

# No complexity-stability relationship in natural communities

Claire Jacquet<sup>1</sup>, Charlotte Moritz<sup>1,2</sup>, Lyne Morissette<sup>2</sup>, Pierre Legagneux<sup>1</sup>, François Massol<sup>3</sup>, Philippe Archambault<sup>2</sup>, and Dominique Gravel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Université du Québec à Rimouski, Département de biologie, chimie et géographie, 300 Allée des Ursulines, Québec, Canada G5L 3A1.

<sup>2</sup>Université du Québec à Rimouski, Institut des sciences de la mer de Rimouski, 300 Allée des Ursulines, Québec, Canada. G5L 3A1.

<sup>3</sup>Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, 1919 route de Mende, 34293 Montpellier cedex 5, France.

## Abstract

Understanding the mechanisms responsible for the stability and persistence of natural communities is one of the greatest challenges in ecology [1]. Robert May showed that contrary to intuition, complex randomly built communities are less likely to be stable than simpler ones [2, 3]. For four decades, ecologists have tried to isolate the non-random characteristics of natural communities that could explain how they persist despite their complexity [1]. Surprisingly, few attempts have been tried to test May's fundamental prediction and we still ignore if there is indeed a relationship between stability and complexity. Here, we performed a comparative stability analysis of 119 quantitative food webs sampled worldwide, from marine, freshwater and terrestrial habitats. Food webs were compiled using a standard methodology to build Ecopath mass-balance models. Our analysis reveals that classic descriptors of complexity (species richness, connectance and variance of interaction strengths) do not affect stability in natural food webs. Food web structure, which is far from random in real communities, reflects another form of complexity that we found influences dramatically the stability of real communities. We conclude that the occurrence of complex communities in nature is possible owing to their trophic structure.

The diversity-stability debate, initiated forty years ago [1], stems from two apparently conflicting observations. On the one hand, complex communities are ubiquitous in nature, as illustrated by diverse tropical forests, coral reefs or intertidal communities, and it inspired ecologists to hypothesize that complexity could stabilize communities [4, 5]. On the other hand, a seminal mathematical analysis stated that complex systems are less likely to recover from small perturbations than simpler ones [2]. This theoretical result was put forth by Robert May who studied the relationship between complexity and stability in random communities [3]. Community complexity was defined as the product of species diversity  $S$ , connectance  $C$  and variance of interaction strengths  $\sigma^2$ . May predicted that a system could be stable only if the criterion  $\sigma\sqrt{SC} < \bar{d}$  was satisfied, where  $\bar{d}$  expresses the magnitude of intraspecific competition.

In an attempt to solve this paradox, a number of subsequent studies have shown that communities, and most notably food webs, have non-random structural properties and interaction strength distribution that promote their stability [6, 7]. However, no clear consensus has emerged from this long debate and theoretical studies proposing alternative stabilizing network properties

are continuously published (e.g. [8, 9]). The gap between theoretical and empirical investigations remains one of the main obstacles to resolve the debate. The first challenge is to get sufficiently good food web data with knowledge of trophic interactions and quantitative energy fluxes [10]. Another problem is that what theoreticians call “interaction strength” is generally not what empiricists measure in the field [11]. Finally, the concept of stability itself encloses many different definitions [12] and each of them yields a different diversity-stability relationship [13].

Here, we performed a local stability analysis on 119 quantitative food webs sampled worldwide from marine, freshwater and terrestrial habitats. The food webs were all compiled using a pre-defined methodology in order to use the Ecopath modeling framework [14]. Ecopath is a trophic mass balance-model, the most widely used tool for ecosystem-based fisheries management, and has also been used to characterize unexploited ecosystems. A large amount of information is included in Ecopath models, such as trophic level, biomass, production and consumption rates of each species within a food web. Quantitative diet composition of species is also available, providing an accurate representation of trophic interactions within food webs. Ecopath models provide a unique opportunity to construct realistic community matrices with empirical data derived from a standardized protocol.




Figure 1: *Method summary: a) Equivalence of Ecopath and Lotka-Volterra models: simplified diagram of trophic flows between one consumer C and one resource R parameterized with Ecopath (in blue) and Lotka-Volterra (in green). B is biomass (t/km<sup>2</sup>), (P/B)<sub>c</sub> and (Q/B)<sub>c</sub> are consumer production and consumption rates /year) respectively, DC<sub>cr</sub> is the proportion of resource R in the diet of consumer C, e<sub>rc</sub> expresses the efficiency of a consumer to convert resource energy biomass with  $e_{rc} = \frac{(P/B)_c}{(Q/B)_c}$ , I is the allochthonous input with  $I = \omega \times (Q/B)_c \times B_c$ , where  $\omega$  is the proportion of input in the diet of the consumer, Y represents the total consumer catches. b) Jacobian matrix construction: derivation of Jacobian matrix elements for the simplified food web presented in the diagram, and an example of Jacobian matrix structure observed in real food webs. c) Measure of stability: the eigenvalues of a Jacobian matrix are contained in a circle on the complex plane (axes cross at the origin). On the real axis, the maximum eigenvalue  $Re(\lambda_{max})$  is influenced by the center of the circle  $\bar{d}$ , which is equal to the mean of intraspecific interaction terms (i.e. the diagonal elements of the Jacobian matrix), and by radius R, which is related to interspecific interaction terms (i.e. off diagonal elements of the Jacobian matrix) and is equal to  $\sigma\sqrt{SC}$  in random communities.*

