork, taking into account consumption and waste, is  
190 not reported in the UK. While customer demand is a theoretical quantity, we used the

Symbol	Definition	Description
<i>Variables</i>		
$v$	$\frac{C}{C_0}$	Rescaled capital
$x$	$\frac{I}{hs}$	Rescaled inventory
$y$	$\frac{D}{h}$	Rescaled demand
$z$	$\frac{P}{q}$	Rescaled price
$\tau$	$\frac{t}{1/a}$	Rescaled time
<i>Parameters</i>		
$\alpha$	$q/b$	Reference price compared to cost of production
$\beta$	$e/a$	Capital depreciation rate compared to its growth rate
$\delta$	$fgC_0/(ahs)$	Initial capital production compared to expected demand per capital growth rate
$\omega$	$w/a$	Inventory waste rate compared to capital growth rate
$\gamma$	$1/(as)$	Inverse of capital growth rate over reference coverage
$\kappa$	$k$	Maximum import proportion of reference demand
$\mu$	$m/a$	Demand change rate compared to capital growth rate
$\rho$	$r/a$	Price change rate compared to capital growth rate

**Table 2:** Symbols and definitions for the dimensionless complex food system model.

total monthly supplies of pig meat, calculated as domestic production of pig meat plus imported pig meat minus exported pig meat, as an indication of customer demand levels per month. Monthly data for UK production of pig meat was accessed from DEFRA (DEFRA 2020a), while monthly imports and exports of pig meat was accessed from the Agricultural and Horticultural Development Board (AHDB 2020). Missing data was considered missing completely at random (i.e. ignorable) because the missing data was not assumed to impact the accuracy of the available data.

The parameters and initial conditions of the non-dimensionalised model were estimated using Bayesian estimation in the probabilistic programming language Stan (Carpenter et al. 2017) using the RStan interface in R (Stan Development Team 2019; R Core Team 2020) using Stan’s Runge-Kutta 4th and 5th order integration scheme (see Stan code in the supplementary materials). The available monthly time series data,  $Y$ , for month  $i$  state variable  $j$  was assumed log normal distributed:

$$Y_i^j \sim \text{Lognormal}(\ln(Z^j), \sigma^j) \quad (9)$$

where  $Z^j$  is the state variable computed from the food systems model. In addition to fitting



the state variables of the model to the time series data, we fit the UK monthly production figures, and the monthly imports and exports, to the respective flows from the model:

$$\text{Production} \sim \text{Lognormal}(\ln(fgZ^1), \epsilon_1) \quad (10)$$

$$\text{Imports} \sim \text{Lognormal}(\ln(kh), \epsilon_2) \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Exports} \sim \text{Lognormal}(\ln(kfgZ^1), \epsilon_3) \quad (12)$$

To aid computation, all parameters were transformed to a similar scale and given Normal(0, 1) prior distributions, and were back-transformed to the appropriate scale when integrating the model. We ran 4 Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains consisting of 2,500 iterations of warmup and 2,500 iterations of sampling, providing 10,000 samples from the posterior distribution for inference. All chains ran without any divergent transitions, and all parameters had effective sample sizes  $\gg 1000$  and  $\hat{R}$  statistics (i.e. the Gelman-Rubin diagnostic)  $0.99 < \hat{R} < 1.002$  indicating convergence.

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Model analysis

While the mechanisms represented by the model are simple, it still comprises a four dimensional system of non-linear equations, of which there are no explicit solutions. Nonetheless, its dynamics can be summarised by investigating its stable modes of behaviour. To investigate stability, we conduct linear stability analyses (Strogatz 1994). Linear stability analysis is based on a Taylor series expansion in multiple variables around the fixed points  $(\{\hat{v}, \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}\})$ , where asymptotic (i.e.  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ) stability to small perturbations can be inferred when the real part of the eigenvalues of the system's matrix of partial derivatives (the Jacobian matrix representing the linearisation around the fixed points) evaluated at each equilibrium are negative. Notably, the inverse of the leading eigenvalue of the Jacobian matrix determines the 'characteristic return time' of the system, with more resilient systems returning more quickly to their equilibria following a disturbance (Pimm 1984).

