

The ecological interpretation of probabilistic networks

Francis Banville^{1,2,3}, Tanya Strydom^{1,3}, Chris Brimacombe⁴, Michael Catchen^{3,5}, Dominique Gravel^{2,3}, Gracielle Higino², Kari Norman¹, Timothée Poisot^{1,3}

¹ Université de Montréal; ² Université de Sherbrooke; ³ Quebec Centre for Biodiversity Science; ⁴ University of Toronto; ⁵ McGill University

Correspondance to:

Francis Banville — francis.banville@umontreal.ca

The stochastic nature of ecological interactions has led biologists to adopt a probabilistic view of ecological networks. Representing species interactions probabilistically (how likely are they occurring?) as opposed to deterministically (are they occurring?) allows a better assessment of their spatiotemporal variability and accounts for inherent uncertainties in both observations and predictions. However, despite this growing interest in probabilistic networks, guidelines for the estimation and documentation of probabilistic interaction data are still lacking. This is concerning given that our biological understanding of probabilistic interactions and their appropriate analyses depend on the often elusive methods and variables used for their estimation. We review how probabilistic interactions are defined at different spatial scales, from local interactions to regional networks (metawebs), with a strong emphasis on trophic interactions. These definitions are based on the distinction between the observation of an interaction at a specific time and space and its biological feasibility. We show that different network representations have different statistical properties when it comes to common ecological applications. Specifically, we argue that local probabilistic networks and metawebs differ in their spatial and temporal scaling of interactions, with potential interactions in metawebs remaining constant across spatial and temporal scales. This is in contrast with the taxonomic scaling of interactions, which does not qualitatively differ between both types of networks. We suggest two approaches to inferring 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 build a spatiotemporally explicit model of probabilistic interactions and develop different case studies using empirical data on host-parasite interactions in Europe. Overall, our results underscore the importance of clear metadata for probabilistic ecological networks, both at the local and regional scales, to inform the appropriate reuse of interaction data.

Keywords:
ecological networks
food webs
metaweb
probabilistic networks
spatial scale
species interactions
temporal scale

1

Introduction

Cataloging ecological interactions is a substantial challenge. There are methodological and biological constraints that hinder our ability to observe all interactions, such as the spatial and temporal uncoupling of species (Jordano (1987)) and the large number of possible interactions in a community, of which the vast majority are rare (Jordano (2016)). Documenting the location and timing of interactions becomes even more difficult when accounting for the spatiotemporal variability of ecological networks (Poisot *et al.* (2012), Poisot *et al.* (2015)). Indeed, knowing the biological capacity of two species to interact is necessary but not sufficient for inferring their interaction at a specific time and space. For example, Golubski & Abrams (2011) presented many cases where trophic interactions in food webs depend on the presence or abundance of a third species (e.g., of a more profitable prey species). More generally, a handful of conditions must be satisfied for an interaction to be observed locally. First, both species must have overlapping geographic ranges, i.e. they must co-occur within the region of interest (Blanchet *et al.* (2020)). Then, they must encounter locally. Probabilities of interspecific encounters are typically low, especially for rare species with

low relative abundances (Canard *et al.* (2012)). Finally, their traits must be locally compatible (Poisot *et al.* (2015)). This includes their phenology (Olesen *et al.* (2010), Singer & McBride (2012)), behavioral choices (Pulliam (1974), Choh *et al.* (2012)) and phenotypes (Bolnick *et al.* (2011), Stouffer *et al.* (2011), Gravel *et al.* (2013)). Environmental factors, such as temperature (Angilletta *et al.* (2004)), drought (Woodward *et al.* (2012)), climate change (Gilman *et al.* (2010), Woodward *et al.* (2010), Araujo *et al.* (2011)), and habitat modifications (Tylianakis *et al.* (2007)), contribute to this spatiotemporal variability of interactions by impacting species abundance and traits. In this context, it is unsurprising that our knowledge of ecological interactions remains limited (Hortal *et al.* (2015)) despite extensive biodiversity data collection (Schmeller *et al.* (2015)).

The recognition of the intrinsic variability of species interactions has led ecologists to expand their representation of ecological networks to include a probabilistic view of interactions (Poisot *et al.* (2016)). As opposed to binary deterministic networks, in which interactions are regarded as either occurring or not, probabilistic networks represent our degree of belief about the realization or feasibility of pairwise interactions at the local or regional scale, respectively. In other words, representing interactions probabilistically takes into account inherent uncertainties and variability associated with ecological data. In the broadest sense, binary networks are also a type of probabilistic network, in which the numerical value of an interaction is restrained to 0 (non-occurring) or 1 (occurring). In probabilistic networks, only forbidden interactions (i.e., interactions prohibited by biological traits, Jordano *et al.* (2003), Olesen *et al.* (2010)) have a probability value of zero, provided that intraspecific trait variability is considered (Gonzalez-Varo & Traveset (2016)). However, *neutrally* forbidden interactions (i.e., improbable interactions between rare species, Canard *et al.* (2012)) could have low probability values in local networks 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 network structure (i.e. community-level properties), which is a major driver 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, often based on a probabilistic representation of interactions, can alleviate the 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 could inform the identification of priority sampling locations of ecological networks where data collection would yield the most valuable information, thereby reducing errors. Optimization models for sampling locations have mostly found applications in biological systems that are not networked, such as identifying priority sampling sites for disease hotspots (Andrade-Pacheco *et al.* (2020)), but there is substantial promise in applying them to probabilistic ecological interactions. Statistical models can also be used to generate network predictions without prior knowledge of pairwise interactions, for instance using body size (Petechy *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)).

The lack of clear guidelines on the use of probabilistic interaction data is worrisome (Brimacombe *et al.* (2023)), both for data producers and re-users who generate and manipulate these numbers. Besides methodological difficulties that may arise when assessing probabilistic interactions, a precise definition of probabilistic interactions appears to be lacking, making the estimation and use of these data more difficult. We aim to take a step back by outlining different ways in which probabilistic interactions are defined and used in network ecology. We distinguish two broad categories of probabilistic networks that necessitate distinct approaches when applied to key ecological questions: local networks of realized interactions, and regional networks (metawebs) of potential interactions. We highlight the distinctions in the ecological meaning of these two representations and show that they yield different statistical outcomes regarding e.g. the spatial and temporal scaling of interactions and the prediction of binary networks across space. Moreover, there is currently no metadata standard that could guide the documentation of all types of probabilistic interactions (Salim *et al.* (2022) discuss data standards for deterministic mutualistic networks). Well-defined metadata

for probabilistic networks would support more adequate manipulation and integration of interaction data from different sources and guard against the potential misinterpretations arising from ambiguous definitions of probabilistic networks. These metadata should outline the nature (i.e., potential or local) and type (e.g., predatory or pollination) of the interactions, provide information regarding the taxonomic level, identities, and characteristics (e.g., life stages) of the individuals involved in an interaction, present the mathematical formulation of probabilities, including clearly identified conditional variables, and describe the methods and contexts (e.g., location, time, environmental conditions) in which interactions were estimated. Inadequately documented probabilistic interaction data should be used with caution when analyzing ecological networks. Although our contribution focuses on food webs, our observations and advice can be applied to other types of ecological networks, from plant-pollinator to host-virus networks. Indeed, excluding networks of indirect interactions such as competition and facilitation networks (Kéfi *et al.* (2015), Kéfi *et al.* (2016)), most ecological networks describe probabilities of direct interactions, which are conceptually and mathematically analogous regardless of their biological type (e.g., trophic and mutualistic interactions).

