

Graph embedding and transfer learning can help predict species interaction networks despite data limitations

Tanya Strydom^{1,2,‡} Salomé Bouskila^{1,‡} Francis Banville^{1,3,2} Ceres Barros⁴ Dominique Caron^{5,2}
Maxwell J Farrell⁶ Marie-Josée Fortin⁶ Victoria Hemming⁷ Benjamin Mercier^{3,2} Laura
J. Pollock^{5,2} Rogini Runghen⁸ Giulio V. Dalla Riva⁹ Timothée Poisot^{1,2,‡}

¹ Département de Sciences Biologiques, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada ² Quebec Centre for Biodiversity Science, Montréal, Canada ³ Département de Biologie, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Canada ⁴ Department of Forest Resources Management, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada ⁵ Department of Biology, McGill University, Montréal, Canada ⁶ Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada ⁷ Department of Forest and Conservation Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada ⁸ Centre for Integrative Ecology, School of Biological Sciences, University of Canterbury, Canterbury, New Zealand ⁹ School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Canterbury, Canterbury, New Zealand

‡ These authors contributed equally to the work

Correspondance to:

Timothée Poisot — timothee.poisot@umontreal.ca

1. Metawebs, (networks of potential interactions within a species pool) are a powerful abstraction to understand how large-scale species interaction networks are structured.
2. Because metawebs are typically expressed at large spatial and taxonomic scales, assembling them is a tedious and costly process; predictive methods can help circumvent the limitations in data deficiencies, by providing 'draft' metawebs.
3. One way to improve our ability to predict metawebs is to maximize available information by using graph embeddings, instead of the list of species interactions. Graph embedding is an emerging field in machine learning that holds great potential for ecological problems.
4. In this perspective, we outline how the challenges associated with inferring metawebs line-up with the advantages of graph embeddings; as well as discuss how the choice of the species pool has consequences on the reconstructed network, but also embeds hypotheses about which human-made boundaries are ecologically meaningful.

1 Being able to infer *potential* interactions could serve as a significant breakthrough in our ability to start
2 thinking about species interaction networks over large spatial scales (Hortal et al., 2015). Understanding
3 species interactions holds enormous potential to not only understand and more rapidly learn about
4 species interactions and metawebs, but also how changes in management of a single species may impact
5 non-target species. In a recent overview of the field of ecological network prediction, Strydom, Catchen, et
6 al. (2021) identified two challenges of interest to the prediction of interactions at large scales. First, there
7 is a relative scarcity of relevant data in most places globally – paradoxically, this restricts our ability to infer
8 interactions for locations where inference is perhaps the least required (and leaves us unable to make
9 inference in regions without interaction data); second, accurate predictors are important for accurate
10 predictions, and the lack of methods that can leverage a small amount of *accurate* data is a serious
11 impediment to our predictive ability. In most places, our most reliable biodiversity knowledge is that of a
12 species pool (*i.e.* a set of potentially interacting species in a given area): through the analysis of databases
13 like GBIF or IUCN, it is possible to construct a list of species in a region of interest; but inferring the
14 potential interactions between these species is difficult.

15 Following the definition of Dunne (2006), a metaweb is the ecological network analogue to the species
16 pool; specifically, it inventories all *potential* interactions between species for a spatially delimited area (and
17 so captures the γ diversity of interactions). The metaweb is not a prediction of the network at a specific
18 point within the spatial area it covers: it will have a different structure, notably by having a larger
19 connectance (see *e.g.* Wood et al., 2015) and complexity (see *e.g.* Galiana et al., 2022), from any of these
20 local networks. These local networks (which capture the α diversity of interactions) are a subset of the
21 metaweb’s species and realized interactions, and have been called “metaweb realizations” (Poisot et al.,
22 2015). Differences between local networks and their metawebs are due to chance, species abundance and
23 co-occurrence, local environmental conditions, and local distribution of functional traits, among others.
24 Yet, recent results by Saravia et al. (2021) strongly suggest that the local (metaweb) realizations only
25 respond weakly to local conditions: instead, they reflect constraints inherited by the structure of their
26 metaweb. This establishes the metaweb structure as the core goal of predictive network ecology, as it is a
27 required information to accurately produce downscaled, local predictions.

28 Because the metaweb represents the joint effect of functional, phylogenetic, and macroecological
29 processes (Morales-Castilla et al., 2015), it holds valuable ecological information. Specifically, it represents
30 the “upper bounds” on what the composition of the local networks, given a local species pool, can be (see

31 *e.g.* McLeod et al., 2021); this information can help evaluate the ability of ecological assemblages to
32 withstand the effects of, for example, climate change (Fricke et al., 2022). These local networks may be
33 reconstructed given an appropriate knowledge of local species composition and provide information on
34 the structure of food webs at finer spatial scales. This has been done for example for tree-galler-parasitoid
35 systems (Gravel et al., 2018), fish trophic interactions (Albouy et al., 2019), tetrapod trophic interactions
36 (Braga et al., 2019; O'Connor et al., 2020), and crop-pest networks (Grünig et al., 2020). In this
37 contribution, we highlight the power in viewing (and constructing) metawebs as *probabilistic* objects in
38 the context of rare interactions, discuss how a family of machine learning tools (graph embeddings and
39 transfer learning) can be used to overcome data limitations to metaweb inference, and highlight how the
40 use of metawebs introduces important questions for the field of network ecology.

41 **A metaweb is an inherently probabilistic object**

42 Treating interactions as probabilistic (as opposed to binary) events is a more nuanced and realistic way to
43 represent them. Dallas et al. (2017) suggested that most links in ecological networks are cryptic, *i.e.*
44 uncommon or hard to observe. This argument echoes Jordano (2016): sampling ecological interactions is
45 difficult because it requires first the joint observation of two species, and then the observation of their
46 interaction. In addition, it is generally expected weak or rare links to be more prevalent in networks than
47 common or strong links (Csermely, 2004), compared to strong, persistent links; this is notably the case in
48 food chains, wherein many weaker links are key to the stability of a system (Neutel et al., 2002). In the
49 light of these observations, we expect to see an over-representation of low-probability (rare) interactions
50 under a model that accurately predicts interaction probabilities. Yet the original metaweb definition, and
51 indeed most past uses of metawebs, was based on the presence/absence of interactions. Moving towards
52 *probabilistic* metawebs, by representing interactions as Bernoulli events (see *e.g.* Poisot et al., 2016), offers
53 the opportunity to weigh these rare interactions appropriately. The inherent plasticity of interactions is
54 important to capture: there have been documented instances of food webs undergoing rapid
55 collapse/recovery cycles over short periods of time (*e.g.* Pedersen et al., 2017). These considerations
56 emphasize why metaweb predictions should focus on quantitative (preferentially probabilistic)
57 predictions, and this should constrain the suite of appropriate models used to predict them.

