Eco-evolutionary dynamics and collective dispersal: implications for salmon metapopulation robustness
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The spatial dispersal of individuals plays an important role in the dynamics of populations, and is central to metapopulation theory. Although the dispersal of individuals from donor to recipient populations provides connections within the metapopulation, promoting demographic and evolutionary rescue, it may also introduce maladapted individuals into habitats where they are ill-suited, potentially lowering the fitness of recipient populations through introgression of heritable traits. To explore this dual nature of dispersal, we modify a well-established eco-evolutionary model of two locally adapted populations and their associated mean trait values, to examine recruiting salmon populations that are connected by density-dependent dispersal, which we assume emerges from collective navigation. When the strength of collective behaviour is weak such that straying is effectively constant, we show that a low level of straying is associated with the highest gains in metapopulation robustness and that high straying serves to erode robustness. Moreover we find that as the strength of collective behaviour increases, metapopulation robustness is enhanced, but this relationship depends on the rate at which individuals stray. We find that strong collective behaviour increases the presence of hidden low-density basins of attraction, which may serve to trap disturbed populations, and that this is exacerbated by increased habitat heterogeneity. Taken as a whole, our findings suggest that density dependent straying may be a currently unappreciated adaptation in salmon that have evolved in dynamic landscapes and which has important ramifications for the conservation of salmon metapopulations facing both natural and anthropogenic contemporary disturbances.
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**Media Summary** Many migratory species, such as salmon, are remarkable in finding their way home. This homing has allowed fine-scale adaptations to the environments in which they evolve. But some individuals do not find their way home and instead stray to other locations, especially when there are fewer individuals to help with collective decision-making. With an eco-evolutionary model, we discovered that low density-dependent straying when the strength of collective behaviour is intermediate allows linked populations to both be robust to disturbance and maintain local adaptations to their respective habitats.

# Introduction

Intraspecific diversity can increase the resilience and stability of species or metapopulations. This diversity-stability linkage occurs when there are asynchronous population dynamics within the metapopulation. This asynchrony will increase the potential for demographic rescue and also decrease the variability of processes that integrate across the metapopulation . For example, different responses to climate variability within populations of a rare plant reduced fluctuations in abundance . This statistical buffer has traditionally been quantified as the Portfolio Effect (PE), which is the ratio of the population CV to the CV of the aggregated metapopulation . Strengthened portfolio effects are expected to increase the robustness of metapopulations to external disturbances, and by extension promote persistence . In contrast, homogenization of populations leading to greater synchronization and weakened PE may be a harbinger of metapopulation collapse and extinction .

Movement of individuals among local populations (i.e. dispersal) can have a large influence on metapopulation persistence . Dispersal facilitates evolutionary rescue, whereby immigration of individuals with heritable adapative traits can rescue small populations from local extinction in the context of maladaptive environmental change . Dispersal also enables demographic rescue, when depressed or extirpated populations are bolstered by immigrants from the rest of the metapopulation. On the other hand, high rates of dispersal may synchronize populations and actually increase the risk of extinction of the entire metapopulation . Lastly, dispersal may also introduce maladapted individuals into habitats that are host to different environmental conditions, possibly lowering the mean fitness of the recipient population . More broadly, dispersal can provide a mechanism by which phenotypes are sorted in space rather than time and facilitates the spread of potentially maladaptive genes . Dispersal in this case may lead to genetic homogenization that erodes the asynchrony underpinning portfolio effects and metapopulation persistence.

There is growing appreciation that a combination of abiotic, biotic, and anthropogenic factors can control the rate of dispersal among populations . Migratory populations that return to breeding sites for reproduction can be linked to each other by some proportion of the population that permanently disperses into the ‘wrong’ site. Recently, the role of social interactions and collective navigation has been hypothesized as a mechanism shaping the success of philopatric migrations . The rate at which individuals disperse may be linked to errors made at an individual-level that are themselves diminished by migrating in groups and pooling individual choices . Thus, dispersal rates can be higher at lower population abundances , which may profoundly influence the eco-evolutionary dynamics of metapopulations.

The eco-evolutionary impacts of dispersal likely have important implications for conservation and management in key taxa such as in migratory salmon . While anadromous salmonid fishes (genera *Oncorhynchus* and *Salmo*) are renown for returning to their natal spawning habitats with high accuracy and precision after years at sea , there are generally some individuals that disperse (termed ‘straying’ and used synonymously with dispersal hereafter) to non-natal sites to spawn . Straying is fundamental to the evolutionary legacy of populations as it has provided a mechanism for the colonization of new or connected habitats following glacial retreat or large scale geomorphic landscape change . Salmon may operate as metapopulations, where populations are genetically distinct but linked by some level of straying . Although extensive work has been done to document the extent of straying from donor populations into recipient populations , only recently have the abiotic, biotic, and anthropogenic influences of straying behaviours been investigated systemically . Straying among salmon may be influenced by environmental factors such as water temperature, human activities such as hatchery practices, and population density as predicted by the collective navigation hypothesis . Straying can introduce new maladaptive genotypes into the recipient population, while the ensuing genetic homogenization could synchronize population dynamics and erode portfolio effects . Given that locally distinct populations are often linked by straying, there is an opportunity and need to understand the fundamental and applied consequences of straying on metapopulation persistence, conservation, and management.