2

Probabilistic representations of 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 taxa to interact (i.e., the probability that they *can* theoretically interact) whereas a realized interaction is the materialization or observation of this interaction in a well-defined space and time (i.e., the probability that they interact locally). Here, we use the terms *metaweb* (Dunne (2006)) to designate networks of potential interactions and *local networks* (Poisot *et al.* (2012)) for those of realized interactions. Metawebs are the network analogues 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)). Without clear documentation, it can be challenging to know if published probabilistic networks describe potential or realized interactions, or if so-called probabilities are in reality *interaction scores* (i.e., non-probabilistic quantitative interactions). When probabilistic potential interactions are used and interpreted as local interactions (and conversely), this may generate misleading findings during data analysis. We believe that a better understanding of the differences, similarities, and relationships between these two probabilistic representations of ecological networks would alleviate interpretation errors and facilitate a more adequate utilization of interaction data.

2.1. Pairwise interactions: the building blocks of ecological networks Local ecological networks and metawebs, like any type of network, are made of nodes and edges that can be represented at different levels of organization and precision. The basic unit of food webs and other ecological networks are individuals that interact with each other (e.g., by predation, Elton (2001)), forming individual-based networks (Melián *et al.* (2011)). The aggregation of these individuals into more or less homogeneous groups (e.g., populations, species, trophic species, families) allows us to represent nodes at broader taxonomic scales, which affects our interpretation of the properties of these systems (Guimarães (2020)). Moreover, edges linking these nodes can describe a variety of interaction measures. Ecologists have traditionally represented interactions as binary objects that were considered realized after observing at least one individual from group i interact with at least another individual from group j . Boolean interactions can be viewed as the result of a Bernoulli process $A_{i,j} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(P(i \rightarrow j))$, with $P(i \rightarrow j)$ being the probability of interaction between i and j that characterizes our limited knowledge of the system and its intrinsic spatiotemporal variability. Depending on the type of networks (local or metaweb), the mathematical formulation and interpretation of stochastic parameters like $P(i \rightarrow j)$ can be linked to environmental and biological factors such as species relative abundance, traits, area, and time (tbl. 1), for example using logistic regression with a logit link function with continuous explanatory variables. In these probabilistic network representations in which $P(i \rightarrow j)$ are edge values, the only two possible outcomes are the presence ($A_{i,j} = 1$) or absence ($A_{i,j} = 0$) of an interaction between each pair of nodes. When considering uncertainties around the estimation of $P(i \rightarrow j)$, a Beta distribution $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ can also be used to encompass all possible probability values. Observing an interaction between two taxa at a given location and time provides important information that can be used to update previous estimates of $P(i \rightarrow j)$, informing us on the biological capacity of both taxa to interact and the environmental conditions that enabled them to interact locally.

Even though binary networks constitute a highly valuable source of ecological information (Pascual *et al.* (2006)), they overlook important factors regarding interaction strengths. These are represented using quantitative interactions, which better describe the energy flows, demographic impacts or frequencies of interactions

between nodes (Berlow *et al.* (2004), Borrett & Scharler (2019)), with $A_{i,j}$ being a natural number \mathbb{N} or a real number \mathbb{R} depending on the measure. For example, they may represent local interaction rates between pairs of taxa (e.g., the flower visiting rates of pollinators in a mutualistic network, Herrera (1989)). Because quantitative interactions can also describe predation pressure on prey taxa in food webs, they can be good estimators of the parameters describing species interactions in a Lotka-Volterra model (e.g., Emmerson & Raffaelli (2004)). The extra amount of ecological information in quantitative networks typically comes at a cost of greater sampling effort and data volume in predictive models (Strydom *et al.* (2021)), which can lead to relatively high levels of uncertainties when inferring quantitative networks with limited data. Just like binary networks, the uncertainty and spatiotemporal variability of quantitative interactions can be represented probabilistically. However, the need to estimate the probability distribution of all possible value of interaction strengths can make the inference of probabilities more challenging in quantitative networks compared to binary networks, which require only one probability estimate for each interaction. Quantitative interactions can follow various probability distributions depending on the measure used, the event's outcome being the value of interaction strength. For instance, quantitative interactions can follow a Poisson distribution $A_{i,j} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_{i,j})$ when predicting frequencies of interactions between pairs of nodes, with $\lambda_{i,j}$ being the expected rate at which individuals of taxa i and j interact (e.g., the average number of prey j consumed by all predators i in a given time period). The Poisson distribution can also be 0-inflated after initially modeling non-interacting taxa (e.g., Boulangeat *et al.* (2012) employ a 0-inflated model to analyze species abundance following the modeling of species presence and absence), which constitute the majority of taxa pairs in most local networks due to their typically high sparseness (Jordano (2016)). Because of the methodological difficulties typically encountered when building deterministic quantitative networks, binary networks, which are easier to sample (Jordano (2016)) and predict (Strydom *et al.* (2021)), are much more documented and modeled in the literature. Moreover, most published probabilistic networks and methods describe Bernoulli interactions (whether interaction probabilities are regarded as constant or variable, e.g. represented by Beta distributions), which underlines the need for better guidelines regarding the interpretation and manipulation of these types of networks. For these reasons, our primary focus in this contribution will be on addressing the challenges in interpreting and using Bernoulli interactions, in both probabilistic local networks and metawebs.

2.2. Local networks: communities interacting in space and time Probabilistic local networks describe how likely taxa are to interact at a given location and time period (i.e., interactions are contingent upon the environmental and biological conditions of the community). In local networks, edges commonly represent our degree of belief that two taxa interact in nature, but can also represent the probability of *observing* this interaction (Catchen *et al.* (2023)). For example, Kopalke *et al.* (2017) assembled a dataset of binary local European food webs of willow-galling sawflies and their natural enemies, clearly referencing each food web in space and time. Gravel *et al.* (2019) used this dataset to infer the probabilities of locally observing interactions between co-occurring species, with the added aspect of situating local networks within the context of environmental variables. This was achieved by including temperature and precipitation as conditional variables in some of their models.

We define space as the set of geographic coordinates (x, y, z) of the spatial boundaries delineating the system, whether sampled or targeted. Ecological interactions may exhibit variations spatially and along altitudinal gradients, as evidenced by changes in hummingbird-plant interactions (Weinstein & Graham (2017b) and Weinstein & Graham (2017a)) and mosquitoes biting rates (e.g., Kulkarni *et al.* (2006)) at different elevations. In contrast, time is defined as the specific time period within which interactions were either observed or predicted. With these definitions in mind, space and time can be conceptualized as distinct patches or time segments. Treating them as discrete dimensions aligns with the common sampling methods of ecological networks and provides actual probabilities of interactions across space and time. This differs from the approach of treating them as continuous variables, where edge values represent probability densities (i.e., relative likelihoods of interactions occurring at infinitesimal locations and instants in time) rather than discrete probability values (which can be obtained by integrating probability densities). By employing discrete locations and time periods, we can quantify both an area A and a duration t , which can be readily used in spatiotemporal analyses of ecological networks. For example, when studying network-area relationships (NAR, Galiana *et al.* (2018)), we anticipate that local probabilities of interactions scale positively with area and duration because taxa have more opportunities to interact as these dimensions expand.

