

# The biological interpretation of probabilistic food webs

Francis Banville<sup>1,2,3,‡</sup> Tanya Strydom<sup>1,3,‡</sup> Timothée Poisot<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Université de Montréal <sup>2</sup> Université de Sherbrooke <sup>3</sup> Quebec Centre for Biodiversity Science

‡ Equal contributions

## Correspondance to:

Francis Banville — [francis.banville@umontreal.ca](mailto:francis.banville@umontreal.ca)

The stochastic nature of ecological interactions has led many biologists to adopt a probabilistic view of ecological networks. Representing species interactions probabilistically (how likely are they to interact?) as opposed to deterministically (do they interact?) allows a better assessment of their spatiotemporal variability and accounts for inherent uncertainties in observations and predictions. However, despite this growing interest in probabilistic networks, general guidelines regarding the estimation and documentation of probabilistic interaction data are still lacking. This is concerning given that their biological interpretation and statistical manipulation are contingent upon the methods and variables used to estimate them, which are poorly documented in most published datasets. In this contribution, we review how probabilistic interactions are defined in the literature at different spatial scales, from local interactions to regional networks, with a strong emphasis on food webs. These definitions are based on the distinction between the realization of an interaction at a specific time and space and its biological feasibility. We show that different network representations have different statistical behaviours when it comes to common ecological applications. Specifically, unlike taxonomic scaling, we argue that local probabilistic networks and metawebs differ in their spatial and temporal scaling of interactions, with potential interactions being scale-independent. Moreover, we suggest two approaches to sampling deterministic networks from probabilistic webs that account for these differences and argue that systematic biases arise when directly inferring local networks from subsets of metawebs. To support our arguments, we built a spatiotemporally explicit model of probabilistic interactions and developed different case studies using empirical and simulated data. Overall, our results emphasize the need for better documentation of probabilistic ecological networks, both at the local and regional scales, to inform the appropriate reuse of these data.

Last revision: *May 7, 2023*

# 1 Introduction

2 Cataloging ecological interactions is a gargantuan task. Regardless of sampling effort, there are practical and  
3 biological constraints that hinder our ability to observe all interactions in nature, such as the spatial and  
4 temporal uncoupling of species and the large number of potential interactions in a community, of which the vast  
5 majority are rare (Jordano 2016). Documenting the location and timing of interactions becomes even more  
6 challenging when accounting for the spatiotemporal variability of ecological networks (Poisot *et al.* 2012,  
7 2015). Indeed, it is now recognized that knowing the biological capacity of two species to interact is necessary  
8 but not sufficient for inferring their interaction at a specific time and space. For example, Golubski & Abrams  
9 (2011) presented many cases where trophic interactions in food webs depend on the presence or abundance of a  
10 third species (e.g., of a more profitable prey species). More generally, a handful of conditions must be satisfied  
11 for an interaction to be observed locally. First, both species must have overlapping geographic ranges, i.e. they  
12 must co-occur within the region of interest (Blanchet *et al.* 2020). Then, they must encounter locally.  
13 Probabilities of interspecific encounters are typically low, especially for rare species with low relative  
14 abundances (Canard *et al.* 2012). Finally, their traits must be locally compatible (Poisot *et al.* 2015). This  
15 includes their phenology (Olesen *et al.* 2010; Singer & McBride 2012), behavioral choices (Pulliam 1974;  
16 Choh *et al.* 2012) and phenotypes [Bolnick2011WhyInt; Stouffer *et al.* (2011); Gravel2013InfFoa].  
17 Environmental factors, such as temperature (Angilletta *et al.* 2004), drought (Woodward *et al.* 2012), climate  
18 change (Gilman *et al.* 2010; Woodward *et al.* 2010; Araujo *et al.* 2011), and habitat modifications (Tylianakis *et*  
19 *al.* 2007), contribute to this spatiotemporal variability of interactions by impacting species abundance and  
20 traits. In this context, it is unsurprising that our knowledge of ecological interactions remains limited (Hortal *et*  
21 *al.* 2015) despite extensive biodiversity data collection (Schmeller *et al.* 2015).

22 The recognition of the intrinsic variability of species interactions has led ecologists to expand their  
23 representation of ecological networks to include a probabilistic view of interactions (Poisot *et al.* 2016). As  
24 opposed to binary deterministic networks, in which interactions are either observed or not, probabilistic  
25 networks represent our degree of belief about the realization or feasibility of pairwise interactions at the local or  
26 regional scale, respectively. In other words, representing interactions probabilistically considers inherent  
27 uncertainties and observation errors associated with ecological data. In the broadest sense, binary networks are  
28 also a type of probabilistic networks, in which the value of interactions is restrained to 0 (non-observed) or 1  
29 (observed). In probabilistic networks, only forbidden interactions (Jordano *et al.* 2003; Olesen *et al.* 2010)

would have a probability value of zero (but see Gonzalez-Varo & Traveset 2016). However, *neutral* forbidden interactions (i.e., improbable interactions between rare species, Canard *et al.* 2012) could have low probability values in a local network but high probability in a regional network (metaweb) describing the biological capacity of species to interact.

