

Predicting metawebs: graph embeddings can help alleviate spatial data deficiencies

Tanya Strydom^{1,2,‡} Timothée Poisot^{1,2,‡}

¹ Département de Sciences Biologiques, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada ² Quebec Centre for Biodiversity Science, Montréal, Canada

[‡] These authors contributed equally to the work

Correspondance to:

Timothée Poisot — timothee.poisot@umontreal.ca

1. Metawebs, i.e. networks of potential interactions within a species pool, are a powerful abstraction to understand how large-scales 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 the predictive ability is to maximize the information used for prediction, by using graph embeddings rather than 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; furthermore, because metawebs are inherently spatial objects, we 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 Having a general solution for inferring *potential* interactions (despite the unavailability of interaction data)
2 could be the catalyst for significant breakthroughs in our ability to start thinking about species interaction
3 networks over large spatial scales. In a recent overview of the field of ecological network prediction,
4 Strydom et al. (2021) identified two challenges of interest to the prediction of interactions at large scales.
5 First, there is a relative scarcity of relevant data in most places globally – paradoxically, this restricts our
6 ability to infer interactions to locations where inference is perhaps the least required; second, accurate
7 predictions often demand accurate predictors, and the lack of methods that can leverage small amount of
8 data is a serious impediment to our predictive ability globally.

9 Following the definition of Dunne (2006), a metaweb is a network analogue to the regional species pool;
10 specifically, it is an inventory of all *potential* interactions between species from a spatially delimited area
11 (and so captures the γ diversity of interactions). The metaweb is, therefore, *not* a prediction of the food
12 web at a specific locale within the spatial area it covers, and will have a different structure (notably by
13 having a larger connectance; see e.g. Wood et al., 2015). These local food webs (which captures the α
14 diversity of interactions) are a subset of the metaweb’s species and interactions, and have been called
15 “metaweb realizations” (Poisot et al., 2015). Differences between local food web and their metaweb are
16 due to chance, species abundance and co-occurrence, local environmental conditions, and local
17 distribution of functional traits, among others.

18 Because the metaweb represents the joint effect of functional, phylogenetic, and macroecological
19 processes (Morales-Castilla et al., 2015), it holds valuable ecological information. Specifically, it is the
20 “upper bounds” on what the composition of the local networks can be (see e.g. McLeod et al., 2021). These
21 local networks, in turn, can be reconstructed given appropriate knowledge of local species composition,
22 providing information on structure of food webs at finer spatial scales. This has been done for example for
23 tree-galler-parasitoid systems (Gravel et al., 2018), fish trophic interactions (Albouy et al., 2019), tetrapod
24 trophic interactions (O’Connor et al., 2020), and crop-pest networks (Grünig et al., 2020). Whereas the
25 original metaweb definition, and indeed most past uses of metawebs, was based on the presence/absence
26 of interactions, we focus on *probabilistic* metawebs where interactions are represented as the chance of
27 success of a Bernoulli trial (see e.g. Poisot et al., 2016); therefore, not only does our method recommend
28 interactions that may exist, it gives each interaction a score, allowing us to properly weigh them.

29 **The metaweb is an inherently probabilistic object**

30 Yet, owing to the inherent plasticity of interactions, there have been documented instances of food webs
31 undergoing rapid collapse/recovery cycles over short periods of time (Pedersen et al., 2017). The
32 embedding of a network, in a sense, embeds its macro-evolutionary history, especially as RDPG captures
33 ecological signal (Dalla Riva & Stouffer, 2016); at this point, it is important to recall that a metaweb is
34 intended as a catalogue of all potential interactions, which should then be filtered (Morales-Castilla et al.,
35 2015). In practice (and in this instance) the reconstructed metaweb will predict interactions that are
36 plausible based on the species' evolutionary history, however some interactions would/would not be
37 realized due to human impact.