58 It is important to recall that a metaweb is intended as a catalogue of all potential interactions, which is

59 then filtered for a given application (Morales-Castilla et al., 2015). In a sense, that most ecological
60 interactions are elusive can call for a slightly different approach to sampling: once the common
61 interactions are documented, the effort required in documenting each rare interaction will increase
62 exponentially. Recent proposals suggest that machine learning algorithms can also act as data generators
63 (Hoffmann et al., 2019): high quality observational data can be used to infer core rules underpinning
64 network structure, and be supplemented with synthetic data coming from predictive models trained on
65 them, thereby increasing the volume of information available for analysis. Indeed, Strydom, Catchen, et
66 al. (2021) suggested that knowing the metaweb may render the prediction of local networks easier,
67 because it fixes an “upper bound” on which interactions can exist. In this context, a probabilistic metaweb
68 represents an aggregation of informative priors on the interactions, elusive information with the potential
69 to boost our predictive ability (Bartomeus et al., 2016).

70 [Figure 1 about here.]

71 **Graph embedding offers promises for the inference of potential** 72 **interactions**

73 Graph (or Network) embedding (fig. 1) is a family of machine learning techniques, whose main task is to
74 learn a mapping function from a discrete graph to a continuous domain (Arsov & Mirceva, 2019; Chami et
75 al., 2022). Their main goal is to learn a low dimensional vector representations for the nodes of the graph
76 (embeddings), such that key properties of the graph (e.g. local or global structures) are retained in the
77 embedding space (Yan et al., 2005). Ecological networks are an interesting candidate for the widespread
78 application of embeddings, as they tend to possess a shared structural backbone (see e.g. Bramon Mora et
79 al., 2018 for food webs), which hints at structural invariants in empirical data; assuming that these
80 structural invariants are indeed widespread, they would dominate the structure of networks, and therefore
81 be adequately captured by the first (lower) dimensions of an embedding, without the need to measure
82 derived aspects of their structure (e.g. motifs, paths, modularity, ...).

83 Indeed, food webs are inherently low-dimensional objects, and can be adequately represented with less
84 than ten dimensions (Braga et al., 2019; Eklöf et al., 2013). Simulation results by Botella et al. (2022)
85 suggest that there is no best method to identify architectural similarities between networks, and that

multiple approaches need to be tested and compared to the network descriptor of interest. This matches previous, more general results on graph embedding, which suggest that different embedding algorithms yield different network embeddings (Goyal & Ferrara, 2018), calling for a careful selection of the problem-specific approach to use. In [tbl. 1](#), we present a selection of common graph and node embedding methods, alongside examples of their use to predict species interactions; most of these methods rely either on linear algebra, or on pseudo-random walks on graphs.

One prominent family of approaches we do not discuss in the present manuscript is Graph Neural Networks (GNN; Zhou et al., 2020). GNN are, in a sense, a method to embed a graph into a dense subspace, but belong to the family of deep learning methods, which has its own set of practices (see *e.g.* Goodfellow et al., 2016). An important issue with methods based on deep learning is that, because their parameter space is immense, the sample size of the data fed into them must be similarly large (typically thousands of instances). This is a requirement for the model to converge correctly during training, but this assumption is unlikely to be met given the size of datasets currently available for metawebs (or single time/location species interaction networks). This data volume requirement is mostly absent from the techniques we list below. Furthermore, GNN still have some challenges related to their shallow structure, and concerns related to scalability (see Gupta et al., 2021 for a review), which are mostly absent from the methods listed in [tbl. 1](#). Assuming that the uptake of next-generation biomonitoring techniques does indeed deliver larger datasets on species interactions (Bohan et al., 2017), there is a potential for GNN to become an applicable embedding/predictive technique in the coming years.

[Table 1 about here.]

The popularity of graph embedding techniques in machine learning is more than the search for structural invariants: graphs are discrete objects, and machine learning techniques tend to handle continuous data better. Bringing a sparse graph into a continuous, dense vector space (Xu, 2020) opens up a broader variety of predictive algorithms, notably of the sort that are able to predict events as probabilities (Murphy, 2022). Furthermore, the projection of the graph itself is a representation that can be learned; Runghen et al. (2021), for example, used a neural network to learn the embedding of a network in which not all interactions were known, based on the nodes' metadata. This example has many parallels in ecology (see [fig. 1 C](#)), in which node metadata can be represented by phylogeny, abundance, or functional traits. Using phylogeny as a source of information assumes (or strives to capture) the action of evolutionary processes

on network structure, which at least for food webs have been well documented **TK REF**; similarly, the use of functional traits assumes that interactions can be inferred from the knowledge of trait-matching rules, which is similarly well supported in the empirical literature **TK REF**. Relating this information to an embedding rather than a list of networks measures would allow to capture their effect on the more fundamental aspects of network structure; conversely, the absence of a phylogenetic or functional signal may suggest that evolutionary/trait processes are not strong drivers of network structure, therefore opening a new way to perform hypothesis testing.

Rather than directly predicting biological rules (see *e.g.* Pichler et al., 2020 for an overview), which may be confounded by the sparse nature of graph data, learning embeddings works in the low-dimensional space that maximizes information about the network structure. This approach is further justified by the observation, for example, that the macro-evolutionary history of a network is adequately represented by some graph embeddings (Random dot product graphs (RDPG); see Dalla Riva & Stouffer, 2016). In a recent publication, Strydom et al. (2022) have used an embedding (based on RDPG) to project a metaweb of trophic interactions between European mammals, and transferred this information to mammals of Canada, using the phylogenetic distance between related clades to infer the values in the latent sub-space into which the European metaweb was projected. By performing the RDPG step on re-constructed values, this approach yields a probabilistic trophic metaweb for mammals of Canada based on knowledge of European species, despite a limited ($\approx 5\%$) taxonomic overlap.