#### 3.1.1 Without international trade

When international trade is not present (i.e.  $\kappa = 0$ ), there is one stable fixed point of the system given by the state variable values  $\{\frac{\alpha(2\omega+\gamma)}{2\delta(1+\beta)}, \frac{\alpha}{1+\beta}, \frac{\alpha}{1+\beta}, \frac{1+\beta}{\alpha}\}$ . Another fixed point is where all state values are 0 (i.e. no industry). Conducting a linear stability analysis around the latter fixed point, the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix at this equilibria

are  $\{(-1 - \beta), -\omega, -\mu, -\rho\}$ . Because all parameters are defined to be positive (except  $\kappa$ , which is 0 here), there are no conditions where the ‘no industry’ equilibria will be stable when international trade is absent. In other words, the domestic industry is always viable.

### 3.1.2 With international trade

When  $0 < \kappa < 1$ , international trade is possible, opening the possibility of competition between domestic and international products, or of an export market for domestic production. An unstable equilibria still exists where all state variables are 0. However, in addition, there is 1) an unsustainable domestic production equilibrium, where the food system is viable overall through complete reliance on international imports, and 2) a sustainable domestic production equilibrium, where the profitability of the domestic industry is high enough to compete with international trade.

The unsustainable domestic production equilibria is given by the set of fixed points  $\{0, \frac{\kappa\gamma}{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}}, \frac{\kappa\gamma}{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}}, \frac{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}}{\kappa\gamma}\}$ . The Jacobian matrix ( $\mathbf{J}$ ) at this equilibria evalutes to:

$$\mathbf{J}|_{\{0, \frac{\kappa\gamma}{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}}, \frac{\kappa\gamma}{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}}, \frac{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}}{\kappa\gamma}\}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\alpha(\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2})}{\kappa\gamma} - 1 - \beta & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \delta(1 - \kappa) & -\omega - \frac{\gamma}{4} & -\frac{\gamma}{4} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu & -\mu(\frac{\kappa\gamma}{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}})^2 \\ 0 & -\rho(\frac{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}}{\kappa\gamma})^2 & \rho(\frac{\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2}}{\kappa\gamma})^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (13)$$

and its eigenvalues ( $\lambda$ ) are the roots of the fourth-degree characteristic polynomial:

$$\left(\frac{\alpha(\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2})}{\kappa\gamma} - 1 - \beta - \lambda\right) \left[-\lambda^3 + \left(-\omega - \frac{\gamma}{4} - \mu\right)\lambda^2 + \left(-\mu(\omega + \rho) - \frac{\gamma}{4}\right)\lambda - \frac{\gamma}{2}\mu\rho\right] = 0 \quad (14)$$


The first eigenvalue can be determined directly as:

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\alpha(\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2})}{\kappa\gamma} - 1 - \beta \quad (15)$$

By using the Routh-Hurwitz conditions, the sign of the remaning eigenvalues’ real parts (Otto and Day 2011) will always be negative (see the supplementary materials). Ultimately, the unsustainable domestic production mode will be stable if:

$$\frac{\alpha(\omega+\frac{\gamma}{2})}{\kappa\gamma(1+\beta)} < 1 \quad (16)$$

The previous ‘critical ratio’ can be loosely interpreted as a balance between *i*) the profitability of domestic production, weighted by both the wastage rate and capital growth rate, and *ii*) the strength of international trade, weighted by the domestic capital growth rate and domestic capital depreciation rate. The most influential parameters dictating the critical ratio’s value are  $\alpha$ ,  $\kappa$  and  $\beta$  (see Figure S1), where increases in  $\alpha$  (the ratio of reference



**Figure 2:** Stable modes of the model incorporating international trade ( $0 < \kappa < 1$ ). Panel a shows the bifurcation diagram between stable (solid blue) and unstable (dashed black) behaviours (with  $\beta, \gamma = 26$ ,  $\omega = 10$ ,  $\kappa = 0.5$ ,  $\delta = 5$ ). Panels b-d show the stable modes of behaviour in  $(\kappa, \alpha)$  space for differing values of  $\beta$  ( $b = 0.1$ ,  $c = 0.6$ ,  $d = 1$ ), distinguishing between unsustainable (red), sustainable with imports (blue), and sustainable with exports (green) behaviours. Panels b-d are produced with the remaining parameters at  $\gamma = 26$ ,  $\omega = 10$  and  $\delta = 5$ .

