

Dissimilarity of species interaction networks: quantifying the effect of turnover and rewiring

Timothée Poisot^{1,2,‡}

¹ Université de Montréal ² Québec Centre for Biodiversity Sciences

‡ These authors contributed equally to the work

Correspondance to:

Timothée Poisot — timothee.poisot@umontreal.ca

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



Last revision: *September 29, 2021*

Despite having established its usefulness in the last ten years, the decomposition of ecological networks in components allowing to measure their β -diversity retains some methodological ambiguities. Notably, how to quantify the relative effect of mechanisms tied to interaction rewiring vs. species turnover has been interpreted differently by different authors. In this contribution, I present mathematical arguments and numerical experiments that should (i) establish that the decomposition of networks as it is currently done is indeed fit for purpose, and (ii) provide guidelines to interpret the values of the components tied to turnover and rewiring.

1 Ecological networks are variable both in time and space (Poisot *et al.* 2015; Trøjelsgaard & Olesen 2016) -
2 this variability motivated the emergence of methodology to compare ecological networks, including in a
3 way that meshes with the core concept for the comparison of ecological communities, namely β -diversity
4 (Poisot *et al.* 2012). The need to understand network variability through partitioning in components
5 equivalent to α , β , and γ diversities is motivated by the prospect to further integrate the analysis of species
6 interactions to the analysis of species compositions. Because species that make up the networks do not
7 react to their environment in the same way, and because interactions are only expressed in subsets of the
8 environments in which species co-occur, the β -diversity of networks may behave in complex ways, and its
9 quantification is likely to be ecologically informative.

10 Poisot *et al.* (2012) and Canard *et al.* (2014) have suggested an approach to β -diversity for ecological
11 networks which is based on the comparison of the number of shared and unique links among species
12 within a pair of networks. Their approach differentiates this sharing of links between those established
13 between species occurring in both networks, and those established with at least one unique species. This
14 framework is expressed as the decomposition $\beta_{wn} = \beta_{os} + \beta_{st}$, namely the fact that network dissimilarity
15 (β_{wn}) has a component that can be calculated directly from the dissimilarity of interactions between
16 shared species (β_{os}), and a component that cannot (β_{st}). Presumably, the value of these components for a
17 pair of networks can generate insights about the mechanisms involved in dissimilarity.

18 This approach has been widely adopted since its publication, with recent examples using it to understand
19 the effect of fire on pollination systems (Baronio *et al.* 2021); the impact of rewiring on spatio-temporal
20 network dynamics (Campos-Moreno *et al.* 2021); the effects of farming on rural and urban landscapes on
21 species interactions (Olsson *et al.* 2021); the impact of environment gradients on multi-trophic
22 metacommunities (Ohlmann2018MapImp?); and as a tool to estimate the sampling completeness of
23 networks (Souza *et al.* 2021). It has, similarly, received a number of extensions, including the ability to
24 account for interaction strength (Magrach *et al.* 2017), the ability to handle probabilistic ecological
25 networks (Poisot *et al.* 2016), and the integration into the Local Contribution to Beta Diversity (Legendre
26 & De Cáceres 2013) approach to understand how environment changes drive network dissimilarity (Poisot
27 *et al.* 2017).

28 Yet, the precise meaning of β_{st} , namely the importance of species turnover in the overall dissimilarity, has
29 been difficult to capture, and a source of confusion for some practitioners. This is not particularly
30 surprising, as this component of the decomposition responds to unique species introducing their unique

31 interactions both between themselves, and with species that are common to both networks. For this
32 reason, it is important to come up with guidelines for the interpretation of this measure, and how to use it
33 to extract ecological insights.

34 Furthermore, much like the definition of β -diversity in all its forms is a contentious topic amongst
35 community ecologists (see *e.g.* Tuomisto 2010), the β -diversity of networks has been submitted to
36 methodological scrutiny over the years. A synthesis of some criticisms, related to the correct denominator
37 to use to express the proportion of different links, has recently been published (Fründ 2021). It argues that
38 the calculation of network dissimilarity terms as originally outlined by Poisot *et al.* (2012) is incorrect, as it
39 can lead to over-estimating the role of interactions between shared species in a network (“rewiring”), and
40 therefore underestimate the importance of species turnover across networks. As mist-understanding
41 either of these quantities can lead to biased inferences about the mechanisms generating network
42 dissimilarity, it is important to assess how the values (notably of β_{os} , and therefore of β_{st}) react to
43 methodological choices.