The probability that two taxa i and j interact locally can be conditional on many environmental and biological factors. One of these is their co-occurrence $C_{i,j}$, which is usually a Boolean describing if the geographic distributions of both taxa overlap within the study area. Co-occurrence can be modeled probabilistically, in which case it may conform to a Bernoulli distribution $C_{i,j} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(P_{i,j}(x, y, z))$, where the probability of co-occurrence $P_{i,j}(x, y, z)$ can be estimated through the application of joint species distribution models

(e.g., Pollock *et al.* (2014)). Considering that the probability that two non co-occurring taxa interact locally is zero (i.e., $P_N(i \rightarrow j|C = 0) = 0$), the probability of local interaction can be obtained by multiplying the probability of interaction given co-occurrence with the probability of co-occurrence:

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j) = P_N(i \rightarrow j|C = 1) \times P_{i,j}(x, y, z). \quad (1)$$

Other important factors that can impact our estimation of interaction probabilities at the local scale are taxa relative abundance (Canard *et al.* (2012)) and traits (Poisot *et al.* (2015)), as well as environmental factors such as temperature (Angilletta *et al.* (2004)), precipitation (Woodward *et al.* (2012)), habitat structure (Klecka & Boukal (2014)), and presence of other interacting taxa in the network (Pilosof *et al.* (2017), Kéfi *et al.* (2012)). Here, we use the variable Ω to describe the biological and ecological context in which interaction probabilities were estimated. For example, if a research team conducts a mesocosm experiment to estimate interaction probabilities between predators and prey with and without shelters, Ω would represent the presence or absence of these shelters. Like co-occurrence, Ω can also be modeled probabilistically when the stochasticity or uncertainty of environmental and biological factors is considered. In sum, Ω represents all ecological and biological variables that were taken into consideration when measuring interaction probabilities and is, therefore, a subset of all factors actually impacting ecological interactions.

The probability that two taxa i and j interact in a local network N can thus be conditional on the area A , the time interval t , their co-occurrence C and chosen environmental and biological conditions Ω . This gives us the following equation when all of these conditions are included in the estimation of interaction probabilities:

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j|A, t, C, \Omega). \quad (2)$$

The representation of the local context in which probabilities are estimated and the variables that should be taken into consideration depend on the study system, the objectives of the study, and the resources available to the researchers. In other words, these variables do not systematically need to be accounted for. For example, in Gravel *et al.* (2019), for the purpose of model comparison, some models incorporated environmental variables as conditional factors to estimate interaction probabilities, while others did not. When accounted for, these variables should be clearly described in the documentation of the data (Brimacombe *et al.* (2023)), preferentially in mathematical terms to avoid any confusion in their interpretation and to limit manipulation errors during their re-use. For instance, ecologists should be explicit about their consideration of co-occurrence in their estimation of local interaction probabilities. Indeed, it is important to specify if probability values are conditional $P_N(i \rightarrow j|C = 1)$ or not $P_N(i \rightarrow j)$ on co-occurrence since this can significantly impact the interpretation and analysis of the data. In [tbl. 1](#), we present examples of studies that used these diverse formulations of probabilistic interactions and conditional variables.

Table 1 Notation of probabilistic interactions. The probability of interaction between two taxa i and j is interpreted differently in a metaweb M of potential interactions and a local network N of realized interactions. Each notation includes a different conditional variable, when applicable. An example of a study employing each of these notations and conditional variables is provided, with the specific variables used indicated in parentheses. The study marked with an asterisk has been carried out on binary networks. Note that interaction probabilities can be contingent upon multiple conditional variables, or none at all. Additionally, local interaction probabilities might represent the probability of observing an interaction, not necessarily its actual occurrence.

Notation	Type	Description	Reference
$P_M(i \rightarrow j)$	potential	biological feasibility of the interaction	Strydom <i>et al.</i> (2022)
$P_N(i \rightarrow j)$	local	realization of the interaction	Fortuna & Bascompte (2006) (null model)
$P_N(i \rightarrow j A)$	local	realization of the interaction in a given area	Galiana <i>et al.</i> (2018) *
$P_N(i \rightarrow j t)$	local	realization of the interaction during a given time period	Weinstein & Graham (2017a)
$P_N(i \rightarrow j C)$	local	realization of the interaction given that the taxa co-occur	Gravel <i>et al.</i> (2019)
$P_N(i \rightarrow j \Omega)$	local	realization of the interaction given environmental conditions	Gravel <i>et al.</i> (2019) (temperature and precipitation)

2.3. Metawebs: regional catalogs of interactions Metawebs are networks of potential interactions that have been designed for broad spatial, temporal, and taxonomic scales (e.g., species food webs at the continental scale). They represent the probability that taxa can biologically interact regardless of their co-occurrence and local environmental conditions. Potential interactions are by definition context-independent, i.e. they are not measured at a specific location and time. In contrast with probabilistic local networks, which represent the stochasticity of interactions occurring in nature, probabilistic metawebs measure our degree of belief in the capacity of two taxa to interact (i.e., the probability that their traits could support an interaction in the right conditions). In other words, potential interactions describe the probability that there exists at least one combination of phenotypes of taxa i and j that can interact with each other if they were to encounter. To reduce any biases in our calculation of this probability, it is crucial to ensure that the set of traits sampled or considered accurately reflects the overall trait distribution in both taxa. This enhances our confidence in concluding that the taxa cannot interact when no positive observation has been made and increases our capacity to detect an interaction when it is biologically feasible. In addition to one-on-one interactions, the extent of sampling effort also contributes to shaping our assessment of metaweb properties, as sampling a larger number of local networks allows us to capture more potential interactions (McLeod *et al.* (2021a)). A probability of potential interaction in a metaweb M can be expressed as

$$P_M(i \rightarrow j), \quad (3)$$

which, in contrast with eq. 2, is not conditional on any spatial, temporal, or environmental variables (tbl. 1).

Starting from a selected set of taxa, which are usually distributed within a broad region of interest, probabilistic metawebs can be built using different data sources, including literature review, fieldwork, and predictive models (e.g., the metaweb of trophic interactions between Canadian mammals inferred by Strydom *et al.* (2022)). Every pair of taxa that have confidently been observed to interact at least once can be given a probability of 1 (i.e., $P_M(i \rightarrow j) = 1$) since we know that they *can* interact. This is not the case in local probabilistic networks, in which interaction events usually remain stochastic (i.e., $P_N(i \rightarrow j) < 1$) after empirically observing interactions because of their intrinsic spatiotemporal variability. Similarly, although rare interactions typically have low probabilities in local networks, they can have high probabilities in metawebs when the traits of both taxa are congruent. On the other hand, interactions that were never observed can have low probability values in both metawebs and local networks, going as low as 0 for forbidden links. However, because of observation errors due to taxonomic misidentifications and ecological misinterpretations (e.g., due to cryptic species and interactions, Pringle & Hutchinson (2020)), many observations of interactions are in reality false positives. Likewise, forbidden interactions can be false negatives in metawebs, e.g. if they have been assessed for specific phenotypes, locations or time. Employing Bayesian models, whether they are mechanistic or phenomenological, has the potential to enhance the accuracy of our estimation of interaction probabilities within both local and potential networks (e.g., Bartomeus *et al.* (2016), Cirtwill *et al.* (2019)). This improvement is achieved in potential networks by leveraging prior information regarding the feasibility of interactions along with the empirical data on observed interactions.

3

Properties of probabilistic networks

Probabilistic local networks and metawebs differ in their type of interactions (i.e., local or potential) and in the conditional variables upon which interaction values depend. These differences are significant as they influence the characteristics of probabilistic networks. Neglecting to consider them may result in misleading results and interpretation errors when analyzing the properties of probabilistic networks, which could be particularly problematic when addressing crucial ecological questions about networks. Here we compare the characteristics of local networks and metawebs through the presentation of four common applications of probabilistic interactions.

3.1. Host-parasite network data We use the collection of tripartite host-parasite networks sampled across Europe, created by Kopelke *et al.* (2017), in most of our case studies. This dataset contains well-resolved binary local interactions between willows (52 species), willow-galling sawflies (96 species), and their parasitoids (126 species). Given its replicated networks spanning large spatiotemporal scales, this dataset is well-suited for analyzing a variety of ecological hypotheses and processes. Out of a total of 374 local networks, we retained those containing at least 5 species, resulting in a set of 233 georeferenced local networks.