By accounting for the uncertainty of interactions, probabilistic networks provide a more realistic portrait of species interactions and of their emerging structure. This is important given that network structure is one of the major drivers of the functioning, dynamics, and resilience of ecosystems worldwide (Proulx *et al.* 2005; McCann 2007; McCann 2011; Rooney & McCann 2012). Moreover, the application and development of computational methods in network ecology, which are often based on a probabilistic representation of interactions, can help alleviate the colossal sampling efforts required to document species interactions (Strydom *et al.* 2021). For example, statistical models can be used to estimate the uncertainty of pairwise interactions (Cirtwill *et al.* 2019) and the probability of missing (false negatives) and spurious (false positives) interactions (Guimerà & Sales-Pardo 2009). Considering the high rate of false negatives in species interaction data due to the difficulty of witnessing rare interactions (Catchen *et al.* 2023), these models can inform the identification of priority sampling locations of ecological networks (e.g., Andrade-Pacheco *et al.* 2020 present an approach to identify priority sampling locations of disease hotspots). Statistical models can also be used to generate network predictions without prior knowledge about their pairwise interactions, for instance using body size (Petchey *et al.* 2008; Gravel *et al.* 2013), phylogeny (Elmasri *et al.* 2020; Strydom *et al.* 2022), or a combination of niche and neutral processes (Bartomeus *et al.* 2016; Pomeranz *et al.* 2019) for inference. Topological null models (e.g., Bascompte *et al.* 2003; Fortuna & Bascompte 2006), which can be used to generate underlying distributions of network measures for null hypothesis significance testing, are other examples of common probabilistic network models. Many measures have been developed to describe the structure (Poisot *et al.* 2016) and diversity (Ohlmann *et al.* 2019; Godsoe *et al.* 2022) of probabilistic networks. These models and measures support the use of this approach for the study of a wide range of ecological questions, from making better predictions of species distribution (Cazelles *et al.* 2016) to forecasting the impact of climate change on ecological networks (Gilman *et al.* 2010).

Despite these advances and opportunities, the lack of clear guidelines on the use of probabilistic interaction data is worrisome, especially for field and computational ecologists who manipulate and generate these numbers. Indeed, beyond methodological challenges encountered when evaluating them, there are important and perhaps more fundamental conceptual challenges when it comes to defining them. To the best of our knowledge, there is

currently no data standard that could guide the estimation and documentation of interaction probabilities (Salim *et al.* 2022 discuss data standards for deterministic mutualistic networks). General guidelines could support a more adequate integration and manipulation of interaction data from different sources and prevent ecologists from being misled by ambiguous and often diverging interpretations of probabilistic networks. In this contribution, we aim to take a step back by outlining different ways in which they were defined and used in network ecology and propose an approach to thinking about them. We distinguish two broad categories of probabilistic networks that have different statistical behaviors when applied to key ecological questions: local networks of realized interactions and regional networks (metawebs) of potential interactions. We show that these representations have different ecological and statistical implications, especially regarding the spatial and temporal scaling of interactions and the prediction of binary networks across space. Although we focus on food webs, our observations and advice can be applied to most types of ecological networks, from plant-pollinator to host-parasite networks. Indeed, with the exception of networks of indirect interactions such as competition and facilitation networks (Kéfi *et al.* 2015, 2016), most ecological networks describe probabilities of direct interactions, which are conceptually and mathematically analogous to each other regardless of their biological type (e.g., trophic and parasitic interactions). Overall, we argue that probabilistic networks should be better documented, clearly defined in mathematical terms, and used with caution when analyzing ecological interactions.

## **Probabilistic representations of ecological interactions**

One of the first aspects to take into consideration when estimating or interpreting probabilities of interactions is knowing if they describe potential or realized interactions. A potential interaction is defined as the biological capacity of two species to interact (i.e., the probability that they *can* theoretically interact) whereas a realized interaction refers to the materialization or observation of this interaction in a delineated space and time period (i.e., the probability that they interact locally). Here, we use the terms *metaweb* to designate networks of potential interactions and *local networks* for those of realized interactions. Metawebs are the network analogue of the species pool, where local networks originate from a subset of both species (nodes) and interactions (edges) of the regional metaweb (Saravia *et al.* 2022). Frequent confusion arises among ecologists over the use of these two terms, especially in a probabilistic context. Indeed, it is often unclear when authors describe potential or realized interactions in their studies, or when so-called probabilities are actually *interaction scores*.

88 Likewise, probabilistic potential interactions are often used and interpreted as realized interactions (and  
89 conversely), even when the type of interaction is specified, which may generate misleading findings when  
90 analyzing these data. We believe that a better understanding of the differences and relationships between these  
91 probabilistic representations of ecological networks would alleviate interpretation errors and help ecologists use  
92 these numbers more appropriately.

### 93 **Pairwise interactions: the building blocks of ecological networks**

94 Local ecological networks and metawebs, like any type of networks, are made of nodes and edges that can be  
95 represented at different levels of organization and precision. The basic unit of food webs and other ecological  
96 networks are individuals that interact with each others (e.g., by predation, Elton (2001)), forming  
97 individual-based networks. The aggregation of these individuals into more or less homogeneous groups (e.g.,  
98 populations, species, trophic species, families) allows us to represent nodes at broader taxonomic scales, which  
99 impacts our interpretation of the properties and behaviour of these systems (Guimarães 2020). Moreover, edges  
100 linking these nodes can describe a variety of interaction measures. Ecologists have traditionally represented  
101 interactions as binary objects that were considered realized after observing at least one individual from group  $i$   
102 interact with at least another individual from group  $j$ . Boolean interactions are actually the result of a Bernoulli  
103 process  $A_{i,j} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_{i,j})$ , with  $p_{i,j}$  being the probability of interaction that characterizes our limited  
104 knowledge of interactions and their intrinsic spatiotemporal variability. Depending on the type of networks  
105 (local or metaweb), the mathematical formulation and interpretation of stochastic parameters like  $p_{i,j}$  are  
106 inextricably linked to environmental and biological factors such as species relative abundance, traits, area, and  
107 time (tbl. ??). In this probabilistic network representation in which  $p_{i,j}$  are edge values, the only two possible  
108 outcomes are the presence ( $A_{i,j} = 1$ ) or absence ( $A_{i,j} = 0$ ) of an interaction between each pair of nodes.  
109 Observing an interaction between two taxa at a given location and time provides important information that can  
110 be used to update previous estimates of  $p_{i,j}$ , informing us on the biological capacity of both taxa to interact and  
111 the environmental conditions that enable the realization of their interaction in space and time.

