

# Increasing realism in models of biotic interactions; ecological and evolutionary consequences

Alba Cervantes-Loreto

## Abstract

Interactions between organisms have a central role in the study of ecological and evolutionary dynamics. The study of biotic interactions usually requires the use of models and simplifying assumptions about reality, since it is impossible to include every aspect of the real world in any model. Choices like the number of species that can alter the interaction between a focal pair, what abiotic variables constitute the environment, and even what type of mathematical formulation to use to capture the system's dynamics are common yet implicit in many ecological and evolutionary models. However, simplifying assumptions can lead to ignoring important heterogeneities at various levels, which could dramatically change model-based predictions. In this thesis, I explore with theoretical and empirical tools how relaxing simplifying assumptions in models of interactions between organisms change predictions related to diversity maintenance at ecological and evolutionary scales. Throughout my thesis, I focus on different types of interactions and organisms, and propose mathematical and statistical frameworks to incorporate biotic

and abiotic variables, as well as different sources of uncertainty in our representations of biotic interactions.

In **Chapter 2** I explore how the presence of multiple species and different environmental contexts change the strength of plant-pollinator interactions. I propose a framework for using pollinator functional responses to examine the roles of pollinator-pollinator interactions and abiotic conditions in altering the times between floral visits of a focal pollinator. I show that while density-dependent responses can substantially change the predicted number of visits a pollinator makes, they also strongly depend on the abiotic context pollinators experience. In **Chapter 3** I explore how incorporating different sources of uncertainty changes our predictions of species coexistence. I do this by simultaneously exploring how different model formulations, environmental contexts, and parameter uncertainty change the probability of predicting coexistence in an experimental system. I provide direct evidence that predictions of species coexistence are likely to change given the models used to quantify density-dependence as well as a theoretical framework to explore predictions made with different models. Finally, in **Chapter 4** I adopted an ecological framework to examine evolutionary dynamics of sexually antagonistic alleles through the same lens as the coexistence of competing species. I show that incorporating environmental fluctuations can substantially increase the amount of genetic diversity in a population under sexually antagonistic selection. Overall, the results of this thesis show that the assumptions adopted by some ecological and evolutionary models tend to be oversimplifying. This thesis also provides the tools for ecologists and evolutionary biologists to explore a more complex representation of biotic interactions.

## Preface

This thesis is a collection of three stand alone scientific articles. Each chapter is a standalone piece of research and, therefore, I only provide a general Introduction and Conclusion chapters linking the three chapters together. In **Chapter 1** I focus on describing how my three chapters are connected. In **Chapter 5** I focus on summarising the results from each of my thesis chapters, their combined implications both in both how we study interactions and their consequences for diversity maintenance and finally I further expand on new ideas beyond those presented in the different chapters to discuss about the future steps moving forward.

At the time of submission, each of these three articles are in different stages of the publication process and are formatted in the style of a journal article.

**Chapter 2:** “The context dependency of pollinator interference: how environmental conditions and co-foraging species impact floral visitaion” was published on May 2021 in the journal of *Ecology Letters* in volume .

**Chapter 3:** “The interplay of environmental conditions, parameter sensitivity and structural sensitivity in predictions of species coexistence” is in preparation for submission to *Ecology Letters*.

**Chapter 4:** “Quantifying the relative contributions of environmental fluctuations to the maintenance of a sexually antagonistic polymorphism” is in preparation for submission to *The American Naturalist*.

# Chapter 1: General Introduction

## Models of biotic interactions

Interactions between organisms underpin the persistence of almost all life forms on Earth (Lawton, 1999). Furthermore, a large body of work has shown that biotic interactions determine emergent properties of natural systems, such as stability (May, 1972; Wootton & Stouffer, 2016; Song & Saavedra, 2018), resilience (Capdevila *et al.*, 2021), ecosystem functioning (Turnbull *et al.*, 2013; Godoy *et al.*, 2020), and the coexistence of multiple species (Chesson, 2000; Saavedra *et al.*, 2017). Unsurprisingly, numerous ecological and evolutionary concepts revolve around the effects that organisms exert on each other (Gause, 1934; MacArthur & Levins, 1967; Thompson, 1999; HilleRisLambers *et al.*, 2012; Chase & Leibold, 2009).