Here we seek to explore how collective density-dependent straying influences the stability and robustness of metapopulations through ecological and evolutionary processes. To address this question we build upon an established eco-evolutionary model of two populations occupying different sites that are linked by straying individuals, each with an associated trait distribution subject to natural selection determined by local conditions . Specifically we compared (a) density-independent (constant) straying with (b) density-dependent straying as a function of the rate at which individuals stray and the strength of collective behaviour across (c) increasing environmental heterogeneity, by assessing two measures of metapopulation robustness: the portfolio effect and the time required for a population(s) to recover following an induced disturbance. This model enables us to explore the tradeoff between the potentially detrimental erosion of local adaptation vs. the positive effects of demographic and evolutionary rescue, both of which are facilitated by straying and the effects of collective navigation.

# Model Description & Analysis

**(a) Metapopulation framework**  
We follow the basic framework described by Ronce and Kirkpatrick , where dispersal connects two populations and that inhabit two distinct habitats, each with trait values and . In our version of the model, and are locally adapted to site-specific conditions such that there is an optimum trait value and associated with each habitat, where recruitment is maximized if the trait value of the local population equals the optimum, such that . Moreover, we assumed that are normally distributed with means and have the same standard deviation . As such, the recruitment rate for both populations is determined by the mean trait value of the local population relative to the optimal value at that site. Trait means for each population are subject to selection, the strength of which is proportional to the difference between the trait mean and the local trait optimum at a given point in time . This is broadly consistent with empirical patterns observed in pacific salmon dynamics . The two populations occur in spatially separate sites that are close enough that a proportion of the population strays into the other site. If there is no straying between these populations, then the mean trait evolves towards the optimal value for each site , and the recruitment rate for each population is maximized. If there is straying between populations at rate , then the traits in each respective location will be pulled away from the optimum, and recruitment rates will be lowered. As , the populations are perfectly mixed.

We used the discrete Ricker framework described by Shelton and Mangel as the basis for our two-site metapopulation model, with the added effect of the local population mixing with a proportion of individuals from a remote population , and where there is no demographic overlap between generations, consistent with the life history of many populations of pink salmon (*O. gorbuscha*) who all mature at two years of age and die after one reproductive season.. In this sense, both populations serve simultaneously as donor and recipient populations. Because total recruitment will be determined by both locals (with a mean trait value closer to the site optimum) and strays (with mean trait values farther from the local optimum), the recruitment of the aggregate is determined by the mean of the trait mix , where

This mix of individuals is subject to identical compensatory effects, which is determined by the parameter . Taken together, the difference equation that determines changes in population size from time to is

$$\begin{aligned}
\label{eq:N}
&N\_i(t+1) = R\_i[\omega\_i\mu\_i(t) + (1-\omega\_i)\mu\_j(t),\theta\_i] \\ \nonumber
&\times \left((1-m)N\_i + mN\_j\right){\rm e}^{-\beta ((1-m)N\_i(t) + m N\_j(t))},\end{aligned}$$

where the recruitment of the population as a function of the mean trait value at time and the local trait optimum is

$$\begin{aligned}
\label{eq:R}
&R\_i[\omega\_i\mu\_i(t) + (1-\omega\_i)\mu\_j(t),\theta\_i] = \\ \nonumber
&\int\_{-\infty}^\infty r\_{\rm max}\exp\left\{\frac{(x\_i-\theta\_i)^2}{2\tau^2}\right\} {\rm pr}(x\_i,\omega\_i\mu\_i(t) + (1-\omega\_i)\mu\_j(t),\sigma^2) {\rm d}x\_i +\tilde{P}\_i\\ \nonumber
&= \frac{r\_{\rm max} \tau }{\sqrt{\sigma ^2+\tau ^2}}\exp\left\{-\frac{(\theta\_i-(\omega\_i\mu\_i(t) + (1-\omega\_i)\mu\_j(t)))^2}{2 \left(\sigma ^2+\tau ^2\right)}\right\} +\tilde{P}\_i.\end{aligned}$$

The mismatch between the mean of the local trait mix and the local optimum scales the recruitment rate for the population, and $\tilde{P}\_i\sim {\rm Normal}(0,0.01)$ introduces a small amount of demographic variability. The parameter is the strength of selection, and controls the sensitivity of recruitment to changes in the mean trait value away from the optimum. Because straying individuals are emigrating from a population with a mean trait value farther from the local optimum, their rate of recruitment is diminished. Recent studies of wild sockeye salmon have indeed found that straying individuals have lower life-time fitness than individuals that do not stray, although it is unknown at what life-stage this selection occurs .