price to cost of production) increase the critical ratio, but increases in  $\kappa$  (strength of trade) and  $\beta$  (capital depreciation rate to growth rate ratio) decrease the critical ratio. Figure 1a illustrates the bifurcation diagram of the dimensionless capital state variable as a function of  $\alpha$ .

When the critical ratio exceeds 1, the sustainable domestic production equilibrium is given by  $\left\{ \frac{2\gamma\kappa(-1-\beta)+\alpha(\gamma+2\omega)}{2\delta(1+\beta)(1-\kappa)}, \frac{\alpha}{1+\beta}, \frac{\alpha}{1+\beta}, \frac{1+\beta}{\alpha} \right\}$ . In the latter case, the equilibrium values of

Parameter	Mean	95% HDI	ESS
$a$			
$k$			
$q$			
critical ratio			

**Table 3:** Key parameter estimates (mean and 95% highest density interval, HDI) and effective sample sizes (ESS) from fitting the model to the UK pig industry data.

inventory, demand and price are the same as the equilibrium values of the model without international trade (see above), determined by the profitability of the domestic industry and the ratio of capital depreciation and growth rates. The equilibrium value of capital is similar to the equilibrium value found in the model without international trade, but now increased  
 265 by both the odds of international trade (i.e.  $\frac{\kappa}{1-\kappa}$ ) but decreased by the term  $-1 - \beta$ , which is always negative for  $\beta > 0$ . The two equilibria are equal when  $\kappa = 0$ . Thus, if the critical ratio  $> 1$  and domestic production is sustainable, trade strength alone has a positive effect on domestic capital keeping other parameters constant.


The latter result can also be viewed as a balance between two separate modes of be-  
 270 haviour: either domestic production will produce a surplus of inventory, allowing exports of domestic capital dependent on the value of  $\kappa$ , or domestic inventory needs to be supplemented by international imports to meet demand. Domestic capital will produce a surplus when  $\frac{\gamma}{\delta} - \hat{v} < 0$ , or when:

$$\alpha > \frac{2\gamma(1 + \beta)}{\gamma + 2\omega} \quad (17)$$

Figures 1b-d demonstrate the relationship between the sustainable and unsustainable stable  
 275 modes of behaviour in  $(\kappa, \alpha)$  space for differing values of  $\beta$ , as well as the distinction between the sustainable state supplemented by imports, and the sustainable state requiring domestic production to be exported.

### 3.2 Application to UK pig industry

The parameter estimates for  $a$ ,  $k$  and  $q$  are given in Table 3, and how the model results  
 280 compare to the raw data is shown in Figure X. There is large uncertainty in the estimates, which is induced both by the tolerance thresholds for the ABC-MCMC algorithm,  $\epsilon$ , and because the amount of data available is relatively small to inform the parameter values. Importantly, the critical ratio is plausibly above 1 (although its 95% HDI approaches 1) suggesting that the the UK pig industry is currently sustainable.



**Figure 3:** Fitting the food systems model to the UK pig industry data. Blue dots show the raw monthly data (some data is missing), thin black lines display 200 random samples from the posterior distribution, and thick black lines indicate the mean posterior trajectory.