44 Here, I present a mathematical analysis of the Poisot *et al.* (2012) method, explain how information about
45 species turnover and link rewiring can be extracted from its decomposition, and conduct numerical
46 experiments to guide the interpretation of the β -diversity values thus obtained (with a specific focus on
47 β_{st}). These numerical experiments establish three core facts. First, the decomposition adequately captures
48 the relative roles of species turnover and interaction rewiring; second, the decomposition responds to
49 differences in network structure (like connectance) as expected; finally, the decomposition more
50 accurately captures rewiring than the proposed alternative using a different denominator put forth by
51 Fründ (2021).

52 **Partitioning network dissimilarity**

53 The approach to quantifying the difference between pairs of networks established in Poisot *et al.* (2012) is
54 a simple extension of the overall method by Koleff *et al.* (2003) for species dissimilarity based on
55 presence-absence data. The objects to compare, X_1 and X_2 , are partitioned into three values,
56 $a = |X_1 \cup X_2|$, $b = |X_2 \setminus X_1|$, and $c = |X_1 \setminus X_2|$, where $|x|$ is the cardinality of set x , and \setminus is the set
57 subtraction operation. In the perspective of species composition comparison, X_1 and X_2 are the sets of
58 species in either community, so that if $X_1 = \{x, y, z\}$ and $X_2 = \{v, w, x, y\}$, we have $X_1 \cup X_2 = \{v, w, x, y, z\}$,

59 $X_1 \cap X_2 = \{x, y\}$, $X_2 \setminus X_1 = \{v, w\}$, and $X_1 \setminus X_2 = \{z\}$. The core message of Koleff *et al.* (2003) is that the
60 overwhelming majority of measures of β -diversity can be re-expressed as functions that operate on the
61 cardinality (number of elements) of these sets.

62 **Re-expressing networks as sets**

63 Applying this framework to networks requires a few additional definitions. Although ecologists tend to
64 think of networks as their adjacency matrix, this representation is far from optimal to get a solid
65 understanding of which elements should be counted as part of which set when measuring network
66 dissimilarity. For this reason, we need fall back on the definition of a graph as a pair of sets, wherein
67 $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$. These two components V and E represent vertices (nodes, species) and edges (interactions),
68 where V is specifically a set containing the vertices \mathcal{G} , and E is a set of ordered pairs, in which every pair is
69 composed of two elements of V ; an element $\{i, j\}$ in E indicates that there is an interaction *from* species i
70 to species j in the network \mathcal{G} .

71 In the context of networks comparison (assuming the networks to compare are \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N}), we can further
72 decompose the contents of these sets as

$$\mathcal{M} = (V_c \cup V_m, E_c \cup E_{sm} \cup E_{um}),$$

73 and

$$\mathcal{N} = (V_c \cup V_n, E_c \cup E_{sn} \cup E_{un}),$$

74 where V_c is the set of shared species, V_k are the species belonging only to network k , E_c are the shared
75 edges, and E_{sk} and E_{uk} are the interactions unique to k involving, respectively, only species in V_c , and at
76 least one species from V_k .

77 **Defining the partitions from networks as sets**

78 The metaweb (Dunne 2006), which is to say the entire regional species pool and their interaction, can be
79 defined as $\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N}$ (this operation is commutative), which is to say

$$\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N} = (V_c \cup V_m \cup V_n, E_c \cup E_{sm} \cup E_{um} \cup E_{sn} \cup E_{un}).$$

80 This operation gives us an equivalent to γ -diversity for networks, in that the set of vertices contains *all*
81 species from the two networks, and the set of edges contains *all* the interactions between these species. If,
82 further, we make the usual assumption that only species with at least one interaction are present in the set
83 of vertices, then all elements of the set of vertices are present at least once in the set of edges, and the set of
84 vertices can be entire reconstructed from the set of edges. Although measures of network β -diversity
85 operate on interactions (not species), this property is maintained at every decomposition we will describe
86 next.