Describing the effect of biotic interactions often requires the use of mathematical models to represent them (Maynard-Smith, 1978; Rossberg *et al.*, 2019). Mathematical descriptions of interactions are “useful fictions” (Box *et al.*, 2011) in a twofold manner. First, they create a description of how organisms that coincide in space and time affect each other. Almost all known types of interactions can be described in the form of mathematical expressions that reproduce the observed data faithfully (Volterra, 1926; Holling, 1959; Holt, 1977; Adler *et al.*, 2018; Wood & Thomas, 1999; Holland *et al.*, 2002; Vázquez *et al.*, 2005; Stouffer & Novak, 2021) Second, models are practical tools with which to make predictions beyond the phenomena they describe and thus, provide general insights into how natural systems operate (Evans *et al.*, 2012; Stouffer, 2019; Rossberg *et al.*, 2019).

## 81 The perils of simple models

82 Models that capture the effect of biotic interactions are abstractions of reality, and abstrac-  
83 tions always reflect choices (Levins, 2006). Building models that include all aspects of  
84 reality is not only impractical but also unfeasible. Therefore, ecologists and evolutionary  
85 biologists have to continuously make choices regarding which variables to include in a  
86 model and which to omit (Evans *et al.*, 2012; Rossberg *et al.*, 2019). A common assumption  
87 when building models is that to achieve general insights, we should favor simple models  
88 (Evans *et al.*, 2013). Indeed there is a general belief in ecology and evolution that a good  
89 model should include as little as possible (Evans *et al.*, 2013; Orzack, 2012). This belief  
90 is often rooted in an implicit philosophical stance that one can not maximize generality  
91 (i.e., models that apply to more than one system) and realism (i.e., models that produce  
92 accurate predictions for a system) (Levins, 2006; Evans *et al.*, 2012).

93 Inevitably, model building in biology leads to a key question that will, in turn, mod-  
94 ify the outcomes achieved by any model: when is a model “realistic” enough (Stouffer,  
95 2019)? The answer to this question will depend on the purpose for which a model is  
96 built. Models that capture the effect of biotic interactions tend to fall into the category of  
97 “demonstration models”. These types of models are often based on phenomenological  
98 descriptions of processes and have the general aim to show that the modeled principles  
99 are sufficient to produce the phenomena of interest (Evans *et al.*, 2013). Demonstration  
100 models however, do not help decide whether the modelled principles are *necessary* (Evans  
101 *et al.*, 2013). The task to decide the necessary principles and thus the answer to the ques-

tion of when a model is realistic enough becomes the modeler's responsibility. In many cases, the answer to this question can appear arbitrary or solely determined by the predominant paradigm regarding the studied system (Holland *et al.*, 2006; Bascompte *et al.*, 2006; Kokko & López-Sepulcre, 2007; AlAdwani & Saavedra, 2019; Mayfield & Stouffer, 2017; Martyn *et al.*, 2021).

Always favoring simple models in ecological and evolutionary studies can be problematic from two perspectives. First, the assumption that more complex models do not lead to general insights is seldomly tested. For example, most models that capture competitive interactions between plants have the implicit assumption that competitive effects between individuals are always additive and direct (Schoener, 1974; Freckleton & Watkinson, 2001; Kraft *et al.*, 2015). However, when models and data collection were set up to capture non-additive effects of interactions between individuals of co-occurring species, the evidence overwhelmingly showed that including these levels of biotic complexity was necessary to capture plant interactions accurately (Mayfield & Stouffer, 2017; Martyn *et al.*, 2021; Lai *et al.*, 2021). Thus, in some cases, increasing complexity increases rather than hampers the general insights obtained from models of biotic interactions.

Second, failing to include necessary levels of complexity can hinder our ability to predict how natural communities will react to novel conditions. Predictions of how natural systems will behave in the future are inherently challenging (Sutherland, 2006). Nevertheless, ignoring heterogeneities at various levels can further complicate rather than simplify predictions (Evans *et al.*, 2012). For instance, demographic models tend to treat ecological and evolutionary dynamics separately, despite the general understanding that both

processes are often intertwined (MacArthur, 1962; Kokko & López-Sepulcre, 2007). Ignoring eco-evolutionary feedbacks leads to predictions that are inconsistent with empirical data and produce counterintuitive results in novel conditions (Kokko & López-Sepulcre, 2007). Thus, the implicit assumption that good models should include as little as possible should be treated with caution in ecological and evolutionary contexts (Evans *et al.*, 2013; Kokko & López-Sepulcre, 2007; Abrams, 2001).

