

Introduction

- definition
- domains + questions

Invariants in ecological networks

One striking particularity of ecological networks is their consistency: even though they depict interactions between different organisms across all sorts of ecosystems, they all tend to look the same (Jordano et al., 2003). Remarkably, even when interactions among species themselves vary (see section **x**), the overall network structure tends to remain unchanged (Kemp et al., 2017). Most ecological networks have a very specific degree distribution (Williams, 2011), whereby most species have a small number of interactions, and a small proportions of species have a large number of interactions. In food webs, which represent interactions between preys and their predators, there is a well-described relationship between the number of species and the number of interactions: the number of interactions (L) increases proportionally to the number of species (S) raised to some exponent, or $L \propto S^k$. Martinez (1992) suggested that this exponent is approximately equal to 2, *i.e.* the number of interactions is proportional to the squared number of species. Brose et al. (2004) show that this general relationship holds even across space: it is possible to estimate how many interactions a species will establish across its entire range. In some other instances, networks may differ on some aspect of their structure, despite obeying to a shared underlying principle. For example, Fortuna et al. (2010) show that in networks with a low connectance, nestedness (the degree to which the diet of specialists and generalists overlaps) and modularity (the tendency of species to form densely aggregated clusters) are positively correlated. In networks with higher connectance, this became the opposite: networks with a large number of interactions were either nested (and not modular) or modular (and not nested). In the recent years, it emerged that many aspects of network structure covary with connectance (Chagnon, 2015; Poisot and Gravel, 2014): this suggests that simply knowing how many species there are, and how many interactions they establish, is already very informative about the network structure.

- motifs **ED**
- evo/phylogenetic structure **MB**
 - Eklöf et al. (2012) => network structure effect on evolutionary history

From structure to properties

- perturbations/extinctions **MB**
- BEF **ED**

- stability **MB**
 - Jacquet et al. (2016)

Linking interactions to ecological mechanisms

It is worth remembering that ecological interactions are the direct expression of ecological mechanisms. A pollinator is able to effectively reach the nectar in a plant because the traits of the two organisms match, because they have compatible phenologies, and because they occur in the same environment. A virus can infect its host because it is able to attach to the cell surface, effectively penetrate it, and hijack the cellular machinery to its benefit. Interactions that are not allowed because trait values do not match have been called “forbidden links” (Olesen et al., 2011). This prompted a search for “linkage rules” (Bartomeus, 2013) in ecological networks, *i.e.* the relationships that must exist between traits borne by two organisms in order for an interaction between them to exist. These can be identified from existing data on traits and interactions (Bartomeus et al., 2016), and then used to generate realistic ecological networks (Crea et al., 2015). González-Varo and Traveset (2016) point out that interactions are happening between individuals: this requires to consider how the traits are distributed at the individual scale, but also how different behaviors may allow organisms to overcome some of the forbidden links. Although traits are an important part of what makes interactions happen, they are only relevant insofar as the organisms are able to encounter one another. The importance of neutral dynamics (*i.e.* how abundances of different species can determine the probability that they can interact, based on how often they would bump into one another by chance) is, somewhat counter-intuitively, great. Canard et al. (2012) reveals that simulating food web dynamics by using only population abundances to predict interactions yields realistic food webs. In a host-parasite system, local abundances has also been identified as a key predictor of species interactions (Canard et al., 2014). Speaking more broadly, because interactions emerge from all of these ecological mechanisms, there is a need to develop a deeper understanding of them (Poisot et al., 2015). Beyond the fundamental advance that this represents, this would allow to predict interactions based on external information (Morales-Castilla et al., 2015).

- interactions => populations and biomass dynamics **ED**

Ecological networks are also spatially and temporally variable (Trøjelsgaard and Olesen, 2016). There are two drivers to this variability: changes in species composition, and changes in the way these species interact (Poisot et al., 2012). Changes in species alone are able to generate variation in network properties (Havens, 1992). Spatial variation in network structure can also reflect deep-time constraints; for example, Dalsgaard et al. (2013) reveal that historical climate change trends have a signature on the nestedness and modularity of pollination networks. Even when the same species are present, interactions between them

can vary. Carstensen et al. (2014) and Trøjelsgaard et al. (2015) investigated this phenomenon in mutualistic networks. Interaction turnover results from variations in partner fidelity (some species pairs are extremely closely associated), but also from variations in the local environment in which the species interact. Interestingly, and as mentioned in section **x**, networks overwhelmingly tend to conserve their structure even when interactions within them change. Díaz-Castelazo et al. (2010) surveyed a pollination network over 10 years, and found important species turnover during this period. Nevertheless, the network retained its structure because species were replaced by their functional equivalent; a generalist pollinator often succeeded to another generalist pollinator. Conversely, species tend to retain their role in different communities: Baker et al. (2015) show that species keep occupying the same position in the network across space, regardless of the species they interact with at every location.