Figure 1 Network accumulation curves. (a) Dissimilarity of interactions between common species (β_{OS}) and (b) dissimilarity in species composition between aggregated local networks and the binary metaweb of host-parasite interactions. Aggregated local networks were obtained by sequentially and randomly selecting a number of binary local networks and aggregating both their species and interactions. In both panels, the colored line represents the median dissimilarity across simulations and the grey areas cover the 50% and 95% percentile intervals. (c) Scaling of the number of links and (d) scaling of connectance with the number of sampled binary and probabilistic local networks. For a better comparison with binary networks, local probabilistic networks were derived from the probabilistic metaweb with a false positive and false negative rates of zero. A specific value of p (the local probability of interaction among potentially interacting species) was used for all local networks within a particular curve. Aggregated probabilistic local networks were obtained by sequentially and randomly selecting a number of probabilistic local networks and aggregating both their species and interactions (with the value of p adjusting according to eq. 5).

We built a binary metaweb by aggregating all local interactions, which gave us a regional metaweb composed of 274 species and 1080 interactions. In the first two panels of fig. 1, we show how the dissimilarity of interactions between common species (β_{OS}) and the dissimilarity in species composition (β_S) between the metaweb and aggregated local networks (Poisot *et al.* (2012)) vary with the number of sampled local networks. This shows that networks of local interactions are highly dissimilar from the metaweb, both in terms of species and interactions, especially when only a limited number of sites has been sampled.

We converted these binary networks into probabilistic ones using models based on simple assumptions. Our models do not aim to precisely estimate the actual values of probabilistic interactions but rather to offer simplified networks as illustrative examples to underscore the differences between probabilistic local networks and metawebs. We created two probabilistic metawebs by employing constant false positive and false negative rates for all potential interactions. In the first metaweb, we set both false positive and false negative rates to zero to prevent artificially inflating the total number of links, enabling a more accurate comparison with binary networks. This gave us a probability of potential interaction of 1 when at least one interaction has been observed and of 0 in the absence of any observed interaction between a given pair of species. In the second metaweb, we introduced a 5% false positive rate to account for spurious interactions and a 10% false negative rate to capture the elevated occurrence of false negatives in ecological networks (Catchen *et al.* (2023)). Observed potential interactions were thus given a probability of 95%, whereas unobserved ones were assigned a probability of 10%.

To build probabilistic local networks, we first recognize that local interactions must initially be biologically feasible before occurring at a specific time and space. A local probability of interaction $P_N(i \rightarrow j)$ can be expressed as the product of the probability of local interaction given that the two taxa can potentially interact $P_N(i \rightarrow j|M_{i \rightarrow j} = 1)$, which we denote as p for the sake of simplicity, with their probability of potential interaction $P_M(i \rightarrow j)$:

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j) = P_N(i \rightarrow j|M_{i \rightarrow j} = 1) \times P_M(i \rightarrow j). \quad (4)$$

We built the probabilistic local networks from the binary ones by using the probabilistic metawebs and a constant value of p across interactions. Lower values of p indicate that feasible interactions rarely occur locally, intermediate values around 50% suggest considerable spatiotemporal variability, while higher values indicate that potential interactions are nearly always realized. Following eq. 4, the local probabilities of

interaction between a given pair of taxa consistently remained equal to or below their probability of potential interaction.

In the last two panels of fig. 1, we show how the aggregated number of links and connectance (i.e., the proportion of all of the S^2 possible links that are realized, where S represents species richness) scale with the number of sampled local probabilistic networks, according to different values of p . When aggregating local probabilistic networks, the constancy of the probability of potential interaction across the entire study area means that any rise in the probability of local interaction is solely attributable to an increase in p . The probability $p_{1,2}$ of local interaction among potentially interacting species in an aggregated network $N_{1,2}$ is obtained by:

$$p_{1,2} = 1 - (1 - p_1) \times (1 - p_2), \quad (5)$$

where p_1 and p_2 are the probabilities of local interaction among two potentially interacting species in the subnetworks N_1 and N_2 , respectively.

By comparing the scaling relationships observed in binary and probabilistic networks, fig. 1 illustrates that high values of p lead to systematic overestimations in the number of links and connectance, especially when $p = 1$ (corresponding to the scenario where local probabilities of interactions are equivalent to the probabilities of potential interactions). However, these biases tend to diminish as the number of sampled networks increases.

3.2. Taxonomic scaling of interactions Probabilistic networks offer a versatile approach to tackle a broad array of ecological questions, depending on their level of organization. For instance, the assemblage of interactions across ecological scales can be explored through species-based networks, while clade-based networks provide insights into macroevolutionary processes (e.g., Gomez *et al.* (2010)). Given that our interpretation of the properties and dynamics of ecological networks depends on their taxonomic scale (Guimarães (2020)), investigating the phylogenetic scaling of network structure emerges as a promising research avenue. Examining the same system at various taxonomic scales can yield meaningful and complementary ecological information, and, in our perspective, employing probabilistic networks is an effective approach for such analyses.

There are no inherent differences in the taxonomic scaling between local networks and metawebs, as only the nodes are defined taxonomically. In other words, the probability values of edges in both local networks (eq. 2) and metawebs (eq. 3) are not conditional on any taxonomic scale. The phylogenetic scale is tied to the definition of the event itself (i.e., the interaction between two taxa), not to the conditional variables. In both types of networks, transitioning to a broader level of organization can be accomplished directly by using probabilities from finer scales. For example, in a network with n_A species from genus A and n_B species from genus B, one can compute the probability that at least one species from genus A interacts with at least one species from genus B as follows:

$$P(A \rightarrow B) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{n_A} \prod_{j=1}^{n_B} (1 - P(A_i \rightarrow B_j)), \quad (6)$$

where A_i and B_j are the species of the corresponding genus. If it is known that at least two of these species interact (i.e., $P(A_i \rightarrow B_j) = 1$ for at least one pair of i, j), it implies a probability of genus interaction equal to 1. Canard *et al.* (2012) built a species-based network following a similar approach, by using simulated interactions between individuals derived from a neutral model (i.e., a model that assumed ecological equivalence among individuals). In contrast, a more sophisticated approach is necessary when transitioning from a broader to a finer level of organization. This is because knowledge of an interaction between two genera does not guarantee that all possible pairwise combinations of their species will also interact. One possible method is to build a finer-scale network by generating probabilities of interactions through random sampling from a beta distribution, parameterized by the broader-scale network.

Ideally, our biological interpretation of probabilistic interactions should remain consistent across a network even if it incorporates heterogenous levels of organization (e.g., a network whose nodes are composed of both species and trophic species). This is common in ecological networks where taxonomic resolution is typically low (Hemprich-Bennett *et al.* (2021), Vázquez *et al.* (2022)). Interaction probabilities at broader taxonomic scales should be based on probabilities of interactions between individuals, for both local networks and metawebs. For instance, in local individual-based food webs, the probability that two individuals interact

reflects our degree of belief that one individual will consume the other. Similarly, in local species-based food webs, the probability that two species interact represents our degree of belief that at least one individual from the predator species consumes at least another individual from the prey species. Furthermore, in local clade-based food webs, the probability that two clades interact represents our degree of belief that at least two species from these clades interact with each other or, equivalently, that at least two individuals from these clades interact with each other. Fundamentally, the taxonomic scaling of interactions involves aggregating interactions between individuals into larger groups, which may exhibit varying degrees of homogeneity based on the organisms and the study system. In that regard, taxonomic scaling is analogous to the spatial and temporal scaling of interactions, as they all represent different ways to aggregate individuals into broader groups (either spatially, temporally, or taxonomically).

