

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

Alba Cervantes-Loreto

## Abstract

Interactions between organisms give rise to emergent properties of natural systems. This underpins the ubiquity of biotic interactions in the study of ecological and evolutionary dynamics. The representation of biotic interactions often requires models and simplifying assumptions since it is impossible to account for all aspects of the world in a single model. Critical choices, such as the number of species that can alter the interaction between a focal pair or which abiotic variables constitute the environment, are necessary when building ecological and evolutionary models. Such simplifying assumptions inevitably lead to the omission of heterogeneities at various levels. Complexity that is unaccounted for can, in turn, make the relationships between organisms appear noisy and fundamentally change model-based predictions. Despite this, ecological and evolutionary studies often lack appropriate frameworks that allow the inclusion of different levels of complexity in representations of biotic interactions. Thus, it is unclear whether including more realistic assumptions is warranted for the vast majority of natural systems. In this thesis, I explore

how incorporating complexity as abiotic and biotic modifiers, as well as different sources of uncertainty, reveals potential explanatory generalities in natural systems. I also explore how accounting for these variables changes predictions related to the maintenance of diversity at ecological and evolutionary scales. Throughout this thesis, I focus on different types of interactions and organisms and propose mathematical and statistical frameworks that can be used beyond the studied systems.

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 role of pollinator-pollinator interactions and abiotic conditions in altering the time between floral visits of a focal pollinator. I show that both density dependent responses and abiotic conditions are necessary to explain the number of visits a pollinator makes. In **Chapter 3**, I explore how incorporating different sources of uncertainty changes 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 a pairwise competition experiment of annual plants. I provide direct evidence that predictions of species coexistence are likely to change given the models used to quantify density-dependence. I also provide a theoretical framework to explore predictions made with different models. Finally, in **Chapter 4**, I adopt an ecological framework to examine the evolutionary dynamics of sexually antagonistic alleles. I show that environmental fluctuations can substantially increase the amount of genetic diversity in a population under sexually antagonistic selection by contributing positively to allele's invasion growth

40 rates. Overall, the results of my thesis show that the assumptions adopted by some eco-  
41 logical and evolutionary models tend to be oversimplifying. Here, I provide tools for  
42 ecologists and evolutionary biologists to explore more realistic representations of biotic  
43 interactions as well as their consequences for diversity maintenance.

## Preface

My thesis has been prepared as a collection of three standalone 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 and their combined implications both in both how we study interactions and their consequences for diversity maintenance. 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 thesis submission, each of these three articles are in different stages of the publication process.

**Chapter 2:** “The context dependency of pollinator interference: how environmental conditions and co-foraging species impact floral visitation” was published in May 2021 in the journal *Ecology Letters* in volume 24, no. 7, pages 1443–1454.

**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; Thompson, 2014).

From their origins as natural sciences, the disciplines of ecology and evolution have shifted from a descriptive towards a more predictive and quantitative approach (Holling, 1966; Pickett, 1980; Simberloff, 2004; Marquet *et al.*, 2014; Lässig *et al.*, 2017; Rossberg *et al.*, 2019). This shift brought with it the use of mathematical models to describe natural phenomena, such as models that describe the effects species have on each other (Holling, 1966; Levins, 1966; Maynard-Smith, 1978; Servedio *et al.*, 2014). 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 faithfully reproduce features of the observed data (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 (Sutherland, 2006; Stouffer, 2019).

## Model tradeoffs

Models that capture the effect of biotic interactions are abstractions of reality, and abstractions always reflect choices (Levins, 2006). Building models that include all aspects of reality is not only impractical but also unfeasible. Therefore, ecologists and evolutionary biologists have to continuously make choices regarding which variables to include in a model and which to omit (Odenbaugh, 2005). A common assumption when building models is that to achieve general insights, we should favor simple models (Evans *et al.*, 2013). Indeed there is a general belief in ecology and evolution that a general model should include as little as possible (Holling, 1966; May, 2019; Roughgarden *et al.*, 2018). This belief is often rooted in an implicit philosophical stance that one can not simultaneously maximize generality (i.e., models that apply to more than one system) and realism (i.e., models that produce accurate predictions for a system) (Levins, 1966; 1993).

