

The effect of starvation on the dynamics of consumer populations

Yeakel, Kempes, & Redner

July 9, 2016

- 1 The behavioral ecology of most, if not all, organisms is influenced by the energetic state
- 2 of individuals. An individual's energetic state directly influences how it invests its stores in
- 3 an uncertain environment. Such behaviors are generally manifested as trade-offs, which often
- 4 concern investing in individual maintenance and growth (somatic effort) or allocating energy
- 5 towards reproduction (reproductive effort) (Martin, 1987; Kirk, 1997; Kempes et al., 2012).
- 6 The timing of these behaviors is often important and is under strong selective pressure, as
- 7 they tend to have large effects on the future fitness of the organism (Mangel and Clark, 1988).
- 8 To what extent, and when, organisms invest in somatic vs. reproductive expenditures may
- 9 be driven by habitat, seasonality, evolutionary history, inter- or intra-specific interactions, as
- 10 well as resource limitation. Importantly, the influence of resource limitation on an organism's
- 11 ability to maintain its nutritional stores may lead to repeated delays or shifts in reproduction
- 12 over the course of an organism's life.
- 13 Maximizing fitness between growth and maintenance activities vs. reproductive efforts
- 14 in large part structures the life-history of species, and this can be achieved by alternative

15 behavioral strategies or via physiological switches, both of which are sensitive to resource
16 availability. Behavioral changes in somatic or reproductive investment occur in response to
17 limited resources (Morris, 1987). For example, reindeer invest less in calves born after harsh
18 winters (when the mother's energetic state is poor) than in calves born after moderate winters
19 (Tveraa et al., 2003), whereas many bird species invest differently in broods during periods
20 of resource scarcity (Daan et al., 1988; Jacot et al., 2009), sometimes delaying or foregoing
21 reproduction for a breeding season (Martin, 1987; Barboza and Jorde, 2002). Such breeding
22 behaviors is generally referred to as *capital breeding*. Freshwater and marine zooplankton
23 have been observed to avoid reproduction under nutritional stress (Threlkeld, 1976), with
24 those that do reproduce evincing lower survival rates (Kirk, 1997), while artificially induced
25 stress has been observed to decrease reproductive success in Atlantic cod (Morgan et al.,
26 1999). Organisms may also separate maintenance and growth from reproduction over space
27 and time. Many salmonids, birds, and some mammals return to migratory breeding sites
28 to reproduce after one or multiple seasons in alternative environments spent accumulating
29 body mass and nutritional reserves (Weber et al., 1998; Mduma et al., 1999; Moore et al.,
30 2014).

31 Physiological mechanisms also play an important role in regulating reproductive expen-
32 ditures during periods of high-risk. Diverse mammals (47 species in 10 families) exhibit
33 delayed implantation whereby females postpone fetal development (blastocyst implantation)
34 to time with accumulation of nutritional reserves (Mead, 1989; Sandell, 1990). Furthermore,
35 many mammals (including humans) suffer irregular menstrual cycling and higher abortion
36 rates during periods of nutritional stress (Bulik et al., 1999; Trites and Donnelly, 2003). In
37 the extreme case of unicellular organisms, nutrition is unavoidably linked to reproduction
38 because the nutritional state of the individual regulates all aspects of the cell cycle (Glazier,

39 2009). The existence of so many independently evolved mechanisms across such a diverse
40 suite of organisms points to the importance and universality of the fundamental tradeoff
41 between somatic and reproductive investment, however the dynamic implications of these
42 constraints are unknown.