87 We can similarly define the intersection (similarly commutative) of two networks:

$$\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N} = (V_c, E_c).$$

88 The decomposition of β -diversity from Poisot *et al.* (2012) uses these components to measure β_{os} (the
89 interaction dissimilarity between shared species, which Fründ (2021) terms “rewiring”), and β_{wn} (the
90 overall dissimilarity including non-shared species). We can express the components a , b , and c of Koleff *et*
91 *al.* (2003) as the cardinality of the following sets:

Component	a	b	c
β_{os}	E_c	E_{sn}	E_{sm}
β_{wn}	E_c	$E_{sn} \cup E_{un}$	$E_{sm} \cup E_{um}$

92 These decompositions are used to perform the calculations of β -diversity in the `EcologicalNetworks.jl`
93 package (Banville *et al.* 2021) for Julia, which I use for the following numerical experiments.

94 Quantifying the importance of species turnover

95 The difference between β_{os} and β_{wn} stems from the species dissimilarity between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} , and it is
96 easier to understand the effect of turnover by picking a dissimilarity measure to work as an exemplar. At
97 this point, Fründ (2021) introduce a confusin terminology in their work, stating that Sørensen’s and

Whittaker's measures of dissimilarity are the same in the Koleff *et al.* (2003) framework (they are not; in practice, $\beta_{Sor} = 1 - \beta_w$), and (ii) noting Whittaker's measure as $(b + c)/(2a + b + c)$, which in the Koleff *et al.* (2003) framework is, in fact, β_t (Wilson & Shmida 1984). This does not change the overall conclusions as these measures can be re-expressed to converge to the same value. For the sake of consistency, I will use β_t moving forward; it returns values in $[0, 1]$, with 0 meaning complete similarity, and 1 meaning complete dissimilarity.

Establishing that $\beta_{wn} \geq \beta_{os}$

Based on a partition between three sets of cardinality a , b , and c ,

$$\beta_t = \frac{b + c}{2a + b + c}.$$

So as to simplify the notation of the following section, I will introduce a series of new variables. Let $A = |E_c|$ be the number of links that are identical between networks; $S = |E_{sn} \cup E_{sm}|$ be the number of links that are not shared, but only involve shared species (*i.e.* links from $\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{N}$ established between species from $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}$); and $U = |E_{un} \cup E_{um}|$ the number of links that are not shared, and involve at least one unique species. Adopting the perspective developed in the previous section, wherein networks are sets and the measures of β -diversity operates on these sets, highlights the conceptual issue in the Fründ (2021) alternative normalization: they are using components of the networks that are *not* part of the networks being compared.

There are two important points to note here. First, the number or proportion of species that are shared is not involved in the calculation. Second, the connectance of either network is not involved in the calculation. That all links counted in *e.g.* U come from \mathcal{M} , or that they are evenly distributed between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} , has no impact on the result. This is a desirable property of the approach: whatever quantitative value of the components of dissimilarity can be interpreted in the light of the connectance and species turnover *without* any risk of circularity. Therefore the argument of Fründ (2021), whereby the β_{os} component should decrease with turnover, and be invariant to connectance, does not hold: the very point of the approach is to provide measures that can be interpreted in the light of connectance and species turnover.

The final component of network dissimilarity in Poisot *et al.* (2012) is β_{st} , *i.e.* the part of β_{wn} that is not

124 explained by changes in interactions between shared species (β_{os}), and therefore stems from species
 125 turnover. This fraction is defined as $\beta_{st} = \beta_{wn} - \beta_{os}$.

126 The expression of β_{st} does not involve a partition into sets that can be plugged into the framework of
 127 Koleff *et al.* (2003), because the part of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} that are composed of their unique species cannot, by
 128 definition, share interactions. One could, theoretically, express these as $\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{N} = (V_m, E_{um})$ and
 129 $\mathcal{N} \setminus \mathcal{M} = (V_v, E_{vn})$ (note the non-commutativity here), but the dissimilarity between these networks is
 130 trivially maximal for the measures considered.

131 Using the β_t measure of dissimilarity, we can re-write (using the notation with A , S , and U)

$$\beta_{os} = \frac{S}{2A + S},$$

132 and

$$\beta_{wn} = \frac{S + U}{2A + S + U}.$$

133 Note that β_{os} has the form x/y with $x = S$ and $y = 2A + S$, and β_{wn} has the form $(x + k)/(y + k)$, with
 134 $k = U$. As long as $k \geq 0$, it is guaranteed that $\beta_{wn} \geq \beta_{os}$, and therefore that $0 \leq \beta_{st} \leq 1$; as A , S , and U are
 135 cardinalities of sets, they are necessarily satisfying this condition.