112 Even though binary networks constitute a highly valuable source of ecological information (Pascual *et al.*  
113 2006), they overlook important factors regarding interaction strengths. These are represented using quantitative  
114 interactions, which better describe the energy flows, demographic impacts or frequencies of interactions  
115 between nodes (Berlow *et al.* 2004; Borrett & Scharler 2019), with  $A_{i,j}$  being a natural number  $\mathbb{N}$  or a real  
116 number  $\mathbb{R}$  depending on the measure. For example, they can represent the average number of prey individuals

117 consumed by a predator in a given time period (e.g., the average number of fish in the stomach of a piscivorous  
 118 species). Because quantitative interactions can describe predation pressure on prey taxa, they can be good  
 119 estimators of the parameters describing species interactions in a Lotka-Volterra model (e.g., Emmerson &  
 120 Raffaelli 2004). However, this extra amount of ecological information typically comes at a cost of greater  
 121 sampling effort or data requirement in predictive models (Strydom *et al.* 2021), which can lead to relatively  
 122 high levels of uncertainties when inferring quantitative networks with limited data. Just like binary networks,  
 123 the uncertainty and spatiotemporal variability of quantitative interactions can be represented probabilistically.  
 124 However, quantitative interactions can follow various probability distributions depending on the measure used,  
 125 with the event's outcome being the value of interaction strength. For instance, quantitative interactions can be  
 126 distributed as a Poisson distribution  $A_{i,j} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_{i,j})$  when predicting frequencies of interactions between  
 127 pairs of nodes, with  $\lambda_{i,j}$  being the expected rate at which individuals of taxa  $i$  and  $j$  interact (e.g., the average  
 128 number of prey  $j$  consumed per unit time by all predators  $i$ ). The Poisson distribution can also be 0-inflated  
 129 when considering non-interacting taxa, which constitute the majority of taxa pairs in most local networks due to  
 130 their typically high sparseness (Jordano 2016). Because of the methodological difficulties typically encountered  
 131 when building deterministic quantitative networks, they have been little used in ecology. As a result, binary  
 132 interactions, which are more easy to sample, are much more documented and modelled in the literature.  
 133 Moreover, most published probabilistic networks and methods describe Bernoulli interactions (tbl. ??), which  
 134 emphasizes the need for better guidelines regarding their interpretation and manipulation. For these reasons, our  
 135 primary focus in this contribution will be on addressing the challenges in estimating and using the probability  
 136 that two taxa interact locally or that they *can* biologically interact.

### 137 **Local networks: communities interacting in space and time**

138 As opposed to metawebs, probabilistic local food webs represent the likelihood that two species will interact at a  
 139 specific location and within a given time period; in other words, they are context dependant. They could also  
 140 represent the likelihood of observing these interactions within a given area and time. To be specific, space is  
 141 defined here as the geographic coordinates  $(x, y)$  of the spatial boundaries delineating the system, whereas time  
 142 is the time interval  $t$  during which interactions were sampled or for which they were predicted. We want to point  
 143 out that they are not single values, but rather continued dimensions that could be outlined differently depending  
 144 on the study system. Regardless of how they were defined, they always delineate a specific area  $A$  and duration  
 145  $t$ . These could refer to the sampled area and duration or to the targeted location and time period.

Many factors could be taken into consideration when estimating the probability that a predator species  $i$  interacts with a given prey species  $j$  locally. One of the most important is species co-occurrence  $C$ , which is a Boolean describing if both species can be found at location and time  $(x, y, t)$ . Surely, the probability that the interaction is realized must be 0 when species do not co-occur ( $C = 0$ ). Interaction probabilities can also be conditional on other biological and environmental variables, such as temperature, precipitation, presence of shelters, phenotypic plasticity, phenology, and presence of other interacting species in the network. These conditions can affect species traits, which greatly impact the capacity of species to interact (Poisot *et al.* 2015). Similarly, species relative abundance is another important predictor of the probability of interaction, because it impacts the probability that species will randomly encounter (Canard *et al.* 2012; Canard *et al.* 2014; Poisot *et al.* 2015). Here, we will use the variable  $\Omega$  as a substitute for the biological and ecological context in which interaction probabilities were estimated, including the presence of higher-order interactions. This gives us the following equation for the probability of realized interaction between species (or taxa)  $i$  and  $j$  in a local network  $N$ :

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j|A, t, C, \Omega), \quad (1)$$

which can be read as the probability of local interaction between the two species in an area  $A$  and time interval  $t$ , given their co-occurrence  $C$  and specific environmental and biological conditions  $\Omega$ . These conditions do not systematically need to be specified for all studies. However, when they are, they should be made explicit in the metadata.

Multiple difficulties of interpretation arise when the conditions are not clearly specified, which we found is often the case in the literature. For example, if  $P_N(i \rightarrow j|C = 1)$  represents the probability that two co-occurring species interact (i.e., the edge's probability value),  $P_N(i \rightarrow j)$  denotes instead the probability of interaction without knowing if they co-occur (i.e., the product of the nodes and edge's probability values). For practical reasons, probabilistic ecological networks are generally represented as matrices of probabilities (i.e., matrices of edges without node values), whose elements are thus hard to interpret without clear indications about  $C$ . Overall, when probabilities of interactions are estimated using specific values of  $A$ ,  $t$ ,  $C$ , and  $\Omega$ , ecologists should make them explicit in their metadata, preferably using mathematical equations to avoid any ambiguity. Below, we will see examples of why this matters when it comes to spatial, temporal, and taxonomic scaling of biotic interactions.