## 285 4 Discussion

### 4.1 Limitations

## References

- Agricultural and H. D. Board (2015). *How does the exchange rate affect the GB pig price?*  
<https://pork.ahdb.org.uk/prices-stats/news/2015/august/how-does-the-exchange-rate-affect-the-gb-pig-price/>. Accessed: 2020-07-08.
- 290 AHDB (2020). *Pig meat trade*. <https://ahdb.org.uk/pork/pig-meat-trade>. Accessed: 2020-08-24.
- Allen, T. and P. Prosperi (2016). “Modeling sustainable food systems”. In: *Environmental Management* 57.5, pp. 956–975.
- 295 Barrett, C. B. (2010). “Measuring food insecurity”. In: *Science* 327.5967, pp. 825–828.
- Béné, C. et al. (2016). “Is resilience a useful concept in the context of food security and nutrition programmes? Some conceptual and practical considerations”. In: *Food Security* 8.1, pp. 123–138.
- Bowman, A. et al. (2013). “Opportunist dealing in the UK pig meat supply chain: Trader mentalities and alternatives”. In: *Accounting Forum*. Vol. 37. 4. Elsevier, pp. 300–314.
- 300 Boyd, R. et al. (2003). “The evolution of altruistic punishment”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 100.6, pp. 3531–3535.
- Carpenter, B. et al. (2017). “Stan: A probabilistic programming language”. In: *Journal of statistical software* 76.1.
- 305 Chung, B. (2018). “System Dynamics Modelling and Simulation of the Malaysian Rice Value Chain: Effects of the Removal of Price Controls and an Import Monopoly on Rice Prices and Self-sufficiency Levels in Malaysia”. In: *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 35.3, pp. 248–264.
- Coase, R. H. and R. F. Fowler (1935). “Bacon production and the pig-cycle in Great Britain”. In: *Economica* 2.6, pp. 142–167.
- 310 Dawson, P. J. (2009). “The UK pig cycle: a spectral analysis”. In: *British Food Journal*.
- De Goede, D., B. Gremmen, and M. Blom-Zandstra (2013). “Robust agriculture: Balancing between vulnerability and stability”. In: *NJAS-Wageningen Journal of Life Sciences* 64, pp. 1–7.
- 315 DEFRA (2020a). *Latest cattle, sheep and pig slaughter statistics*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/cattle-sheep-and-pig-slaughter>. Accessed: 2020-08-24.
- (2020b). *Livestock numbers in England and the UK*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/structure-of-the-livestock-industry-in-england-at-december>. Accessed: 2020-08-24.
- 320 — (2020c). *Livestock prices, finished and store*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/cattle-sheep-and-pig-slaughter>. Accessed: 2020-08-24.
- Drimie, S. and M. McLachlan (2013). “Food security in South Africa: first steps toward a transdisciplinary approach”. In: *Food Security* 5.2, pp. 217–226.

- Ericksen, P. J. (2008). “Conceptualizing food systems for global environmental change re-  
 325 search”. In: *Global environmental change* 18.1, pp. 234–245.
- Ericksen, P. et al. (2010). “The value of a food system approach”. In: *Food security and global  
 environmental change* 25, pp. 24–25.
- Executive, B. P. (2011). *Profitability in the pig supply chain*. Tech. rep.
- Ezekiel, M. (1938). “The cobweb theorem”. In: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 52.2,  
 330 pp. 255–280.
- FAO. (1996). *World Food Summit: Rome Declaration on World Food Security and World  
 Food Summit Plan of Action*. FAO.
- Gao, J., B. Barzel, and A.-L. Barabási (2016). “Universal resilience patterns in complex  
 networks”. In: *Nature* 530.7590, p. 307.
- 335 Gouel, C. (2012). “Agricultural price instability: a survey of competing explanations and  
 remedies”. In: *Journal of economic surveys* 26.1, pp. 129–156.
- Haldane, J. (1934). “A contribution to the theory of price fluctuations”. In: *The Review of  
 Economic Studies* 1.3, pp. 186–195.
- Hammond, R. A. and L. Dubé (2012). “A systems science perspective and transdisciplinary  
 340 models for food and nutrition security”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sci-  
 ences* 109.31, pp. 12356–12363.
- Harlow, A. A. (1960). “The hog cycle and the cobweb theorem”. In: *Journal of Farm Eco-  
 nomics* 42.4, pp. 842–853.
- Ingram, J. S. (2011). “A food systems approach to researching food security and its interac-  
 345 tions with global environmental change”. In: *Food Security* 3.4, pp. 417–431.
- Kermack, W. O. and A. G. McKendrick (1927). “A contribution to the mathematical theory  
 of epidemics”. In: *Proceedings of the royal society of london. Series A, Containing papers  
 of a mathematical and physical character* 115.772, pp. 700–721.
- Legrand, N. (2019). “The empirical merit of structural explanations of commodity price  
 350 volatility: Review and perspectives”. In: *Journal of Economic Surveys* 33.2, pp. 639–664.
- Marchand, P. et al. (2016). “Reserves and trade jointly determine exposure to food supply  
 shocks”. In: *Environmental Research Letters* 11.9, p. 095009.
- Maxwell, S. (1996). “Food security: a post-modern perspective”. In: *Food policy* 21.2, pp. 155–  
 170.
- 355 May, R. M. (1973). “Qualitative stability in model ecosystems”. In: *Ecology* 54.3, pp. 638–  
 641.
- Meadows, D. L. (1971). “Dynamics of commodity production cycles.” In: *Dynamics of com-  
 modity production cycles*.
- Nerlove, M. (1958). “Adaptive expectations and cobweb phenomena”. In: *The Quarterly  
 360 Journal of Economics* 72.2, pp. 227–240.
- Ngonghala, C. N. et al. (2017). “General ecological models for human subsistence, health  
 and poverty”. In: *Nature ecology & evolution* 1.8, pp. 1153–1159.