The Ecopath model is canonical to the general Lotka-Volterra model that was studied by May [2, 3], enabling us to study food web stability with traditional local stability analysis. Technically, the definition of local stability is that a system will come back to the equilibrium following a small perturbation. It does not guarantee stability following large perturbations (global stability), neither it quantifies persistence (the number of species remaining after a perturbation). We translated parameters of the Ecopath models into interaction coefficients of the Lotka-Volterra interaction model following the same approach as de Ruiter and colleagues [15] (Fig. 1a). The Lotka-Volterra model was slightly modified to account for the external exchanges of Ecopath models (see Appendix for further details).

Interaction coefficients from all pair-wise interactions of a food web constitute the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A} = [\alpha_{ij}]$ . Because of the Ecopath equilibrium assumption, a Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}$  can be constructed for each food web by multiplying the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  with species biomass (Fig. 1b). We measured food web stability using the maximal eigenvalue (real part) of the Jacobian matrix in order to be directly comparable to May’s approach. This quantity indicates the rate with which a system returns to (if negative) or moves away from (if positive) equilibrium after small perturbations. Ecopath models rarely document the intraspecific interactions, we therefore centered for each web the distribution of eigenvalues on zero to avoid any bias in the evaluation of stability. Theory on Gerschgorin discs (a visual representation of the distribution of real and imaginary parts of eigenvalues for a given Jacobian matrix) states that the mean real part is a function of the mean diagonal elements of the Jacobian matrix, while the range of eigenvalues is a function of off-diagonal elements [16]. Adding intraspecific interactions (i.e. negative elements on the diagonal of the Jacobian matrix) has a stabilizing effect on food webs, by moving the mean of the eigenvalues toward negative values on the real axis (Fig. 1c). The centralization operation thus provides an unbiased estimation of the contribution of off-diagonal elements to the stability. Stability will decrease with increasing variance of the distribution of eigenvalues.

We first investigated the relationship between stability and classic descriptors of community complexity [10], i.e. species richness  $S$ , connectance  $C$ , and variance of interaction strengths  $\sigma^2$ . This is the first time that the main prediction from May’s analysis is tested with empirical data. Contrary to theoretical prediction, we observed no relationship between food web stability and species diversity, neither with connectance nor with variance of interaction strengths (Fig. 2). Further analyses also reveal that this result is robust to the variability of sampling intensity among the 119 food webs (see Methods and Supplementary Information). The absence of a stability-complexity relationship we observed is a striking departure from May’s prediction, suggesting there are ecological processes or structural elements preventing the negative relationship between stability and complexity found in random communities. We therefore investigated the mechanisms preventing this relationship to occur.

A consequence of the stability criterion  $\sigma\sqrt{SC} < \bar{d}$  is that for complex systems to occur in nature, interaction strength should be weaker in species-rich, highly connected systems [3]. It is consistent with our observations: we found that the variance of interaction strengths  $\sigma^2$  across the 119 food webs was negatively correlated to the product of diversity and connectance  $\sqrt{SC}$  (Fig. 2). There is a growing constraint on interaction strength as diversity and connectance increase, which allows the overall complexity  $\sigma\sqrt{SC}$  to remain relatively low and the system stable.

Theoretical studies of the stability-complexity relationship suggest that real communities have non-random structural properties promoting their stability despite their complexity [10].




Figure 2: *Food web stability related to measures of complexity in 119 food webs. a) Number of species  $S$  ( $P = 0.10, R^2 < 0.01$ ), b) Connectance  $C = (L/S^2)$  with  $L$  is the number of links ( $P = 0.38, R^2 = 0.002$ ), c) Standard deviation of interaction strengths  $\sigma$  ( $P = 0.01, R^2 = 0.05$ ), d) May's complexity measure  $\sigma\sqrt{SC}$  ( $P = 0.002, R^2 = 0.07$ ). Stability is measured as  $Re(\lambda_{max}) - \bar{d}$  for marine (blue), freshwater (green) and terrestrial ecosystems (orange). Food webs with eigenvalues close to zero are the most stable. All quantities are dimensionless.*