Because individuals from the local population are mixed with individuals from the remote population via straying and subsequent reproduction, the resulting trait distribution is a complex mixture of trait distributions. We make two simplifying assumptions. First, we approximate the distribution resulting from the mix of remote and local individuals prior to reproduction as a Gaussian distribution, where with probability . The expectation of the actual trait distribution as well as the Gaussian approximation are the same, such that ${\rm E}\{g(x\_i)\} = \omega\_i\mu\_i + (1-\omega\_i)\mu\_j$, with weights corresponding to the proportion of the mixed population that are local individuals, , and straying individuals, . Thus, strays can successfully reproduce and introduce their genotypes into the recipient population, which is supported by observations in wild populations . Second, we assumed that changes in trait variance through time are minimal, such that is constant over time, which is a common simplification in eco-evolutionary models of population dynamics . These simplifications are the same as those introduced by Ronce and Kirkpatrick, and were shown to have negligible impacts on dynamics .

Following Lande , and given our assumption of trait distribution normality, the mean trait value thus changes through time according to the difference equation

with . Although trait heritability among salmonids is variable, most life-history traits have an , and for all additional analyses we have conservatively set .  
**(b) Density-dependent straying** There is mounting evidence that straying is density-dependent, perhaps reflecting a signature of collective navigation . Specifically, straying has been linked directly to a collective decision-making phenomenon, where greater numbers of individuals tend to decrease the rate at which individuals err, reducing the overall proportion of a population that strays. According to Berdahl et al. , given the probability that an individual strays is , the proportion of the local population that strays is

where is a half-saturation constant, and determines to what extent collective behaviour, as a function of group size, diminishes straying. If is small, relatively small groups of organisms ‘correct’ for even high individual error rates, suppressing straying between sites. In the context of our model, small values of indicate that the effects of collective behaviour on modifying straying are strong. As , groups of any size have no impact on straying, such that , and the model reverts to that of constant straying. When and the population density is high, , whereas if the population is small, individuals operate without regard to the collective, such that , such that in all cases, .

**(c) Measuring metapopulation robustness** We evaluated metapopulation robustness by measuring the average-CV portfolio effect (PE) as well as the recovery time, which is the time required for the system to return to a steady-state following an induced disturbance to one or both populations . Throughout, we refer to an increase in portfolio effects and/or reduction in recovery time as promoting metapopulation robustness.

The average-CV portfolio effect is, as the name implies, the average CV across each population divided by the CV of the aggregate , such that

$$\langle{\rm PE}\rangle =\frac{1}{X}\sum\_{i=1}^{X} \frac{\sqrt{{\rm VAR}(N\_i^\*)}}{{\rm E}(N\_i^\*)}\cdot \frac{{\rm E}(N\_T^\*)}{\sqrt{{\rm VAR}(N\_T^\*)}},
\label{eq:pe}$$

where in this case the number of populations is limited to and the expectations $\rm E(\cdot)$ and variances $\rm VAR(\cdot)$ are evaluated at the steady-state. The steady-state condition is denoted by ‘’. As the CV of decreases relative to that of the constituent populations, $\langle{\rm PE}\rangle > 1$, and the metapopulation is presumed to be more stable because the aggregate has functioned to dampen population-level variance. Moreover, portfolio effects greater than unity correspond to less synchronization and thus a greater potential for demographic rescue among populations, buffering the system as a whole against extinction.

A more direct way to measure system robustness is to measure the time required for the system (measured as the aggregate steady-state biomass ) to recover following an induced disturbance: systems that recover quickly (shorter recovery times) are more robust than those that recover more slowly (longer recovery times). Although there is a direct eigenvalue relationship between the rate of return following a small pulse perturbation , because we aimed to 1) assess the effects of a large perturbation far from the stable state, and 2) estimate the time required for all transient effects to decay following this perturbation (including dampened oscillations), we used a simulation-based numerical procedure. Recovery time was calculated by initiating a disturbance at , and monitoring as , where is large. The aggregate was deemed recovered at , such that recovery time was calculated as , and recovery at was determined by the initial where $N\_T(t) < N\_T^\*\pm{\rm SD}\left( N\_T^\* \right)$ for , where $\rm{SD}(\cdot)$ is standard deviation (illustrated in figure [fig:recovery]).