Table: Articles using probabilistic interactions and the definitions and variables they considered. {#tbl:prob}



173 Quantitative interactions can be converted to probabilistic interactions by normalizing.

## 174 **Metawebs: regional catalogs of interactions**

175 Metawebs are networks of potential interactions, representing the probability that two taxa can interact  
176 regardless of biological plasticity, environmental variability or co-occurrence. Instead of describing stochastic  
177 biological processes occurring in nature, probabilistic potential interactions can be thought of as a measure of  
178 imperfect knowledge about the capacity of two taxa to interact. For this reason, they have been initially  
179 designed for broad spatial, temporal, and taxonomic scales (e.g, species food webs at the continental scale).

180 We can express the probability that two taxa  $i$  and  $j$  can interact in a metaweb  $M$  as

$$P_M(i \rightarrow j), \quad (2)$$

181 which is context independent. In other words, the probability that two species can interact is not contingent on  
182 location, time, and environmental factors. Nevertheless, one aspect of a metaweb that could be conditional on  
183 these factors is the list of species (or taxa) it is built from when assembled for a specific region.

184 Starting from a selected set of species, metawebs can be built using different data sources, including literature  
185 review, field work, and predictive models (e.g., the metaweb of Canadian mammals inferred by Strydom *et al.*  
186 2022). Every pair of species that has been observed to interact at least once can be given a probability of  
187 interaction of 1; we know that they *can* interact. This means that rare interactions can technically be given high  
188 probabilities in the metaweb. Unobserved interactions, on the other hand, are given lower probabilities, going as  
189 low as 0 for forbidden links. Two important nuances must however be made here. Because of observation errors  
190 due to taxonomic misidentifications and ecological misinterpretations [e.g., due to cryptic species and  
191 interactions; Pringle & Hutchinson (2020)], many observations of interactions are actually false positives.  
192 Similarly, forbidden interactions can be false negatives if e.g. they have been assessed for specific phenotypes,  
193 locations or time. Implementing a Bayesian framework, which updates prior probabilities of interactions with  
194 empirical data, could lessen these errors.

## Statistical behaviour of networks in key ecological applications

### Taxonomic agglomeration and division of nodes

The properties of ecological networks depend on their level of organization (Guimarães 2020). Indeed, at different taxonomic scales, different behaviours and dynamics can be observed and distinct ecological questions can be answered (e.g., exploring evolutionary dynamics at broad taxonomic scales). Because of these reasons, it could be important to analyse the same network at different taxonomic scales. However, we want to emphasize here that many networks do not have an homogenous level of organisation (Vázquez *et al.* 2022). Indeed, different nodes within the same network can be represented at different taxonomic scales (e.g., a network composed of species and trophic species). This becomes important when we consider that the biological interpretation of interaction probabilities depends on the nodes' resolution. For example, in individual-based networks, the probability that two individuals interact could represent the degree of belief that one will actually consume the other. In species-based networks, the probability that two species interact could rather represent the degree of belief that *at least* one individual from the predator species will eat *at least* another individual from the prey species. This distinction in interpretation impacts the way probability values change with taxonomic scale.

There are a lot of similarities between taxonomic and spatiotemporal scaling of probabilistic interactions. Fundamentally, these types of scaling are just different ways to aggregate individuals into broader nodes, either spatially, temporally, or taxonomically. However, there are also important differences between them. First, in metawebs, if we know that two species have the capacity to interact, we can infer that their respective genus should also be able to interact (i.e., there should be at least two individuals within these genus that can interact). On the contrary, knowing that two genus can interact does not mean that all pairwise combinations of species within these genus can also interact among themselves. This observation also applies to local networks. When it comes to probabilistic networks, interaction probabilities at broader taxonomic scales can be directly obtained from probabilities at finer scales when aggregating nodes. For example, if we have in a network  $n_A$  species from genus  $A$  and  $n_B$  species from genus  $B$ , we can calculate the probability that the two genus interact as  $P_N(A \rightarrow B) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n_A} \prod_{j=1}^{n_B} (1 - P_N(A_i \rightarrow B_j))$ , where  $A_i$  and  $B_j$  are the species of the corresponding genus. However, more sophisticated models need to be used when building probabilistic networks at smaller taxonomic resolutions (e.g., when building a species-level network from a genus-level network). One could, for example, estimate the probabilities of all pairwise species interactions by using a Beta distribution parametrised by the

224 broader-scale network.

225 [Figure 3 about here]. Conceptual figure of how a scale up of the nodes from an individual to a population to  
226 any higher taxonomic group change our interpretation of the probability of interaction.

## 227 **Spatial and temporal scaling of probabilistic interactions**

228 Metawebs and local networks intrinsically differ in their relation to scale. On one hand, as mentioned above,  
229 probabilistic metawebs are context independent, i.e., probabilistic pairwise interactions do not scale with space  
230 and time because they depend solely on the biological capacity of the two taxa to interact. This implies that the  
231 estimated likelihood that two species can potentially interact should be the same among all metawebs in which  
232 they are present. In practice, this is rarely the case because ecologists use different methods and data to estimate  
233 these probabilities of interactions (e.g., different sampling area and time period). However, in the case where  
234 local metawebs  $M_{x,y}$  are subsampled from their regional counterpart  $M_0$ , we should expect edge values to be  
235 identical among all networks, regardless of their spatial scale, i.e.  $P_{M_{x,y}}(i \rightarrow j) = P_{M_0}(i \rightarrow j)$ . On the other  
236 hand, local probabilistic networks are indissociable from their spatial and temporal contexts because there are  
237 more opportunities of interactions (e.g., more individuals, more trait variations, more chance of encounter) in a  
238 larger area and longer time period (McLeod *et al.* 2020). Let  $N_0$  be a local probabilistic food web delineated in  
239 an area  $A_0$  and  $N_1$  a network of area  $A_1 < A_0$  within  $A_0$ . We should expect the probability that  $i$  and  $j$  interacts  
240 to scale spatially, i.e.  $P_{N_1}(i \rightarrow j | A < A_0) \leq P_{N_0}(i \rightarrow j | A = A_0)$ . Similarly, the temporal scaling of probabilistic  
241 local food webs could be manifested through the effect of sampling effort on the observation of interactions  
242 (Jordano 2016; McLeod *et al.* 2021) or of time itself on their realization (Poisot *et al.* 2012). There are many  
243 network-area relationships (e.g., Wood *et al.* 2015; Galiana *et al.* 2018) and interaction accumulation curves  
244 (e.g, Jordano 2016) explored in the literature. These could inspire the development and testing of different  
245 equations describing the spatiotemporal scaling of probabilistic pairwise interactions in local networks, which  
246 are over the scope of this manuscript.