We consequently looked at the existence of such properties and then investigated their respective contribution to stability by randomisations of some properties of the Jacobian matrices. *H1: Interaction strength topology* [17, 18]. We found that interaction strength was related to trophic level, the occurrence of strong interactions being more likely at low trophic levels. Moreover, there was a correlation between the magnitude of the Jacobian elements  $c_{ij}$  and  $c_{ji}$ , since  $c_{ji} = \frac{-c_{ij} \times e_{ij} \times B_j}{B_i}$  (see Fig. 1b and Supplementary Information). We therefore hypothesized that food webs with random topology of interaction strengths (i.e. off-diagonal elements of the Jacobian matrix) are less stable than real food webs. *H2: Interaction strength distribution* [19, 20]. In agreement with previous studies, we observed a leptokurtic distribution of interaction strengths (highly skewed towards many weak interactions). This pattern differs from May's




Figure 3: *Correlation between complexity parameters in real food webs, where  $\sigma$  is the standard deviation of interaction strengths,  $S$  the number of species and  $C$  the connectance. The product  $\sqrt{SC}$  were negatively correlated to  $\sigma$  ( $P < 10^{-13}$ ,  $R^2 = 0.39$ ).*

random community matrices in which interaction strengths were drawn from a normal distribution. Consequently, we hypothesized that food webs with a random frequency distribution of interaction strengths, illustrated by a normal distribution, are less stable than natural food webs. *H3: Interaction type [3, 9, 21]*. Our dataset includes only predator-prey interactions and thus lacked other interaction types such as mutualism and interspecific competition. Based on previous findings, we assumed that communities with a strong proportion of mutualistic and competitive interactions are less stable than natural communities in which consumer-resource interactions prevail.

We performed randomisation tests to remove the structural properties of food web corresponding to our three hypotheses and computed stability of the permuted Jacobian matrices (see Methods for details). We employed this method to determine whether these structural properties had a significant effect on food web stability and to compare their respective stabilizing effect. The stability of the permuted food webs was compared to stability of the original food webs. We found that each of the three structural properties enhances food web stability (Fig.4). A remarkable feature however is their unequal contribution to stability. The type of interaction (with predator-prey module removal, H3) had the strongest impact on stability. Frequency distribution of interaction strengths, resulting in a large proportion of weak interactions (H2), was the second factor contributing to stability, followed by the topology of interaction strengths (H1 - Fig. 4).

Even if we conserved the same  $S$ ,  $C$  and  $\sigma$ , we found a negative complexity-stability relationship for all randomized Jacobian matrices (Fig. 5). The relationship was strongest when we normalised the interaction strength distribution (H2). We conclude that May's stability criterion do not apply to natural communities because of their non-random trophic structure,




Figure 4: a) Frequency distributions of eigenvalues of real and permuted food webs. Eigenvalues are on a logarithmic scale and dimensionless. Permutation tests were carried out 1000 times for each food web. Eigenvalue distributions were smoothed using a kernel density estimate of 0.28. b) Stability of real and permuted food webs related to May’s complexity criterion. Real food webs ( $P = 0.002, R^2 < 0.07$ ), H1: interaction strength topology ( $P < 10^{-5}, R^2 = 0.17$ ), H2: interaction strength distribution ( $P < 10^{-15}, R^2 = 0.86$ ) and H3: interaction type ( $P = 0.88, R^2 = 0.3$ ). Stability is measured as  $\text{Re}(\lambda_{\max}) - \bar{d}$  and  $\sigma\sqrt{SC}$  corresponds to May’s stability criterion. Communities with eigenvalues close to zero are the most stable

which has several stabilizing properties. First, the asymmetric sign structure (predator-prey modules) confers stability to Jacobian matrices (H3), as we found that for similar variation of interaction strengths, mutualistic and competitive interactions were destabilizing. Second, the frequency distribution of interaction strengths balanced the destabilizing effect of species richness. Interestingly, we observed in real data a strong negative correlation between the kurtosis  $\kappa$  (index of the flatness/peakness of the interaction strength distribution) and species richness in real food webs. Thus the probability of having many weak interactions increases with species richness (Fig 3 and Supplementary Information). Finally, the nonrandom topology of interaction strengths along trophic level was also stabilizing, as suggested by previous studies [15, 22].

The relevance of local stability analysis to study real communities may be questioned. More general and realistic definitions of stability have been introduced during the “complexity-stability” debate, such as persistence, resilience or resistance [12]. Indeed, local stability analysis only tests the impact of small perturbations on ecological dynamics, and may not apply to large perturbations typical of most empirical studies. However, it allows the use of analytically tractable Jacobian matrices, and thus the investigation of May’s complexity-stability relationship on real communities.

Although May’s conclusion that diversity begets instability in random communities was cor-

rect, we showed that diversity is not related to stability in natural communities, a question that has stimulated ecological research for four decades. We found that intrinsic energetic organization of food webs is highly stabilizing and allow complex communities to recover from perturbations. The structural complexity of food webs occurs from the successive addition of consumers having an increasingly large diet, which causes a growing frequency of weak interactions. The diversity-stability debate has contributed to the development of productive research that have pointed out the key role of the structural properties of real communities. There is increasing evidence that the strengths of trophic interactions are related to the body size distribution of species [23]. Changes in frequency distributions of body size could therefore strongly affect community stability and resilience.