Graph embeddings *can* serve as a dimensionality reduction method. For example, RDPG (Strydom et al., 2022) and t-SVD (truncated Singular Value Decomposition; Poisot et al., 2021) typically embed networks using fewer dimensions than the original network (the original network has as many dimensions as species, and as many informative dimensions as trophically unique species; Strydom, Dalla Riva, et al., 2021). But this is not necessarily the case – indeed, one may perform a PCA (a special case of SVD) to project the raw data into a subspace that improves the efficacy of t-SNE (t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding; Maaten, 2009). There are many dimensionality reductions (Anowar et al., 2021) that can be applied to an embedded network should the need for dimensionality reduction (for example for data visualisation) arise. In brief, many graph embeddings *can* serve as dimensionality reduction steps, but not all do, neither do all dimensionality reduction methods provide adequate graph embedding capacities. In the next section (and fig. 2), we show how the amount of dimensionality reduction can affect the quality of the embedding.

An illustration of metaweb embedding

In this section, we illustrate the embedding of a collection of bipartite networks collected by Hadfield et al. (2014), using t-SVD and RDPG (see Strydom et al., 2022 for the full details). Briefly, an RDPG decomposes a network into two subspaces (left and right), which are matrices that when multiplied give an approximation of the original network. The code to reproduce this example is available as supplementary material (note, for the sake of comparison, that Strydom, Catchen, et al., 2021 have an example using embedding through PCA followed by prediction using a deep neural network on the same dataset). The resulting (binary) metaweb \mathcal{M} has 2131 interactions between 206 parasites and 121 hosts, and its adjacency matrix has full rank (*i.e.* it represents a space with 121 dimensions). All analyses were done using Julia (Bezanson et al., 2017) version 1.7.2, *Makie.jl* (Danisch & Krumbiegel, 2021), and *EcologicalNetworks.jl* (Poisot et al., 2019).

[Figure 2 about here.]

The embedding of the metaweb holds several pieces of information (fig. 2). In panel **A**, we show that the L_2 loss (*i.e.* the sum of squared errors) between the empirical and reconstructed metaweb decreases when the number of dimensions (rank) of the subspace increases, with an inflection point around 25 dimensions. As discussed by Runghen et al. (2021), there is often a trade-off between the number of dimensions to use (more dimensions are more computationally demanding) and the quality of the representation. In this instance, accepting $L_2 = 500$ as an approximation of the network means that the error for every position in the metaweb is $\approx (500/(206 \times 121))^{1/2}$. In fig. 2, panel **B**, we show the positions of hosts and parasites on the first two dimensions of the left and right subspaces. Note that these values largely skew negative, because the first dimensions capture the coarse structure of the network: most pairs of species do not interact, and therefore have negative values. In fig. 2, panel **C**, we show the predicted weight (*i.e.* the result of the multiplication of the RDGP subspaces at a rank of 25) as a function of whether the interactions are observed, not-observed, or unknown due to lack of co-occurrence. This reveals that the observed interactions have higher predicted weights, although there is some overlap; the usual approach to identify potential interactions based on this information would be a thresholding analysis, which is outside the scope of this manuscript (and is done in the papers cited in this illustration). Note that the values are not bound to the unit interval, which emphasizes the need for either scaling or

173 clamping (although thresholding analyses are insensitive to this choice). Finally, in fig. 2, panel D, we
174 show that the embedding, as it captures structural information about the network, holds ecological
175 information; indeed, the position of the parasite on the first dimension of the left sub-space is a linear
176 predictor of its number of hosts.

177 **The metaweb embeds both ecological hypotheses and practices**

178 The goal of metaweb inference is to provide information about the interactions between species at a large
179 spatial scale. But as Herbert (1965) rightfully pointed out, “[y]ou can’t draw neat lines around planet-wide
180 problems”; any inference of a metaweb at large scales must contend with several novel, and interwoven,
181 families of problems. In this section, we list some of the most pressing research priorities (*i.e.* problems
182 that can be addressed with subsequent data analysis or simulations), as well as issues related to the
183 application of these methods at the science-policy interface.

184 The first open research problem is the taxonomic and spatial limit of the metaweb to embed and transfer.
185 If the initial metaweb is too narrow in scope, notably from a taxonomic point of view, the chances of
186 finding another area with enough related species (through phylogenetic relatedness or similarity of
187 functional traits) to make a reliable inference decreases; this would likely be indicated by large confidence
188 intervals during estimation of the values in the low-rank space, meaning that the representation of the
189 original graph is difficult to transfer to the new problem. Alternatively, if the initial metaweb is too large
190 (taxonomically), then the resulting embeddings would need to represent interactions between taxonomic
191 groups that are not present in the new location. This would lead to a much higher variance in the starting
192 dataset, and to under-dispersion in the target dataset, resulting in the potential under or over estimation of
193 the strength of new predicted interactions. The lack of well documented metawebs is currently preventing
194 the development of more concrete guidelines. The question of phylogenetic relatedness and distribution is
195 notably relevant if the metaweb is assembled in an area with mostly endemic species (*e.g.* a system that
196 has undergone recent radiation or that has remained in isolation for a long period of time might not have
197 an analogous system with which to draw knowledge from), and as with every predictive algorithm, there
198 is room for the application of our best ecological judgement. Because this problem relates to distribution
199 of species in the geographic or phylogenetic space, it can certainly be approached through assessing the
200 performance of embedding transfer in simulated starting/target species pools.