247 [Figure 2 about here]. Conceptual figure showing (1) the spatiotemporal scaling of probabilistic metawebs and  
248 local food webs and (2) the spatial sampling of metawebs and local food webs into Boolean networks.

## Spatiotemporally explicit model of probabilistic interactions

The variability of species interactions spurred the development of methods aiming at predicting ecological networks at fine spatial and temporal scales. For example, Bohan *et al.* (2017) proposed a framework to reconstruct networks in real time using continuous biomonitoring. Here, we will build on these studies by proposing a simple model to make probabilistic local networks spatiotemporally explicit. These types of models could prove useful when inferring food webs across time and space from sparse data. However, they are not suitable for metawebs, which are static objects.

One way that probabilistic food webs can be made spatiotemporally explicit is by modelling interactions between co-occurring species as a Poisson process with rate  $\lambda$ . Specifically, if the total observation time for a location is  $t_0$ , the probability that two co-occurring species  $i$  and  $j$  will interact during this time period is  $P_N(i \rightarrow j | C_{i,j} = 1, t = t_0) = 1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}$ , which approaches 1 when  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . The value of the parameter  $\lambda$  could be estimated using prior data on interaction strengths, if available. Additionally, we can estimate the probability of co-occurrence at location  $(x, y)$  with  $P_{x,y}(C_{i,j} = 1) = P_{x,y}(i)P_{x,y}(j)\gamma$ , where  $P_{x,y}(i)$  and  $P_{x,y}(j)$  are respectively the probabilities of occurrence of species  $i$  and  $j$  and  $\gamma$  is the strength of association between occurrence and co-occurrence, as defined in Cazelles *et al.* (2016). Note that in empirical networks,  $\gamma$  is typically  $> 1$  (Catchen *et al.* 2023). The observation of this interaction would thus follow a Bernoulli distribution with parameter  $p = p_A(x, y)p_B(x, y)\gamma(1 - e^{-\lambda t_0})$ . This simple model could be customized in many ways, e.g. by linking  $\lambda$  with given environmental variables or by adding in observation errors (i.e., probability of false negatives and false positives; Catchen *et al.* (2023)).

## Binary conversion of probabilistic networks through random draws

Another conceptual challenge encountered when using probabilistic food webs is the prediction of Boolean networks across space. Lets take  $n \times n$  grid cells each representing a probabilistic food web. If they contain potential interactions, a single random trial must be conducted for each pairwise interaction across the region (i.e., we should have only one random realization of the regional metaweb). On the contrary, if they represent probabilities of realized interactions, each food web must be independently sampled (i.e.,  $n^2$  independent random draws). This has direct implications on the spatial scaling of interactions. For example, let  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  be networks of area  $< A_0$  within a bigger area  $A_0$  and disjoint from each other, such as  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  form  $N_0$  (think of two contiguous cells that together delineate  $N_0$ ). All other things being equal, we should expect the

probability that  $i$  and  $j$  interacts in  $A_0$  to be  $P_{N_0}(i \rightarrow j) = 1 - (1 - P_{N_1}(i \rightarrow j)) \times (1 - P_{N_2}(i \rightarrow j))$  if  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  are independently sampled. This also implies that we should expect interactions to be realized in a certain number of local networks depending on the probability value, which is not the case with metawebs. Note that spatial auto-correlation and the concept of meta-network (i.e., networks of networks) could invalidate the statistical assumption of independence. Nevertheless, the fundamental difference in sampling metawebs and local networks stands even when considering these factors. This difference in sampling further sheds light on the importance of clearly defining interaction probabilities. What we consider as a *Bernoulli trial*, when randomly drawing deterministic networks from probabilistic food webs, depends on our biological interpretation of these probabilities.

## **Prediction of local networks from probabilistic metawebs**

Even though the spatiotemporal variability of interactions is not considered in metawebs, they can still be useful to reconstruct local networks of realized interactions. Indeed, local networks are formed from subsets of their metaweb (called subnetworks), which are obtained by selecting a subset of both species and interactions (Dunne 2006). Because a community's composition is arguably easier to sample (or predict) than its interactions, the biggest challenge is to sample links from the metaweb. This becomes a conceptual issue when we consider how potential and realized interactions differ. Despite these concerns, metawebs remain an important source of ecological information that can be leveraged for realistically predicting spatially explicit networks. First, metawebs set the upper limit of species interactions (McLeod *et al.* 2021), i.e. the probability that two species interact at a specific location is always lower or equal to the probability of their potential interaction:

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j|A, t, C, \Omega) \leq P_M(i \rightarrow j). \quad (3)$$

Therefore, inferring local networks from their metaweb keeping the same values of interaction probability would generate systematic biases in the prediction. In that case, these networks would instead be called *spatially explicit* or *local* metawebs (i.e., smaller-scale networks of potential interactions). Second, the structure of local networks is constrained by the one of their metaweb (Saravia *et al.* 2022). This suggests that a metaweb not only constrains the pairwise interactions of its corresponding local networks, but also their emerging properties. Inferring the structure of local networks from the metaweb could thus help estimate more realistically the likelihood that potential interactions are realized and observed locally (Strydom *et al.* 2021).