3.3. Spatial and temporal scaling of interactions The investigation of network-area relationships (NARs) and interaction accumulation curves (IACs) is an important area of research in network ecology. First, NARs elucidate the scaling of network properties (such as modularity and trophic chain lengths) with spatial scale (e.g., Wood *et al.* (2015), Galiana *et al.* (2018)). The variations in network structure across spatial scales may stem from the scaling of species richness (species-area relationships, SARs) and the number of interactions (Brose *et al.* (2004)) with the sampled area. Additionally, ecological processes unfolding at distinct spatial scales, such as the spatial variability in local community composition resulting from different sequences of extinction and colonization events, can also contribute to this variation (Galiana *et al.* (2018)). Next, IACs describe the scaling of the number of observed interactions with sampling effort (Jordano (2016)), which can also impact various measures of network structure such as connectance (McLeod *et al.* (2021b)). Apart from sampling effort, the temporal scaling of interactions elucidates how network structure changes with the duration of the network (Poisot *et al.* (2012)), acknowledging that distinct interactions take place over time. Given that probabilistic local networks can quantify the spatiotemporal variability of interactions (eq. 2), they serve as valuable tools for developing and testing equations describing the scaling of network structure with space and time.

Metawebs and local networks exhibit distinct relationships with spatial and temporal scales. On one hand, probabilistic metawebs, being independent of any local context, feature potential interactions that do not scale with space and time. This is because potential interactions depend solely on the biological capacity of two taxa to interact, regardless of their co-occurrence and specific environmental conditions. This implies that the probability of two taxa potentially interacting should theoretically be the same in all metawebs in which they are present, provided that the data and methods used for estimation are consistent. As a result, if a smaller metaweb M_1 is derived from subsampling a regional metaweb M_0 to represent potential interactions among a subset of taxa in a smaller region, their probabilities of interaction should be identical regardless of scale, i.e. $P_{M_1}(i \rightarrow j) = P_{M_0}(i \rightarrow j)$. However, because the number of taxa may be higher in the larger metaweb, it is expected that the overall number of interactions would be higher in the larger network, despite pairwise probabilities being identical.

On the other hand, local interactions scale both spatially and temporally, given that they have more opportunities to be realized and observed in larger areas and longer durations. This is attributed to factors such as a higher number of individuals, greater trait variations, and increased opportunities for encounters, as highlighted by McLeod *et al.* (2020). For example, if a local probabilistic network N_1 with an area A_1 is derived from a larger network N_0 with an area A_0 , and A_1 is entirely nested within A_0 , interaction probabilities should be lower in the smaller network, i.e. $P_{N_1}(i \rightarrow j|A_1 < A_0) \leq P_{N_0}(i \rightarrow j|A_0)$. However, if A_1 and A_0 are disjoint, interaction probabilities could potentially be higher in the smaller area, contingent upon their environmental and biological conditions. Likewise, interaction probabilities are expected to be lower in networks with shorter durations when time intervals are nested. In fig. 2, we show how the expected number of local host-parasite interactions scales with area, represented as an expanding latitudinal window, in comparison with potential interactions. Even though we employed local probabilities of interactions equal to potential interactions for the purpose of comparison (i.e., using $p = 1$ here), we notice that the total number of potential interactions scales more rapidly than local interactions. This is due to the fact that numerous potential interactions involve species that never co-occur, and as a result, these interactions are not captured in local networks.

3.4. Box 1: A spatiotemporally explicit model of interactions Predicting local networks across time and space is an important goal of network ecology (Strydom *et al.* (2021)). Indeed, in a context of scarcity of interaction data (Jordano (2016)), ecologists must rely on predictive models to reconstruct networks at fine spatial and temporal scales. For example, local ecological networks could be reconstructed using real-time biomonitoring data and adequate numerical models (Bohan *et al.* (2017)), which could pave the way for fine-scale




Figure 2 Spatial scaling of interactions. Expected number of host-parasite interactions in a network aggregating all probabilistic (a) local and (b) potential interactions within a latitudinal window of a given length. Every dashed curve corresponds to a different expanding window characterized by a different central latitude, with the colored solid line representing the median number of interactions. Heatmaps of the expected number of (c) local and (d) potential interactions found in windows of specified length and central latitudes. Probabilities of potential interactions were obtained with a false positive rate of 5% and a false negative rate of 10%. Local probabilistic interactions were derived from the probabilistic metaweb by setting the value of p (the local probability of interaction among potentially interacting species) to 1, ensuring a conservative comparison between aggregated local networks and metawebs. Aggregated local networks were obtained by aggregating both the species and interactions found within a particular latitudinal window, with the values of p remaining at their maximum value of 1 following eq. 5.

studies of ecosystem functioning and dynamics. Besides predictive models, statistical models can also be built to describe parameters of interest, such as probabilities of interactions. In that case, parameter values provide valuable ecological information in their own rights. Different types of models (e.g., Bayesian and machine learning models) of ecological interactions have been built for predictive and descriptive purposes (Strydom *et al.* (2021)). Representing interactions probabilistically reflects the uncertainty of these models, which is usually represented in terms of probability distributions. Here we show how to build a simple generative mechanistic model of probabilistic interactions that takes into account their inherent spatiotemporal variability, i.e. a spatiotemporally-explicit model. Our model is not suitable for potential interactions, which are scale-independent. Rather, it could prove useful for predicting local interactions across time and space by generating new interaction data after parameter inference.

As stated by eq. 1, the probability that two taxa i and j interact at a given location (x, y) is given by the product of their probability of interaction given co-occurrence and their probability of co-occurrence. First, their probability of co-occurrence is given by their respective probabilities of occurrence $P_i(x, y)$ and $P_j(x, y)$ and the strength of association γ between their occurrence and co-occurrence (Cazelles *et al.* (2016)):

$$P_{ij}(x, y) = P_i(x, y)P_j(x, y)\gamma. \quad (7)$$

When $\gamma > 1$, the geographic distributions of both taxa are positively associated, which implies that the occurrence of one taxon increases the probability of occurrence of the other. In empirical networks, $\gamma > 1$ for most species pairs (Catchen *et al.* (2023)). The co-occurrence of both taxa is the result of a Bernoulli trial

$$C \sim \text{Bernoulli}(P_{ij}(x, y)). \quad (8)$$

Second, the probability of interaction given co-occurrence can be made temporally explicit by modeling it as a Poisson process with rate λ . This parameter corresponds to the expected frequency of interaction between both taxa in a given time period and its value can be estimated using prior data on interaction strengths, if available. Specifically, the probability that two co-occurring taxa interact during a time period t_0 is:

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j|C = 1) = 1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}, \quad (9)$$

which approaches 1 when $t_0 \rightarrow \infty$.

The realization of the interaction between i and j is the result of a Bernoulli trial with probability $P_N(i \rightarrow j)$. A Bayesian inference model can thus be built from the previous equations to estimate the value of the λ parameter and generate new interaction data:


$$I \sim \text{Bernoulli}(P_N(i \rightarrow j)) \quad (10)$$

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j) = P_i(x, y)P_j(x, y)\gamma(1 - e^{-\lambda t_0}) \quad (11)$$

$$\gamma \sim \text{Gamma}(2, 0.5) \quad (12)$$

$$\lambda \sim \text{Exponential}(2) \quad (13)$$

This simple model can be customized in many ways, e.g. by linking λ with given environmental variables or by explicitly modeling observation errors (i.e., the probability of false negatives and false positives).