## Challenges and consequences of increasing realism

Despite arguments in favor of increasing realism in models of biotic interactions, doing so remains a challenge in many ecological and evolutionary studies. One of those challenges arises from the lack of theoretical frameworks that allow incorporating intricate empirical observations into models (Abrams, 1983). Such is the case of competition between pollinators that forage for the same resources (Thomson & Page, 2020). An overwhelmingly amount of empirical evidence shows that pollinators modify their foraging behavior in the presence of other foraging species (Morse, 1977; Inouye, 1978; Thompson *et al.*, 2006; Brosi & Briggs, 2013; Briggs, 2016), however, incorporating these behavioral changes into population dynamics remains elusive (Thomson & Page, 2020). Furthermore, density-dependent responses could themselves depend on the abiotic conditions pollinators experience, as many studies have shown that environmental conditions can drastically change how pollinators behave while foraging (Heinrich, 1976; Thomson *et al.*, 1987; Cnaani *et al.*, 2006; Westphal *et al.*, 2006; Briggs *et al.*, 2018; Classen *et al.*, 2020). A coherent framework with which to incorporate both abiotic and biotic drivers into plant–pollinator interac-

tions was lacking. To this end, in **Chapter 2** I develop a general framework to show how pollinator functional responses can be used to incorporate biotic and abiotic drivers into floral visitation rates. Furthermore, I show the empirical relevance of this framework by parameterizing different models that incorporated pollinator-pollinator interactions and environmental conditions when predicting observed data from a highly controlled foraging chamber experiment. Results from this chapter have substantial implications related to our understanding of how species loss and environmental change might affect mutualistic communities.

Another theoretical challenge emerges when alternative models to represent biotic interactions are used interchangeably. Such is the case of phenomenological models of plant competition, where more than one mathematical form can faithfully reproduce empirical data (Levine & HilleRisLambers, 2009; Godoy & Levine, 2014; Godoy *et al.*, 2014; Mayfield & Stouffer, 2017; Bimler *et al.*, 2018). The effect biotic and abiotic drivers have in model based predictions can be dramatically different due to uncertainty associated with phenomenological models (Jørgensen & Bendoricchio, 2001; Flora *et al.*, 2011; Aldebert Clement & Stouffer Daniel B., 2018). To understand the interplay between uncertainty and abiotic complexity, in **Chapter 3** I introduce a mathematical and statistical framework to simultaneously explore how different phenomenological models of plant competition, environmental contexts, and parameter uncertainty determine predictions of species coexistence. Additionally, I use this framework to make predictions around a pairwise competition experiment between annual plants, where I show that the effect of abiotic conditions in predictions of species coexistence is not independent of the model formulation



used to describe species interactions.

Finally, it is not only important to understand whether increasing realism changes predictions, but it is also essential to understand how. For instance, theoretical studies have shown that environmental fluctuations can substantially increase the levels of genetic diversity in populations that experience sexually antagonistic selection (Connallon & Clark, 2012; Connallon *et al.*, 2019; Patten *et al.*, 2010; Jordan & Charlesworth, 2012). However, there are no approaches that directly quantify how environmental fluctuations promote genetic diversity in populations that experience sexual conflict. Hence, in **Chapter 4** I adopt an ecological framework that allows the quantification of the relative contributions of environmental fluctuations using simulations to capture the effect of environmental fluctuations in evolutionary dynamics. In this chapter I show that incorporating environmental heterogeneity is essential to fully understand the effect of when and how sexually antagonistic selection can maintain genetic diversity.

## **Concluding remarks**

In this thesis, I propose theoretical and statistical frameworks that allow increasing realism in models of biotic interactions with the aim to understand when higher levels of complexity are justified. Furthermore, I also explore the consequences of increasing model realism in predictions related to diversity maintenance at ecological and evolutionary scales. The individual chapters of this thesis are thematically broad as they are focused on different types of interactions and organisms, but all address in a different way the challenges and consequences of incorporating biotic and abiotic complexity in

188 the study of biotic interactions.