38 Dallas et al. (2017) suggested that most links in ecological networks may be cryptic, *i.e.* uncommon or
39 otherwise hard to observe. This argument essentially echoes Jordano (2016): the sampling of ecological
40 interactions is difficult because it requires first the joint observation of two species, and then the
41 observation of their interaction. In addition, it is generally expected that weak or rare links would be more
42 common in networks (Csermely, 2004), compared to strong, persistent links; this is notably the case in
43 food chains, wherein many weaker links are key to the stability of a system (Neutel et al., 2002). In the
44 light of these observations, the results in fig. ?? are not particularly surprising: we expect to see a surge in
45 these low-probability interactions under a model that has a good predictive accuracy. Because the
46 predictions we generate are by design probabilistic, then one can weigh these rare links appropriately. In a
47 sense, that most ecological interactions are elusive can call for a slightly different approach to sampling:
48 once the common interactions are documented, the effort required in documenting each rare interaction
49 may increase exponentially. Recent proposals suggest that machine learning algorithms, in these
50 situations, can act as data generators (Hoffmann et al., 2019): in this perspective, high quality
51 observational data can be supplemented with synthetic data coming from predictive models, which
52 increases the volume of information available for inference. Indeed, Strydom et al. (2021) suggested that
53 knowing the metaweb may render the prediction of local networks easier, because it fixes an “upper
54 bound” on which interactions can exist; indeed, with a probabilistic metaweb, we can consider that the
55 metaweb represents an aggregation of informative priors on the interactions.

56 **Graph embedding offers promises for the inference of potential** 57 **interactions**

58 Graph embedding is a varied family of machine learning techniques aiming to transform nodes and edges
59 into a vector space, usually of a lower dimension, whilst maximally retaining key properties of the graph
60 (Yan et al., 2005). Ecological networks are an interesting candidate for the widespread application of
61 embeddings, as they tend to possess a shared structural backbone (Mora et al., 2018), which hints at
62 structural invariants that can be revealed at lower dimensions. Indeed, previous work by Eklöf et al. (2013)
63 suggests that food webs are inherently low-dimensional objects, and can be adequately represented with
64 less than ten dimensions.

65 The popularity of graph embedding techniques in machine learning is rather intuitive: while graphs are
66 discrete objects, machine learning techniques tend to handle continuous data better. Therefore, bringing a
67 discrete graph into a continuous vector space opens up a broader variety of predictive algorithms.

Method	Embedding approach	Reference	Species interactions application
RDPG	graphs through SVD	Young & Scheinerman (2007)	Poisot et al. (2021)
tSNE	nodes through statistical divergence	Hinton & Roweis (2002)	Cieslak et al. (2020) – statistical interactions
DeepWalk	graph walk	Perozzi et al. (2014)	Wardeh et al. (2021)
FastEmbed	graph through PCA/SVD analogue	Ramasamy & Madhoo (2015)	
LINE	nodes through statistical divergence	Tang et al. (2015)	
SDNE	nodes through auto-encoding	D. Wang et al. (2016)	

Method	Embedding approach	Reference	Species interactions application
node2vec	node embedding	Grover & Leskovec (2016)	
graph2vec	sub-graph embedding	Narayanan et al. (2017)	
DMSE	joint node embedding	D. Chen et al. (2017)	D. Chen et al. (2017) – joint SDMs
HARP	nodes through a meta-strategy	H. Chen et al. (2017)	
Joint methods	multiple graphs	S. Wang et al. (2021)	

The metaweb embeds hypotheses about which spatial boundaries are meaningful

As Herbert (1965) rightfully pointed out, “[y]ou can’t draw neat lines around planet-wide problems”; in this regard, our approach (and indeed, any inference of a metaweb at large scales) must contend with several interesting and interwoven families of problems. The first is the limit of the metaweb to embed and transfer. If the initial metaweb is too narrow in scope, notably from a taxonomic point of view, the chances of finding another area with enough related species to make a reliable inference decreases; this would likely be indicated by large confidence intervals during ancestral character estimation, but the lack of well documented metawebs is currently preventing the development of more concrete guidelines. The question of phylogenetic relatedness and dispersal is notably true if the metaweb is assembled in an area with mostly endemic species, and as with every predictive algorithm, there is room for the application of our best ecological judgement. Conversely, the metaweb should be reliably filled, which assumes that the S^2 interactions in a pool of S species have been examined, either through literature surveys or expert elicitation. Supp. Mat. 1 provides some guidance as to the type of sampling effort that should be prioritized. While RDPG was able to maintain very high predictive power when interactions were missing,