43 The mechanisms by which different organisms avoid or delay reproduction during times
44 of nutritional stress has received tremendous empirical and theoretical attention owing to
45 the importance of these activities in shaping life-history (Cody, 1966; Martin, 1987; Man-
46 gel and Clark, 1988). Less well understood is how resource limitation and these behav-
47 ioral/physiological tradeoffs affect dynamics at the level of the population. Traditional
48 Lotka-Volterra models assume a dependence of consumer population growth rates on resource
49 density, thus *implicitly* incorporating the requirement of resource availability for reproduc-
50 tion (Murdoch et al., 2003). Although this implicit dependence connects resource limitation
51 to lower consumer growth rates, the following biological realities are not included: *i*) some
52 individuals experience nutritional stress at a given time and under a given set of external
53 conditions, while others do not; those that do have multiple pathways enabling reproductive
54 cessation; *ii*) the portion of the population that is not nutritionally stressed is expected to
55 reproduce at a near-constant rate and this is – averaged across species – determined strongly
56 by body size (Kempes et al., 2012); *iii*) the rates that individuals transition from nutrition-
57 ally poor to replete states and back have different metabolically-constrained timescales that
58 can lead to reproductive lags. Importantly, the exclusion of these biological details may have
59 important dynamic shortcomings, masking the effects of starvation on consumer population
60 dynamics.

61 Resource limitation and the subsequent effects of starvation may be alternatively ac-
62 counted for *explicitly*, such that reproduction is permitted only for individuals with sufficient

63 energetic reserves. Though straightforward conceptually, incorporating the energetic dynam-
64 ics of individuals (Kooijman, 2000) into a population-level framework (Kooijman, 2000; Sousa
65 et al., 2010) presents numerous mathematical obstacles (in particular a lack of smoothness,
66 or differentiability; Diekmann and Metz, 2010), and often suffers from over-fitting due to
67 an overabundance of parameters. These issue have limited the development of theoretical
68 models that may aid our understanding of the effects of such tradeoffs on population dynam-
69 ics. An alternative approach to individual-to-population frameworks is redirecting focus to
70 macroscale relationships guiding somatic vs. reproductive investment in a consumer-resource
71 system.

72 Here we explore how the energetic tradeoff between maintaining and building somatic
73 tissue vs. reproduction can influence the dynamics of populations, and how such dynamics
74 may be determined by allometric constraints. We begin by establishing a simple Nutritional
75 State-structured population Model (NSM), where consumer starvation, and cessation of
76 reproduction, is the consequence of resource limitation. Similarly, recovery from the starved
77 to a reproductive state increases with resource density. Importantly, the rate at which
78 consumers decline and recover from a starved state is wholly constrained by metabolism. By
79 relating different rate constants to allometric constraints, we uncover important relationships
80 between the timescales of physiological and reproductive processes, and show how organisms
81 of different body sizes and taxonomic affinities may be prone to alternative dynamics.

82 We show that rates of starvation and recovery tend to result in systems with stable,
83 non-cyclic fixed points and that the ratio between the rate of starvation and recovery may
84 – in part – contribute to lower size limitations. Moreover, larger consumer body size results
85 in rates that are less prone to cyclic dynamics than are rates for smaller organisms, pointing
86 to potential empirical verification of the NSM framework. Finally, we show that rates of

87 starvation and recovery appear to be constrained to a parameter range where both transient
 88 and equilibrial population dynamics result in the lowest risk of extinction for the consumer.
 89 This surprising result suggests that the risks associated with different fluxes of consumers
 90 in and out of a starved (non-reproductive) state may serve as an important selective driver
 91 over evolutionary time.

92 **Starvation dynamics**

93 We integrate the somatic/reproductive tradeoff into the dynamics of a consumer-resource
 94 system by dividing the consumer population into discrete energetic states, the occupation of
 95 each being contingent on the consumption of a single resource R . In the NSM there are only
 96 two energetic states for the consumer population: *i*) an energetically replete (full) state F ,
 97 where the consumer reproduces at a constant rate λ , and *ii*) an energetically deficient (hun-
 98 gry) state H , where reproduction is suppressed, and mortality occurs at rate μ . Consumers
 99 transition from state F to state H by starvation at rate σ and in proportion to the lack of
 100 resources $(1 - R)$. Conversely, consumers recover from state H to the full state F at rate ρ
 101 and in proportion to R . The resource has logistic growth with a linear growth rate α and
 102 a carrying capacity of unity. Resources are eliminated by the consumer in both states: by
 103 energetically deficient consumers at rate ρ , and by energetically replete consumers at rate β .