201 The second series of problems relate to determining which area should be used to infer the new metaweb
202 in, as this determines the species pool that must be used. Metawebs can be constructed by assigning
203 interactions in a list of species within geographic boundaries. The upside of this approach is that
204 information at the country level is likely to be required for biodiversity assessments, as countries set
205 conservation goals at the national level (Buxton et al., 2021), and as quantitative instruments are designed
206 to work at these scales (Turak et al., 2017); specific strategies are often enacted at smaller scales, nested
207 within a specific country (Ray et al., 2021). But there is no guarantee that these boundaries are
208 meaningful. In fact, we do not have a satisfying answer to the question of “where does a food web stop?”;
209 the most promising solutions involve examining the spatial consistency of network area relationships
210 (Fortin et al., 2021; see e.g. Galiana et al., 2018, 2019, 2021), which is impossible in the absence of enough
211 information about the network itself. This suggests that inferred metawebs should be further downscaled
212 to allow for *a posteriori* analyses. The methodology for metaweb downscaling is currently limited, and it is
213 likely that the sustained effort to characterize the spatial dependency of food web structure will lead to
214 more prescriptive guidelines about the need for prediction downscaling.

215 The final family of problems relates less to ecological methods than to the praxis of ecological research.
216 Operating under the context of national divisions, in large parts of the world, reflects nothing more than
217 the legacy of settler colonialism, which drives a disparity in available ecological data. Applying any
218 embedding to biased data does not debias them, but instead embeds these very same biases, propagating
219 them to the machine learning models using embeddings to make predictions. Indeed, the use of ecological
220 data is not an apolitical act (Nost & Goldstein, 2021), as data infrastructures tend to be designed to answer
221 questions within national boundaries (therefore placing contingencies on what is available to be
222 embedded), and their use often draws upon and reinforces territorial statecraft. As per Machen & Nost
223 (2021), this is particularly true when the output of “algorithmic thinking” (e.g. relying on machine
224 learning to generate knowledge) can be re-used for governance (e.g. enacting conservation decisions at the
225 national scale). As information on species interaction networks structure is increasingly leveraged as a
226 tool to guide conservation actions (see e.g. recent discussions for food-web based conservation; Eero et al.,
227 2021; Naman et al., 2022; Stier et al., 2017), the need to appraise and correct biases that are unwittingly
228 propagated to algorithms when embedded from the original data is paramount. Predictive approaches
229 deployed at the continental scale, no matter their intent, originate in the framework that contributed to
230 the ongoing biodiversity crisis (Adam, 2014) and reinforced environmental injustice (Choudry, 2013;

231 Domínguez & Luoma, 2020). Particularly on Turtle Island and other territories that were traditionally
232 stewarded by Indigenous people, these approaches should be replaced (or at least guided and framed) by
233 Indigenous principles of land management (Eichhorn et al., 2019; No'kmaq et al., 2021), as part of an
234 “algorithm-in-the-loop” approach. Human-algorithm interactions are notoriously difficult and can yield
235 adverse effect (Green & Chen, 2019; Stevenson & Doleac, 2021), suggesting the need to systematically
236 study them for the specific purpose of biodiversity governance, as well as to improve the algorithmic
237 literacy of decision makers. As we see artificial intelligence/machine learning being increasingly
238 mobilized to generate knowledge that is lacking for conservation decisions (*e.g.* Lamba et al., 2019;
239 Mosebo Fernandes et al., 2020) and drive policy decisions (Weiskopf et al., 2022), our discussion of these
240 tools need to go beyond the technical and statistical, and into the governance consequences they can have.

241 **Acknowledgements:** We acknowledge that this study was conducted on land within the traditional
242 unceded territory of the Saint Lawrence Iroquoian, Anishinabewaki, Mohawk, Huron-Wendat, and
243 Omàmiwininiwak nations. TP, TS, DC, and LP received funding from the Canadian Institute for Ecology
244 & Evolution. FB is funded by the Institute for Data Valorization (IVADO). TS, SB, and TP are funded by a
245 donation from the Courtois Foundation. CB was awarded a Mitacs Elevate Fellowship no. IT12391, in
246 partnership with fRI Research, and also acknowledges funding from Alberta Innovates and the Forest
247 Resources Improvement Association of Alberta. M-JF acknowledges funding from NSERC Discovery
248 Grant and NSERC CRC. RR is funded by New Zealand’s Biological Heritage Ngā Koiora Tuku Iho
249 National Science Challenge, administered by New Zealand Ministry of Business, Innovation, and
250 Employment. BM is funded by the NSERC Alexander Graham Bell Canada Graduate Scholarship and the
251 FRQNT master’s scholarship. LP acknowledges funding from NSERC Discovery Grant (NSERC
252 RGPIN-2019-05771). TP acknowledges financial support from the Fondation Courtois, and NSERC
253 through the Discovery Grants and Discovery Accelerator Supplement programs. MJF is supported by an
254 NSERC PDF and an RBC Post-Doctoral Fellowship.

255 **Conflict of interest:** The authors have no conflict interests to disclose

256 **Authors’ contributions:** TS, and TP conceived the ideas discussed in the manuscript. All authors
257 contributed to writing and editing the manuscript.

258 **Data availability:** There is no data associated with this manuscript.

259 References

- 260 Adam, R. (2014). *Elephant treaties: The Colonial legacy of the biodiversity crisis*. UPNE.
- 261 Albouy, C., Archambault, P., Appeltans, W., Araújo, M. B., Beauchesne, D., Cazelles, K., Cirtwill, A. R.,
262 Fortin, M.-J., Galiana, N., Leroux, S. J., Pellissier, L., Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., Wood, S. A., & Gravel, D.
263 (2019). The marine fish food web is globally connected. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 3(8, 8),
264 1153–1161. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0950-y>
- 265 Anowar, F., Sadaoui, S., & Selim, B. (2021). Conceptual and empirical comparison of dimensionality
266 reduction algorithms (PCA, KPCA, LDA, MDS, SVD, LLE, ISOMAP, LE, ICA, t-SNE). *Computer*
267 *Science Review*, 40, 100378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosrev.2021.100378>
- 268 Arsov, N., & Mirceva, G. (2019). *Network Embedding: An Overview*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.11726>
- 269 Bartomeus, I., Gravel, D., Tylianakis, J. M., Aizen, M. A., Dickie, I. A., & Bernard-Verdier, M. (2016). A
270 common framework for identifying linkage rules across different types of interactions. *Functional*
271 *Ecology*, 30(12), 1894–1903.
272 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-2435.12666/full>
- 273 Bezanson, J., Edelman, A., Karpinski, S., & Shah, V. (2017). Julia: A Fresh Approach to Numerical
274 Computing. *SIAM Review*, 59(1), 65–98. <https://doi.org/10.1137/141000671>
- 275 Bohan, D. A., Vacher, C., Tamaddoni-Nezhad, A., Raybould, A., Dumbrell, A. J., & Woodward, G. (2017).
276 Next-Generation Global Biomonitoring: Large-scale, Automated Reconstruction of Ecological
277 Networks. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.03.001>
- 278 Botella, C., Dray, S., Matias, C., Miele, V., & Thuiller, W. (2022). An appraisal of graph embeddings for
279 comparing trophic network architectures. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 13(1), 203–216.
280 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13738>
- 281 Braga, J., Pollock, L. J., Barros, C., Galiana, N., Montoya, J. M., Gravel, D., Maiorano, L., Montemaggiore,
282 A., Ficetola, G. F., Dray, S., & Thuiller, W. (2019). Spatial analyses of multi-trophic terrestrial vertebrate
283 assemblages in Europe. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 28(11), 1636–1648.
284 <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12981>
- 285 Bramon Mora, B., Gravel, D., Gilarranz, L. J., Poisot, T., & Stouffer, D. B. (2018). Identifying a common