136 We can get an expression for β_{st} , by bringing β_{os} and β_{wn} to a common denominator and simplifying the
 137 numerator:

$$\beta_{st} = \frac{2AU}{(2A + S)(2A + S + U)}.$$

138 Note that this value varies in a non-monotonic way with regards to the number of interactions that are
 139 part of the common set of species – this is obvious when developing the denominator into

$$4A^2 + S^2 + 4AS + 2AU + SU,$$

140 As such, we expect that the value of β_{st} will vary in a hump-shaped way with the proportion of shared
 141 interactions. For this reason, Poisot *et al.* (2012) suggest that β_{st}/β_{wn} (alt. $1 - \beta_{os}/\beta_{wn}$) is a better indicator

142 of the *relative* importance of turnover processes on network dissimilarity. This can be calculated as

$$\frac{\beta_{st}}{\beta_{wn}} = \frac{2AU}{(2A + S)(2A + S + U)} \times \frac{S + U}{2A + S + U},$$

143 which reduces to

$$\frac{\beta_{st}}{\beta_{wn}} = \frac{2AU}{(2A + S)(S + U)}.$$

144 The roots of this expression are $A = 0$ (the turnover of species has no contribution to the difference
145 between β_{wn} and β_{os} if there are no shared species, and therefore no rewiring), and for $U = 0$ (the
146 turnover of species has no contribution if all species are shared).

147 **Numerical experiment: response of the components to different sources of network variation**

148 To illustrate the behavior of β_{st} , I conducted a simple numerical experiment in which two networks have
149 the same number of interactions L (recall from the previous section that we do not need to set a number of
150 species yet), and these interactions are partitionned according to proportions p_s and p_r into shared (A),
151 rewired (S), and unique (U) links, with $A = p_s \times L$, $S = (1 - p_s) \times p_r \times L$, and $U = (1 - p_s) \times (1 - p_r) \times L$.
152 The results are represented in fig. 1.

153 [Figure 1 about here.]

154 The rewiring component β_{os} varies as a function of the proportion of shared links that are rewired; by
155 contrast, β_{wn} varies *only* as a function of the proportion of links that are shared: that the unshared links
156 are established between common or unique species has no effect on overall network dissimilarity. The
157 quadratic nature of the denominator for β_{st} is clear here, with a maximum reach when there is no
158 re-wiring, and a small number of shared links (*i.e.* the networks are almost entirely dissimilar except for
159 the links between shared species). Although the *raw* values of β_{st} may seem low, the normalization using
160 β_{st}/β_{wn} magnifies this effect: its values are indeed maximized when the rewiring is lower, *i.e.* all of the
161 network variation stems from turnover processes.

162 **Is this decomposition over-estimating the effect of “rewiring?”**

163 One of the arguments put forth by Fründ (2021) is that the decomposition outlined above will
 164 overestimate the effect of rewiring; I argue that this is based on a misunderstanding of what β_{st} achieves.
 165 It is paramount to clarify that β_{st} is not a direct measure of the importance of turnover: it is a
 166 quantification of the relative impact of rewiring to overall dissimilarity, which, all non-turnover
 167 mechanisms being accounted for in the decomposition, can be explained by turnover mechanisms. In this
 168 section, I present two numerical experiments showing (i) that the β_{os} component is in fact an accurate
 169 measure of rewiring, and (ii) that β_{st} captures the consequences of species turnover, and of the
 170 interactions brought by unique species.

171 **Illustrations on arbitrarily small networks are biased**

172 We can re-calculate the illustration of Fründ (2021), wherein a pair of networks with two shared
 173 interactions ($A = 2$) receive either an interaction in S , in U , or in both:

A	S	U	β_{os}	β_{wn}	β_{st}	β_{st}/β_{wn}
2	0	0	0	0	0	
2	1	0	1/5	1/5	0	0
2	0	1	0	1/5	1/5	0
2	1	1	1/5	1/3	2/15	2/5

