

# Draft information

version: draft-0.5

2020-04-18

## Done

- Included feedback to paper (thanks Jason)
- Added many references including some to GBIF datasets
- Minor adjustments to figure captions
- Tidied up the supplementary materials

## To-do

- Add a few references to the methods justifying occurrence cleaning approach (thanks Audrey)

## Won't-do

- Finish the manual checks for species names that we were unable to correct automatically. It takes ~5-10 mins per species and we have ~600. Given the amount of data we already have it probably won't make much of a difference.

## Comments

- Jason, one of your comments was: *"I can't remember if I've raised this before, but if species are near to the boundaries of number of partners (close to zero or close to  $N$ , where  $N$  is the number of species in a community), a random change in the number of partners is more likely to bring them towards the mean because they can't go any higher than  $N$  or lower than 0. Is there any way to deal with this?"*. That certainly might be happening for species with few partners. I try to address that in the discussion (see page 15, line 308). I don't think it happens for species with many partners because very few of the species analysed are close to  $N$  (only ~2% of plants and ~3% of animals have a normalised degree  $> 0.5$ , ~0.5% of both have a normalised degree  $> 0.75$ ). To

avoid confusion I've removed the "regression to the mean" statements in the discussion.

- Appart from that, I think I followed most suggestions one way or another. **Thanks!**