the addition of false positive interactions was immediately detected; this suggests that it may be appropriate to err on the side of “too many” interactions when constructing the initial metaweb to be transferred. The second series of problems are related to determining which area should be used to infer the new metaweb in, as this determines the species pool that must be used.

In our application, we focused on the mammals of Canada. The upside of this approach is that information at the country level is likely to be required by policy makers and stakeholders for their biodiversity assessment, as each country tends to set goals at the national level (Buxton et al., 2021) for which quantitative instruments are designed (Turak et al., 2017), with specific strategies often enacted at smaller scales (Ray et al., 2021). And yet, we do not really have a satisfying answer to the question of “where does a food web stop?”; the current most satisfying solutions involve examining the spatial consistency of network area relationships (see e.g. Galiana et al., 2018, 2019, 2021; Fortin2021NetEco?), which is of course impossible in the absence of enough information about the network itself. This suggests that an *a posteriori* refinement of the results may be required, based on a downscaling of the metaweb. The final family of problems relates less to the availability of data or quantitative tools, and more to the praxis of spatial ecology. Operating under the context of national divisions, in large parts of the world, reflects nothing more than the legacy of settler colonialism. Indeed, the use of ecological data is not an apolitical act (Nost & Goldstein, 2021), as data infrastructures tend to be designed to answer questions within national boundaries, and their use both draws upon and reinforces territorial statecraft; as per Machen & Nost (2021), this is particularly true when the output of “algorithmic thinking” (e.g. relying on machine learning to generate knowledge) can be re-used for governance (e.g. enacting conservation decisions at the national scale). We therefore recognize that methods such as we propose operate under the framework that contributed to the ongoing biodiversity crisis (Adam, 2014), reinforced environmental injustice (Choudry, 2013; Domínguez & Luoma, 2020), and on Turtle Island especially, should be replaced by Indigenous principles of land management (Eichhorn et al., 2019; No’kmaq et al., 2021). As we see AI/ML being increasingly mobilized to generate knowledge that is lacking for conservation decisions (e.g. Lamba et al., 2019; Mosebo Fernandes et al., 2020), our discussion of these tools need to go beyond the technical, and into the governance consequences they can have.

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge that this study was conducted on land within the traditional unceded territory of the Saint Lawrence Iroquoian, Anishinabewaki, Mohawk, Huron-Wendat, and Omàmiwininiwak nations. TP, TS, DC, and LP received funding from the Canadian Institue for Ecology &

113 Evolution. FB is funded by the Institute for Data Valorization (IVADO). TS, SB, and TP are funded by a
 114 donation from the Courtois Foundation. CB was awarded a Mitacs Elevate Fellowship no. IT12391, in
 115 partnership with fRI Research, and also acknowledges funding from Alberta Innovates and the Forest
 116 Resources Improvement Association of Alberta. M-JF acknowledges funding from NSERC Discovery
 117 Grant and NSERC CRC. RR is funded by New Zealand's Biological Heritage Ngā Koiora Tuku Iho
 118 National Science Challenge, administered by New Zealand Ministry of Business, Innovation, and
 119 Employment. BM is funded by the NSERC Alexander Graham Bell Canada Graduate Scholarship and the
 120 FRQNT master's scholarship. LP acknowledges funding from NSERC Discovery Grant (NSERC
 121 RGPIN-2019-05771). TP acknowledges financial support from NSERC through the Discovery Grants and
 122 Discovery Accelerator Supplement programs.