backbone of interactions underlying food webs from different ecosystems. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 2603. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05056-0>

Buxton, R. T., Bennett, J. R., Reid, A. J., Shulman, C., Cooke, S. J., Francis, C. M., Nyboer, E. A., Pritchard, G., Binley, A. D., Avery-Gomm, S., Ban, N. C., Beazley, K. F., Bennett, E., Blight, L. K., Bortolotti, L. E., Camfield, A. F., Gadallah, F., Jacob, A. L., Naujokaitis-Lewis, I., ... Smith, P. A. (2021). Key information needs to move from knowledge to action for biodiversity conservation in Canada. *Biological Conservation*, 256, 108983. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.108983>

Chami, I., Abu-El-Haija, S., Perozzi, B., Ré, C., & Murphy, K. (2022). Machine Learning on Graphs: A Model and Comprehensive Taxonomy. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(89), 1–64. <http://jmlr.org/papers/v23/20-852.html>

Chen, D., Xue, Y., Fink, D., Chen, S., & Gomes, C. P. (2017). *Deep Multi-species Embedding*. 3639–3646. <https://www.ijcai.org/proceedings/2017/509>

Chen, H., Perozzi, B., Hu, Y., & Skiena, S. (2017). *HARP: Hierarchical Representation Learning for Networks*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07845>

Choudry, A. (2013). Saving biodiversity, for whom and for what? Conservation NGOs, complicity, colonialism and conquest in an era of capitalist globalization. In *NGOization: Complicity, contradictions and prospects* (pp. 24–44). Bloomsbury Publishing.

Cieslak, M. C., Castelfranco, A. M., Roncalli, V., Lenz, P. H., & Hartline, D. K. (2020). T-Distributed Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE): A tool for eco-physiological transcriptomic analysis. *Marine Genomics*, 51, 100723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.margen.2019.100723>

Csermely, P. (2004). Strong links are important, but weak links stabilize them. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, 29(7), 331–334. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibs.2004.05.004>

Dalla Riva, G. V., & Stouffer, D. B. (2016). Exploring the evolutionary signature of food webs' backbones using functional traits. *Oikos*, 125(4), 446–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.02305>

Dallas, T., Park, A. W., & Drake, J. M. (2017). Predicting cryptic links in host-parasite networks. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 13(5), e1005557. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005557>

Danisch, S., & Krumbiegel, J. (2021). Makie.jl: Flexible high-performance data visualization for Julia. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 6(65), 3349. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.03349>

Domínguez, L., & Luoma, C. (2020). Decolonising Conservation Policy: How Colonial Land and Conservation Ideologies Persist and Perpetuate Indigenous Injustices at the Expense of the Environment. *Land*, 9(3, 3), 65. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land9030065>

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

Eero, M., Dierking, J., Humborg, C., Undeman, E., MacKenzie, B. R., Ojaveer, H., Salo, T., & Köster, F. W. (2021). Use of food web knowledge in environmental conservation and management of living resources in the Baltic Sea. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 78(8), 2645–2663. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsab145>

Eichhorn, M. P., Baker, K., & Griffiths, M. (2019). Steps towards decolonising biogeography. *Frontiers of Biogeography*, 12(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.21425/F5FBG44795>

Eklöf, A., Jacob, U., Kopp, J., Bosch, J., Castro-Urgal, R., Chacoff, N. P., Dalsgaard, B., de Sassi, C., Galetti, M., Guimarães, P. R., Lomáscolo, S. B., Martín González, A. M., Pizo, M. A., Rader, R., Rodrigo, A., Tylianakis, J. M., Vázquez, D. P., & Allesina, S. (2013). The dimensionality of ecological networks. *Ecology Letters*, 16(5), 577–583. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12081>

Fortin, M.-J., Dale, M. R. T., & Brimacombe, C. (2021). Network ecology in dynamic landscapes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 288(1949), rspb.2020.1889, 20201889. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.1889>

Fricke, E. C., Ordonez, A., Rogers, H. S., & Svenning, J.-C. (2022). The effects of defaunation on plants' capacity to track climate change. *Science*. <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.abk3510>

Galiana, N., Barros, C., Braga, J., Ficetola, G. F., Maiorano, L., Thuiller, W., Montoya, J. M., & Lurgi, M. (2021). The spatial scaling of food web structure across European biogeographical regions. *Ecography*, n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.05229>

Galiana, N., Hawkins, B. A., & Montoya, J. M. (2019). The geographical variation of network structure is scale dependent: Understanding the biotic specialization of host–parasitoid networks. *Ecography*, 42(6), 1175–1187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.03684>

Galiana, N., Lurgi, M., Bastazini, V. A. G., Bosch, J., Cagnolo, L., Cazelles, K., Claramunt-López, B., Emer,

C., Fortin, M.-J., Grass, I., Hernández-Castellano, C., Jauker, F., Leroux, S. J., McCann, K., McLeod, A. M., Montoya, D., Mulder, C., Osorio-Canadas, S., Reverté, S., ... Montoya, J. M. (2022). Ecological network complexity scales with area. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-021-01644-4>

Galiana, N., Lurgi, M., Claramunt-López, B., Fortin, M.-J., Leroux, S., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., & Montoya, J. M. (2018). The spatial scaling of species interaction networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2(5), 782–790. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0517-3>

Gibb, R., Albery, G. F., Becker, D. J., Brierley, L., Connor, R., Dallas, T. A., Eskew, E. A., Farrell, M. J., Rasmussen, A. L., Ryan, S. J., Sweeny, A., Carlson, C. J., & Poisot, T. (2021). Data Proliferation, Reconciliation, and Synthesis in Viral Ecology. *BioScience*, 71(11), 1148–1156.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biab080>

Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). *Deep learning*. MIT Press.