3.5. Sampling binary networks Probabilistic networks can be used to predict binary interactions through random draws. This can be useful when analyzing the structure of a probabilistic network when analytical probabilistic measures are lacking. A binary network can be generated from independent Bernoulli trials for each interaction. The distribution of a network's property can then be obtained after measuring the structure of all randomly generated networks (Poisot *et al.* (2016)). Doing so allows us to represent the variability of network structure, although possibly with biases when connectance is low (Poisot & Gravel (2014), Chagnon (2015)). When binary networks are generated under a null model, this method can be used for null hypothesis significance testing, in which case the observed measure is compared to a null distribution (e.g., Bascompte *et al.* (2003)). Furthermore, randomly generating binary networks across space and time can help us visualize the spatiotemporal variability of network structure and test ecological hypotheses on interactions across large spatial and temporal scales.

There are at least two different approaches when sampling binary networks from probabilistic webs across space, e.g. if we want to predict a binary network for each of $n \times n$ grid cells. The first approach is to conduct a single Bernoulli trial for each pair of taxa found in the region of interest based on their regional probability of interaction. As a result, each pair of taxa that are predicted to interact in the regional network realization will interact in all of the n^2 networks in which they co-occur. This sampling technique is best used with potential interactions that have no spatial variation. The second approach is to independently sample each of the n^2 networks. In practice, this can be done by generating a different probabilistic network for each grid cell. Depending on how they were obtained, these networks can differ in their taxa composition (nodes) and/or interaction probabilities (edges). Then, binary networks can be independently sampled for each grid cell. Because this method generates spatial variation in binary interactions, it is best used with local interactions.

The choice of sampling approach has an impact on the selection of grid cell size. In the first approach, interactions will be the same regardless of cell size because interactions are sampled only once from the regional network. However, in the second approach, local interaction probabilities depend on the network area. For example, let N_1 and N_2 be networks of area $\frac{1}{2}A_0$ nested within A_0 and disjoint from each other, i.e. two contiguous cells that form N_0 . If N_1 and N_2 are independent (which is rarely the case in reality because of spatial auto-correlation), the probability that two taxa i and j interact in N_0 is given by:

$$P_{N_0}(i \rightarrow j) = 1 - (1 - P_{N_1}(i \rightarrow j)) \times (1 - P_{N_2}(i \rightarrow j)). \quad (14)$$

Because of its larger area, the probability that the two taxa interact in N_0 is higher than in N_1 and N_2 . When sampling binary interactions from local networks, it is thus important to sample at the same spatial scale as the one for which probabilities were estimated. Otherwise, interaction probabilities must be adjusted to correspond to the targeted cell size and avoid systematic biases in prediction.



3.6. Prediction of local networks from metawebs Metawebs are an important source of ecological information that can be leveraged for predicting local networks. Indeed, binary local networks can be reconstructed by selecting a subset of both taxa and interactions from the metaweb (Dunne (2006)). This implies that there are always more interactions in a metaweb compared to its corresponding local networks. In practice, because a community's composition is arguably easier to sample or predict than its interactions, the list of taxa to select can be known empirically or obtained using range maps or species distribution models. The challenge is rather to choose which interactions to select from the metaweb, which could require more sophisticated statistical models and ecological knowledge. Because the structure of local networks is constrained by the one of the metaweb (Saravia *et al.* (2022)), inferring their structure from the metaweb before predicting local pairwise interactions could prove promising (Strydom *et al.* (2021)).

When building probabilistic local networks from a probabilistic metaweb, interaction probabilities decrease. This is because two taxa must first have the capacity to interact (i.e., $M_{i,j}^* = 1$ in the binary metaweb M^*) before interacting locally:

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j) = P_M(i \rightarrow j) \times P_N(i \rightarrow j | M_{i,j}^* = 1).$$

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 represent smaller-scale metawebs of potential interactions, which could be misinterpreted as local interactions. As suggested by McLeod *et al.* (2021b), even though metawebs do not capture the spatiotemporal variability of interactions, they set the upper limit of local interactions. In other words, the probability that two taxa interact at a given location and time is always lower or equal to the probability of their potential interaction:

$$P_N(i \rightarrow j|A, t, C, \Omega) \leq P_M(i \rightarrow j). \quad (15)$$

Moreover, the probability that two taxa have the biological capacity to interact must be higher than the probability that they will ever interact because they might never co-occur or encounter locally. More precisely, the accumulated probability of realized interactions across all spatial, temporal, and environmental conditions must be lower than the probability of potential interaction, i.e.

$$\int_{\Omega} \int_A \int_t P_N(i \rightarrow j|A, t, \Omega) dt dA d\Omega \leq P_M(i \rightarrow j). \quad (16)$$

4

Conclusion

In this contribution, we underline the importance of network metadata for adequately interpreting and manipulating probabilistic interaction data. The mathematical representation of probabilities and their statistical properties depend on the type of interactions (local or potential) and the conditions in which they were estimated. We showed that probabilistic local networks and metawebs differ in their relationship to spatial and temporal scales, with potential interactions remaining consistent across scales. In contrast with metawebs, local interactions are measured in a specific context (e.g., in a given area, time, and biological and environmental conditions) and depend on taxa co-occurrence. These important conceptual differences bring to light the need to use probabilistic data with caution, for instance when generating binary network realizations across space and predicting local networks from metawebs. Clear metadata describing the type of interaction and the variables used in their estimation are required to ensure adequate data manipulation. Better data practices and foundations for probabilistic thinking in network ecology could enable more reliable assessments of the spatiotemporal variability and uncertainty of biotic interactions.

It is essential to enhance our comprehension of both potential and local interactions, especially considering the current scarcity of interaction data. However, while sampling biological communities does decrease the uncertainty of interactions by accumulating evidence for their feasibility and local realization, there is a limit to how much we can diminish their inherent randomness. In metawebs, probabilities reflect our limited knowledge of interactions (i.e., our degree of belief that interactions are feasible), which is expected to improve with a larger volume of data. We should anticipate that potential interactions will become more definitive (with probabilities approaching 0 or 1) as we investigate various conditions, including different combinations of species traits. Conversely, in the case of local networks, which can be seen as random instances of metawebs, randomness cannot be as reduced. In local interactions, probabilities can be divided into a component representing uncertainty and another representing spatiotemporal variability. Owing to environmental heterogeneity, there will invariably be instances in which an interaction occurs and others in which it does not, across different times and locations, irrespective of the extent to which we can improve our knowledge of its biological feasibility and the local conditions that facilitate its occurrence. When local networks depict probabilities of observing interactions rather than just their actual occurrence, we must also consider the observation variability as an additional source of randomness. Every ecological process is stochastic but there is also a possibility that a phenomenon goes undetected. Quantifying and partitioning this stochasticity will enable us to make more accurate predictions about ecological interactions at various spatial and temporal scales.

5

Acknowledgment

We acknowledge that this study was conducted on land within the traditional unceded territory of the Saint Lawrence Iroquoian, Anishinabewaki, Mohawk, Huron-Wendat, and Omàmiwininiwak nations. This work was supported by the Institute for Data Valorisation (IVADO) and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Collaborative Research and Training Experience (CREATE) program, through the Computational Biodiversity Science and Services (BIOS²) program. A special thanks to all members of the Black Holes and Revelations working group (organized by BIOS²) for their insightful discussions and valuable feedback on this manuscript.