## References

1. McCann, K. S. The diversity-stability debate. *Nature* **405**, 228–233. ISSN: 0028-0836 (May 2000).
2. May, R. M. Will a Large Complex System be Stable? *Nature* **238**, 413–414 (Aug. 1972).
3. May, R. M. *Stability and Complexity in Model Ecosystems* (Princeton University Press, 2001).
4. MacArthur, R. Fluctuations of animal populations and a measure of community stability. *Ecology* **36**, 533–536 (1955).
5. Paine, R. Food web complexity and species diversity. *American Naturalist* **100**, 65–75 (1966).
6. Yodzis, P. The stability of real ecosystems. *Nature* **289**, 674–676 (Feb. 1981).
7. Allesina, S. & Pascual, M. Network structure, predator–prey modules, and stability in large food webs. *Theoretical Ecology* **1**, 55–64. ISSN: 1874-1738 (Oct. 2007).
8. Gravel, D., Canard, E., Guichard, F. & Mouquet, N. Persistence increases with diversity and connectance in trophic metacommunities. *PloS one* **6**, e19374. ISSN: 1932-6203 (Jan. 2011).
9. Allesina, S. & Tang, S. Stability criteria for complex ecosystems. *Nature* **483**, 205–208. ISSN: 1476-4687 (Feb. 2012).
10. Dunne, J. a. in *Ecological Networks: linking structure to dynamics in food webs* (eds Pascual, M. & Dunne, J. a.) 27–86 (Oxford University Press, 2006).
11. Berlow, E. L. *et al.* Interaction strengths in food webs: issues and opportunities. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **73**, 585–598. ISSN: 0021-8790 (May 2004).
12. Grimm, V. Babel , or the Ecological Stability Discussions : An Inventory and Analysis of Terminology and a Guide for Avoiding Confusion. *Oecologia* **109**, 323–334 (1997).
13. Ives, A. R. & Carpenter, S. R. Stability and diversity of ecosystems. *Science* **317**, 58–62. ISSN: 1095-9203 (July 2007).
14. Christensen, V. ECOPATH II - a software for balancing steady-state ecosystem models and calculating network characteristics\*. *Ecological modelling* **61**, 169–185 (1992).
15. De Ruiter, P. C., Neutel, A.-M. & Moore, J. C. Energetics, patterns of interaction strengths, and stability in real ecosystems. *Science* **269**, 1257–60. ISSN: 0036-8075 (Sept. 1995).

16. Haydon, D. Maximally stable model ecosystems can be highly connected. *EN. Ecology* **81**, 2631–2636. ISSN: 0012-9658 (Sept. 2000).
17. Montoya, J. M., Pimm, S. L. & Solé, R. V. Ecological networks and their fragility. *Nature* **442**, 259–64. ISSN: 1476-4687 (July 2006).
18. De Angelis, D. L. Stability and connectance in food web models. *Ecology* **56**, 238–243 (1975).
19. McCann, K. S. & Hastings, A. Weak trophic interactions and the balance of nature. *Nature* **247**, 337–45. ISSN: 0022-5193 (July 1998).
20. Berlow, E. L. Strong effects of weak interactions in ecological communities. *Nature* **398** (1999).
21. Stouffer, D. B. & Bascompte, J. Understanding food-web persistence from local to global scales. *Ecology letters* **13**, 154–61. ISSN: 1461-0248 (Feb. 2010).
22. Neutel, A.-M., Heesterbeek, J. a. P. & De Ruiter, P. C. Stability in real food webs: weak links in long loops. *Science* **296**, 1120–3. ISSN: 1095-9203 (May 2002).
23. Emmerson, M. C. & Raffaelli, D. Predator-prey body size, interaction strength and the stability of a real food web. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **73**, 399–409. ISSN: 0021-8790 (May 2004).

## Methods

**Calibration of Ecopath models.** Ecopath provides a quantitative overview of how species interact in a food web. Species sharing the same prey and predators and having similar physiological characteristics are aggregated in trophic species. Ecopath rely on a system of linear equations describing the in and out flows of each compartment. We compiled 119 Ecopath food web models from published studies. A list of models with references, habitat types, species richness  $S$ , connectance  $C$  and standard deviation of interaction strengths  $\sigma$  is available in Supplementary Information. Model calibration is based on the following input data: biomass, production rates, consumption rates, fishery yields, and diet composition for species of the food web. Input data can have different origins: field sampling (e.g. trawl survey), derived from similar Ecopath models, or known empirical relationships.

**Parameterization of Lotka Volterra interaction coefficients.** We used the method from ref [15] to derive the Jacobian matrices from Ecopath models. Assuming direct dependence of feeding rates on predator population density, we calculated the per capita effect of predator  $j$  on the growth rate of prey  $i$  as  $\alpha_{ij} = -\frac{(Q/B)_j \times DC_{ji}}{B_i}$  where  $B$  is biomass ( $t/km^2$ ),  $(P/B)_j$  and  $(Q/B)_j$  are predator production and consumption rates ( $/year$ ) respectively,  $DC_{ji}$  is the proportion of species  $i$  in the diet of predator  $j$ . Effects of prey on their predator are defined as predator growth resulting from this predation. Consequently, effect of the prey  $i$  on the predator  $j$  is related to effect of the predator on the prey according to:  $\alpha_{ji} = -e_{ij} \times \alpha_{ij}$ , where  $e_{ij}$  is the efficiency with which  $j$  converts food into biomass, from feeding on  $i$ :  $e_{ij} = \frac{(P/B)_i}{(Q/B)_j}$ .