Goyal, P., & Ferrara, E. (2018). Graph embedding techniques, applications, and performance: A survey. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 151, 78–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2018.03.022>

Gravel, D., Baiser, B., Dunne, J. A., Kopelke, J.-P., Martinez, N. D., Nyman, T., Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., Tylianakis, J. M., Wood, S. A., & Roslin, T. (2018). Bringing Elton and Grinnell together: A quantitative framework to represent the biogeography of ecological interaction networks. *Ecography*, 0(0).
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.04006>

Green, B., & Chen, Y. (2019). Disparate Interactions: An Algorithm-in-the-Loop Analysis of Fairness in Risk Assessments. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 90–99.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287563>

Grover, A., & Leskovec, J. (2016). Node2vec: Scalable Feature Learning for Networks. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 855–864.
<https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939754>

Grünig, M., Mazzi, D., Calanca, P., Karger, D. N., & Pellissier, L. (2020). Crop and forest pest metawebs shift towards increased linkage and suitability overlap under climate change. *Communications Biology*, 3(1, 1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-020-0962-9>

Gupta, A., Matta, P., & Pant, B. (2021). Graph neural network: Current state of Art, challenges and

370 applications. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 46, 10927–10932.

371 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2021.01.950>

372 Hadfield, J. D., Krasnov, B. R., Poulin, R., & Nakagawa, S. (2014). A Tale of Two Phylogenies: Comparative
 373 Analyses of Ecological Interactions. *The American Naturalist*, 183(2), 174–187.

374 <https://doi.org/10.1086/674445>

375 Herbert, F. (1965). *Dune* (1st ed.). Chilton Book Company.

376 Hinton, G., & Roweis, S. T. (2002). Stochastic neighbor embedding. *NIPS*, 15, 833–840.

377 Hoffmann, J., Bar-Sinai, Y., Lee, L. M., Andrejevic, J., Mishra, S., Rubinstein, S. M., & Rycroft, C. H. (2019).
 378 Machine learning in a data-limited regime: Augmenting experiments with synthetic data uncovers
 379 order in crumpled sheets. *Science Advances*, 5(4), eaau6792.

380 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aau6792>

381 Hortal, J., de Bello, F., Diniz-Filho, J. A. F., Lewinsohn, T. M., Lobo, J. M., & Ladle, R. J. (2015). Seven
 382 Shortfalls that Beset Large-Scale Knowledge of Biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and*
 383 *Systematics*, 46(1), 523–549. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-112414-054400>

384 Jordano, P. (2016). Sampling networks of ecological interactions. *Functional Ecology*, 30(12), 1883–1893.

385 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12763>

386 Lamba, A., Cassey, P., Segaran, R. R., & Koh, L. P. (2019). Deep learning for environmental conservation.
 387 *Current Biology*, 29(19), R977–R982. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.08.016>

388 Maaten, L. van der. (2009). Learning a Parametric Embedding by Preserving Local Structure. *Proceedings*
 389 *of the Twelfth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 384–391.

390 <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v5/maaten09a.html>

391 Machen, R., & Nost, E. (2021). Thinking algorithmically: The making of hegemonic knowledge in climate
 392 governance. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 46(3), 555–569.

393 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12441>

394 McLeod, A., Leroux, S. J., Gravel, D., Chu, C., Cirtwill, A. R., Fortin, M.-J., Galiana, N., Poisot, T., & Wood,
 395 S. A. (2021). Sampling and asymptotic network properties of spatial multi-trophic networks. *Oikos*,
 396 *n/a*(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.08650>

397 Melnyk, K., Klus, S., Montavon, G., & Conrad, T. O. F. (2020). GraphKKE: Graph Kernel Koopman

embedding for human microbiome analysis. *Applied Network Science*, 5(1), 96.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-020-00339-2>

Morales-Castilla, I., Matias, M. G., Gravel, D., & Araújo, M. B. (2015). Inferring biotic interactions from proxies. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(6), 347–356.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.03.014>

Mosebo Fernandes, A. C., Quintero Gonzalez, R., Lenihan-Clarke, M. A., Leslie Trotter, E. F., & Jokar Arsanjani, J. (2020). Machine Learning for Conservation Planning in a Changing Climate. *Sustainability*, 12(18, 18), 7657. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12187657>

Murphy, K. P. (2022). *Probabilistic machine learning: An introduction*. MIT Press. probml.ai

Naman, S. M., White, S. M., Bellmore, J. R., McHugh, P. A., Kaylor, M. J., Baxter, C. V., Danehy, R. J., Naiman, R. J., & Puls, A. L. (2022). Food web perspectives and methods for riverine fish conservation. *WIREs Water*, n/a(n/a), e1590. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1590>

Narayanan, A., Chandramohan, M., Venkatesan, R., Chen, L., Liu, Y., & Jaiswal, S. (2017). *Graph2vec: Learning Distributed Representations of Graphs*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1707.05005>

Neutel, A.-M., Heesterbeek, J. A. P., & de Ruiter, P. C. (2002). Stability in Real Food Webs: Weak Links in Long Loops. *Science*, 296(5570), 1120–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1068326>

No'kmaq, M., Marshall, A., Beazley, K. F., Hum, J., Joudry, shalan, Papadopoulos, A., Pictou, S., Rabesca, J., Young, L., & Zurba, M. (2021). “Awakening the sleeping giant”: Re-Indigenization principles for transforming biodiversity conservation in Canada and beyond. *FACETS*, 6(1), 839–869.