303 [Figure 1 about here]. Empirical example of the association between the number of interactions in realized local  
304 food webs and the number of interactions in the corresponding subnetworks of their regional metaweb. We  
305 should expect the association to be linear below the 1:1 line, illustrating eq. 3.

## 306 **Conclusion**

307 The emergence of probabilistic thinking in network ecology has paved the way to a better assessment of the  
308 spatiotemporal variability and uncertainty of biotic interactions. However, measuring probabilities empirically  
309 can be strenuous given the difficulties of deciphering species and interactions (Pringle & Hutchinson 2020). In  
310 this context, the development of computational methods makes it possible to estimate interaction probabilities at  
311 large scales, which in turn can pinpoint where we should go to optimise our sampling effort for better resolving  
312 local food webs.

313 In this contribution, we showed that network metadata are perhaps as important as interaction data themselves  
314 when it comes to interpreting probabilistic food webs in ecological terms. First, the type of probabilistic  
315 interaction (potential or realized) impacts the importance of scale, with interactions in metawebs being scale  
316 independent, both spatially and temporally. Second, the conditions in which local networks were estimated  
317 (e.g., area, time, biological and environmental factors) and the attributes of the interacting species that were  
318 considered (e.g., species co-occurrence) are essential contextual factors that impact the mathematical  
319 representation of probabilities and their resulting behaviour. Third, the biological interpretation of probabilities  
320 changes with the level of organization of the network due to the aggregation of individuals into broader groups.  
321 All these information should be available as clear metadata so that ecologists can use probabilistic network data  
322 appropriately.

323 Moreover, many statistical models in ecology that yield accurate predictions of biotic interactions are black  
324 boxes difficult to interpret. Ecologists should be careful before using the output of these models as probabilistic  
325 objects, since there is often a thin line between a real probability and a non-probabilistic predictive number (or  
326 score). Probabilities are numbers between 0 and 1 that sum to 1 and either represent the expected frequency of a  
327 phenomenon or the degree of belief that it will be realized. Non-probabilistic scores, which are more akin to  
328 interaction strengths, have different mathematical properties, which impacts how we should handle these  
329 numbers in a spatially or temporally explicit context. Therefore, researchers should use their expertise to assess  
330 if their interaction data are actually probabilities or scores. This should also be added to the metadata before

331 sharing them, as well as the methods used to build the networks.

332 Better metadata documentation would allow researchers to use and manipulate probabilistic ecological  
333 interactions according to how they were actually defined and obtained. This would support better scientific  
334 practices, in particular when these data are used for ecological prediction and forecasting. For instance, we  
335 showed that building a rigorous workflow to predict local networks from a probabilistic metaweb requires a  
336 good understanding of the data at hand. Similarly, explicitly stating the context in which probabilistic data were  
337 estimated would help using forecasting food-web models more rigorously under specific climate change and  
338 habitat use scenarios. Regardless of the method and application, fostering a better foundation for probabilistic  
339 reasonings in network ecology, from the very nature of probabilities and biotic interactions, is essential.

## 340 **Acknowledgement**

341 We acknowledge that this study was conducted on land within the traditional unceded territory of the Saint  
342 Lawrence Iroquoian, Anishinabewaki, Mohawk, Huron-Wendat, and Omàmiwininiwak nations. This work was  
343 supported by the Institute for Data Valorisation (IVADO) and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research  
344 Council of Canada (NSERC) Collaborative Research and Training Experience (CREATE) program, through the  
345 Computational Biodiversity Science and Services (BIOS<sup>2</sup>) program. A special thank to all members of the  
346 Black Holes and Revelations working group (organized by BIOS<sup>2</sup>) for their insightful discussions and valuable  
347 feedback on this manuscript.

## 348 **References**

- 349 Andrade-Pacheco, R., Rerolle, F., Lemoine, J., Hernandez, L., Meité, A., Juziwele, L., *et al.* (2020). [Finding](#)  
350 [hotspots: Development of an adaptive spatial sampling approach](#). *Scientific Reports*, 10, 10939.
- 351 Angilletta, M.J., Jr., Steury, T.D. & Sears, M.W. (2004). [Temperature, Growth Rate, and Body Size in](#)  
352 [Ectotherms: Fitting Pieces of a Life-History Puzzle](#)<sup>1</sup>. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 44, 498–509.
- 353 Araujo, M.B., Rozenfeld, A., Rahbek, C. & Marquet, P.A. (2011). [Using species co-occurrence networks to](#)  
354 [assess the impacts of climate change](#). *Ecography*, 34, 897–908.

355 Bartomeus, I., Gravel, D., Tylianakis, J.M., Aizen, M.A., Dickie, I.A. & Bernard-Verdier, M. (2016). [A](#)  
356 [common framework for identifying linkage rules across different types of interactions](#). *Functional Ecology*,  
357 30, 1894–1903.

358 Bascompte, J., Jordano, P., Melián, C.J. & Olesen, J.M. (2003). [The nested assembly of plant-animal mutualistic](#)  
359 [networks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 9383–9387.

360 Berlow, E.L., Neutel, A.-M., Cohen, J.E., De Ruiter, P.C., Ebenman, B., Emmerson, M., *et al.* (2004).  
361 [Interaction strengths in food webs: Issues and opportunities](#). *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 73, 585–598.

362 Blanchet, F.G., Cazelles, K. & Gravel, D. (2020). [Co-occurrence is not evidence of ecological interactions](#).  
363 *Ecology Letters*, 23, 1050–1063.

364 Bohan, D.A., Vacher, C., Tamaddon-Nezhad, A., Raybould, A., Dumbrell, A.J. & Woodward, G. (2017).  
365 [Next-Generation Global Biomonitoring: Large-scale, Automated Reconstruction of Ecological Networks](#).  
366 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 32, 477–487.