104 Accordingly, the system of equations is written

$$\dot{F} = \lambda F + \rho RH - \sigma(1 - R)F,$$

$$\dot{H} = \sigma(1 - R)F - \rho RH - \mu H,$$

$$\dot{R} = \alpha R(1 - R) - R(\rho H + \beta F).$$

105 There are three steady states for the NSM: two trivial fixed points at $(R^* = 0, H^* =$
106 $0, F^* = 0)$ and $(R^* = 1, H^* = 0, F^* = 0)$, and one non-trivial internal fixed point at

$$F^* = \frac{\alpha\lambda\mu(\mu + \rho)}{(\lambda\rho + \mu\sigma)(\lambda\rho + \mu\beta)},$$
$$H^* = \frac{\alpha\lambda^2(\mu + \rho)}{(\lambda\rho + \mu\sigma)(\lambda\rho + \mu\beta)},$$
$$R^* = \frac{\mu(\sigma - \lambda)}{\lambda\rho + \mu\sigma}.$$

107 Because there is only one internal fixed point, as long as it is stable the population trajectories
108 will serve as a global attractor for any set of positive initial conditions. In a multidimensional
109 system, linear stability is determined with respect to the Jacobian Matrix $\mathbf{J}|_*$ (where $|_*$
110 denotes evaluation at the internal steady state), where each element of the matrix is defined
111 by the partial derivative of each differential equation with respect to each variable.

112 If the parameters of $\mathbf{J}|_*$ are such that the real part of its leading eigenvalue is < 0 ,
113 then the system is stable to small pulse perturbations. In the case of the NSM, stability
114 is conditioned on the consumer's starvation rate σ relative to the its reproduction rate λ .

115 As σ becomes less than λ , the R^* crosses the origin and the fixed point becomes unstable.
116 This condition $\sigma = \lambda$ marks a transcritical (TC) bifurcation, thus marking a hard boundary
117 below which the system becomes unphysical due to the unregulated growth of the consumer
118 population. That the timescale of reproduction is larger than the timescale of starvation
119 is intuitive for macroscopic organisms, as the rate at which one loses tissue due to lack of
120 resources is generally much faster than reproduction, though we will show using allometric
121 principles that this relationship always holds.

122 In addition to the hard bound defined by the TC bifurcation, oscillating or cyclic dynam-

123 ics present an implicit constraint to persistence by increasing the risk of extinction. If cycles
124 are large, stochastic effects may result in either the consumer or resource population. In
125 continuous-time systems, a stable limit cycle arises when a pair of complex conjugate eigen-
126 values crosses the imaginary axis to attain positive real parts (Guckenheimer and Holmes,
127 1983). This condition is called a Hopf bifurcation, and is defined by $\text{Det}(\mathbf{S}) = 0$, where \mathbf{S} is
128 the Sylvester matrix, which is composed of the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial
129 describing the Jacobian (Gross and Feudel, 2004). In addition to the onset of stable cycles,
130 as a system with a stable fixed point nears the Hopf bifurcation, transient or decaying cycles
131 can grow in magnitude. Given that ecological systems exist in a state of constant perturba-
132 tion (Hastings, 2001), even the onset of transient cycles that decay over time can increase
133 the risk of extinction (Neubert and Caswell, 1997; Caswell and Neubert, 2005; Neubert and
134 Caswell, 2009), such that the distance of a system from the Hopf bifurcation, even in the
135 stable region, is relevant to persistence.

136 Allometric constraints

137 Chris - Linking paragraph here – what does allometry provide to the story? Biological,
138 linked constraints... vast amounts of diversity in a small number of parameters. Etc.

