

# 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

Community ecologists are increasingly thinking probabilistically when it comes to food webs and other ecological networks. Assuredly, the benefits of representing ecological interactions as probabilistic events (e.g., how likely are species to interact?) instead of binary objects (e.g., do species interact?) are numerous, from a better assessment of the spatiotemporal variation of trophic interactions to an increase capacity to reconstruct networks from sparse data. However, probabilities need to be used with caution when working with species interactions. Indeed, depending on the system at hand and the method used to build probabilistic networks, probabilities can have different interpretations that imply different ways to manipulate them. At the core of these differences lie the distinction between assessing the likelihood that two groups of individuals *can* interact and the likelihood that they *will* interact. This impacts the spatial, temporal, and taxonomic scaling of interaction probabilities, thus enlightening the need to properly define them in their ecological context. Published data on probabilistic species interactions are poorly documented in the literature, which impedes our ability to use them appropriately. With these challenges in mind, we propose a general approach to thinking about probabilities in regards to ecological interactions, with a strong focus on food webs, and call for better definitions and conceptualizations of probabilistic ecological networks, both at the local and regional scales.

This work is released by its authors under a CC-BY 4.0 license



Last revision: *March 21, 2023*

# 1 Introduction

2 Cataloging species interactions across space and time is a gargantuan task. At the core of this challenge lies the  
3 spatiotemporal variability of ecological networks (Poisot *et al.* 2012, 2015), which makes documenting the  
4 location and timing of interactions difficult. Indeed, it is not sufficient to know that two species have the  
5 biological capacity to interact to infer the realization of their interaction at a specific time and space (Dunne  
6 2006). Taking food webs as an example, a predator species and its potential prey must first co-occur in order for  
7 a trophic interaction to take place (Blanchet *et al.* 2020). They must then encounter, which is conditional on  
8 their relative abundances in the ecosystem and the matching of their phenology (Poisot *et al.* 2015). Finally, the  
9 interaction occurs only if the predators have a desire to consume their prey and are able to capture and ingest  
10 them (Pulliam 1974). Environmental (e.g. temperature and presence of shelters) and biological  
11 (e.g. physiological state of both species and availability of other prey species) factors contribute to this  
12 variability by impacting species co-occurrence (Araujo *et al.* 2011) and the realization of their interactions  
13 (Poisot *et al.* 2015). In this context, the development of computational methods in ecology can help alleviate  
14 the colossal sampling efforts required to document species interactions across time and space (Strydom *et al.*  
15 2021). Having a better portrait of species interactions and the emerging structure of their food webs is  
16 important since it lays the groundwork for understanding the functioning, dynamics, and resilience of  
17 ecosystems worldwide (e.g., Proulx *et al.* 2005; Pascual *et al.* 2006; Delmas *et al.* 2019).

18 The recognition of the intrinsic variability of species interactions and the emergence of numerical methods have  
19 led ecologists to rethink their representation of ecological networks to include a probabilistic view of species  
20 interactions (Poisot *et al.* 2016). This has several benefits. For example, probabilities represent the limit of our  
21 knowledge about species interactions and can inform us about the expected number of interactions and  
22 emerging network properties despite this limited knowledge (Poisot *et al.* 2016). They are also very helpful in  
23 predicting the spatial distribution of species within networks (Cazelles *et al.* 2016) and the temporal variability  
24 of interactions (Poisot *et al.* 2015), generating new ecological data (e.g., Strydom *et al.* 2022), and identifying  
25 priority sampling locations of species interactions (see Andrade-Pacheco *et al.* 2020 for an ecological example  
26 of a sampling optimization problem). Moreover, the high rate of false negatives in ecological network data,  
27 resulting from the difficulty of witnessing interactions between rare species, makes it hard to interpret  
28 non-observations of species interactions ecologically (Catchen *et al.* 2023). Using probabilities instead of  
29 Boolean interactions accounts for these observation errors; in that case, only forbidden interactions (Jordano *et*

30 *al.* 2003; Olesen *et al.* 2010) would have a probability value of zero (but see Gonzalez-Varo & Traveset 2016).  
31 Many measures have been developed to describe the structure (Poisot *et al.* 2016) and diversity (Ohlmann *et al.*  
32 2019; Godsoe *et al.* 2022) of probabilistic interactions, which shows the potential of this framework in the study  
33 of a variety of ecological phenomena.

34 However, representing species interactions probabilistically is challenging. Beyond methodological difficulties  
35 in estimating these numbers, there are important conceptual challenges in defining what we mean by  
36 “probability of interactions”. To the best of our knowledge, because the building blocks of this mathematical  
37 representation of food webs are still being laid, there is no clear definition found in the literature or data  
38 standard when it comes to publishing data on probabilistic interactions (see Salim *et al.* 2022 for a discussion  
39 on data standardization for mutualistic networks). This is worrisome, since working with probabilistic species  
40 interactions without clear guidelines could be misleading as much for field ecologists as for computational  
41 ecologists who use and generate these data. In this contribution, we outline different ways to define and  
42 interpret interactions probabilities in network ecology and propose an approach to thinking about them. These  
43 definitions mostly depend on the study system (e.g. local network or metaweb) and on the method used to  
44 generate them. We show that different definitions can have different ecological implications, especially  
45 regarding spatial, temporal, and taxonomic scaling. Although we will focus on food webs, our observations and  
46 advice can be applied to all types of ecological networks, from plant-pollinator to host-parasite networks.