367 Borrett, S.R. & Scharler, U.M. (2019). [Walk partitions of flow in Ecological Network Analysis: Review and](#)  
368 [synthesis of methods and indicators](#). *Ecological Indicators*, 106, 105451.

369 Canard, E.F., Mouquet, N., Mouillot, D., Stanko, M., Miklisova, D. & Gravel, D. (2014). [Empirical Evaluation](#)  
370 [of Neutral Interactions in Host-Parasite Networks](#). *The American Naturalist*, 183, 468–479.

371 Canard, E., Mouquet, N., Marescot, L., Gaston, K.J., Gravel, D. & Mouillot, D. (2012). [Emergence of](#)  
372 [Structural Patterns in Neutral Trophic Networks](#). *PLOS ONE*, 7, e38295.

373 Catchen, M.D., Poisot, T., Pollock, L.J. & Gonzalez, A. (2023). The missing link: Discerning true from false  
374 negatives when sampling species interaction networks.

375 Cazelles, K., Araujo, M.B., Mouquet, N. & Gravel, D. (2016). [A theory for species co-occurrence in interaction](#)  
376 [networks](#). *Theoretical Ecology*, 9, 39–48.

377 Choh, Y., Ignacio, M., Sabelis, M.W. & Janssen, A. (2012). [Predator-prey role reversals, juvenile experience](#)  
378 [and adult antipredator behaviour](#). *Scientific Reports*, 2, 728.

379 Cirtwill, A.R., Eklöf, A., Roslin, T., Wootton, K. & Gravel, D. (2019). [A quantitative framework for](#)  
380 [investigating the reliability of empirical network construction](#). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10,  
381 902–911.



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

384 Elmasri, M., Farrell, M.J., Davies, T.J. & Stephens, D.A. (2020). [A hierarchical Bayesian model for predicting](#)  
 385 [ecological interactions using scaled evolutionary relationships](#). *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 14,  
 386 221–240.

387 Elton, C.S. (2001). *Animal Ecology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

388 Emmerson, M.C. & Raffaelli, D. (2004). [Predatorprey body size, interaction strength and the stability of a real](#)  
 389 [food web](#). *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 73, 399–409.

390 Fortuna, M.A. & Bascompte, J. (2006). [Habitat loss and the structure of plantanimal mutualistic networks](#).  
 391 *Ecology Letters*, 9, 281–286.

392 Galiana, N., Lurgi, M., Claramunt-López, B., Fortin, M.-J., Leroux, S., Cazelles, K., *et al.* (2018). [The spatial](#)  
 393 [scaling of species interaction networks](#). *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2, 782–790.

394 Gilman, S.E., Urban, M.C., Tewksbury, J., Gilchrist, G.W. & Holt, R.D. (2010). [A framework for community](#)  
 395 [interactions under climate change](#). *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 25, 325–331.

396 Godsoe, W., Murray, R. & Iritani, R. (2022). [Species interactions and diversity: A unified framework using Hill](#)  
 397 [numbers](#). *Oikos*, n/a, e09282.

398 Golubski, A.J. & Abrams, P.A. (2011). [Modifying modifiers: What happens when interspecific interactions](#)  
 399 [interact?](#) *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 80, 1097–1108.

400 Gonzalez-Varo, J.P. & Traveset, A. (2016). [The Labile Limits of Forbidden Interactions](#). *Trends in Ecology &*  
 401 *Evolution*, 31, 700–710.

402 Gravel, D., Poisot, T., Albouy, C., Velez, L. & Mouillot, D. (2013). [Inferring food web structure from](#)  
 403 [predatorprey body size relationships](#). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 1083–1090.

404 Guimarães, P.R. (2020). [The Structure of Ecological Networks Across Levels of Organization](#). *Annual Review*  
 405 *of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 51, 433–460.

406 Guimerà, R. & Sales-Pardo, M. (2009). [Missing and spurious interactions and the reconstruction of complex](#)  
 407 [networks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106, 22073–22078.

408 Hortal, J., de Bello, F., Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Lewinsohn, T.M., Lobo, J.M. & Ladle, R.J. (2015). [Seven Shortfalls](#)  
409 [that Beset Large-Scale Knowledge of Biodiversity](#). *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*,  
410 46, 523–549.

411 Jordano, P. (2016). [Sampling networks of ecological interactions](#). *Functional Ecology*, 30, 1883–1893.

412 Jordano, P., Bascompte, J. & Olesen, J.M. (2003). [Invariant properties in coevolutionary networks of](#)  
413 [plantanimal interactions](#). *Ecology Letters*, 6, 69–81.

414 Kéfi, S., Berlow, E.L., Wieters, E.A., Joppa, L.N., Wood, S.A., Brose, U., *et al.* (2015). [Network structure](#)  
415 [beyond food webs: Mapping non-trophic and trophic interactions on Chilean rocky shores](#). *Ecology*, 96,  
416 291–303.

417 Kéfi, S., Miele, V., Wieters, E.A., Navarrete, S.A. & Berlow, E.L. (2016). [How Structured Is the Entangled](#)  
418 [Bank? The Surprisingly Simple Organization of Multiplex Ecological Networks Leads to Increased](#)  
419 [Persistence and Resilience](#). *PLOS Biology*, 14, e1002527.

420 McCann, K. (2007). Protecting biostructure. *Nature*, 446, 29–29.

421 McCann, K.S. (2011). Food webs (MPB-50). In: *Food Webs (MPB-50)*. Princeton University Press.

422 McLeod, A., Leroux, S.J., Gravel, D., Chu, C., Cirtwill, A.R., Fortin, M.-J., *et al.* (2021). [Sampling and](#)  
423 [asymptotic network properties of spatial multi-trophic networks](#). *Oikos*, n/a.