Inevitably, model building in biology leads to a key question that will, in turn, modify the outcomes achieved by any model: when is a model “realistic” enough (Stouffer, 2019)? The answer to this question will depend on the purpose for which a model is built (Odenbaugh, 2005; Levins, 2006). The classification of biological models and their purposes have been and continue to be widely debated (Holling, 1966; May, 2019; Lewontin,

1963; Levins, 1966; Orzack & Sober, 1993; Levins, 1993; Odenbaugh, 2005; Weisberg, 2006; Evans *et al.*, 2013). Overall, it is generally recognized that the purposes of different biological models fall on a continuum (Levins, 1993; Evans *et al.*, 2013; Servedio *et al.*, 2014). On one end of this continuum are models that aim to understand and identify general principles (called strategic models by Holling (1966) and May (2019), or a minimal model of ideas by Roughgarden *et al.* (2018)). On the other end are models that aim to make detailed quantitative predictions (also called tactical models by Holling (1966) or synthetic models by Roughgarden *et al.* (2018)). The tradeoffs between generality, realism, and precision at each end of the spectrum have sparked extensive debate among biologists (Levins, 1966; Orzack & Sober, 1993; Levins, 1993; Weisberg, 2006).

Models that capture the effect of biotic interactions tend to fall in the spectrum under the category of “demonstration models”, as first defined by (Crick, 1988) and later by (Evans *et al.*, 2013). These types of models are often based on phenomenological descriptions of processes and have the general aim to show that the modeled principles are sufficient to reproduce some phenomena of interest (Crick, 1988; Evans *et al.*, 2013). Demonstration models, however, do not help decide whether the modelled principles are *necessary* (Evans *et al.*, 2013). The task to decide the necessary principles and thus the answer to the 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. For example, mutualistic interactions between two species can be described by a simple model that assumes a linear functional response (Bascompte *et al.*, 2006a), or by a more realistic model that incorpo-

rates saturating effects (Holland *et al.*, 2002). The choice between these two models has substantial implications for predictions related to the coexistence of species and the assembly of communities (Holland *et al.*, 2002). However, there is no consensus on which representation to favor, as the choice is usually defined by the modelers' particular school of thought and mathematical convince (Holland *et al.*, 2006; Bascompte *et al.*, 2006b).

### **The perils of simple models**

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 seldom 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 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 (D'Andrea *et al.*, 2018). 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.

## **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; 2001). Such is the case of competition between pollinators that forage for the same resources (Thomson & Page, 2020). An overwhelming 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, models that incorporate these behavioral changes into population dynamics remain scarce (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 and interact with plant species (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 interactions 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 models of floral visitation rates. Furthermore, I show the empirical relevance of this framework by parameterizing different models of varying complexity that incorporate pollinator–pollinator interactions and environmental conditions when predicting observed data from a highly controlled foraging chamber experiment. Results from this chapter provide important insights 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 on model based predictions can be dramatically different due to uncertainty associated with phenomenological models (Jørgensen & Bendoricchio, 2001; Flora *et al.*, 2011; Aldebert & Stouffer, 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 context, and parameter uncertainty impact 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 coexistence outcomes is not independent of the model formulation used to describe species interactions.

Finally, even when existing studies show that increasing model realism is warranted, understanding exactly how the addition of complexity changes predictions remains a challenge. For instance, theoretical and empirical 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; Glaser-Schmitt *et al.*, 2021). However, there are no approaches that directly quantify *how* abiotic heterogeneity promotes the maintenance of genetic diversity in populations that experience sexual conflict. Hence, in **Chapter 4** I adopt an ecological framework to explicitly quantify the contributions of fluctuations in population sizes and selection to allele's growth rates when rare across using simulations. I show that environmental fluctuations can help maintain genetic variance in a population by allowing disadvantageous alleles to have positive invasion growth rates, but that their effect depends on the pathway by which each allele is introduced to the population.