123 References

- 124 Adam, R. (2014). *Elephant treaties: The Colonial legacy of the biodiversity crisis*. UPNE.
- 125 Albouy, C., Archambault, P., Appeltans, W., Araújo, M. B., Beauchesne, D., Cazelles, K., Cirtwill, A. R.,
 126 Fortin, M.-J., Galiana, N., Leroux, S. J., Pellissier, L., Poisot, T., Stouffer, D. B., Wood, S. A., & Gravel, D.
 127 (2019). The marine fish food web is globally connected. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 3(8, 8),
 128 1153–1161. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0950-y>
- 129 Buxton, R. T., Bennett, J. R., Reid, A. J., Shulman, C., Cooke, S. J., Francis, C. M., Nyboer, E. A., Pritchard,
 130 G., Binley, A. D., Avery-Gomm, S., Ban, N. C., Beazley, K. F., Bennett, E., Blight, L. K., Bortolotti, L. E.,
 131 Camfield, A. F., Gadallah, F., Jacob, A. L., Naujokaitis-Lewis, I., ... Smith, P. A. (2021). Key
 132 information needs to move from knowledge to action for biodiversity conservation in Canada.
 133 *Biological Conservation*, 256, 108983. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.108983>
- 134 Chen, D., Xue, Y., Fink, D., Chen, S., & Gomes, C. P. (2017). *Deep Multi-species Embedding*. 3639–3646.
 135 <https://www.ijcai.org/proceedings/2017/509>
- 136 Chen, H., Perozzi, B., Hu, Y., & Skiena, S. (2017, November 16). *HARP: Hierarchical Representation*
 137 *Learning for Networks*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07845>
- 138 Choudry, A. (2013). Saving biodiversity, for whom and for what? Conservation NGOs, complicity,
 139 colonialism and conquest in an era of capitalist globalization. In *NGOization: Complicity*,

140 *contradictions and prospects* (pp. 24–44). Bloomsbury Publishing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

161 Galiana, N., Barros, C., Braga, J., Ficetola, G. F., Maiorano, L., Thuiller, W., Montoya, J. M., & Lurgi, M.
 162 (2021). The spatial scaling of food web structure across European biogeographical regions. *Ecography*,
 163 *n/a(n/a)*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.05229>

164 Galiana, N., Hawkins, B. A., & Montoya, J. M. (2019). The geographical variation of network structure is
 165 scale dependent: Understanding the biotic specialization of host–parasitoid networks. *Ecography*,
 166 42(6), 1175–1187. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.03684>

167 Galiana, N., Lurgi, M., Claramunt-López, B., Fortin, M.-J., Leroux, S., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., & Montoya,

168 J. M. (2018). The spatial scaling of species interaction networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2(5),
 169 782–790. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0517-3>

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

174 Grover, A., & Leskovec, J. (2016). Node2vec: Scalable Feature Learning for Networks. *Proceedings of the*
 175 *22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 855–864.
 176 <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939754>

177 Grünig, M., Mazzi, D., Calanca, P., Karger, D. N., & Pellissier, L. (2020). Crop and forest pest metawebs
 178 shift towards increased linkage and suitability overlap under climate change. *Communications Biology*,
 179 3(1, 1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-020-0962-9>

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

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

182 Hoffmann, J., Bar-Sinai, Y., Lee, L. M., Andrejevic, J., Mishra, S., Rubinstein, S. M., & Rycroft, C. H. (2019).
 183 Machine learning in a data-limited regime: Augmenting experiments with synthetic data uncovers
 184 order in crumpled sheets. *Science Advances*, 5(4), eaau6792.
 185 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aau6792>

186 Jordano, P. (2016). Sampling networks of ecological interactions. *Functional Ecology*, 30(12), 1883–1893.
 187 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12763>

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

190 Machen, R., & Nost, E. (2021). Thinking algorithmically: The making of hegemonic knowledge in climate
 191 governance. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 46(3), 555–569.
 192 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12441>