**Evaluation of Ecopath model quality.** We assessed the robustness of our comparative analysis to ensure that results were not an artifact of differences in model quality. The amount of aggregation of each model was measured, based on the criterion that groups with taxonomic

name were more resolved than groups with trophic function names. We defined four resolution levels and qualified it for each trophic species with the following index values: taxonomic species (i.e. greenland turbot, index = 1), family/class (i.e. whales, gadoids; index = 0.7), trophic function (i.e. small demersal fish; index = 0.4) and general name (i.e. benthos, fish; index=0.1). Resolution indices  $RI$  of Ecopath models correspond to the mean resolution index of species within each food web. We investigated the complexity-stability relationship on a subset of the 37 best resolved models with  $RI \geq 0.7$ . Results were similar to the overall analysis. Resolution indices and results of the stability analysis on the most resolved models are available in Supplementary Information.

**Randomisation tests.** Reported maximal eigenvalues of randomised food webs correspond to the mean of 1000 replicates. For randomisation of interaction strength topology (H1), we permuted off-diagonal elements of the Jacobian matrix, keeping sign structure and the frequency distribution of interaction strengths, positive and negative terms were permuted separately in order to keep the initial interaction strength mean. For randomisation of interaction strength distribution (H2), we created a random Jacobian matrix in which off-diagonal elements were picked from a normal distribution  $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$  where  $\mu$  is the mean and  $\sigma^2$  the variance of initial Jacobian matrix elements, then we imposed the sign structure of the initial Jacobian matrix. Positive and negative terms of the initial Jacobian matrix were replaced by positive and negative normalised terms respectively. For the randomisation of sign structure (H3), we permuted only non-zero elements of the Jacobian matrix in order to keep the same link density and connectance than the initial Jacobian matrix, and a similar frequency distribution of the elements of the Jacobian matrix.

# Supplementary Information: No complexity-stability relationship in natural communities

Claire Jacquet      Charlotte Moritz      Lyne Morissette      Pierre Legagneux  
François Massol      Philippe Archambault      Dominique Gravel

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Supplementary figures</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Structural properties observed in food webs and corresponding null hypotheses (red lines) . . . . .	2
1.2	Food web stability related to measures of complexity in the 37 best resolved models	3
1.3	Correlation between species richness and the shape of interaction strength distribution . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Ecopath models</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Dataset information . . . . .	5
2.2	References . . . . .	9

arXiv:1307.5364v1 [q-bio.PE] 20 Jul 2013

# 1 Supplementary figures

## 1.1 Structural properties observed in food webs and corresponding null hypotheses (red lines).




Figure 1: **H1)** Species average interaction strength as a function of trophic level (top 5% were omitted from the figure for illustration). Green line 95% quantile regression illustrates average interaction strength pyramidal pattern. **H2)** Frequency distribution of interaction strengths (only the interval  $[-2; 2]$  is represented, which corresponds to 90% of all interaction coefficients). **H3)** Interaction type frequency in real food web (orange) and in random food web (red) where trophic interactions (+/-) or (-/+), mutualism (+/+) and interspecific competition (-/-) have the same probability of occurrence.

## 1.2 Food web stability related to measures of complexity in the 37 best resolved models

We were concerned that the lack of a complexity-stability relationship may have arisen because of the use of trophic species in food web models, inducing a bias in the evaluation of  $S$  and consequently  $C$  and  $\sigma$ . Indeed, species aggregation in trophic groups was unequal between Ecopath models, possibly hiding a relationship between diversity and stability,. We thus performed a stability analysis on a subset of the data, selecting only the most highly resolved models with low aggregation. Results were consistent with those of the overall analysis, demonstrating the robustness of the method to species aggregation. Aggregation level of Ecopath models was measured, based on the criterion that groups with taxonomic names were more resolved than groups with trophic function names.




Figure 2: **a**) Number of species  $S$  ( $P = 0.41, R^2 = 0.008$ ), **b**) Connectance  $C = \frac{L}{S^2}$  where  $L$  is the number of links ( $P = 0.92, R^2 = 0.03$ ), **c**) Standard deviation of interaction strengths  $\sigma$  ( $P = 0.16, R^2 = 0.03$ ), **d**) Mays complexity measure  $\sigma\sqrt{SC}$  ( $P = 0.05, R^2 = 0.02$ ). Stability is measured as the maximum eigenvalue of each food webs, for marine (blue), freshwater (green) and terrestrial ecosystems (orange). Food webs with eigenvalues close to zero are the most stable. All quantities are dimensionless.