References

- Andrade-Pacheco, R., Rerolle, F., Lemoine, J., Hernandez, L., Meité, A., Juziwelo, L., et al. (2020). [Finding hotspots: Development of an adaptive spatial sampling approach](#). *Scientific Reports*, 10, 10939.
- Angilletta, M.J., Jr., Steury, T.D. & Sears, M.W. (2004). [Temperature, Growth Rate, and Body Size in Ectotherms: Fitting Pieces of a Life-History Puzzle](#). *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 44, 498–509.
- Araujo, M.B., Rozenfeld, A., Rahbek, C. & Marquet, P.A. (2011). [Using species co-occurrence networks to assess the impacts of climate change](#). *Ecography*, 34, 897–908.
- Bartomeus, I., Gravel, D., Tylianakis, J.M., Aizen, M.A., Dickie, I.A. & Bernard-Verdier, M. (2016). [A common framework for identifying linkage rules across different types of interactions](#). *Functional Ecology*, 30, 1894–1903.
- Bascompte, J., Jordano, P., Melián, C.J. & Olesen, J.M. (2003). [The nested assembly of plant-animal mutualistic networks](#). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 9383–9387.
- Berlow, E.L., Neutel, A.-M., Cohen, J.E., De Ruiter, P.C., Ebenman, B., Emmerson, M., et al. (2004). [Interaction strengths in food webs: Issues and opportunities](#). *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 73, 585–598.
- Blanchet, F.G., Cazelles, K. & Gravel, D. (2020). [Co-occurrence is not evidence of ecological interactions](#). *Ecology Letters*, 23, 1050–1063.
- Bohan, D.A., Vacher, C., Tamaddoni-Nezhad, A., Raybould, A., Dumbrell, A.J. & Woodward, G. (2017). [Next-Generation Global Biomonitoring: Large-scale, Automated Reconstruction of Ecological Networks](#). *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 32, 477–487.
- Bolnick, D.I., Amarasekare, P., Araújo, M.S., Bürger, R., Levine, J.M., Novak, M., et al. (2011). [Why intraspecific trait variation matters in community ecology](#). *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 26, 183–192.
- Borrett, S.R. & Scharler, U.M. (2019). [Walk partitions of flow in Ecological Network Analysis: Review and synthesis of methods and indicators](#). *Ecological Indicators*, 106, 105451.
- Boulangeat, I., Gravel, D. & Thuiller, W. (2012). [Accounting for dispersal and biotic interactions to disentangle the drivers of species distributions and their abundances](#). *Ecology Letters*, 15, 584–593.
- Brimacombe, C., Bodner, K., Michalska-Smith, M., Poisot, T. & Fortin, M.-J. (2023). [Shortcomings of reusing species interaction networks created by different sets of researchers](#). *PLOS Biology*, 21, e3002068.
- Brose, U., Ostling, A., Harrison, K. & Martinez, N.D. (2004). [Unified spatial scaling of species and their trophic interactions](#). *Nature*, 428, 167–171.
- Canard, E., Mouquet, N., Marescot, L., Gaston, K.J., Gravel, D. & Mouillot, D. (2012). [Emergence of Structural Patterns in Neutral Trophic Networks](#). *PLOS ONE*, 7, e38295.
- Catchen, M.D., Poisot, T., Pollock, L.J. & Gonzalez, A. (2023). [The missing link: Discerning true from false negatives when sampling species interaction networks](#).
- Cazelles, K., Araujo, M.B., Mouquet, N. & Gravel, D. (2016). [A theory for species co-occurrence in interaction networks](#). *Theoretical Ecology*, 9, 39–48.
- Chagnon, P.-L. (2015). [Characterizing topology of ecological networks along gradients: The limits of metrics' standardization](#). *Ecological Complexity*, 22, 36–39.
- Choh, Y., Ignacio, M., Sabelis, M.W. & Janssen, A. (2012). [Predator-prey role reversals, juvenile experience and adult antipredator behaviour](#). *Scientific Reports*, 2, 728.
- Cirtwill, A.R., Eklöf, A., Roslin, T., Wootton, K. & Gravel, D. (2019). [A quantitative framework for investigating the reliability of empirical network construction](#). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 902–911.
- Dunne, J.A. (2006). The Network Structure of Food Webs. In: *Ecological networks: Linking structure and dynamics* (eds. Dunne, J.A. & Pascual, M.). Oxford University Press, pp. 27–86.
- Elmasri, M., Farrell, M.J., Davies, T.J. & Stephens, D.A. (2020). [A hierarchical Bayesian model for predicting ecological interactions using scaled evolutionary relationships](#). *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 14, 221–240.

- Elton, C.S. (2001). *Animal Ecology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Emmerson, M.C. & Raffaelli, D. (2004). Predator-prey body size, interaction strength and the stability of a real food web. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 73, 399–409.
- Fortuna, M.A. & Bascompte, J. (2006). Habitat loss and the structure of plant-animal mutualistic networks. *Ecology Letters*, 9, 281–286.
- Galiana, N., Lurgi, M., Claramunt-López, B., Fortin, M.-J., Leroux, S., Cazelles, K., et al. (2018). The spatial scaling of species interaction networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2, 782–790.
- Gilman, S.E., Urban, M.C., Tewksbury, J., Gilchrist, G.W. & Holt, R.D. (2010). A framework for community interactions under climate change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 25, 325–331.
- Godsoe, W., Murray, R. & Iritani, R. (2022). Species interactions and diversity: A unified framework using Hill numbers. *Oikos*, n/a, e09282.
- Golubski, A.J. & Abrams, P.A. (2011). Modifying modifiers: What happens when interspecific interactions interact? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 80, 1097–1108.
- Gomez, J.M., Verdu, M. & Perfectti, F. (2010). Ecological interactions are evolutionarily conserved across the entire tree of life. *Nature*, 465, 918–U6.
- Gonzalez-Varo, J.P. & Traveset, A. (2016). The Labile Limits of Forbidden Interactions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 31, 700–710.
- Gravel, D., Baiser, B., Dunne, J.A., Kopelke, J.-P., Martinez, N.D., Nyman, T., et al. (2019). Bringing Elton and Grinnell together: A quantitative framework to represent the biogeography of ecological interaction networks. *Ecography*, 42, 401–415.
- Gravel, D., Poisot, T., Albouy, C., Velez, L. & Mouillot, D. (2013). Inferring food web structure from predator-prey body size relationships. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 1083–1090.
- Guimarães, P.R. (2020). The Structure of Ecological Networks Across Levels of Organization. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 51, 433–460.
- Guimerà, R. & Sales-Pardo, M. (2009). Missing and spurious interactions and the reconstruction of complex networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106, 22073–22078.
- Hemprich-Bennett, D.R., Oliveira, H.F.M., Le Comber, S.C., Rossiter, S.J. & Clare, E.L. (2021). Assessing the impact of taxon resolution on network structure. *Ecology*, 102, e03256.
- Herrera, C.M. (1989). Pollinator abundance, morphology, and flower visitation rate: Analysis of the “quantity” component in a plant-pollinator system. *Oecologia*, 80, 241–248.
- Hortal, J., de Bello, F., Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Lewinsohn, T.M., Lobo, J.M. & Ladle, R.J. (2015). Seven Shortfalls that Beset Large-Scale Knowledge of Biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 46, 523–549.
- Jordano, P. (1987). Patterns of Mutualistic Interactions in Pollination and Seed Dispersal: Connectance, Dependence Asymmetries, and Coevolution. *The American Naturalist*, 129, 657–677.
- Jordano, P. (2016). Sampling networks of ecological interactions. *Functional Ecology*, 30, 1883–1893.
- Jordano, P., Bascompte, J. & Olesen, J.M. (2003). Invariant properties in coevolutionary networks of plant-animal interactions. *Ecology Letters*, 6, 69–81.
- Kéfi, S., Berlow, E.L., Wieters, E.A., Joppa, L.N., Wood, S.A., Brose, U., et al. (2015). Network structure beyond food webs: Mapping non-trophic and trophic interactions on Chilean rocky shores. *Ecology*, 96, 291–303.
- Kéfi, S., Berlow, E.L., Wieters, E.A., Navarrete, S.A., Petchey, O.L., Wood, S.A., et al. (2012). More than a meal... integrating non-feeding interactions into food webs. *Ecology Letters*, 15, 291–300.
- Kéfi, S., Miele, V., Wieters, E.A., Navarrete, S.A. & Berlow, E.L. (2016). How Structured Is the Entangled Bank? The Surprisingly Simple Organization of Multiplex Ecological Networks Leads to Increased Persistence and Resilience. *PLOS Biology*, 14, e1002527.
- Klecka, J. & Boukal, D.S. (2014). The effect of habitat structure on prey mortality depends on predator and prey microhabitat use. *Oecologia*, 176, 183–191.