Nyström, M. et al. (2019). “Anatomy and resilience of the global production ecosystem”. In: *Nature* 575.7781, pp. 98–108.

365 Otto, S. P. and T. Day (2011). *A biologist’s guide to mathematical modeling in ecology and evolution*. Princeton University Press.

Otto, S. P. and A. Rosales (2020). “Theory in service of narratives in evolution and ecology”. In: *The American Naturalist* 195.2, pp. 290–299.

Parker, P. S. and J. Shonkwiler (2014). “On the centenary of the German hog cycle: New findings”. In: *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 41.1, pp. 47–61.

370 Pimm, S. L. (1984). “The complexity and stability of ecosystems”. In: *Nature* 307.5949, pp. 321–326.

R Core Team (2020). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.

375 Sampedro, C. et al. (2020). “Food supply system dynamics in the Galapagos islands: Agriculture, livestock and imports”. In: *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems* 35.3, pp. 234–248.

Scalco, A. et al. (2019). “An Agent-Based Model to Simulate Meat Consumption Behaviour of Consumers in Britain”. In: *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*.

380 Seekell, D. et al. (2017). “Resilience in the global food system”. In: *Environmental Research Letters* 12.2, p. 025010.

Smaldino, P. (2019). “Better methods can’t make up for mediocre theory.” In: *Nature* 575.7781, p. 9.

Smaldino, P. E. (2017). “Models are stupid, and we need more of them”. In: *Computational social psychology*, pp. 311–331.

385 Springmann, M. et al. (2018). “Options for keeping the food system within environmental limits”. In: *Nature* 562.7728, p. 519.

Stan Development Team (2019). *RStan: the R interface to Stan*. R package version 2.19.2. URL: <http://mc-stan.org/>.

390 Sterman, J. (2000). *Business dynamics*. Irwin/McGraw-Hill c2000..

Strogatz, S. H. (1994). “Nonlinear dynamics and chaos: with applications to physics”. In: *Biology, Chemistry and Engineering*, p. 1.

Strzepek, K. and B. Boehlert (2010). “Competition for water for the food system”. In: *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 365.1554, pp. 2927–2940.

395 Suweis, S. et al. (2015). “Resilience and reactivity of global food security”. In: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112.22, pp. 6902–6907.

Taylor, D. H. (2006). “Strategic considerations in the development of lean agri-food supply chains: a case study of the UK pork sector”. In: *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*.

- Tendall, D. et al. (2015). “Food system resilience: Defining the concept”. In: *Global Food Security* 6, pp. 17–23.
- Tu, C., S. Suweis, and P. D’Odorico (2019). “Impact of globalization on the resilience and sustainability of natural resources”. In: *Nature Sustainability* 2.4, p. 283.
- 405 Zawadzka, D. (2010). “The history of research on the " pig cycle"”. In: *Zagadnienia Ekonomiki Rolnej* 1 Dodatek.