Numerically estimating the time that it takes for a perturbed system to recover also permits a more nuanced perspective of metapopulation robustness. For example, if populations settle to alternative stable states, comparing recovery times after a disturbance applied to individual populations allows for an assessment of which component of the metapopulation has a longer-lasting influence on the system’s recovery. We measured recovery time following three types of induced disturbance: (*i*) extinction of the low-density population; (*ii*) extinction of the high-density population (scenarios *i* and *ii* are equivalent if populations have the same density); (*iii*) near-collapse of both populations where just 1.0% of each survives.

# Results

Density-independent straying lowers stable state densities for both populations by (*i*) the numerical loss of locally-adapted individuals from donor to recipient populations and (*ii*) the introduction of maladapted individuals and their associated traits to the recipient population from the donor population (figure [fig:traj]). The decline in steady-state densities is abrupt: as straying increases, the system moves from a single stable state where the populations have the same (symmetric) densities, to a region with alternative stable states. Two types of alternative stable state regimes occur in this system, and have important effects on robustness. The first that is encountered at lower straying , separated by a fold bifurcation , has an intermediate stable state, as well as a dominant and subordinate stable state (regime II in figure [fig:traj]). Because the intermediate state is stable, the dominant and subordinate densities are not encountered unless the system is pushed into basins of attraction that define these states (dashed lines in figure [fig:traj]). The second type of alternative stable state regime (regime I) is separated from regime II by a pitchfork bifurcation. Here the only stable points are the dominant (high) and subordinate (low) stable state densities (regime I in figure [fig:traj]). Importantly, we find that increasing the asymmetry in the vital rates of populations between sites does not significantly alter the presence or position of these different regimes (figure [fig:symmetry]).  
**(a) Nonlinear effects of straying on metapopulation robustness**  
Straying has a large effect on metapopulation robustness, measured by the portfolio effect and the time to recovery following the three types of induced disturbance: near-collapse of both populations, the extinction of the dominant population, and the extinction of the subordinate population (figure [fig:mpert]). Importantly, the presence of alternative stable state regimes I and II both have a direct impact on robustness as a function of straying . We observe that as straying increases, the portfolio effect increases sharply as regime I or II is entered, and then declines gradually (figure [fig:mpert]a). Thus, low levels of straying (2-10% of the population) are associated with the strongest portfolio effects. This non-linear relationship between straying and portfolio effects is linked to the alternative stable state regimes I and II (figure [fig:traj]).

Different types of disturbance lead to different relationships between straying and porfolio effects. When either population suffers extinction, PE is shown to increase with lower straying; in the case of near-collapse of both populations, PE increases when straying is higher (figure [fig:mpert]a). This difference is due to the hidden basin of attraction at low population densities that only plays a role when a disturbance impacts a single population. In other words, disturbance to a single population can push that population into a low-density alternative state, which in turn contributes to higher PE. The increase in PE for the synchronous near-collapse scenario occurs at higher values of when the system enters regime I, where there exists only an asymmetric dominant (high-density) and subordinate (low-density) state. The PE spikes again when straying is very high and the system leaves the alternative stable state regime I, entering a symmetric low-density state.

Similar patterns are observed with respect to the recovery time as straying is increased (figure [fig:mpert]b). For lower , recovery of single extinctions is impacted by the appearance of low-density basins of attraction in regime II, whereas recovery following near-collapse is not. For intermediate values of (regime I), the time to recovery is only diminished when the subordinate population becomes extinct, whereas the time to recovery following near-collapse and the extinction of the dominant population are similar and grow until Regime I is exited at high . In the case where the subordinate population is extirpated, the most rapid recovery rate occurs when straying is low (). In contrast, when the dominant population goes extinct, the most rapid recovery is associated with minimal straying. It should be noted that when there is no straying (), then recovery from extinction is infinite and these values are not shown. The relationship between straying and recovery time in the case of synchronous population disturbance is generally positive.

Collectively, these patterns in recovery time and PE are influenced by the different regimes of alternative stable states. As the alternative stable state regime is approached with increasing , both measures of robustness increase sharply due to an amplification in variance within both populations. This amplification in variance is the product of *critical slowing down*, which occurs near some bifurcations and has been suggested to serve as an early warning indicator for approaching phase transitions . Because these large increases in robustness metrics pertain to a very small range of , we do not consider them to be biologically relevant, and are primarily useful in this context for observing transitions between dynamic regimes. Together, these results suggest that under the assumption of constant (and symmetric) dispersal, robustness depends strongly on the magnitude of straying as well as the type of disturbance experienced by the metapopulation. Although the emergence of alternative stable states presents their own risks to the persistence of populations – including the appearance of subordinate state densities and potentially hidden low-density basins of attraction – low-intermediate also serves to increase robustness by dampening the variance of the aggregate metapopulation (increasing PE), though the effect on recovery time is more idiosyncratic. We next examine how density-dependent straying challenges these expectations.  
**(b) The effects of collective navigation and density-dependent straying**  
If we assume that straying is density-dependent, the probability that an individual errs in part determines the magnitude of straying within the population (Eq. [eq:ddm]), such that becomes lower as increases, which we assume here to be the consequence of collective decision-making behaviours . The parameter in Eq. [eq:ddm] determines to what extent straying is reduced as group size increases, where low values correspond to the effects of strong collective behaviour, and high values correspond to the effects of weak collective behaviour, such that straying is effectively constant . To enable comparisons between models with constant and density-dependent straying, we compare constant to both the individual straying probability as well as the value of straying observed at the stable state . In the alternative stable state regimes, the dispersing populations are characterized by alternative values if the populations have asymmetric densities, corresponding to dominant and subordinate states.