Nost, E., & Goldstein, J. E. (2021). A political ecology of data. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 25148486211043503. <https://doi.org/10.1177/25148486211043503>

O'Connor, L. M. J., Pollock, L. J., Braga, J., Ficetola, G. F., Maiorano, L., Martinez-Almoyna, C., Montemaggiori, A., Ohlmann, M., & Thuiller, W. (2020). Unveiling the food webs of tetrapods across Europe through the prism of the Eltonian niche. *Journal of Biogeography*, 47(1), 181–192.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13773>

Pedersen, E. J., Thompson, P. L., Ball, R. A., Fortin, M.-J., Gouhier, T. C., Link, H., Moritz, C., Nenzen, H., Stanley, R. R. E., Taranu, Z. E., Gonzalez, A., Guichard, F., & Pepin, P. (2017). Signatures of the collapse and incipient recovery of an overexploited marine ecosystem. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(7),

170215. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.170215>

Perozzi, B., Al-Rfou, R., & Skiena, S. (2014). DeepWalk: Online learning of social representations. *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 701–710. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2623330.2623732>

Pichler, M., Boreux, V., Klein, A.-M., Schleuning, M., & Hartig, F. (2020). Machine learning algorithms to infer trait-matching and predict species interactions in ecological networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 11(2), 281–293. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13329>

Poisot, T., Belisle, Z., Hoebeke, L., Stock, M., & Szefer, P. (2019). EcologicalNetworks.jl - analysing ecological networks. *Ecography*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.04310>

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(3), 303–312.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12468>

Poisot, T., Ouellet, M.-A., Mollentze, N., Farrell, M. J., Becker, D. J., Albery, G. F., Gibb, R. J., Seifert, S. N., & Carlson, C. J. (2021). *Imputing the mammalian virome with linear filtering and singular value decomposition*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14973>

Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., & Gravel, D. (2015). Beyond species: Why ecological interaction networks vary through space and time. *Oikos*, 124(3), 243–251. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01719>

Ramasamy, D., & Madhoo, U. (2015). Compressive spectral embedding: Sidestepping the SVD. In C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, & R. Garnett (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems* (Vol. 28). Curran Associates, Inc. <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2015/file/4f6ffe13a5d75b2d6a3923922b3922e5-Paper.pdf>

<https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2015/file/4f6ffe13a5d75b2d6a3923922b3922e5-Paper.pdf>

Ray, J. C., Grimm, J., & Olive, A. (2021). The biodiversity crisis in Canada: Failures and challenges of federal and sub-national strategic and legal frameworks. *FACETS*, 6, 1044–1068.

<https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2020-0075>

Runghen, R., Stouffer, D. B., & Dalla Riva, G. V. (2021). *Exploiting node metadata to predict interactions in large networks using graph embedding and neural networks*.

<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.10.447991>

S, N. S., & Surendran, S. (2013). Graph Embedding and Dimensionality Reduction - A Survey.

454 *International Journal of Computer Science & Engineering Technology*, 4(1). [https://www.](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Graph-Embedding-and-Dimensionality-Reduction-A-Surendran/3f413d591e4b2b876e033eeb9390e232ad4826ca)
455 [semanticscholar.org/paper/Graph-Embedding-and-Dimensionality-Reduction-A-Surendran/](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Graph-Embedding-and-Dimensionality-Reduction-A-Surendran/3f413d591e4b2b876e033eeb9390e232ad4826ca)
456 [3f413d591e4b2b876e033eeb9390e232ad4826ca](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Graph-Embedding-and-Dimensionality-Reduction-A-Surendran/3f413d591e4b2b876e033eeb9390e232ad4826ca)

457 Saravia, L. A., Marina, T. I., Kristensen, N. P., De Troch, M., & Momo, F. R. (2021). Ecological network
458 assembly: How the regional metaweb influences local food webs. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, n/a(n/a).
459 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13652>

460 Stevenson, M. T., & Doleac, J. L. (2021). *Algorithmic Risk Assessment in the Hands of Humans* (SSRN
461 Scholarly Paper No. 3489440). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3489440>

462 Stier, A. C., Samhouri, J. F., Gray, S., Martone, R. G., Mach, M. E., Halpern, B. S., Kappel, C. V.,
463 Scarborough, C., & Levin, P. S. (2017). Integrating Expert Perceptions into Food Web Conservation and
464 Management. *Conservation Letters*, 10(1), 67–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12245>

465 Strydom, T., Bouskila, S., Banville, F., Barros, C., Caron, D., Farrell, M. J., Fortin, M.-J., Hemming, V.,
466 Mercier, B., Pollock, L. J., Runghen, R., Dalla Riva, G. V., & Poisot, T. (2022). Food web reconstruction
467 through phylogenetic transfer of low-rank network representation. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*,
468 n/a(n/a). <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13835>

469 Strydom, T., Catchen, M. D., Banville, F., Caron, D., Dansereau, G., Desjardins-Proulx, P., Forero-Muñoz,
470 N. R., Higino, G., Mercier, B., Gonzalez, A., Gravel, D., Pollock, L., & Poisot, T. (2021). A roadmap
471 towards predicting species interaction networks (across space and time). *Philosophical Transactions of*
472 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 376(1837), 20210063.
473 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0063>

474 Strydom, T., Dalla Riva, G. V., & Poisot, T. (2021). SVD Entropy Reveals the High Complexity of Ecological
475 Networks. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2021.623141>

476 Tang, J., Qu, M., Wang, M., Zhang, M., Yan, J., & Mei, Q. (2015). LINE: Large-scale Information Network
477 Embedding. *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 1067–1077.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1145/2736277.2741093>

479 Torres, L., Chan, K. S., & Eliassi-Rad, T. (2020). GLEE: Geometric Laplacian Eigenmap Embedding.
480 *Journal of Complex Networks*, 8(2), cnaa007. <https://doi.org/10.1093/comnet/cnaa007>

481 Turak, E., Brazill-Boast, J., Cooney, T., Drielsma, M., DelaCruz, J., Dunkerley, G., Fernandez, M., Ferrier,

482 S., Gill, M., Jones, H., Koen, T., Leys, J., McGeoch, M., Mihoub, J.-B., Scanes, P., Schmeller, D., &
 483 Williams, K. (2017). Using the essential biodiversity variables framework to measure biodiversity
 484 change at national scale. *Biological Conservation*, 213, 264–271.
 485 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.08.019>