Other uses of networks in ecology

- epidemiology **TP**
- animal societies
- landscape connectivity **TP**

Conclusion

References

- Jordano P, Bascompte J, Olesen JM. Invariant properties in coevolutionary networks of plant–animal interactions. *Ecology Letters* 2003;6:69–81. doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2003.00403.x.
- Kemp JE, Evans DM, Augustyn WJ, Ellis AG. Invariant antagonistic network structure despite high spatial and temporal turnover of interactions. *Ecography* 2017;n/a–a. doi:10.1111/ecog.02150.
- Williams RJ. Biology, Methodology or Chance? The Degree Distributions of Bipartite Ecological Networks. *PLoS One* 2011;6:e17645. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0017645.
- Martinez ND. Constant Connectance in Community Food Webs. *The American Naturalist* 1992;139:1208–18.
- Brose U, Ostling A, Harrison K, Martinez ND. Unified spatial scaling of species and their trophic interactions. *Nature* 2004;428:167–71. doi:10.1038/nature02297.
- Fortuna MA, Stouffer DB, Olesen JM, Jordano P, Mouillot D, Krasnov BR, et al.

- Nestedness versus modularity in ecological networks: two sides of the same coin? *Journal of Animal Ecology* 2010;79:811–7. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2010.01688.x.
- Chagnon P-L. Characterizing topology of ecological networks along gradients: the limits of metrics’ standardization. *Ecological Complexity* 2015;22:36–9.
- Poisot T, Gravel D. When is an ecological network complex? Connectance drives degree distribution and emerging network properties. *PeerJ* 2014;2:e251. doi:10.7717/peerj.251.
- Eklöf A, Helmus MR, Moore M, Allesina S. Relevance of evolutionary history for food web structure. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 2012;279:1588–96. doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.2149.
- Jacquet C, Moritz C, Morissette L, Legagneux P, Massol F, Archambault P, et al. No complexity–stability relationship in empirical ecosystems. *Nature Communications* 2016;7:12573. doi:10.1038/ncomms12573.
- Olesen JM, Bascompte J, Dupont YL, Elberling H, Rasmussen C, Jordano P. Missing and forbidden links in mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 2011;278:725–32.
- Bartomeus I. Understanding linkage rules in plant-pollinator networks by using hierarchical models that incorporate pollinator detectability and plant traits. *PloS One* 2013;8:e69200.
- Bartomeus I, Gravel D, Tylianakis JM, Aizen MA, Dickie IA, Bernard-Verdier M. A common framework for identifying linkage rules across different types of interactions. *Functional Ecology* 2016;30:1894–903.
- Crea C, Ali RA, Rader R. A new model for ecological networks using species-level traits. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 2015.
- González-Varo JP, Traveset A. The Labile Limits of Forbidden Interactions. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 2016;31:700–10. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2016.06.009.
- Canard E, Mouquet N, Marescot L, Gaston KJ, Gravel D, Mouillot D. Emergence of Structural Patterns in Neutral Trophic Networks. *PLOS ONE* 2012;7:e38295. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0038295.
- Canard EF, Mouquet N, Mouillot D, Stanko M, Miklisova D, Gravel D. Empirical evaluation of neutral interactions in host-parasite networks. *Am Nat* 2014;183:468–79. doi:10.1086/675363.
- Poisot T, Stouffer DB, Gravel D. Beyond species: why ecological interaction networks vary through space and time. *Oikos* 2015;124:243–51. doi:10.1111/oik.01719.
- Morales-Castilla I, Matias MG, Gravel D, Araújo MB. Inferring biotic interactions from proxies. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 2015;30:347–56. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2015.03.014.
- Trøjelsgaard K, Olesen JM. Ecological networks in motion: micro- and macro-

- scopic variability across scales. *Funct Ecol* 2016;30:1926–35. doi:10.1111/1365-2435.12710.
- Poisot T, Canard E, Mouillot D, Mouquet N, Gravel D. The dissimilarity of species interaction networks. *Ecol Lett* 2012;15:1353–61. doi:10.1111/ele.12002.
- Havens K. Scale and structure in natural food webs. *Science* 1992;257:1107–9. doi:10.1126/science.257.5073.1107.
- Dalsgaard B, Trøjelsgaard K, Martín González AM, Nogués-Bravo D, Ollerton J, Petanidou T, et al. Historical climate-change influences modularity and nestedness of pollination networks. *Ecography* 2013;36:1331–40. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.2013.00201.x.
- Carstensen DW, Sabatino M, Trøjelsgaard K, Morellato LPC. Beta Diversity of Plant-Pollinator Networks and the Spatial Turnover of Pairwise Interactions. *PLoS ONE* 2014;9:e112903. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0112903.
- Trøjelsgaard K, Jordano P, Carstensen DW, Olesen JM. Geographical variation in mutualistic networks: similarity, turnover and partner fidelity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 2015;282:20142925–5. doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2925.
- Díaz-Castelazo C, Guimarães PR, Jordano P, Thompson JN, Marquis RJ, Rico-Gray V. Changes of a mutualistic network over time: reanalysis over a 10-year period. *Ecology* 2010;91:793–801.
- Baker NJ, Kaartinen R, Roslin T, Stouffer DB. Species’ roles in food webs show fidelity across a highly variable oak forest. *Ecography* 2015;38:130–9. doi:10.1111/ecog.00913.