When collective behaviour is very strong, such that is very low, small increases in population density beget large reductions in straying. These reductions can be large enough that the system avoids the alternative stable state regime altogether (figure [fig:cb], left inset). Conversely, when collective behaviour is very weak, such that is very high, there is effectively no reduction in straying with increased group size, and the dynamics are those expected if straying were constant (figure [fig:cb], right inset). However, when collective behaviour is of intermediate strength (), the dynamics are altered in two important ways. First, in the alternative stable state regime, the low density subordinate population has correspondingly higher , whereas the high density dominant population has correspondingly lower (figure [fig:cb], center inset). Second, the alternative stable state regime results in a that is reduced when individual straying is low, and magnified when individual straying is high (figure [fig:cb], main). In other words, when collective behaviour is of intermediate strength – the more realistic range for species that navigate via collective decision-making – increased individual straying exaggerates the differences between the stable state densities, effectively pushing the subordinate population closer to extinction.

Density-dependent straying directly alters the dynamic regimes of the model, and this has a large effect on metapopulation robustness. When the effects of collective behaviour are weak (high ) the portfolio effects and recovery times conform to those examined in the case of constant straying (figures [fig:mpert], [fig:pert]). When the effects of collective behaviour are very strong (low ), we observe that recovery times are shorter in the case of near-collapse (figure [fig:pert]b). Recovery times also tend to be shorter when a single population becomes extinct except for very low , in which case the time to recovery is much longer (figure [fig:pert]c,d). As before, when the strength of collective behaviour is intermediate (), the relationships become more complex. With intermediate there is a general increase in robustness if straying is low-intermediate (higher portfolio effect, shorter recovery time), followed by an erosion in robustness as straying becomes high. In this parameter space, collective migration can mean that the low-density population will stray more, losing well-adapted local individuals, while still receiving some maladapted strays from the larger population, increasing the likelihood of stochastic extinction.

Observed changes in metapopulation robustness are due to changes in alternative stable state regimes I and II as the strength of collective behaviour increases (lower , figure [fig:bifurcationsddm]a). When collective behaviour is weak (large ), alternative stable states tend to occur at low-intermediate values of individual straying . As collective behaviour is strengthened (smaller ), Regime I first expands across higher values of and then collapses (black region in figure [fig:bifurcationsddm]a), whereas regime II plays a larger role over a larger range of (gray region in figure [fig:bifurcationsddm]a). Importantly, when the strength of collective behaviour is intermediate, both regimes I and II are relevant at low-intermediate . In this case, the combined effect of regimes I and II leads to the observed increase in robustness at low-intermediate and subsequent decline with high .

**(c) The role of habitat heterogeneity and changing selective landscapes**  
As habitat heterogeneity () increases, even small amounts of straying can lead to the appearance of alternative stable states, and this is in direct accord with the findings of Ronce and Kirkpatrick . However, if straying is density-dependent, the strength of collective behaviour has a large influence on the occurrence of both alternative stable state regimes I and II. When heterogeneity is low and the effects of collective behaviour are weak such that straying is constant (large ), regime I occurs for small-intermediate , and regime II does not play a role (figure [fig:bifurcationsddm]b), mirroring the findings of Ronce and Kirkpatrick . The absence of regime II implies that there are no hidden stable state configurations that might trap a disturbed population in a low-density state. As the strength of collective behaviour increases, regime II appears at a cusp and becomes increasingly dominant with greater individual straying. For sites distributed across more heterogeneous habitats, the alternative stable state regimes I and II expand (figure [fig:bifurcationsddm]a,c). Regime I dominates all but very high individual straying when the effects of collective behaviour are weak, and very low individual straying when the effects of collective behaviour are strong. Moreover, in highly heterogeneous habitats, if the effects of collective behaviour are strong and straying is low (low and values), regime II, which harbors low-density basins of attraction, cannot be avoided.