## **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

213 focused on different types of interactions and organisms, but all address in a different  
214 way the challenges and consequences of incorporating biotic and abiotic complexity in  
215 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.
- Aldebert, C. & Stouffer, D.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. (2006a). Asymmetric coevolutionary networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance. *Science*, 312, 431–433.
- Bascompte, J., Jordano, P. & Olesen, J.M. (2006b). 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.

- 235 Box, G.E., Luceño, A. & del Carmen Paniagua-Quinones, M. (2011). *Statistical control by*  
236 *monitoring and adjustment*. vol. 700. John Wiley & Sons.
- 237 Briggs, H.M. (2016). *Competitive context drives pollinator behavior: linking foraging plasticity,*  
238 *natural pollen deposition, and plant reproduction*. Ph.D. thesis, UC Santa Cruz.
- 239 Briggs, H.M., Graham, S., Switzer, C.M. & Hopkins, R. (2018). Variation in context-  
240 dependent foraging behavior across pollinators. *Ecology and evolution*, 8, 7964–7973.
- 241 Brosi, B.J. & Briggs, H.M. (2013). Single pollinator species losses reduce floral fidelity  
242 and plant reproductive function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110,  
243 13044–13048.
- 244 Capdevila, P., Stott, I., Oliveras Menor, I., Stouffer, D.B., Raimundo, R.L., White, H., Bar-  
245 bour, M. & Salguero-Gómez, R. (2021). Reconciling resilience across ecological systems,  
246 species and subdisciplines.
- 247 Chase, J.M. & Leibold, M.A. (2009). *Ecological niches*. University of Chicago Press.
- 248 Chesson, P. (2000). Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual review of*  
249 *Ecology and Systematics*, 31, 343–366.
- 250 Classen, A., Eardley, C.D., Hemp, A., Peters, M.K., Peters, R.S., Ssymank, A. & Steffan-  
251 Dewenter, I. (2020). Specialization of plant–pollinator interactions increases with tem-  
252 perature at mt. kilimanjaro. *Ecology and evolution*, 10, 2182–2195.
- 253 Cnaani, J., Thomson, J.D. & Papaj, D.R. (2006). Flower Choice and Learning in Foraging

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

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

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

Crick, F. (1988). What mad pursuit: A personal view of scientific discovery. basic books,  
new york.

D’Andrea, R., Ostling, A. & O’Dwyer, J.P. (2018). Translucent windows: How uncertainty in competitive interactions impacts detection of community pattern. *Ecology Letters*, 21,  
826–835.

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

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

Freckleton, R. & Watkinson, A. (2001). Predicting competition coefficients for plant mix-

tures: reciprocity, transitivity and correlations with life-history traits. *Ecology Letters*, 4,  
348–357.

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

Glaser-Schmitt, A., Wittmann, M.J., Ramnarine, T.J. & Parsch, J. (2021). Sexual antagonism, temporally fluctuating selection, and variable dominance affect a regulatory polymorphism in *drosophila melanogaster*. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 38, 4891–4907.

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

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

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

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

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



- Holland, J.N., DeAngelis, D.L. & Bronstein, J.L. (2002). Population dynamics and mutualism: functional responses of benefits and costs. *The American Naturalist*, 159, 231–244.
- Holland, J.N., Okuyama, T. & DeAngelis, D.L. (2006). Comment on “asymmetric coevolutionary networks facilitate biodiversity maintenance”. *Science*, 313, 1887–1887.
- Holling, C.S. (1959). Some characteristics of simple types of predation and parasitism. *The Canadian Entomologist*, 91, 385–398.
- Holling, C.S. (1966). The strategy of building models of complex ecological systems. *Systems analysis in ecology*, pp. 195–214.
- Holt, R.D. (1977). Predation, apparent competition, and the structure of prey communities. *Theoretical population biology*, 12, 197–229.
- Inouye, D.W. (1978). Resource Partitioning in Bumblebees: Experimental Studies of Foraging Behavior. *Ecology*, 59, 672–678.
- Jørgensen, S.E. & Bendoricchio, G. (2001). *Fundamentals of Ecological Modelling*. vol. 21. Elsevier.
- Kokko, H. & López-Sepulcre, A. (2007). The ecogenetic link between demography and evolution: can we bridge the gap between theory and data? *Ecology Letters*, 10, 773–782.
- Kraft, N.J., Godoy, O. & Levine, J.M. (2015). Plant functional traits and the multidimensional nature of species coexistence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 797–802.