139 Nearly all of the rates described in the NSM are to some extent governed by consumer
140 metabolism, and thus can be estimated based on known allometric constraints. The scal-
141 ing relationship between an organism's metabolic rate B and its body size at reproductive
142 maturity M is well documented (West et al., 2002) and plays a central role in a variety of
143 scaling relationships. Organismal metabolic rate B is known to scale as $B = B_0 M^\eta$, where η
144 is the scaling exponent, generally assumed to be $3/4$ for metazoans, and varies in unicellular
145 species between $\eta \approx 1$ in eukaryotes and $\eta \approx 1.76$ in bacteria (?). Several efforts have shown
146 how a partitioning of this metabolic rate between growth and maintenance purposes can be

¹⁴⁷ used to derive a general equation for the growth trajectories and growth rates of organisms
¹⁴⁸ ranging from bacteria to metazoans (Kempes et al., 2012). More specifically, the interspecific
¹⁴⁹ trends in growth rate can be approximated by $\lambda = \lambda_0 M^{\eta-1}$. This relationship is derived
¹⁵⁰ from the simple balance

$$B_0 m^\eta = E_m \frac{dm}{dt} + B_m m \quad (-1)$$

¹⁵¹ [a and b notation — these parameters are easily measured bioenergetic parameters which
¹⁵² are often approximately invariant across organisms of vastly different size. Our notation
¹⁵³ seeks to illustrate that the allometric model fundamentally depends on a small number of
¹⁵⁴ free parameters.] where E_m is the energy needed to synthesize a unit of mass, B_m is the
¹⁵⁵ metabolic rate to support an existing unit of mass, and m is the mass at any point in
¹⁵⁶ development. It is useful to explicitly write this balance because it can also be modified
¹⁵⁷ to understand the rates of both starvation and recovery from starvation. [Spell out the
¹⁵⁸ connection to nutritional state more explicitly] [As we will see it is possible to derive both
¹⁵⁹ sigma and rho from this balance]

¹⁶⁰ For the rate of starvation, we make the simple assumption that an organism must meet
¹⁶¹ its maintenance requirements using digested mass as the sole energy source. This assumption
¹⁶² implies the simple metabolic balance

$$\frac{dm}{dt} E'_m = -B_m m \quad (-1)$$

¹⁶³ where E'_m is the amount of energy stored in a unit of existing body mass which may differ
¹⁶⁴ from E_m , the energy required to synthesis a unit of biomass. Give the adult mass, M , of an

165 organism this energy balance prescribes the mass trajectory of a starving organism:

$$m(t) = M e^{-B_m t/E'_m}. \quad (-1)$$

166 Considering that only certain tissues can be digested for energy, for example the brain cannot
167 be degraded to fuel metabolism, we define the rate for starvation and death by the timescales
168 required to reach specific fractions of normal adult mass. We define $m_{starve} = \epsilon M$ where it
169 could be the case that organisms have a systematic size-dependent requirement for essential
170 tissues, such as the minimal bone or brain mass. For example, considering the observation
171 that body fat in mammals scales with overall body size according to $M_f = f_0 M^\gamma$, and
172 assuming that once this mass is fully digested the organism begins to starve, would imply
173 that $\epsilon = 1 - f_0 M^\gamma / M$. Taken together the time scale for starvation is given by

$$t_\sigma = -\frac{E_m \log(\epsilon)}{B_m}. \quad (-1)$$

174 The starvation rate is $\sigma = 1/t_\sigma$, which implies that σ is independent of adult mass if ϵ is a
175 constant, and if ϵ does scale with mass, then σ will have a factor of $1/\log(1 - f_0 M^\gamma / M)$.
176 In either case σ does not have a simple scaling with λ which is important for the dynamics
177 that we later discuss.

178 The time to death should follow a similar relationship, but defined by a lower fraction
179 of adult mass, $m_{death} = \epsilon' M$. Consider, for example, that an organism dies once it has
180 digested all fat and muscle tissues, and that muscle tissue scales with body mass according
181 to $M_{mm} = m m_0 M^\zeta$, then $\epsilon' = 1 - (f_0 M^\gamma + m m_0 M^\zeta) / M$. Muscle mass has been shown to
182 be roughly proportional to body mass ? in mammals and thus ϵ' is effectively ϵ minus a

183 constant. Thus

$$t_\mu = -\frac{E_m \log(\epsilon')}{B_m} \quad (-1)$$

184 and $\mu = 1/t_\mu$.

185 It should be noted that we have thus far used mammalian allometry to describe the
186 size-based relationships for growth, starvation, and death. However, our presentation is
187 general, and other functional forms for ϵ , for example, could be determined for other classes
188 of organisms. Considering bacteria, we might expect that starvation or death is defined
189 by the complete digestion of proteins, and in Table 1 we provide all parameter values for
190 bacteria which we later use as a comparison in our analysis.