### 1.3 Correlation between species richness and the shape of interaction strength distribution




Figure 3: The kurtosis  $\kappa$  is a measure of the flatness/peakness of the interaction strength distribution, for a normal distribution  $\kappa = 0$ . Species richness  $S$  were positively correlated to  $\kappa$  ( $P < 10^{-15}$ ,  $R^2 = 0.71$ ) on a logarithmic scale. All quantities are dimensionless.

## 2 Ecopath models

### 2.1 Dataset information

Table S1: List of the 119 Ecopath models with references, habitat types, number of species  $S$ , connectance  $C$ , standard deviation of interaction strengths  $\sigma$ , and resolution index  $RI$ .

Model Name	Reference	Habitat	S	C	$\sigma$	RI
Alaka Prince William Sound OM	Okey & Pauly 1999 [1]	marine	18	0.35	12.63	0.62
Alto Golfo De California	Morales-Zrate et al. 2004 [2]	marine	28	0.55	2.99	0.63
Antarctica Weddel Sea	Jarre-Teichmann et al. 1997 [3]	marine	19	0.26	4.31	0.57
Arctic islands, Alert	Legagneux et al. (submitted)	terrestrial	17	0.26	33.22	0.86
Arctic islands, Bylot	Legagneux et al. (submitted)	terrestrial	18	0.35	31.71	0.85
Arctic islands, Erkuta	Legagneux et al. (submitted)	terrestrial	23	0.29	24.38	0.84
Arctic islands, Herschel	Legagneux et al. (submitted)	terrestrial	24	0.27	26.63	0.85
Arctic islands, Nenetsky	Legagneux et al. (submitted)	terrestrial	24	0.29	22.95	0.83
Arctic islands, Svalbard	Legagneux et al. (submitted)	terrestrial	14	0.27	33.76	0.76
Arctic islands, Zackenberg	Legagneux et al. (submitted)	terrestrial	17	0.27	32.11	0.86
Bali Strait	Buchary et al. 2002 [4]	marine	13	0.6	16.38	0.51
Bay Of Biscay 1998	Ainsworth et al. 2001 [5]	marine	36	0.64	2.56	0.42
Bay Of Somme	Rybarczyk et al. 2003 [6]	marine	8	0.41	120.28	0.33
Black Sea	Orek 2000 [7]	marine	9	0.43	21.23	0.43
Brunei Darussalam, China Sea	Silvestre et al. 1993 [8]	marine	12	0.65	19.54	0.45
Campeche Bank, Gulf of Mexico	Vega-Cendejas et al. 1993 [9]	marine	18	0.51	7.09	0.6
Campeche Sound	Manickchand-Heileman et al. 1998 [10]	marine	24	0.52	5.34	0.61
Cape Verde	Stobberup et al. 2004 [11]	marine	24	0.5	13.86	0.61
Caribbean	Morissette et al. 2010 [12]	marine	28	0.32	4.45	0.68
Celestun	Chavez et al. 1993 [13]	marine	15	0.53	4.37	0.6
Central Atlantic 50s	Vasconcellos & Watson 2004 [14]	marine	37	0.3	3.95	0.56
Central Chile 1992	Neira et al. 2004 [15]	marine	20	0.28	12.1	0.93
Central Gulf Of California	Arreguin-Sanchez et al. 2002 [16]	marine	25	0.38	5.83	0.63
Central Pacific, sharks	Kitchell et al. 2002 [17]	marine	21	0.6	4.31	0.8
Chesapeake Present	Christensen et al. 2009 [18]	marine	44	0.19	19.32	0.79
Darwin Harbour, Australia	Martin 2005 [19]	marine	20	0.51	6.47	0.5
Eastern Scotian Shelf 90s	Bundy 2004 [20]	marine	38	0.6	1.5	0.72
Eastern Tropical Pacific	Olson & Walters 2003 [21]	marine	38	0.42	25.39	0.81
Etang de Thau, France	Palomares et al. 1993 [22]	freshwater	10	0.84	2.04	0.52
Gambia 1986	Mendy 2003 [23]	marine	21	0.39	10.5	0.63
Gambia 1992	Mendy 2004 [24]	marine	21	0.39	10.5	0.63