- 312 Lai, H.R., Chong, K.Y., Yee, A.T.K., Mayfield, M.M. & Stouffer, D.B. (2021). Non-additive  
313 biotic interactions improve predictions of tropical tree growth and impact community  
314 size structure. *bioRxiv*, pp. 2020–09.
- 315 Lässig, M., Mustonen, V. & Walczak, A.M. (2017). Predicting evolution. *Nature ecology &*  
316 *evolution*, 1, 1–9.
- 317 Lawton, J.H. (1999). Are there general laws in ecology? *Oikos*, pp. 177–192.
- 318 Levine, J.M. & HilleRisLambers, J. (2009). The importance of niches for the maintenance  
319 of species diversity. *Nature*, 461, 254–257.
- 320 Levins, R. (1966). The strategy of model building in population biology. *American scientist*,  
321 54, 421–431.
- 322 Levins, R. (1993). A response to orzack and sober: formal analysis and the fluidity of  
323 science. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 68, 547–555.
- 324 Levins, R. (2006). Strategies of abstraction. *Biology and Philosophy*, 21, 741–755.
- 325 Lewontin, R.C. (1963). Models, mathematics and metaphors. *Synthese*, pp. 222–244.
- 326 MacArthur, R. & Levins, R. (1967). The limiting similarity, convergence, and divergence  
327 of coexisting species. *The american naturalist*, 101, 377–385.
- 328 MacArthur, R.H. (1962). Some generalized theorems of natural selection. *Proceedings of*  
329 *the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 48, 1893.

330 Marquet, P.A., Allen, A.P., Brown, J.H., Dunne, J.A., Enquist, B.J., Gillooly, J.F., Gowaty,  
 331 P.A., Green, J.L., Harte, J., Hubbell, S.P. *et al.* (2014). On theory in ecology. *BioScience*,  
 332 64, 701–710.

333 Martyn, T.E., Stouffer, D.B., Godoy, O., Bartomeus, I., Pastore, A.I. & Mayfield, M.M.  
 334 (2021). Identifying “useful” fitness models: Balancing the benefits of added complexity  
 335 with realistic data requirements in models of individual plant fitness. *The American*  
 336 *Naturalist*, 197, 415–433.

337 May, R.M. (1972). Will a large complex system be stable? *Nature*, 238, 413–414.

338 May, R.M. (2019). *Stability and complexity in model ecosystems*. Princeton university press.

339 Mayfield, M.M. & Stouffer, D.B. (2017). Higher-order interactions capture unexplained  
 340 complexity in diverse communities. *Nature ecology & evolution*, 1, 1–7.

341 Maynard-Smith, J. (1978). *Models in ecology*. CUP Archive.

342 Morse, D.H. (1977). Resource Partitioning in Bumble Bees: The Role of Behavioral Factors.  
 343 *Science*, 197, 678–680.

344 Odenbaugh, J. (2005). Idealized, inaccurate but successful: A pragmatic approach to eval-  
 345 uating models in theoretical ecology. *Biology and Philosophy*, 20, 231–255.

346 Orzack, S.H. & Sober, E. (1993). A critical assessment of levins’s the strategy of model  
 347 building in population biology (1966). *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, 68, 533–546.

348 Pickett, S.T. (1980). Non-equilibrium coexistence of plants. *Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical*  
349 *Club*, pp. 238–248.