191 The rate of recovery $\rho = 1/t_\rho$ requires that an organism accrues tissue from the starving
192 state to the full state. We again use the balance given in Equation to find the timescale to
193 return to the mature mass from a given reduced starvation mass. The general solution to
194 Equation is given by

$$m(t) = \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{b}{a} m_0^{1-\alpha} \right) e^{-b(1-\alpha)t} \right]^{1/(1-\alpha)} \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)} \quad (-1)$$

195 with $a = B_0/E_m$ and $b = B_m/E_m$. We are then interested in the timescale, $t_\rho = t_2 - t_1$,
196 which is the time it takes to go from $m(t_1) = \epsilon M$ to $m(t_2) = M$, which has the final form
197 of

$$t_\rho = \frac{\log \left(1 - \left(M \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right) - \log \left(1 - \left(M \epsilon \left(\frac{a}{b} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \right)^{1-\alpha} \right)}{(\alpha-1)b}. \quad (-1)$$

198 The stabilizing effects of allometric constraints

199 Although starvation leads to mortality risk for the individual, a moderate amount promotes
200 persistence of both consumer and resource populations. Analysis of the NSM shows that

201 (non-cyclic) stability of the fixed point generally requires a higher starvation rate σ rel-
202 ative to the recovery rate ρ . The intuition behind this is that transition to the hungry
203 (non-reproductive) state permits the resource to recover and transient dynamics to subside,
204 whereas a low σ overloads the system with energetically-replete (reproducing) individuals,
205 thus producing maintained oscillations between consumer and resource (Fig. 1). However if
206 σ is too large, mortality due to starvation depletes the consumer population, resulting in a
207 lower steady state density, and an opposingly higher steady state density for the resource.

208 Whereas the rate of consumer growth defines a hard bound of biological feasibility (the
209 TC bifurcation), the rate of starvation determines the sensitivity of the consumer population
210 to changes in resource density. While higher rates of starvation result in lower steady state
211 population size – increasing the risk of stochastic extinction – lower rates of starvation result
212 in a system poised near either the TC or Hopf bifurcation (or both), which will lead to
213 extinction of the resource or the development of cyclic oscillations, respectively. Which
214 bifurcation is approached is wholly dependent on the rate of recovery: if it is high, then
215 cyclic dynamics will develop; if it is low, resource extinction becomes more likely.

216 As the allometric derivations of NSM rate laws reveal, σ and ρ are not independent
217 parameters, such that the bifurcation space shown in Fig. 1 cannot be freely navigated if
218 assuming biologically reasonable parameterizations. Given the parameterization for mam-
219 mals shown in Table ?? with mass M as the only free parameter, rates of starvation and
220 recovery are constrained to a fairly small window of potential values. Importantly, for larger
221 organismal masses, the distance between $\sigma(M)$ and $\rho(M)$ compared to both the TC and
222 Hopf bifurcations is increased. Uncertainty in allometric parameters (20% variation around
223 the mean; Fig. ??) results in little difference in the position of both bifurcations as well as
224 consumer energetic rates. This suggests 1)that small mammals are more prone to popula-

225 tion oscillations – including both stable limit cycles as well as transient cycles – than large
226 mammals, and 2) the decreasing distance to the Hopf bifurcation with lower body sizes is
227 suggestive of a dynamic barrier to the mass of endothermic organisms. Although the predic-
228 tion of oscillations with smaller body sizes generally holds, empirical observations of large
229 animal population cycles are plagued by long generation times and the influence of top-down
230 effects [REFS].