424 McLeod, A.M., Leroux, S.J. & Chu, C. (2020). [Effects of species traits, motif profiles, and environment on](#)  
425 [spatial variation in multi-trophic antagonistic networks](#). *Ecosphere*, 11, e03018.

426 Ohlmann, M., Miele, V., Dray, S., Chalmandrier, L., O'Connor, L. & Thuiller, W. (2019). [Diversity indices for](#)  
427 [ecological networks: A unifying framework using Hill numbers](#). *Ecology Letters*, 22, 737–747.

428 Olesen, J.M., Bascompte, J., Dupont, Y.L., Elberling, H., Rasmussen, C. & Jordano, P. (2010). [Missing and](#)  
429 [forbidden links in mutualistic networks](#). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278,  
430 725–732.

431 Pascual, M., Dunne, J.A. & Dunne, J.A. (2006). *Ecological Networks: Linking Structure to Dynamics in Food*  
432 *Webs*. Oxford University Press, USA.

433 Petchey, O.L., Beckerman, A.P., Riede, J.O. & Warren, P.H. (2008). [Size, foraging, and food web structure](#).  
434 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105, 4191–4196.

435 Poiset, T., Canard, E., Mouillot, D., Mouquet, N. & Gravel, D. (2012). [The dissimilarity of species interaction](#)  
436 [networks](#). *Ecology Letters*, 15, 1353–1361.

437 Poiset, T., Cirtwill, A.R., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., Fortin, M.-J. & Stouffer, D.B. (2016). [The structure of](#)  
438 [probabilistic networks](#). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 303–312.

439 Poiset, T., Stouffer, D.B. & Gravel, D. (2015). [Beyond species: Why ecological interaction networks vary](#)  
440 [through space and time](#). *Oikos*, 124, 243–251.

441 Pomeranz, J.P.F., Thompson, R.M., Poiset, T. & Harding, J.S. (2019). [Inferring predatorprey interactions in](#)  
442 [food webs](#). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 356–367.

443 Pringle, R.M. & Hutchinson, M.C. (2020). [Resolving Food-Web Structure](#). *Annual Review of Ecology,*  
444 *Evolution, and Systematics*, 51, 55–80.

445 Proulx, S.R., Promislow, D.E.L. & Phillips, P.C. (2005). [Network thinking in ecology and evolution](#). *Trends in*  
446 *Ecology & Evolution*, SPECIAL ISSUE: BUMPER BOOK REVIEW, 20, 345–353.

447 Pulliam, H.R. (1974). [On the Theory of Optimal Diets](#). *The American Naturalist*, 108, 59–74.

448 Rooney, N. & McCann, K.S. (2012). [Integrating food web diversity, structure and stability](#). *Trends in Ecology*  
449 *& Evolution*, 27, 40–46.

450 Salim, J.A., Saraiva, A.M., Zermoglio, P.F., Agostini, K., Wolowski, M., Drucker, D.P., *et al.* (2022). [Data](#)  
451 [standardization of plantpollinator interactions](#). *GigaScience*, 11, giac043.

452 Saravia, L.A., Marina, T.I., Kristensen, N.P., De Troch, M. & Momo, F.R. (2022). [Ecological network](#)  
453 [assembly: How the regional metaweb influences local food webs](#). *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 91, 630–642.

454 Schmeller, D.S., Julliard, R., Bellingham, P.J., Böhm, M., Brummitt, N., Chiarucci, A., *et al.* (2015). [Towards a](#)  
455 [global terrestrial species monitoring program](#). *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 25, 51–57.

456 Singer, M.C. & McBride, C.S. (2012). [Geographic mosaics of species' association: A definition and an](#)  
457 [example driven by plantinsect phenological synchrony](#). *Ecology*, 93, 2658–2673.

458 Stouffer, D.B., Rezende, E.L. & Amaral, L.A.N. (2011). [The role of body mass in diet contiguity and food-web](#)  
459 [structure](#). *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 80, 632–639.

460 Strydom, T., Bouskila, S., Banville, F., Barros, C., Caron, D., Farrell, M.J., *et al.* (2022). [Food web](#)  
461 [reconstruction through phylogenetic transfer of low-rank network representation](#). *Methods in Ecology and*

462 *Evolution*, 13.

463 Strydom, T., Catchen, M.D., Banville, F., Caron, D., Dansereau, G., Desjardins-Proulx, P., *et al.* (2021). [A](#)  
464 [roadmap towards predicting species interaction networks \(across space and time\)](#). *Philosophical*  
465 *Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 376, 20210063.

466 Tylianakis, J.M., Tscharnkte, T. & Lewis, O.T. (2007). [Habitat modification alters the structure of tropical](#)  
467 [hostparasitoid food webs](#). *Nature*, 445, 202–205.

468 Vázquez, D.P., Peralta, G., Cagnolo, L., Santos, M. & Igual, E. autores contribuyeron por. (2022). [Ecological](#)  
469 [interaction networks. What we know, what we don't, and why it matters](#). *Ecología Austral*, 32, 670–697.

470 Wood, S.A., Russell, R., Hanson, D., Williams, R.J. & Dunne, J.A. (2015). [Effects of spatial scale of sampling](#)  
471 [on food web structure](#). *Ecology and Evolution*, 5, 3769–3782.

472 Woodward, G., Benstead, J.P., Beveridge, O.S., Blanchard, J., Brey, T., Brown, L.E., *et al.* (2010). [Chapter 2 -](#)  
473 [Ecological Networks in a Changing Climate](#). In: *Advances in Ecological Research*, Ecological Networks  
474 (ed. Woodward, G.). Academic Press, pp. 71–138.

475 Woodward, G., Brown, L.E., Edwards, F.K., Hudson, L.N., Milner, A.M., Reuman, D.C., *et al.* (2012). [Climate](#)  
476 [change impacts in multispecies systems: Drought alters food web size structure in a field experiment](#).  
477 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367, 2990–2997.