**Working title**

Can we use metabarcoding data for food web studies of invertebrate communities or

What is learned from these types of data that complements/revises/boosts other methods?

**Introduction**

Challenge: Invertebrate communities have many cryptic interactions, making it challenging to build interaction data based on real observations. Metabarcoding diet could be a solution in these systems to otherwise inferred or unknown data.

There is a dearth of terrestrial food webs in the literature, due to many historic limitations, one including lack of an ability to capture interactions for many consumers who are invertebrates. This also has the potential to re-evaluate and disaggregate data for aquatic food webs with invertebrate consumers.

Werewolf: If we use metabarcoding data to build interaction data, we want to know that it is giving us information comparable to or better than rule-based or ecology-based inferred or observation-based data.

Silver Bullet: We look at metabarcoding data of generalist predator species and show some examples of comparable or better than inferred data.

**Questions**

1. Does molecular diet give you more diet resolution (links) than other approaches?
   1. Per species links comparison between published interactions and molecular
      1. Both at the family level (more data) and the species level (less but more resolved data) (also consider coding these with the method of interaction assignment)
2. Does molecular diet give you different kinds of links (e.g. functional groups) than other approaches?
   1. Trophic levels and functional composition of links
      1. Both at the family level and species level
3. Does molecular diet give you a different picture of predator-prey body size ratios for a predator species?
   1. Body size ratios between predators and their prey
      1. Probably do at species-level average for predators and stick to only data for which there is species-level prey assignments.

**Methods**

Sample collection methods:

How many predators of total predators in Palmyra food web?

Sample extraction, PCR, and sequencing methods:

Sample cleaning, denoising, taxonomic assignment, and rarefying methods:

Literature search:

Looking for datasets of terrestrial invertebrate interactions. We used various sources that curate online food webs, including Mangal (through rmangal in R version), Dryad data, NCEAS InteractionWeb Database, and the Global Web Database. For rmangal, only one dataset of 172 (Hines et al. 2019, 714 nodes, 51,496 interactions, accessed June 24, 2020) fit this specification. For Dryad datasets, we searched using multiple search terms (all accessed between June 24-July 1, 2020: “food web” (463 papers), “interaction network” (553 papers), “predator prey interactions” (520 papers), “diet analysis insect” (42 datasets), “diet analysis spider” (16 datasets), “gut content analysis” (41 datasets), “diet analysis invertebrate” (24 datasets)). Of these datasets, 13 reported invertebrate predation interactions and \_\_ of these represented interaction data with diet resolution at the family level or lower. (Laigle et al. 2017: 878 nodes, 65,536 documented interactions across multiple food webs). There were no terrestrial food webs in the NCEAS InteractionWeb Database on our access date (June 2020), and no terrestrial food webs with family-level or lower resolution for invertebrate consumers in the Global Web Database.

Reporting stats:

Number of predators in each study. Number of prey items in each study.