231 both the location of TC and Hopf bifurcations over σ and ρ relative to the allometrically-
232 determined starvation and recovery rates of species across different body sizes

233 [First describe the dynamics of the model and HOW IT WORKS] [Then Allometry and
234 stability]

235 Analysis of the 2-stage consumer resource model shows that the equilibrial states of both
236 populations are highly sensitive to changes in starvation and recovery rates of the consumer.
237 The consumer and resource population densities vary inversely: when the consumer densities
238 are high, resource densities are low, and vice versa. High starvation and low recovery rates
239 result in low consumer densities and high resource densities. If starvation rates are low,
240 resources have a fixed point near zero for any value of the recovery rate. Full and hungry
241 consumer stages tend have fixed points that are tightly correlated, the extent to which is
242 driven by the similarity of consumer growth and mortality rates; if $\lambda = \mu$, then $F^* = H^*$.

243 A transcritical bifurcation exists at $\lambda = \sigma$, such that the condition $\sigma > \lambda$ is required
244 for biologically reasonable dynamics. The TC bifurcation occurs in this model because
245 we have assumed that the portion of the population that is not starved reproduces at a
246 constant rate. Because the process of starvation is incorporated explicitly, the consumer's
247 rate of reproduction is not dependent on the density of resources. In fact, the existence of
248 the TC bifurcation at $\lambda = \sigma$ reveals an important biological insight. Reproduction requires

249 maintenance and growth of biological tissues, both of which have strong scaling relationships
250 with body size. Recent work by Kempes et al. [REF] derived the timescale of reproduction
251 in terms of allometric considerations, where $t_\lambda \propto M^{1-\eta}$ (REF). Starvation is the loss of
252 energy required for maintenance, and we have shown it to have a timescale $t_\sigma \propto \log(M)$.
253 Accordingly, the timescale of reproduction is always larger than the timescale of starvation,
254 such that λ must be less than σ by definition. A third important parameter in our framework
255 is the rate of recovery. The recovery timescale t_ρ controls the rate at which individuals move
256 from the hungry class to the full class, and this requires not only tissue maintenance, but
257 growth, such that it is bounded on the short side by t_σ . Moreover, [why is recovery timescale
258 bounded on the high side], such that it is bounded on the long side by t_λ . Thus, incorporating
259 allometric considerations shows us that $\lambda < \rho < \sigma$ (alternatively $t_\lambda > t_\rho > t_\sigma$).

260 The 2-stage consumer resource model exhibits two qualitatively different behavioral
261 regimes. Because portions of the consumer population exist in either full or hungry states
262 simultaneously, the internal fixed point can either be a stable equilibrium, or exhibit sus-
263 tained oscillatory behavior, depending on the rates of starvation σ and recovery ρ . The
264 transition from stable non-oscillatory dynamics to oscillatory dynamics occurs at the Hopf
265 bifurcation condition where two complex conjugate eigenvalues cross the imaginary axis and
266 attain positive real parts. Although there is an analytical solution to the Hopf bifurcation
267 condition, it cannot be written efficiently.

268 When the starvation rate is low, oscillatory dynamics are more likely to occur for a given
269 value of the recovery rate. This can be understood intuitively: for low starvation rates,
270 resources are depressed by an infusion of full consumers, which subsequently starve thereby
271 allowing the resource to recover and continuing the cycle. When the starvation rate is high,
272 the response of consumer growth to resource abundance is muted, such that oscillations tend

273 to decay over time. Thus, higher starvation rates σ desensitizes changes in the consumer
274 population to changes in resource density, and lower rates of recovery ρ amplifies this effect.

275 Both full and hungry consumers remove resources at rates b and ρ , respectively. As the
276 rate of resource consumption by full consumers increases, the Hopf condition changes from
277 a convex to a concave function over σ , limiting the potential for oscillatory dynamics. These
278 rates are considered separately because full consumers need only to maintain their tissues,
279 whereas hungry consumers require both growth and maintenance, such that $t_\rho > t_b$, or $\rho < b$.
280 If this constraint is enacted, the likelihood of oscillatory dynamics is reduced for a given

281 If instead the consumer's growth was proportional to resource abundance, such that the
282 effects of starvation on reproduction were incorporated explicitly (where the 2-stage consumer
283 resource model collapses to the Lotka-Volterra consumer-resource model with logistic growth
284 of the resource), the TC bifurcation exists only for $\lambda = \mu$, such that the rate of mortality
285 cannot exceed the intrinsic birth rate.