174 The over-estimation argument hinges on the fact that $\beta_{st} < \beta_{os}$ in the last situation (one interaction as
 175 rewiring, one as turnover). Reaching the conclusion of an overestimation from this is based on a
 176 mis-interpretation of what β_{st} means. The correct interpretation is that, out of the entire network
 177 dissimilarity, only three-fifths are explained by re-wiring. The fact that this fraction is not exactly one-half
 178 comes from the fact that the Wilson & Shmida (1984) measure counts shared interactions *twice* (*i.e.* it has
 179 a $2A$ term), which over-amplifies the effect of shared interactions as the network is really small. Running
 180 the same calculations with $A = 10$ gives a relative importance of the turnover processes of 47%, and β_{st}
 181 goes to $1/2$ as $A/(S + U)$ increases. As an additional caveat, the value of β_{st} will depend on the measure of
 182 beta-diversity used. Measures that do not count the shared interaction twice are not going to amplify the
 183 effect of rewiring.

184 **Numerical experiment: the decomposition captures the roles of rewiring and turnover**
185 **accurately**

186 Consider two bipartite networks, each with R species on either side, and each with the same connectance
187 ρ . We will assume that these networks *share* a proportion p of their species from one side (and share all
188 species from the other), and that the interactions between these species are undergo rewiring with at a rate
189 q . This is sufficient information to calculate the values of A , S , and U required to get the values of β_{os} and
190 β_{wn} . Note that the simplification of assuming that only species from one side can vary is merely for the
191 sake of simplicity, but does not decrease the generality of the argument.

192 Each network will have $\rho(1 - p)R^2$ interactions that are unique due to species turnover, and so

$$U = 2\rho(1 - p)R^2.$$

193 The part of both networks composed of overlapping species has $\rho p R^2$ interactions, of which $\rho(1 - q)p R^2$
194 are shared, and $\rho q p R^2$ underwent rewiring. This leads to

$$A = \rho(1 - q)p R^2,$$

195 and

$$S = \rho p q R^2.$$

196 Note that we can drop the multiplicative constant R^2 , making the result independent of the size of the
197 network. Based on these components, we can get the values of β_{os} and β_{wn} , as presented in fig. 2.

198 [Figure 2 about here.]

199 The value of β_{os} is entirely unchanged by variations in p (species sharing), and responds *only* to changes in
200 q (the probability of rewiring), whereas as expected, β_{wn} responded to changes in both of these
201 parameters: the most dissimilar networks have low species sharing (interactions are dissimilar because
202 brought by unique species), and high rewiring (shared species do not share interactions). The relative

changes in β_{os} and β_{wn} lead to predictable changes in β_{st} : its value is maximized when both rewiring *and* species sharing are low. Increasing rewiring decreases the impact of species turnover (because, for an equal number of interactions, the dissimilarity of interactins in shared species contributes more to β_{wn}); increasing the chance of sharing species also does decrease β_{st} , trivially because there is no species turnover anymore. Note that when using the correction of β_{st}/β_{wn} , the effect of species turnover is magnified for low probabilities of re-wiring.

In conclusion, this numerical experiment shows that the decomposition as initially presented by Poisot *et al.* (2012), *i.e.* using denominators that make sense from a network composition point of view, succeeds at capturing the relative effect of turnover and rewiring.

Numerical experiment: the decomposition captures the roles of species turnover and connectance accurately

Consider now two bipartite networks, which still have R species on either side, but differ in their connectance (ρ_1 and ρ_2) – by maintaining the assumption that species on one side are shared with probability p , and that interactions between shared species are rewired at probability q , we can examine the effect of varying both connectance and turnover on the value of the β -diversity components. Note that, although not presented, we will drop the multiplicative constant R^2 from all calculations, as it is a common factor for all values; again, this implies that the results presented here are independant of network richness.

The number of unique links due to species turnover is

$$U = (1 - p)(\rho_1 + \rho_2),$$

which decreases with the proportion of shared species, but increases with connectance. The number of links between shared species takes a little more steps to calculate. First, amongst the pR^2 species in both sub-graphs, network 1 will have $\rho_1 pR^2$, and network 2 will have $\rho_2 pR^2$. Because $\rho_1 \neq \rho_2$, there are only $\min(\rho_1, \rho_2) pR^2$ links that can be shared, a proportion q of which will undergo re-wiring, and a proportion $(1 - q)$ of which will be shared. This leads to the expression (after dropping R^2) for the number of shared links:

$$A = p(1 - q)\min(\rho_1, \rho_2).$$

228 The number of unique links due to shared species is the sum of all links in network 1 ($\rho_1 R^2$), minus the
 229 sum of the shared links (AR^2) and the unique links due to species turnover $((1 - p)\rho_1 R^2)$; this same
 230 quantity is calculated in the same way for the second networks, leading to (after dropping the
 231 multiplicative constant R^2 and some simplifications)

$$S = p(\rho_1 + \rho_2) - 2A.$$

232 Note that as expected, this last quantity scales with the proportion of shared species (p) and with
 233 connectance (as shared species bring more of their interactions), but decreases with the size of the shared
 234 links components. The consequences of varying ρ_2 and p are presented in fig. 3.