Table 1 – continued from previous page

<b>Model Name</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Habitat</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>C</b>	$\sigma$	<b>RI</b>
Gambia 1995	Mendy 2004 [24]	marine	21	0.38	10.63	0.63
Gironde Estuary, France	Lobry 2004 [25]	marine	16	0.42	7.58	0.56
Golfo Dulce, Costa Rica	Wolff et al. 1996 [26]	marine	20	0.56	9.1	0.6
Guinee 1985	Gunette & Diallo 2004 [27]	marine	43	0.44	5.85	0.66
Guinee 1998	Gunette & Diallo 2004 [27]	marine	43	0.44	5.89	0.66
Guinee Bissau 1991	Amorim et al. 2003 [28]	marine	30	0.44	7.19	0.57
Gulf of Salamanca, Upwelling	Duarte & Garcia 2004 [29]	marine	17	0.61	8.2	0.54
High Barents Sea AllJuvs1990	Blanchard et al. 2002 [30]	marine	15	0.52	4.71	0.54
High Barents Sea Final 1990	Blanchard et al. 2002 [30]	marine	38	0.36	3.4	0.66
Huizache Caimanero, Mexico	Zetina-Rejn et al. 2004 [31]	marine	25	0.52	2.89	0.64
Iceland Fisheries	Buchary 2001 [32]	marine	20	0.54	2.04	0.69
Icelandic Shelf	Mendy & Buchary 2001 [32]	marine	20	0.54	2.02	0.69
Jalisco y Colima	Galvn-Pia 2005 [33]	marine	36	0.46	3.33	0.7
Kuala Terengganu, Malaysia	Liew & Chan 1987 [34]	marine	12	0.66	19.71	0.4
Kuosheng Bay, Taiwan	Lin et al. 2004 [35]	marine	16	0.29	18.15	0.49
Lagoon Chiku, Taiwan	Lin et al. 1999 [36]	marine	12	0.42	87.51	0.5
Lagoon of Venice	Carrer & Opitz 1999 [37]	marine	15	0.34	1.14	0.48
Laguna De Bay, Philippines, 1950	Delos Reyes 1995 [38]	marine	20	0.34	23.31	0.73
Laguna De Bay, Philippines, 1980	Delos Reyes & Martens 1993 [39]	marine	16	0.33	37.43	0.76
Laguna De Bay, Philippines, 1990	Delos Reyes 1995 [38]	marine	19	0.33	31.61	0.73
Lake Aydat, France	Reyes-Marchant et al. 1993 [40]	freshwater	10	0.69	16.4	0.49
Lake Chad, Africa	Palomares et al. 1993 [22]	freshwater	14	0.62	15.94	0.55
Lake George, Uganda	Moreau et al. 1993 [41]	freshwater	13	0.7	13	0.72
Lake Kariba, Africa	Machena et al. 1993 [42]	freshwater	9	0.36	17.88	0.67
Lake Kinneret, Israel	Walline et al. 1993 [43]	freshwater	13	0.41	58.05	0.52
Lake Malawi 2, Africa	Degnbol 1993 [44]	freshwater	8	0.61	43.53	0.63
Lake Malawi, Africa	Nsiku 1999 [45]	freshwater	25	0.39	30.29	0.7
Lake Tanganyka, Africa, 1975	Moreau et al. 1993a [46]	freshwater	6	0.92	26.08	0.5
Lake Tanganyka, Africa, 1981	Moreau et al. 1993a [46]	freshwater	6	0.92	19.83	0.5
Lake Turkana, Kenya, 1973	Kolding 1993 [47]	freshwater	7	0.53	12.59	0.57
Lake Turkana, Kenya, 1987	Kolding 1993 [47]	freshwater	7	0.53	12.09	0.57
Lake Victoria, Africa, 1971	Moreau et al. 1993b [48]	freshwater	15	0.71	11.37	0.62