350 Rossberg, A.G., Barabás, G., Possingham, H.P., Pascual, M., Marquet, P.A., Hui, C., Evans,  
351 M.R. & Meszéna, G. (2019). Let’s train more theoretical ecologists—here is why. *Trends*  
352 *in ecology & evolution*, 34, 759–762.

353 Roughgarden, J., Bergman, A., Shafir, S. & Taylor, C. (2018). Adaptive computation in  
354 ecology and. *Adaptive Individuals In Evolving Populations: Models And Algorithms*, p. 25.

355 Saavedra, S., Rohr, R.P., Bascompte, J., Godoy, O., Kraft, N.J. & Levine, J.M. (2017). A  
356 structural approach for understanding multispecies coexistence. *Ecological Monographs*,  
357 87, 470–486.

358 Schoener, T.W. (1974). Some methods for calculating competition coefficients from  
359 resource-utilization spectra. *The American Naturalist*, 108, 332–340.

360 Servedio, M.R., Brandvain, Y., Dhole, S., Fitzpatrick, C.L., Goldberg, E.E., Stern, C.A.,  
361 Van Cleve, J. & Yeh, D.J. (2014). Not just a theory—the utility of mathematical models  
362 in evolutionary biology. *PLoS biology*, 12, e1002017.

363 Simberloff, D. (2004). Community ecology: Is it time to move on? (an american society of  
364 naturalists presidential address). *The American Naturalist*, 163, 787–799.

365 Song, C. & Saavedra, S. (2018). Will a small randomly assembled community be feasible  
366 and stable? *Ecology*, 99, 743–751.

- 367 Stouffer, D.B. (2019). All ecological models are wrong, but some are useful. *Journal of*  
368 *Animal Ecology*, 88, 192–195.
- 369 Stouffer, D.B. & Novak, M. (2021). Hidden layers of density dependence in consumer  
370 feeding rates. *Ecology Letters*, 24, 520–532.
- 371 Sutherland, W.J. (2006). Predicting the ecological consequences of environmental change:  
372 a review of the methods. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 43, 599–616.
- 373 Thompson, A.R., Nisbet, R.M. & Schmitt, R.J. (2006). Dynamics of mutualist populations  
374 that are demographically open. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 75, 1239–1251.
- 375 Thompson, J.N. (1999). The evolution of species interactions. *Science*, 284, 2116–2118.
- 376 Thompson, J.N. (2014). *Interaction and coevolution*. University of Chicago Press.
- 377 Thomson, D.M. & Page, M.L. (2020). The importance of competition between insect pol-  
378 linators in the Anthropocene. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, 38, 55–62.
- 379 Thomson, J.D., Peterson, S.C. & Harder, L.D. (1987). Response of traplining bumble bees  
380 to competition experiments: shifts in feeding location and efficiency. *Oecologia*, 71, 295–  
381 300.
- 382 Turnbull, L.A., Levine, J.M., Loreau, M. & Hector, A. (2013). Coexistence, niches and  
383 biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning. *Ecology letters*, 16, 116–127.
- 384 Vázquez, D.P., Morris, W.F. & Jordano, P. (2005). Interaction frequency as a surrogate for  
385 the total effect of animal mutualists on plants. *Ecology letters*, 8, 1088–1094.

- 386 Volterra, V. (1926). Fluctuations in the abundance of a species considered mathematically.  
387 *Nature*, 118, 558–560.
- 388 Weisberg, M. (2006). Forty years of ‘the strategy’: Levins on model building and idealiza-  
389 tion. *Biology and Philosophy*, 21, 623–645.
- 390 Westphal, C., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Tscharntke, T. (2006). Bumblebees experience land-  
391 scapes at different spatial scales: possible implications for coexistence. *Oecologia*, 149,  
392 289–300.
- 393 Wood, S.N. & Thomas, M.B. (1999). Super-sensitivity to structure in biological models.  
394 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 266, 565–570.
- 395 Wootton, K. & Stouffer, D. (2016). Many weak interactions and few strong; food-web  
396 feasibility depends on the combination of the strength of species’ interactions and their  
397 correct arrangement. *Theoretical Ecology*, 9, 185–195.