235 [Figure 3 about here.]

236 Although β_{os} is only responding to changes in connectance (as is expected, seeing that the relative
 237 connectances of both networks appear in the expression for S and A), β_{wn} changes in response to both
 238 parameters. Specifically, increasing the difference in connectance between the two networks, especially
 239 when also increasing the species dissimilarity, results in more dissimilar networks – this is because unique
 240 species from both networks bring their own interactions (at rate ρ_1 and ρ_2), and therefore contribute to
 241 dissimilarity. It is particularly noteworthy that β_{st} , regardless of the differences in connectance, increases
 242 with the proportion of unique species. At an equal proportion of shared species, β_{st} decreases with
 243 differences in connectance: this is an equally expected result, which indicates that the difference between
 244 β_{os} and β_{wn} is in part explained by non-turnover mechanisms (here, changes in connectance). Relying on
 245 the β_{st}/β_{wn} correction again magnifies this effect, without changing their interpretation.

246 **Does the partition of network dissimilarity needs a new normalization?**

247 Based on the arguments presented above, I do not think the suggestion of Fründ (2021) to change the
 248 denominator of β_{os} makes sense as a default; the strength of the original approach by Poisot *et al.* (2012) is
 249 indeed that the effect of turnover is based on a rigorous definition of networks as graphs (as opposed to

networks as matrices), in which the induction of vertices from the edgelist being compared gives rise to biologically meaningful denominators. The advantage of this approach is that at no time does the turnover of species itself (or indeed, as shown in many places in this manuscript, the network richness), or the connectance of the network, enter into the calculation. As such, it is possible to use β_{os} and β_{wn} in relationship to these terms, calculated externally (as was recently done by e.g. Higinio & Poisot 2021), without creating circularities.

The choice of changing the denominator hinges on what one admits as a definition for β_{st} . If the point of β_{st} is to be a component of overall β -diversity as advocated by Fründ (2021) and Novotny (2009), a change of numerator *might* be acceptable. Nevertheless, this change of numerator contributes to blurring the frontier between a measure of interaction dissimilarity and a measure of community dissimilarity which starts to add the effect of relative richness; this later case warrants a thorough methodological assessment. Conversely, if as we argue in Poisot *et al.* (2012), β_{st} is to be meant as a *guide* to the interpretation of β_{wn} and β_{os} , and related to actual measures of species turnover and network connectance, one must not change the denominator.

It is essential to recognize that there are multiple reasons to calculate network dissimilarity, and it is our opinion that the arguments levied by Fründ (2021) against the original partition stem from a misunderstanding of what it intends to do (and does, indeed, do well), not from intrinsic methodological issues in the partition itself. Based on the results presented in this contribution, I argue that the original partition of network β -diversity from Poisot *et al.* (2012) should remain the default.

References

- Banville, F., Vissault, S. & Poisot, T. (2021). Mangal.jl and EcologicalNetworks.jl: Two complementary packages for analyzing ecological networks in Julia. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 6, 2721.
- Baronio, G.J., Souza, C.S., Maruyama, P.K., Raizer, J., Sigrist, M.R. & Aoki, C. (2021). Natural fire does not affect the structure and beta diversity of plant-pollinator networks, but diminishes floral-visitor specialization in Cerrado. *Flora*, 281, 151869.
- Campos-Moreno, D.F., Dyer, L.A., Salcido, D., Massad, T.J., Pérez-Lachaud, G., Tepe, E.J., *et al.* (2021). Importance of interaction rewiring in determining spatial and temporal turnover of tritrophic (Piper-caterpillar-parasitoid) metanetworks in the Yucatán Península, México. *Biotropica*, 53,

278 1071–1081.