47 Indeed, all ecological networks, whether they are unipartite or bipartite, share fundamental commonalities in  
48 their biological conceptualization and mathematical representation that support these comparisons (i.e., they all  
49 describe groups of individuals interacting with each other). Regardless of the study system, we argue that  
50 probabilities should be better documented, defined mathematically, and used with caution when describing  
51 species interactions.

## 52 **Definitions and interpretations**

### 53 **Food-web representations**

54 The basic unit of food webs and other ecological networks are individuals that interact with each others [e.g., by  
55 predation; Elton (2001)], forming individual-based networks. The aggregation of these individuals into more or  
56 less homogeneous groups (e.g., populations, species, trophic species, families) allows us to represent networks  
57 at broader taxonomic scales, which impacts our interpretation of the properties and behaviour of these systems

(Guimarães 2020). Nodes can thus designate distinct levels of organization, whereas edges linking these nodes can describe a variety of interaction measures. When using a Boolean representation of biotic interactions, the observation that one individual from group (or node)  $i$  interacts with another individual from group  $j$  is enough to set the interaction  $A_{i,j}$  to 1. This simplified representation of food webs is a highly valuable source of ecological information (Pascual *et al.* 2006) even though it overlooks important factors regarding interaction strengths. These, in turn, can be 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 can be used to estimate the average number of prey individuals consumed by the predators in a given time period (e.g., the average number of fish in the stomach of a piscivorous species). Interaction strengths can also be used as good estimators of the parameters describing species interactions in a Lotka-Volterra model (e.g., Emmerson & Raffaelli 2004). This extra amount of ecological information typically comes at a cost of greater sampling effort or data requirement in predictive models (Strydom *et al.* 2021), which can lead to high uncertainties when building these networks.

The uncertainty and spatiotemporal variability of both types of trophic interactions (Boolean and quantitative) can be represented probabilistically. On one hand, Boolean interactions follow a Bernoulli distribution  $A_{i,j} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ , with  $p$  being the probability of interactions. The only two possible outcomes are the presence ( $A_{i,j} = 1$ ) or absence ( $A_{i,j} = 0$ ) of an interaction between the two nodes. Quantitative interactions, on the other hand, can follow various probability distributions depending on the measure used. In this case, the event's outcome is the value of interaction strength. For instance, these interaction strengths can follow a Poisson distribution  $A_{i,j} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$  when predicting frequencies of interactions between pairs of nodes, with  $\lambda$  being the expected rate of interaction. Note that quantitative interactions can be converted to probabilistic interactions by normalizing. The definition and interpretation of parameters like  $p$  and  $\lambda$  are inextricably linked to environmental and biological factors such as species relative abundance, traits, area, and time, depending on the type of interaction. Because Boolean species interactions are much more documented in the literature, our primary focus in this contribution will be on addressing the challenges in defining and interpreting  $p$  for pairwise species interactions.

The first aspect to take into consideration when estimating or interpreting probabilities of interactions is knowing if they describe the likelihood of 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* 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). Here, we will use the terms *metaweb* to designate networks of potential interactions and *local networks* for those of realized interactions. Frequent confusion arises among ecologists over the use of these two terms, especially in a probabilistic context. Indeed, in many studies of probabilistic ecological networks, it remains unclear when authors describe potential or realized interactions, or when so-called probabilities are actually *interaction scores*. Likewise, probabilistic potential interactions are often used as realized interactions (and conversely), even when the type of interaction is clearly indicated. We believe that a better understanding of these differences and concepts would alleviate interpretation errors and help ecologists use these numbers more appropriately.

## Probabilistic metawebs

Metawebs are networks of potential interactions, representing the probability that two taxa can interact regardless of biological plasticity, environmental variability or co-occurrence. Instead of describing stochastic biological processes occurring in nature, probabilistic potential interactions can be thought of as a measure of imperfect knowledge about the capacity of two taxa to interact. They are the network analogue to the species pool, where local networks originate from a subset of both species (nodes) and interactions (edges). For this reason, they have been initially designed for broad spatial, temporal, and taxonomic scales (e.g, species food webs at the continental scale). However, in the next section, we argue that this concept can also be used at smaller scales, with similar ecological meaning.