## References

- Abrams, P.A. (1983). Arguments in favor of higher order interactions. *The American Naturalist*, 121, 887–891.
- Abrams, P.A. (2001). Describing and quantifying interspecific interactions: a commentary on recent approaches. *Oikos*, 94, 209–218.
- Adler, P.B., Smull, D., Beard, K.H., Choi, R.T., Furniss, T., Kulmatiski, A., Meiners, J.M., Tredennick, A.T. & Veblen, K.E. (2018). Competition and coexistence in plant communities: intraspecific competition is stronger than interspecific competition. *Ecology letters*, 21, 1319–1329.
- AlAdwani, M. & Saavedra, S. (2019). Is the addition of higher-order interactions in ecological models increasing the understanding of ecological dynamics? *Mathematical Biosciences*, 315, 108222.
- Aldebert Clement & Stouffer Daniel B. (2018). Community dynamics and sensitivity to model structure: towards a probabilistic view of process-based model predictions. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 15, 20180741.
- Bascompte, J., Jordano, P. & Olesen, J.M. (2006). Response to comment on “asymmetric coevolutionary networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance”. *Science*, 313, 1887–1887.
- Bimler, M.D., Stouffer, D.B., Lai, H.R. & Mayfield, M.M. (2018). Accurate predictions of coexistence in natural systems require the inclusion of facilitative interactions and environmental dependency. *Journal of Ecology*, 106, 1839–1852.

209 Box, G.E., Luceño, A. & del Carmen Paniagua-Quinones, M. (2011). *Statistical control by*  
210 *monitoring and adjustment*. vol. 700. John Wiley & Sons.

211 Briggs, H.M. (2016). *Competitive context drives pollinator behavior: linking foraging plasticity,*  
212 *natural pollen deposition, and plant reproduction*. Ph.D. thesis, UC Santa Cruz.

213 Briggs, H.M., Graham, S., Switzer, C.M. & Hopkins, R. (2018). Variation in context-  
214 dependent foraging behavior across pollinators. *Ecology and evolution*, 8, 7964–7973.

215 Brosi, B.J. & Briggs, H.M. (2013). Single pollinator species losses reduce floral fidelity  
216 and plant reproductive function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110,  
217 13044–13048.

218 Capdevila, P., Stott, I., Oliveras Menor, I., Stouffer, D.B., Raimundo, R.L., White, H., Bar-  
219 bour, M. & Salguero-Gómez, R. (2021). Reconciling resilience across ecological systems,  
220 species and subdisciplines.

221 Chase, J.M. & Leibold, M.A. (2009). *Ecological niches*. University of Chicago Press.

222 Chesson, P. (2000). Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual review of*  
223 *Ecology and Systematics*, 31, 343–366.

224 Classen, A., Eardley, C.D., Hemp, A., Peters, M.K., Peters, R.S., Ssymank, A. & Steffan-  
225 Dewenter, I. (2020). Specialization of plant–pollinator interactions increases with tem-  
226 perature at mt. kilimanjaro. *Ecology and evolution*, 10, 2182–2195.

227 Cnaani, J., Thomson, J.D. & Papaj, D.R. (2006). Flower Choice and Learning in Foraging

228 Bumblebees: Effects of Variation in Nectar Volume and Concentration. *Ethology*, 112,  
229 278–285.

230 Connallon, T. & Clark, A.G. (2012). A general population genetic framework for antag-  
231 onistic selection that accounts for demography and recurrent mutation. *Genetics*, 190,  
232 1477–1489.

233 Connallon, T., Sharma, S. & Olito, C. (2019). Evolutionary Consequences of Sex-Specific  
234 Selection in Variable Environments: Four Simple Models Reveal Diverse Evolutionary  
235 Outcomes. *The American Naturalist*, 193, 93–105.

236 Evans, M.R., Grimm, V., Johst, K., Knuuttila, T., De Langhe, R., Lessells, C.M., Merz, M.,  
237 O'Malley, M.A., Orzack, S.H., Weisberg, M. *et al.* (2013). Do simple models lead to  
238 generality in ecology? *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 28, 578–583.