286 whereas the traditional Lotka-Volterra dynamic assumes that the reproductive rate of the
287 consumer is scaled to resource density, such that the growth function would be $G(F, R) =$
288 λRF . Thus, the Lotka-Volterra dynamic *implicitly* accounts for starvation in reducing the
289 reproductive rate of the consumer. However, our 2-stage model *explicitly* accounts for starva-
290 tion as well as recovery, such that individuals who are not starved should adopt a reproductive
291 rate independent of resource density.

292 We have used scaling relationships between tissue turnover and growth to strictly con-
293 strain 5/6 population-level parameters in our 2-stage consumer resource model (including
294 the mortality rate t_μ , which we have shown is just a xxx of t_σ). This exercise accomplishes
295 two goals: 1) it allows us to constrain the plausible parameter space of the two-stage model,
296 and 2)

297 This allows us to derive many aspects of the system in terms of consumer body mass M
298 and the allometric scaling exponent η .

299 **Minimizing extinction risk**

300

Table 1: Parameter Values For Various Classes of Organisms

	Mammals	Unicellular Eukaryotes	Bacteria
η	3/4		1.70
E_m	10695 (J gram $^{-1}$)		10695 (J gram $^{-1}$)
E'_m	$\approx E_m$		$\approx E_m$
B_0	0.019 (W gram $^{-\alpha}$)		1.96×10^{17}
B_m	0.025 (W gram $^{-1}$)		0.025 (W gram $^{-1}$)
a	1.78×10^{-6}		1.83×10^{13}
b	2.29×10^{-6}		2.29×10^{-6}
$\eta - 1$	-0.21		0.73
λ_0	3.39×10^{-7} (s $^{-1}$ gram $^{1-\eta}$)		56493
γ	1.19		0.68
f_0	0.02		1.30×10^{-5}
ζ	1.01		
mm_0	0.32		




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4

³⁰¹ **References**

- ³⁰²
³⁰³ Barboza, P. and Jorde, D. (2002). Intermittent fasting during winter and spring affects body
³⁰⁴ composition and reproduction of a migratory duck. *J Comp Physiol B*, 172(5):419–434.
- ³⁰⁵ Bulik, C. M., Sullivan, P. F., Fear, J. L., Pickering, A., Dawn, A., and McCullin, M.
³⁰⁶ (1999). Fertility and Reproduction in Women With Anorexia Nervosa. *J. Clin. Psy-
³⁰⁷ chiatry*, 60(2):130–135.
- ³⁰⁸ Caswell, H. and Neubert, M. G. (2005). Reactivity and transient dynamics of discrete-time
³⁰⁹ ecological systems. *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications*, 11(4-5):295–310.
- ³¹⁰ Cody, M. L. (1966). A General Theory of Clutch Size. *Evolution*, 20(2):174–184.
- ³¹¹ Daan, S., Dijkstra, C., Drent, R., and Meijer, T. (1988). Food supply and the annual timing
³¹² of avian reproduction. In *Proceedings of the International . . .*
- ³¹³ Diekmann, O. and Metz, J. A. J. (2010). How to lift a model for individual behaviour to
³¹⁴ the population level? *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. B*, 365(1557):3523–3530.
- ³¹⁵ Glazier, D. S. (2009). Metabolic level and size scaling of rates of respiration and growth in
³¹⁶ unicellular organisms. *Funct. Ecol.*, 23(5):963–968.
- ³¹⁷ Gross, T. and Feudel, U. (2004). Analytical search for bifurcation surfaces in parameter
³¹⁸ space. *Physica D*, 195(3-4):292–302.
- ³¹⁹ Guckenheimer, J. and Holmes, P. (1983). *Nonlinear oscillations, dynamical systems, and
³²⁰ bifurcations of vector fields*. Springer, New York.