279 Canard, E.F., Mouquet, N., Mouillot, D., Stanko, M., Miklisova, D. & Gravel, D. (2014). Empirical
 280 evaluation of neutral interactions in host-parasite networks. *The American Naturalist*, 183, 468–479.

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

283 Fründ, J. (2021). Dissimilarity of species interaction networks: How to partition rewiring and species
 284 turnover components. *Ecosphere*, 12, e03653.

285 Higinio, G.T. & Poisot, T. (2021). Beta and phylogenetic diversities tell complementary stories about
 286 ecological networks biogeography. *Parasitology*, 1–23.

287 Koleff, P., Gaston, K.J. & Lennon, J.J. (2003). Measuring beta diversity for presence–absence data. *Journal*
 288 *of Animal Ecology*, 72, 367–382.

289 Legendre, P. & De Cáceres, M. (2013). Beta diversity as the variance of community data: Dissimilarity
 290 coefficients and partitioning. *Ecology Letters*, 16, 951–963.

291 Magrach, A., Holzschuh, A., Bartomeus, I., Riedinger, V., Roberts, S.P.M., Rundlöf, M., *et al.* (2017).
 292 Plant-pollinator networks in semi-natural grasslands are resistant to the loss of pollinators during
 293 blooming of mass-flowering crops. *Ecography*, n/a–n/a.

294 Novotny, V. (2009). Beta diversity of plant–insect food webs in tropical forests: A conceptual framework.
 295 *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 2, 5–9.

296 Olsson, R.L., Brousil, M.R., Clark, R.E., Baine, Q. & Crowder, D.W. (2021). Interactions between plants
 297 and pollinators across urban and rural farming landscapes. *Food Webs*, 27, e00194.

298 Poisot, T., Canard, E., Mouillot, D., Mouquet, N. & Gravel, D. (2012). The dissimilarity of species
 299 interaction networks. *Ecology Letters*, 15, 1353–1361.

300 Poisot, T., Cirtwill, A.R., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., Fortin, M.-J. & Stouffer, D.B. (2016). The structure of
 301 probabilistic networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 303–312.

302 Poisot, T., Guevenoux-Julien, C., Fortin, M.-J., Gravel, D. & Legendre, P. (2017). Hosts, parasites and their
 303 interactions respond to different climatic variables. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, n/a–n/a.

304 Poisot, T., Stouffer, D.B. & Gravel, D. (2015). Beyond species: Why ecological interaction networks vary

305 through space and time. *Oikos*, 124, 243–251.

306 Souza, C.S., Maruyama, P.K., Santos, K.C.B.S., Varassin, I.G., Gross, C.L. & Araujo, A.C. (2021).

307 Plant-centred sampling estimates higher beta diversity of interactions than pollinator-based sampling

308 across habitats. *New Phytologist*, 230, 2501–2512.

309 Trøjelsgaard, K. & Olesen, J.M. (2016). Ecological networks in motion: Micro- and macroscopic variability

310 across scales. *Functional Ecology*, 30, 1926–1935.

311 Tuomisto, H. (2010). A diversity of beta diversities: Straightening up a concept gone awry. Part 1. Defining

312 beta diversity as a function of alpha and gamma diversity. *Ecography*, 33, 2–22.

313 Wilson, M.V. & Shmida, A. (1984). Measuring Beta Diversity with Presence-Absence Data. *Journal of*

314 *Ecology*, 72, 1055–1064.





Figure 1: Values of β_{os} , β_{wn} , β_{st} , and β_{st}/β_{wn} as a function of the proportion of rewired links and the proportion of shared links.



figures/numexp2.png

Figure 2: Response of β_{os} and β_{wn} , and the consequences on β_{st} , to changes in rewiring probability (q) and probability of species sharing (p). As expected, β_{os} is not affected by species turnover, but increases with the rewiring probability. By contrast, β_{wn} increases when the rewiring probability is higher *and* when fewer species are shared. This has important consequences for β_{st} : its value is maximized for low species sharing, and decreases for high rewiring probability.




Figure 3: Effects of varying the connectance of the second network (ρ_2) and the proportion of shared species (p) on the values of the β -diversity components. As expected, β_{os} is still independent of species turnover, and β_{wn} increases when species turnover increases, or when the connectances become more dissimilar. These figures have been generated with $\rho_1 = 0.25$ and $q = 0.15$, and the results are qualitatively robust to changes in these parameters.