486 Wang, D., Cui, P., & Zhu, W. (2016). Structural Deep Network Embedding. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM*
 487 *SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 1225–1234.
 488 <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939753>

489 Wang, S., Arroyo, J., Vogelstein, J. T., & Priebe, C. E. (2021). Joint Embedding of Graphs. *IEEE*
 490 *Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 43(4), 1324–1336.
 491 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2019.2948619>

492 Wardeh, M., Baylis, M., & Blagrove, M. S. C. (2021). Predicting mammalian hosts in which novel
 493 coronaviruses can be generated. *Nature Communications*, 12(1, 1), 780.
 494 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21034-5>

495 Weiskopf, S. R., Harmáčková, Z. V., Johnson, C. G., Londoño-Murcia, M. C., Miller, B. W., Myers, B. J. E.,
 496 Pereira, L., Arce-Plata, M. I., Blanchard, J. L., Ferrier, S., Fulton, E. A., Harfoot, M., Isbell, F., Johnson,
 497 J. A., Mori, A. S., Weng, E., & Rosa, I. M. D. (2022). Increasing the uptake of ecological model results in
 498 policy decisions to improve biodiversity outcomes. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 149, 105318.
 499 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2022.105318>

500 Wood, S. A., Russell, R., Hanson, D., Williams, R. J., & Dunne, J. A. (2015). Effects of spatial scale of
 501 sampling on food web structure. *Ecology and Evolution*, 5(17), 3769–3782.
 502 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.1640>

503 Xu, M. (2020). *Understanding graph embedding methods and their applications*.
 504 <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.08019>

505 Yan, S., Xu, D., Zhang, B., & Zhang, H.-J. (2005). Graph embedding: A general framework for
 506 dimensionality reduction. *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern*
 507 *Recognition (CVPR'05)*, 2, 830–837 vol. 2. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2005.170>

508 Young, S. J., & Scheinerman, E. R. (2007). Random Dot Product Graph Models for Social Networks. In A.
 509 Bonato & F. R. K. Chung (Eds.), *Algorithms and Models for the Web-Graph* (pp. 138–149). Springer.
 510 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-77004-6_11

511 Zhou, J., Cui, G., Hu, S., Zhang, Z., Yang, C., Liu, Z., Wang, L., Li, C., & Sun, M. (2020). Graph neural
512 networks: A review of methods and applications. *AI Open*, 1, 57–81.
513 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aiopen.2021.01.001>




Figure 1: Overview of the embedding process. A network (**A**), represented here as its adjacency matrix, is converted into a lower-dimensional object (**B**) where nodes, subgraphs, or edges have specific values (see [tbl. 1](#) for an overview of methods and their use for species interactions). For the purposes of prediction, this low-dimensional object encodes feature vectors for *e.g.* the nodes. Embedding also allows to visualize the structure in the data differently (see [fig. 2](#)), much like with a principal component analysis. From a low-dimensional feature vector, it is possible to develop predictive approaches. Nodes in an ecological network are usually species (**C**), for which we can leverage phylogenetic relatedness (*e.g.* Strydom et al., 2022) or functional traits to fill the values of additional species we would like to project in this space (here for nodes I, J, K, and L) from the embedding of known species (here, nodes A, B, C, and D). Because embeddings can be projected back to a graph, this allows us to reconstruct a network with these new species (**D**). This entire cycle constitutes an instance of transfer learning, where the transferred information is the representation of graph **A** through its embedding.




Figure 2: Illustration of an embedding for a host-parasite metaweb, using Random Dot Product Graphs. **A**, decrease in approximation error as the number of dimensions in the subspaces increases. **B**, position of hosts and parasites in the first two dimensions of their respective subspaces. **C**, predicted interaction weight from the RDPG based on the status of the species pair in the metaweb. **D**, relationship between the position on the first dimension and parasite generalism.

Table 1: Overview of some common graph embedding approaches, by type of embedded objects, alongside examples of their use in the prediction of species interactions. These methods have not yet been routinely used to predict species interactions; most examples that we identified were either statistical associations, or analogues to joint species distribution models. ^a: statistical interactions; ^b: joint-SDM-like approach. Given the need to evaluate different methods on a problem-specific basis, the fact that a lot of methods have not been used on network problems is an opportunity for benchmarking and method development. Note that the row for PCA also applies to kernel/probabilistic PCA, which are variations on the more general method of SVD. Note further that tSNE has been included because it is frequently used to embed graphs, including of species associations/interactions, despite not being strictly speaking, a graph embedding technique (see e.g. Chami et al., 2022)

Method	Object	Technique	Reference	Application
tSNE	nodes	statistical divergence	Hinton & Roweis (2002)	Gibb et al. (2021); Cieslak et al. (2020) ^a
LINE	nodes	stochastic gradient descent	Tang et al. (2015)	
SDNE	nodes	gradient descent	D. Wang et al. (2016)	
node2vec	nodes	stochastic gradient descent	Grover & Leskovec (2016)	
HARP	nodes	meta-strategy	H. Chen et al. (2017)	
DMSE	joint nodes	deep neural network	D. Chen et al. (2017)	D. Chen et al. (2017) ^b
graph2vec	sub-graph	skipgram network	Narayanan et al. (2017)	
RDPG	graph	SVD	Young & Scheinerman (2007)	Poisot et al. (2021); Dalla Riva & Stouffer (2016)
GLEE	graph	Laplacian eigenmap	Torres et al. (2020)	
DeepWalk	graph	stochastic gradient descent	Perozzi et al. (2014)	Wardeh et al. (2021)
GraphKKE	graph	stochastic differential equation	Melnyk et al. (2020)	Melnyk et al. (2020) ^a
FastEmbed	graph	eigen decomposition	Ramasamy & Madhow (2015)	
PCA	graph	eigen decomposition	S & Surendran (2013)	Strydom, Catchen, et al. (2021)
Joint methods	multiple graphs	multiple strategies	S. Wang et al. (2021)	