- ³²¹ Hastings, A. (2001). Transient dynamics and persistence of ecological systems. *Ecol. Lett.*,
³²² 4(3):215–220.
- ³²³ Jacot, A., Valcu, M., van Oers, K., and Kempenaers, B. (2009). Experimental nest site lim-
³²⁴ itation affects reproductive strategies and parental investment in a hole-nesting passerine.
³²⁵ *Animal Behaviour*, 77(5):1075–1083.
- ³²⁶ Kempes, C. P., Dutkiewicz, S., and Follows, M. J. (2012). Growth, metabolic partitioning,
³²⁷ and the size of microorganisms. *PNAS*, 109(2):495–500.
- ³²⁸ Kirk, K. L. (1997). Life-History Responses to Variable Environments: Starvation and Re-
³²⁹ production in Planktonic Rotifers. *Ecology*, 78(2):434–441.
- ³³⁰ Kooijman, S. A. L. M. (2000). *Dynamic Energy and Mass Budgets in Biological Systems*.
³³¹ Cambridge.
- ³³² Mangel, M. and Clark, C. W. (1988). *Dynamic Modeling in Behavioral Ecology*. Princeton
³³³ University Press, Princeton.
- ³³⁴ Martin, T. E. (1987). Food as a Limit on Breeding Birds: A Life-History Perspective. *Annu.*
³³⁵ *Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 18:453–487.
- ³³⁶ Mduma, S. A. R., Sinclair, A. R. E., and Hilborn, R. (1999). Food regulates the Serengeti
³³⁷ wildebeest: a 40-year record. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 68(6):1101–1122.
- ³³⁸ Mead, R. A. (1989). The Physiology and Evolution of Delayed Implantation in Carnivores.
³³⁹ In *Carnivore Behavior, Ecology, and Evolution*, pages 437–464. Springer US, Boston, MA.
- ³⁴⁰ Moore, J. W., Yeakel, J. D., Peard, D., Lough, J., and Beere, M. (2014). Life-history diversity

- 341 and its importance to population stability and persistence of a migratory fish: steelhead
- 342 in two large North American watersheds. *J. Anim. Ecol.*
- 343 Morgan, M. J., Wilson, C. E., and Crim, L. W. (1999). The effect of stress on reproduction
- 344 in Atlantic cod. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 54(3):477–488.
- 345 Morris, D. W. (1987). Optimal Allocation of Parental Investment. *Oikos*, 49(3):332.
- 346 Murdoch, W. W., Briggs, C. J., and Nisbet, R. M. (2003). *Consumer-resource Dynamics*.
- 347 Monographs in population biology. Princeton University Press.
- 348 Neubert, M. and Caswell, H. (1997). Alternatives to resilience for measuring the responses
- 349 of ecological systems to perturbations. *Ecology*, 78(3):653–665.
- 350 Neubert, M. and Caswell, H. (2009). Detecting reactivity. *Ecology*.
- 351 Sandell, M. (1990). The Evolution of Seasonal Delayed Implantation. *The Quarterly Review*
- 352 *of Biology*, 65(1):23–42.
- 353 Sousa, T., Domingos, T., Poggiale, J. C., and Kooijman, S. A. L. M. (2010). Dynamic energy
- 354 budget theory restores coherence in biology. *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. B*, 365(1557):3413–3428.
- 355 Threlkeld, S. T. (1976). Starvation and the size structure of zooplankton communities.
- 356 *Freshwater Biol.*, 6(6):489–496.
- 357 Trites, A. W. and Donnelly, C. P. (2003). The decline of Steller sea lions *Eumetopias jubatus*
- 358 in Alaska: a review of the nutritional stress hypothesis. *Mammal Review*, 33(1):3–28.
- 359 Tveraa, T., Fauchald, P., Henaug, C., and Yoccoz, N. G. (2003). An examination of a com-
- 360 pensatory relationship between food limitation and predation in semi-domestic reindeer.
- 361 *Oecologia*, 137(3):370–376.

- ³⁶² Weber, T. P., Ens, B. J., and Houston, A. I. (1998). Optimal avian migration: A dynamic
³⁶³ model of fuel stores and site use. *Evolutionary Ecology*, 12(4):377–401.
- ³⁶⁴ West, G. B., Woodruff, W. H., and Brown, J. H. (2002). Allometric scaling of metabolic
³⁶⁵ rate from molecules and mitochondria to cells and mammals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*,
³⁶⁶ 99 Suppl 1(suppl 1):2473–2478.