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

$$P_M(i \rightarrow j), \quad (1)$$

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

Starting from a selected set of species, metawebs can be built using different data sources, including literature review, field work, and predictive models (e.g., the metaweb of Canadian mammals inferred by Strydom *et al.* 2022). Every pair of species that has been observed to interact at least once can be given a probability of interaction of 1; we know that they *can* interact. This means that rare interactions can technically be given high

114 probabilities in the metaweb. Unobserved interactions, on the other hand, are given lower probabilities, going as  
115 low as 0 for forbidden links. Two important nuances must however be made here. Because of observation errors  
116 due to taxonomic misidentifications and ecological misinterpretations [e.g., due to cryptic species and  
117 interactions; Pringle & Hutchinson (2020)], many observations of interactions are actually false positives.  
118 Similarly, forbidden interactions can be false negatives if e.g. they have been assessed for specific phenotypes,  
119 locations or time. Implementing a Bayesian framework, which updates prior probabilities of interactions with  
120 empirical data, could lessen these errors.

## 121 **Probabilistic local networks**

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

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

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

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 1 about here]. Articles using probabilistic interactions and the definitions and variables they considered.

## Applications of probabilistic interactions data

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

### Sampling random draws from probabilistic food webs

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



192 local networks stands even when considering these factors. This difference in sampling further sheds light on  
193 the importance of clearly defining interaction probabilities. What we consider as a *Bernoulli trial*, when  
194 randomly drawing deterministic networks from probabilistic food webs, depends on our biological  
195 interpretation of these probabilities.

## 196 **Describing the spatial and temporal scaling of probabilistic interactions**

197 Metawebs and local networks intrinsically differ in their relation to scale. On one hand, as mentioned above,  
198 probabilistic metawebs are context independent, i.e., probabilistic pairwise interactions do not scale with space  
199 and time because they depend solely on the biological capacity of the two taxa to interact. This implies that the  
200 estimated likelihood that two species can potentially interact should be the same among all metawebs in which  
201 they are present. In practice, this is rarely the case because ecologists use different methods and data to estimate  
202 these probabilities of interactions (e.g., different sampling area and time period). However, in the case where  
203 local metawebs  $M_{x,y}$  are subsampled from their regional counterpart  $M_0$ , we should expect edge values to be  
204 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  
205 hand, local probabilistic networks are indissociable from their spatial and temporal contexts because there are  
206 more opportunities of interactions (e.g., more individuals, more trait variations, more chance of encounter) in a  
207 larger area and longer time period (McLeod *et al.* 2020). Let  $N_0$  be a local probabilistic food web delineated in  
208 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  
209 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  
210 local food webs could be manifested through the effect of sampling effort on the observation of interactions  
211 (Jordano 2016; McLeod *et al.* 2021) or of time itself on their realization (Poisot *et al.* 2012). There are many  
212 network-area relationships (e.g., Wood *et al.* 2015; Galiana *et al.* 2018) and interaction accumulation curves  
213 (e.g, Jordano 2016) explored in the literature. These could inspire the development and testing of different  
214 equations describing the spatiotemporal scaling of probabilistic pairwise interactions in local networks, which  
215 are over the scope of this manuscript.

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

## Making probabilistic interactions spatiotemporally explicit

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)).

## Exploring different taxonomic resolutions

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

246 networks, the probability that two individuals interact could represent the degree of belief that one will actually  
247 consume the other. In species-based networks, the probability that two species interact could rather represent  
248 the degree of belief that *at least* one individual from the predator species will eat *at least* another individual  
249 from the prey species. This distinction in interpretation impacts the way probability values change with  
250 taxonomic scale.

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

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

## 268 Conclusion

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

274 local food webs.

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

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

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

## Acknowledgement

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 (BIOS<sup>2</sup>) program. A special thank to all members of the Black Holes and Revelations working group (organized by BIOS<sup>2</sup>) 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.
- 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.
- 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., Tamaddon-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.
- 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.
- Canard, E.F., Mouquet, N., Mouillot, D., Stanko, M., Miklisova, D. & Gravel, D. (2014). [Empirical Evaluation of Neutral Interactions in Host-Parasite Networks](#). *The American Naturalist*, 183, 468–479.
- 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.

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

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

332 Delmas, E., Besson, M., Brice, M.-H., Burkle, L.A., Dalla Riva, G.V., Fortin, M.-J., *et al.* (2019). [Analysing](#)  
 333 [ecological networks of species interactions](#). *Biological Reviews*, 94, 16–36.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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.

Salim, J.A., Saraiva, A.M., Zermoglio, P.F., Agostini, K., Wolowski, M., Drucker, D.P., *et al.* (2022). [Data standardization of plantpollinator 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.

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.

- 382 Vázquez, D.P., Peralta, G., Cagnolo, L., Santos, M. & Igual, E. autores contribuyeron por. (2022). [Ecological](#)  
383 [interaction networks. What we know, what we don't, and why it matters.](#) *Ecología Austral*, 32, 670–697.
- 384 Wood, S.A., Russell, R., Hanson, D., Williams, R.J. & Dunne, J.A. (2015). [Effects of spatial scale of sampling](#)  
385 [on food web structure.](#) *Ecology and Evolution*, 5, 3769–3782.