239 Evans, M.R., Norris, K.J. & Benton, T.G. (2012). Predictive ecology: systems approaches.

240 Flora, C., David, N., Mathias, G., Andrew, M. & Jean-Christophe, P. (2011). Structural  
241 sensitivity of biological models revisited. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 283, 82–91.

242 Freckleton, R. & Watkinson, A. (2001). Predicting competition coefficients for plant mix-  
243 tures: reciprocity, transitivity and correlations with life-history traits. *Ecology Letters*, 4,  
244 348–357.

245 Gause, G.F. (1934). Experimental analysis of vito volterra's mathematical theory of the  
246 struggle for existence. 79, 16–17.

247 Godoy, O., Gómez-Aparicio, L., Matías, L., Pérez-Ramos, I.M. & Allan, E. (2020). An  
 248 excess of niche differences maximizes ecosystem functioning. *Nature communications*,  
 249 11, 1–10.

250 Godoy, O., Kraft, N.J.B. & Levine, J.M. (2014). Phylogenetic relatedness and the determi-  
 251 nants of competitive outcomes. *Ecology Letters*, 17, 836–844.

252 Godoy, O. & Levine, J.M. (2014). Phenology effects on invasion success: insights from  
 253 coupling field experiments to coexistence theory. *Ecology*, 95, 726–736.

254 Heinrich, B. (1976). Resource Partitioning Among Some Eusocial Insects: Bumblebees.  
 255 *Ecology*, 57, 874–889.

256 HilleRisLambers, J., Adler, P.B., Harpole, W.S., Levine, J.M. & Mayfield, M.M. (2012).  
 257 Rethinking community assembly through the lens of coexistence theory. *Annual review*  
 258 *of ecology, evolution, and systematics*, 43, 227–248.

259 Holland, J.N., DeAngelis, D.L. & Bronstein, J.L. (2002). Population dynamics and mutu-  
 260 alism: functional responses of benefits and costs. *The American Naturalist*, 159, 231–244.

261 Holland, J.N., Okuyama, T. & DeAngelis, D.L. (2006). Comment on “asymmetric coevo-  
 262 lutionary networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance”. *Science*, 313, 1887–1887.

263 Holling, C.S. (1959). Some characteristics of simple types of predation and parasitism1.  
 264 *The Canadian Entomologist*, 91, 385–398.

265 Holt, R.D. (1977). Predation, apparent competition, and the structure of prey communi-  
 266 ties. *Theoretical population biology*, 12, 197–229.

- 267 Inouye, D.W. (1978). Resource Partitioning in Bumblebees: Experimental Studies of For-  
268 aging Behavior. *Ecology*, 59, 672–678.
- 269 Jordan, C.Y. & Charlesworth, D. (2012). The potential for sexually antagonistic polymor-  
270 phism in different genome regions. *Evolution: International Journal of Organic Evolution*,  
271 66, 505–516.
- 272 Jørgensen, S.E. & Bendoricchio, G. (2001). *Fundamentals of Ecological Modelling*. vol. 21.  
273 Elsevier.
- 274 Kokko, H. & López-Sepulcre, A. (2007). The ecogenetic link between demography and  
275 evolution: can we bridge the gap between theory and data? *Ecology Letters*, 10, 773–782.
- 276 Kraft, N.J., Godoy, O. & Levine, J.M. (2015). Plant functional traits and the multidimen-  
277 sional nature of species coexistence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112,  
278 797–802.
- 279 Lai, H.R., Chong, K.Y., Yee, A.T.K., Mayfield, M.M. & Stouffer, D.B. (2021). Non-additive  
280 biotic interactions improve predictions of tropical tree growth and impact community  
281 size structure. *bioRxiv*, pp. 2020–09.
- 282 Lawton, J.H. (1999). Are there general laws in ecology? *Oikos*, pp. 177–192.
- 283 Levine, J.M. & HilleRisLambers, J. (2009). The importance of niches for the maintenance  
284 of species diversity. *Nature*, 461, 254–257.
- 285 Levins, R. (2006). Strategies of abstraction. *Biology and Philosophy*, 21, 741–755.