Until now, we have treated straying and habitat heterogeneity as independent parameters, however they could covary. For instance, if sites are separated by greater distance, they may be assumed to have increased habitat heterogeneity as well as less straying. Alternatively, individuals may be genetically predisposed to stray into sites that are more similar , such that higher straying can be assumed to occur between sites that are more homogeneous in aspect. We implemented this inverse relationship by setting where controls the degree to which an increase in lowers (figure [fig:mtheta], inset). Accordingly, is greater for lower , such that there is less straying between dissimilar sites and more straying between similar sites. Under these conditions we find that regime I appears for very low , and regime II appears for higher (figure [fig:mtheta]), which is opposite the case where and are independent. As the straying rate increases and decreases, a single (symmetric) stable state emerges as the fold bifurcation is crossed, which is opposite the pattern observed when straying is independent of habitat heterogeneity.

# Discussion

In this paper we show that density-dependent straying between populations consistent with collective navigation, coupled with localized selection against immigrant phenotypes has large, nonlinear impacts on metapopulation robustness. Building upon the dynamical framework introduced by Ronce and Kirkpatrick , we assess robustness by measuring 1) the average-CV portfolio effect , a statistical metric commonly used to assess the buffering capacity of metapopulations, and 2) the recovery time, defined here as the time required for the aggregate metapopulation biomass to return to its steady-state following an induced disturbance, which is mechanistically linked to persistence . These statistical and mechanistic descriptors of metapopulation dynamics and robustness are tightly coupled, which is not uncommon for diverse metrics of stability . We discovered that a low level of straying is associated with the highest metapopulation robustness for most types of disturbance.

We introduce density-dependent straying by assuming that larger group sizes lower population-level straying from the baseline probability than an individual errs , with the strength of this effect determined by in equation [eq:ddm] (lower values of indicate that the effects of collective behaviour are strong). Generally, we find that when the effects of collective behaviour are strong, metapopulation robustness is enhanced. However, empirical observations of natural populations suggest that the effects of collective behaviour are intermediate (e.g. ) . In this case, we find that the robustness of the metapopulation is increased only if the probability that individuals stray is low, and is substantially eroded if the probability that individuals err is high.

Metapopulation robustness was found to depend strongly on the magnitude of straying between sites. We generally found that metapopulation robustness was highest (as indicated by higher PE and lower recovery times) when straying was at an low-intermediate level. Exceedingly low levels of straying did not permit the metapopulation to buffer itself against variability (figure [fig:pert]a), whereas excess straying led to genetic homogenization and maladaptation, and consequently lower abundances, which conspired to lengthen recovery time (figure [fig:pert]b). Thus, we speculate that intermediate-low levels of straying enables populations to solve the ecological and evolutionary challenges posed by disturbance and local adaptation in meta-populations.

A central dynamic of the model is that straying can lead to the emergence of asymmetric alternative stable states, or *migrational meltdown* , pushing one of the populations to a dominant, well-adapted, high density, state, and one to a subordinate, maladapted, low density, state. Although there are subtle differences in our model and the general framework presented in Ref. , the general dynamic features are the same if we assume that dispersal is symmetric between sites and density-independent (which occurs when ). The dynamic regimes that emerge from the eco-evolutionary model – in particular the occurrence of alternative stable state regimes I and II – have large effects on both the portfolio effect and the recovery time following an induced disturbance (figure [fig:pert]). In general, we find that intermediate straying increases the PE and lowers the time to recovery, particularly in the case of the extinction of the subordinate (low-density) population. As straying continues to increase, robustness declines.

This themed issue formalizes the role of collective movement in the ecology of natural systems and illuminates a signature of collective navigation in animal populations on the move. Here we explore the implications of this collective navigation on metapopulations. We highlight three important findings that contribute to our understanding of collective movement suggesting that density-dependent straying may play an important role in the persistence of metapopulations over evolutionary time. We will first examine the potentially unrealistic case of very strong collective behaviour, and then discuss the more complicated, but more realistic case of intermediate collective behaviour.

First, if the effects of collective behaviour are very strong (low ), metapopulation robustness is increased, due primarily to the avoidance of alternative stable state regime I (figures [mpert],[fig:bifurcationsddm]a). This means that - despite potentially high individual error rates - group formation minimizes straying. This occurs when groups of individuals significantly minimizes straying, which may be unrealistic (REF). Moreover, when the effects of collective behaviour are strong, regime I gives way to the dominance of regime II, which harbors low-density basins of attraction (dashed lines in figure [fig:traj]) that can effectively trap disturbed populations in a subordinate stable state, not unlike the allee effects observed in the collective migration model explored by Berdahl et al. .