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

196 Mora, B. B., Gravel, D., Gilarranz, L. J., Poisot, T., & Stouffer, D. B. (2018). Identifying a common backbone
 197 of interactions underlying food webs from different ecosystems. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 2603.
 198 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05056-0>

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

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

205 Narayanan, A., Chandramohan, M., Venkatesan, R., Chen, L., Liu, Y., & Jaiswal, S. (2017, July 17).
 206 *Graph2vec: Learning Distributed Representations of Graphs*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1707.05005>

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

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

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

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

218 Pedersen, E. J., Thompson, P. L., Ball, R. A., Fortin, M.-J., Gouhier, T. C., Link, H., Moritz, C., Nenzen, H.,
 219 Stanley, R. R. E., Taranu, Z. E., Gonzalez, A., Guichard, F., & Pepin, P. (2017). Signatures of the
 220 collapse and incipient recovery of an overexploited marine ecosystem. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(7),
 221 170215. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.170215>

222 Perozzi, B., Al-Rfou, R., & Skiena, S. (2014). DeepWalk: Online learning of social representations.
 223 *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data*

224 Mining, 701–710. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2623330.2623732>

225 Poisot, T., Cirtwill, A. R., Cazelles, K., Gravel, D., Fortin, M.-J., & Stouffer, D. B. (2016). The structure of
 226 probabilistic networks. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(3), 303–312.
 227 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12468>

228 Poisot, T., Ouellet, M.-A., Mollentze, N., Farrell, M. J., Becker, D. J., Albery, G. F., Gibb, R. J., Seifert, S. N.,
 229 & Carlson, C. J. (2021, May 31). *Imputing the mammalian virome with linear filtering and singular*
 230 *value decomposition*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14973>

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

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

236

237 Ray, J. C., Grimm, J., & Olive, A. (2021). The biodiversity crisis in Canada: Failures and challenges of
 238 federal and sub-national strategic and legal frameworks. *FACETS*, 6, 1044–1068.
 239 <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2020-0075>

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

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

248 Turak, E., Brazill-Boast, J., Cooney, T., Drielsma, M., DelaCruz, J., Dunkerley, G., Fernandez, M., Ferrier,
 249 S., Gill, M., Jones, H., Koen, T., Leys, J., McGeoch, M., Mihoub, J.-B., Scanes, P., Schmeller, D., &
 250 Williams, K. (2017). Using the essential biodiversity variables framework to measure biodiversity
 251 change at national scale. *Biological Conservation*, 213, 264–271.
 252 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.08.019>

- 253 Wang, D., Cui, P., & Zhu, W. (2016). Structural Deep Network Embedding. *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM*
254 *SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 1225–1234.
255 <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939753>
- 256 Wang, S., Arroyo, J., Vogelstein, J. T., & Priebe, C. E. (2021). Joint Embedding of Graphs. *IEEE*
257 *Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 43(4), 1324–1336.
258 <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2019.2948619>
- 259 Wardeh, M., Baylis, M., & Blagrove, M. S. C. (2021). Predicting mammalian hosts in which novel
260 coronaviruses can be generated. *Nature Communications*, 12(1, 1), 780.
261 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21034-5>
- 262 Wood, S. A., Russell, R., Hanson, D., Williams, R. J., & Dunne, J. A. (2015). Effects of spatial scale of
263 sampling on food web structure. *Ecology and Evolution*, 5(17), 3769–3782.
264 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.1640>
- 265 Yan, S., Xu, D., Zhang, B., & Zhang, H.-J. (2005). Graph embedding: A general framework for
266 dimensionality reduction. *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern*
267 *Recognition (CVPR'05)*, 2, 830–837 vol. 2. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2005.170>
- 268 Young, S. J., & Scheinerman, E. R. (2007). Random Dot Product Graph Models for Social Networks. In A.
269 Bonato & F. R. K. Chung (Eds.), *Algorithms and Models for the Web-Graph* (pp. 138–149). Springer.
270 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-77004-6_11