- Kopelke, J.-P., Nyman, T., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., Vissault, S. & Roslin, T. (2017). Food-web structure of willow-galling sawflies and their natural enemies across Europe. *Ecology*, 98, 1730–1730.
- Kulkarni, M.A., Kweka, E., Nyale, E., Lyatuu, E., Mosha, F.W., Chandramohan, D., et al. (2006). Entomological Evaluation of Malaria Vectors at Different Altitudes in Hai District, Northeastern Tanzania. *Journal of Medical Entomology*, 43, 580–588.
- McCann, K. (2007). Protecting biostructure. *Nature*, 446, 29–29.
- McCann, K.S. (2011). Food webs (MPB-50). In: *Food Webs (MPB-50)*. Princeton University Press.
- McLeod, A., Leroux, S.J., Gravel, D., Chu, C., Cirtwill, A.R., Fortin, M.-J., et al. (2021a). Sampling and asymptotic network properties of spatial multi-trophic networks. *Oikos*, 130, 2250–2259.
- McLeod, A., Leroux, S.J., Gravel, D., Chu, C., Cirtwill, A.R., Fortin, M.-J., et al. (2021b). Sampling and asymptotic network properties of spatial multi-trophic networks. *Oikos*, n/a.
- McLeod, A.M., Leroux, S.J. & Chu, C. (2020). Effects of species traits, motif profiles, and environment on spatial variation in multi-trophic antagonistic networks. *Ecosphere*, 11, e03018.
- Melián, C.J., Vilas, C., Baldó, F., González-Ortegón, E., Drake, P. & Williams, R.J. (2011). Eco-evolutionary Dynamics of Individual-Based Food Webs. In: *Advances in Ecological Research*, The Role of Body Size in Multispecies Systems (ed. Belgrano, A.). Academic Press, pp. 225–268.
- Ohlmann, M., Miele, V., Dray, S., Chalmandrier, L., O'Connor, L. & Thuiller, W. (2019). Diversity indices for ecological networks: A unifying framework using Hill numbers. *Ecology Letters*, 22, 737–747.
- Olesen, J.M., Bascompte, J., Dupont, Y.L., Elberling, H., Rasmussen, C. & Jordano, P. (2010). Missing and forbidden links in mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278, 725–732.
- Pascual, M., Dunne, J.A. & Dunne, J.A. (2006). *Ecological Networks: Linking Structure to Dynamics in Food Webs*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Petchey, O.L., Beckerman, A.P., Riede, J.O. & Warren, P.H. (2008). Size, foraging, and food web structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105, 4191–4196.
- Pilosof, S., Porter, M.A., Pascual, M. & Kéfi, S. (2017). The multilayer nature of ecological networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1, 1–9.
- Poisot, T., Canard, E., Mouillot, D., Mouquet, N. & Gravel, D. (2012). The dissimilarity of species interaction networks. *Ecology Letters*, 15, 1353–1361.
- Poisot, T., Cirtwill, A.R., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., Fortin, M.-J. & Stouffer, D.B. (2016). The structure of probabilistic networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 303–312.
- Poisot, T. & Gravel, D. (2014). When is an ecological network complex? Connectance drives degree distribution and emerging network properties. *PeerJ*, 2, e251.
- Poisot, T., Stouffer, D.B. & Gravel, D. (2015). Beyond species: Why ecological interaction networks vary through space and time. *Oikos*, 124, 243–251.
- Pollock, L.J., Tingley, R., Morris, W.K., Golding, N., O'Hara, R.B., Parris, K.M., et al. (2014). Understanding co-occurrence by modelling species simultaneously with a Joint Species Distribution Model (JSDM). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 5, 397–406.
- Pomeranz, J.P.F., Thompson, R.M., Poisot, T. & Harding, J.S. (2019). Inferring predator-prey interactions in food webs. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 356–367.
- Pringle, R.M. & Hutchinson, M.C. (2020). Resolving Food-Web Structure. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 51, 55–80.
- Proulx, S.R., Promislow, D.E.L. & Phillips, P.C. (2005). Network thinking in ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, SPECIAL ISSUE: BUMPER BOOK REVIEW, 20, 345–353.
- Pulliam, H.R. (1974). On the Theory of Optimal Diets. *The American Naturalist*, 108, 59–74.
- Rooney, N. & McCann, K.S. (2012). Integrating food web diversity, structure and stability. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 27, 40–46.
- Salim, J.A., Saraiva, A.M., Zermoglio, P.F., Agostini, K., Wolowski, M., Drucker, D.P., et al. (2022). Data standardization of plant-pollinator interactions. *GigaScience*, 11, giac043.

- Saravia, L.A., Marina, T.I., Kristensen, N.P., De Troch, M. & Momo, F.R. (2022). Ecological network assembly: How the regional metaweb influences local food webs. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 91, 630–642.
- Schmeller, D.S., Julliard, R., Bellingham, P.J., Böhm, M., Brummitt, N., Chiarucci, A., et al. (2015). Towards a global terrestrial species monitoring program. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 25, 51–57.
- Singer, M.C. & McBride, C.S. (2012). Geographic mosaics of species' association: A definition and an example driven by plant-insect phenological synchrony. *Ecology*, 93, 2658–2673.
- Stouffer, D.B., Rezende, E.L. & Amaral, L.A.N. (2011). The role of body mass in diet contiguity and food-web structure. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 80, 632–639.
- Strydom, T., Bouskila, S., Banville, F., Barros, C., Caron, D., Farrell, M.J., et al. (2022). Food web reconstruction through phylogenetic transfer of low-rank network representation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 13.
- Strydom, T., Catchen, M.D., Banville, F., Caron, D., Dansereau, G., Desjardins-Proulx, P., et al. (2021). A roadmap towards predicting species interaction networks (across space and time). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences*, 376, 20210063.
- Tylianakis, J.M., Tscharntke, T. & Lewis, O.T. (2007). Habitat modification alters the structure of tropical host-parasitoid food webs. *Nature*, 445, 202–205.
- Vázquez, D.P., Peralta, G., Cagnolo, L., Santos, M. & Igual, E. autores contribuyeron por. (2022). Ecological interaction networks. What we know, what we don't, and why it matters. *Ecología Austral*, 32, 670–697.
- Weinstein, B.G. & Graham, C.H. (2017a). On comparing traits and abundance for predicting species interactions with imperfect detection. *Food Webs*, 11, 17–25.
- Weinstein, B.G. & Graham, C.H. (2017b). Persistent bill and corolla matching despite shifting temporal resources in tropical hummingbird-plant interactions. *Ecology Letters*, 20, 326–335.
- Wood, S.A., Russell, R., Hanson, D., Williams, R.J. & Dunne, J.A. (2015). Effects of spatial scale of sampling on food web structure. *Ecology and Evolution*, 5, 3769–3782.
- Woodward, G., Benstead, J.P., Beveridge, O.S., Blanchard, J., Brey, T., Brown, L.E., et al. (2010). Chapter 2 - Ecological Networks in a Changing Climate. In: *Advances in Ecological Research*, Ecological Networks (ed. Woodward, G.). Academic Press, pp. 71–138.
- Woodward, G., Brown, L.E., Edwards, F.K., Hudson, L.N., Milner, A.M., Reuman, D.C., et al. (2012). Climate change impacts in multispecies systems: Drought alters food web size structure in a field experiment. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367, 2990–2997.