Our second important finding reveals that when the effects of collective behaviour are intermediate, metapopulation robustness is impacted in three ways, depending on the magnitude of individual straying. Empirical studies suggest that collective behaviour occurs when group sizes are around 100-1000 (REFSXX). Here, the system is generally in alternative stable state regime I or II except for perhaps unrealistically low levels of individual straying (figure [fig:bifurcationsddm]a). If individual straying is high (), 1) there is a magnified difference between the numerical densities of the subordinate and dominant populations, effectively pushing the subordinate population to lower steady state densities (figure [fig:cb]), 2) the portfolio effect is low, such that the coefficient of variance for the aggregate metapopulation biomass is on-par with the coefficient of variance for its constituent populations, and 3) additional time generally required for the population(s) to recover following an induced disturbance, and this is particularly true for the recovery of the system following near-collapse of both populations (figure [fig:mpert]b). Together, this suggests that when the effects of collective behaviour are intermediate, and straying is high, there is an overall reduction in metapopulation robustness, thereby reducing persistence.

The decline in metapopulation robustness only holds if individual straying is very high. Empirical observations of straying support low-intermediate levels of individual error rates in most species . If is low (), 1) the differences between the numerical densities of the subordinate and dominant populations are not exaggerated, and the range of that avoids the alternative stable state regime I is larger (figure [fig:cb]), 2) the portfolio effect is exaggerated, meaning that the variance of the combined metapopulation is dampening variance observed in the constituent populations (figure [fig:mpert]a), and 3) the time required for the population(s) to recover following an induced disturbance is lower (figure [fig:mpert]b-d).

Third, we find that greater habitat heterogeneity increases the role of alternative stable state regimes, particularly when the effects of collective behaviour are strong (high , low ; figure [fig:bifurcationsddm]c), and this increases the potential complexity of metapopulation dynamics. Salmon are distributed and stray across a diverse range of habitats, and the rates of straying between geographically diverse sites can be plastic and idiosyncratic . Our surrogate measure for habitat heterogeneity is the difference in trait optima between sites . We show that as habitat heterogeneity increases, the occurrence of alternative stable states associated with regime I becomes unavoidable, particularly for , and regime II becomes minimized (figure [fig:bifurcationsddm]). This may be particularly consequential for populations that are spatially adjacent but separated by sharp environmental boundaries, such that trait optima are divergent yet dispersal is relatively high. Such a scenario plays out repeatedly in the context of wild and hatchery-produced salmon. Although wild and hatchery populations may occur close on the landscape, and indeed often are sympatric within the same river network, the selective environments to which they are locally adapted differ dramatically . Straying of domesticated hatchery-produced fish from release sites and spawning in the wild drastically reduces the productivity of wild populations through competition and outbreeding depression .

In other cases, habitats that are closer in space can be assumed to have greater similarity in environmental conditions than those that are geographically distant, and phenotypes of more proximately located populations should be more similar . It is thus reasonable to expect a larger number of straying individuals between sites that are geographically proximate and indeed evidence corroborates this prediction . Alternatively, salmon that cue to specific environmental conditions may be more likely to stray into sites that are structurally and physiognamically more similar . These considerations justify imposing a negative correlation between habitat heterogeneity and individual straying : as site heterogeneity increases, so too should straying decrease (figure [fig:mtheta], inset). When habitat heterogeneity and straying are linked in this way, we show that very small amounts of straying give rise to regime I, and that regime II occurs for higher values of (figure [fig:mtheta]). This pattern is opposite that observed for scenarios were habitat heterogeneity and straying are assumed to be independent, and suggests that increases in straying that are associated with growing similarities between habitats can push a metapopulation into a regime where hidden low-density basins of attraction exist. Thus, management activities that alter dispersal rates by outplanting individuals or reconnecting disconnected habitats could have unintended eco-evolutionary consequences , introducing particular management challenges.

A general message from our theoretical framework is that the emergence of alternative eco-evolutionary states depends jointly on the strength of collective behaviour and individual straying, and that this has large implications for metapopulation robustness. Although robustness is in many cases aided by increasing the strength of collective behaviour, the greater role of both alternative stable state regimes I and II portends additional complexity in the potential eco-evolutionary dynamics, and this could serve to hinder effective management. Moreover, this increased complexity at empirically observed levels of straying and at realistic (intermediate) ranges for the strength of collective behaviour, is only magnified with increasing habitat heterogeneity and when heterogeneity itself is linked to individual straying. An additional component that we have not explored here, but that may be particularly relevant to consider, are the potential effects of including additional sites, as well as the pattern of dispersal that connects these sites. The structure of dispersal has been shown to have a large influence on population dynamics , and to what extent density-dependent straying influences the eco-evolutionary dynamics of populations in large spatially-structure networks would be of considerable interest. We are hopeful that these theoretical predictions may inspire future theoretical and empirical studies that aim to unravel and expand upon the relationships that we have explored.