- 286 MacArthur, R. & Levins, R. (1967). The limiting similarity, convergence, and divergence  
287 of coexisting species. *The american naturalist*, 101, 377–385.
- 288 MacArthur, R.H. (1962). Some generalized theorems of natural selection. *Proceedings of*  
289 *the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 48, 1893.
- 290 Martyn, T.E., Stouffer, D.B., Godoy, O., Bartomeus, I., Pastore, A.I. & Mayfield, M.M.  
291 (2021). Identifying “useful” fitness models: Balancing the benefits of added complexity  
292 with realistic data requirements in models of individual plant fitness. *The American*  
293 *Naturalist*, 197, 415–433.
- 294 May, R.M. (1972). Will a large complex system be stable? *Nature*, 238, 413–414.
- 295 Mayfield, M.M. & Stouffer, D.B. (2017). Higher-order interactions capture unexplained  
296 complexity in diverse communities. *Nature ecology & evolution*, 1, 1–7.
- 297 Maynard-Smith, J. (1978). *Models in ecology*. CUP Archive.
- 298 Morse, D.H. (1977). Resource Partitioning in Bumble Bees: The Role of Behavioral Factors.  
299 *Science*, 197, 678–680.
- 300 Orzack, S.H. (2012). The philosophy of modelling or does the philosophy of biology have  
301 any use? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 367, 170–180.
- 302 Patten, M.M., Haig, D. & Ubeda, F. (2010). Fitness variation due to sexual antagonism  
303 and linkage disequilibrium. *Evolution: International Journal of Organic Evolution*, 64,  
304 3638–3642.



- Rossberg, A.G., Barabás, G., Possingham, H.P., Pascual, M., Marquet, P.A., Hui, C., Evans, M.R. & Meszéna, G. (2019). Let's train more theoretical ecologists—here is why. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 34, 759–762.
- Saavedra, S., Rohr, R.P., Bascompte, J., Godoy, O., Kraft, N.J. & Levine, J.M. (2017). A structural approach for understanding multispecies coexistence. *Ecological Monographs*, 87, 470–486.
- Schoener, T.W. (1974). Some methods for calculating competition coefficients from resource-utilization spectra. *The American Naturalist*, 108, 332–340.
- Song, C. & Saavedra, S. (2018). Will a small randomly assembled community be feasible and stable? *Ecology*, 99, 743–751.
- Stouffer, D.B. (2019). All ecological models are wrong, but some are useful. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 88, 192–195.
- Stouffer, D.B. & Novak, M. (2021). Hidden layers of density dependence in consumer feeding rates. *Ecology Letters*, 24, 520–532.
- Sutherland, W.J. (2006). Predicting the ecological consequences of environmental change: a review of the methods. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 43, 599–616.
- Thompson, A.R., Nisbet, R.M. & Schmitt, R.J. (2006). Dynamics of mutualist populations that are demographically open. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 75, 1239–1251.
- Thompson, J.N. (1999). The evolution of species interactions. *Science*, 284, 2116–2118.

- 324 Thomson, D.M. & Page, M.L. (2020). The importance of competition between insect pol-  
325 linators in the Anthropocene. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 38, 55–62.
- 326 Thomson, J.D., Peterson, S.C. & Harder, L.D. (1987). Response of traplining bumble bees  
327 to competition experiments: shifts in feeding location and efficiency. *Oecologia*, 71, 295–  
328 300.
- 329 Turnbull, L.A., Levine, J.M., Loreau, M. & Hector, A. (2013). Coexistence, niches and  
330 biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning. *Ecology letters*, 16, 116–127.
- 331 Vázquez, D.P., Morris, W.F. & Jordano, P. (2005). Interaction frequency as a surrogate for  
332 the total effect of animal mutualists on plants. *Ecology letters*, 8, 1088–1094.
- 333 Volterra, V. (1926). Fluctuations in the abundance of a species considered mathematically.  
334 *Nature*, 118, 558–560.
- 335 Westphal, C., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Tscharntke, T. (2006). Bumblebees experience land-  
336 scapes at different spatial scales: possible implications for coexistence. *Oecologia*, 149,  
337 289–300.
- 338 Wood, S.N. & Thomas, M.B. (1999). Super-sensitivity to structure in biological models.  
339 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 266, 565–570.
- 340 Wootton, K. & Stouffer, D. (2016). Many weak interactions and few strong; food-web  
341 feasibility depends on the combination of the strength of species' interactions and their  
342 correct arrangement. *Theoretical Ecology*, 9, 185–195.