While our theoretical work is a vast simplification of natural systems, our results have important potential implications for understanding the eco-evolutionary dynamics of spatially structured populations such as in salmon. A particularly salient finding was that density-dependent straying may serve to promote or inhibit population robustness, depending on the strength of the collective behaviour, and the underlying magnitude of straying. When the strength of collective behaviour is at plausible intermediate levels, straying increased population robustness through enhanced portfolio effects and reduced time to recovery following disturbance. Salmon have evolved within a context of dynamic gemomorphic landscapes where habitat quantity and quality shifts as a mosaic through time. Our results provide evidence supporting the hypothesis described in Berdahl et al. 2014 that collective behaviour may underpin rapid habitat colonization following natural disturbance such as volcanic eruptions, reconnected habitats following restoration, or in the context of glacial retreat and climate warming. Moreover, our results are consistent with the role of collective behaviour in facilitating reproductive isolation and local adapation to site-specific selection in populations that recover following disturbance to the extent that straying decreases as population sizes increase. Additionally, collective behaviour may be beneficial in facilitating navigation though increasingly modified and fragmented habitats. On the other hand, collective behaviour coupled with high straying may push populations to extirpation. Thus, collective behaviour could provide both resilience to salmon metapopulations but also vulnerabilities.

Our study broadly indicates that management activities that alter patterns of straying could have profound implications for metapopulation robustness and adaptive potential. High rates of straying are predicted to decrease metapopulation robustness, and there are a series of common practices in salmon management that may be elevating straying rates. For example, transporting young salmon downstream via barge to avoid infrastructure (e.g., dams) or dangerous habitats may disrupt the processes involved with critical periods of imprinting prior to or during downstream migration by sea-going individuals and increase straying by adults later in life. Additionally, our results support the conservation concern that large-scale releases of salmon produced in hatcheries that stray could have profound impacts on the robustness of salmon metapopulations through the erosion of portfolio effects. Moreover, hatchery environments are associated with marked changes in fish social behaviour that may increase collective dynamics of migrating groups, consistent with the findings of Jonsson and Jonsson who report stronger associations between straying and abundance in escaped aquaculture produced Atlantic salmon than their wild counterparts. Thus, management activities that have the unintended consequence of altering straying may compromise recovery efforts.

Beyond salmon, density-dependent dispersal, whether it is caused by collective decision-making or other factors, has a large influence on the dynamics of populations in the presence of local adaptation. The rate at which individual err, and the influence of group size on navigation at the population level, are two important components of dynamic dispersal . We show that changes in these characteristics can alter the occurrence and positioning of two different alternative stable state regimes, one of which may harbor hidden low-density basins of attractions that can effectively trap populations after a large disturbance. Generally, increasing the strength of collective behaviour mitigates the potentially negative impacts of so-called *migrational meltdown* . Thus, preserving the biological processes that facilitate collective behaviour of migratory species may be an important conservation target in its own right, echoing the sentiments of Hardesty-Moore et al. . We suggest that increased understanding the proximate and ultimate factors governing dispersal among local populations within metapopulations, across heterogeneous environments, in tandem with the mosaic of selective forces acting on those environments, may be key to promoting persistence in the wild.  
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Table of parameters, definitions, and assigned values (var. = variable).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Definition | Value |
| , | Individual, aggregate population over time | var. |
|  | Trait value for an individual in population | var. |
|  | Mean of for population over time | var. |
| , | Constant, density-dependent straying rate | var. |
|  | Straying rate of an individual | var. |
|  | Strength of collective behavior (low=strong) | var. |
|  | Recruitment rate of population | var. |
| $r\_{\rm max}$ | Maximum recruitment rate | 2.0 |
|  | Strength of density dependence |  |
|  | Optimal trait value for habitat | 5.0 |
|  | Genetic variance of trait | 1.0 |
|  | Strength of selection | 1.0 |
|  | Heritability | 0.2 |
|  | Habitat heterogeneity | var. |
|  | Sensitivity of to changes in | 20.0 |
| ${\rm PE}$ | Portfolio Effect | var. |
|  | Terminal simulation time |  |

![ The steady-state densities of N_i and N_j vs. straying m for the constant straying model. Alternative stable states exist for regimes I and II, labeled RI and RII, respectively. One configuration exists in regime I: an asymmetric dominant/subordinate state (red and blue lines, respectively). Two configurations exist in regime II: a symmetric, intermediate state (solid line), and an asymmetric dominant/subordinate state (red and blue dashed lines, respectively). ](data:application/pdf;base64,)

The steady-state densities of and vs. straying for the constant straying model. Alternative stable states exist for regimes I and II, labeled RI and RII, respectively. One configuration exists in regime I: an asymmetric dominant/subordinate state (red and blue lines, respectively). Two configurations exist in regime II: a symmetric, intermediate state (solid line), and an asymmetric dominant/subordinate state (red and blue dashed lines, respectively).