Table 1 – continued from previous page

<b>Model Name</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Habitat</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>C</b>	$\sigma$	<b>RI</b>
Lake Victoria, Africa, 1985	Moreau et al. 1993b [48]	freshwater	15	0.74	11.09	0.62
Looe Key, Florida, USA	Venier & Pauly 1997 [49]	marine	19	0.55	10.62	0.51
Low Barents Sea 1995	Blanchard et al. 2002 [30]	marine	38	0.36	3.38	0.69
Low Barents Sea Juvs 1995	Blanchard et al. 2002 [30]	marine	15	0.51	4.85	0.54
Mandinga Lagoon, Mexico	De la Cruz-Aguero 1993 [50]	marine	19	0.33	10.37	0.65
Maputo Bay, Mozambique	De Paula et al. 1993 [51]	marine	9	0.6	39.66	0.5
Mid Atlantic Bight	Okey 2001 [52]	marine	54	0.38	4.98	0.7
Monterey Bay, California	Olivieri et al. 1993 [53]	marine	15	0.36	22.71	0.36
Moorea Barrier reef	Arias- Gonzalez et al. 1997 [54]	marine	45	0.34	8.64	0.54
Moorea Fringing reef	Arias- Gonzalez et al. 1997 [54]	marine	42	0.33	7.17	0.56
Morocco 1984	Stanford et al. 2001	marine	37	0.45	3.87	0.52
Newfoundland Banks 1900	Heymans & Pitcher 2002b [56]	marine	49	0.44	2.75	0.72
Newfoundland Banks mid-1980s	Bundy 2001 [57]	marine	30	0.58	2.29	0.76
Newfoundland Banks mid-1980s	Heymans & Pitcher 2002a [58]	marine	49	0.44	2.83	0.76
Newfoundland Grand Banks mid-1990s	Heymans & Pitcher 2002a [58]	marine	49	0.44	3.87	0.76
North Atlantic 1950s	Vasconcellos & Watson 2004 [14]	marine	37	0.3	4.97	0.59
North Atlantic 1990s	Vasconcellos & Watson 2004 [14]	marine	37	0.3	4.98	0.59
Northeastern shelf	Venezuela Mendoza 1993 [59]	marine	15	0.57	23.47	0.54
Northwest Africa	Morissette et al. 2010a [60]	marine	26	0.28	20.92	0.69
Orbetello Lagoon	Ceccarelli et al. 2005 [61]	marine	11	0.37	11.25	0.73
Pallude Della Rosa Venice	Lag Carreer & Opitz 1999 [62]	marine	11	0.25	0.07	0.4
Patos Lagoon Estuary	Betito 2006 [63]	marine	23	0.52	17.39	0.65
Peruvian upwelling system 1950s	Jarre-Teichmann 1998 [64]	marine	19	0.43	26.81	0.7
Peruvian upwelling system 1960s	Jarre-Teichmann 1998 [64]	marine	19	0.44	25.28	0.7
Ria Formosa	Gamito & Erzini 2005 [65]	freshwater	13	0.65	23.39	0.58
Sakumo Lagoon, Ghana	Pauly 2002 [66]	marine	12	0.29	35.58	0.65
San Pedro Bay, Philippines	Leyte, Campos 2003 [67]	marine	15	0.68	9.09	0.48
Seine Estuary	Rybarczyk & Elkam 2003 [68]	marine	14	0.41	20.34	0.64
Sene-Gambia	Samb & Mendy 2004 [69]	marine	16	0.42	27.15	0.56
Sierra Leone 1964	Heymans & Vakily 2002 [70]	marine	43	0.41	6.86	0.61
Sierra Leone 1978	Heymans & Vakily 2002 [70]	marine	43	0.41	6.84	0.61
Sierra Leone 1990	Heymans & Vakily 2002 [70]	marine	43	0.42	6.84	0.61

Table 1 – continued from previous page

<b>Model Name</b>	<b>Reference</b>	<b>Habitat</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>C</b>	$\sigma$	<b>RI</b>
Sonda Campeche	Manickchand-Heileman et al. 1998 [10]	marine	18	0.64	6.18	0.7
South Pacific, marine mammals	Morissette	marine	42	0.33	7.17	0.55
Southern Brazil	Vasconcellos & Gasalla 2001 [71]	marine	12	0.49	21.66	0.73
Southern Gulf St Lawrence 1980	Savenkoff et al. 2004 [72]	marine	29	0.53	2.1	0.7
Southwest Coast Of India	Vivekanandan et al. 2003 [73]	marine	10	0.62	16.26	0.4
SriLanka Lake Prakrama Samudra	Moreau et al. 2001 [74]	freshwater	16	0.39	71.76	0.63
Strait Of Georgia	Martell et al. 2002 [75]	marine	26	0.47	9.81	0.73
Subantarctic Plateau New Zealand	Bradford-Grieve et al. 2003 [76]	marine	17	0.28	64.77	0.54
Tamiahua Lagoon, Gulf of Mexico	Abarca-Arenas & Valero-Pacheco 1993 [77]	marine	12	0.63	6.46	0.7
Tampa Bay	Walters et al. 2005 [78]	marine	51	0.28	4.42	0.86
Tampamachoco Lagoon, Mexico	Rosado-Solorzano & Guzman del Proo 1998 [79]	marine	22	0.36	7.95	0.7
Terminos Lagoon, Gulf of Mexico	Manickchand-Heileman et al. 1998 [10]	marine	19	0.67	3.89	0.6
Terminos Lagoon, seagrass	Rivera-Arriaga et al. [80]	marine	15	0.53	10.9	0.56
UK Virgin Islands, Caribbean	Opitz 1996 [37]	marine	20	0.57	9.96	0.45
Upper Parana River Floodplain	Angelini & Agostinho 2005 [81]	freshwater	39	0.21	8.95	0.82
Veli Lake, India	Aravindan 1993 [82]	freshwater	13	0.45	32.13	0.58
Weddell Sea	Jarre-Teichmann et al. 1997 [3]	marine	19	0.26	4.31	0.57
West Coast of Greenland	Pedersen & Zeller 2001 [83]	marine	21	0.52	4.98	0.74
West Coast of Sabah	Garces et al. 2003 [84]	marine	28	0.49	14.18	0.6
West Coast of Sarawak	Garces et al. 2003 [84]	marine	28	0.49	14.18	0.6
West Coast of Vancouver Island	Martell 2002 [85]	marine	14	0.64	15.59	0.83
West Greenland, Shrimp Pound	Pedersen 1994 [86]	marine	11	0.54	2.34	0.59
Western Bering Sea	Aydin et al. 2002 [87]	marine	33	0.4	3.56	0.72
Western Gulf of Mexico	Arreguin-Sanchez et al. 1993 [88]	marine	23	0.45	5.84	0.65
Yucatan shelf, Gulf of Mexico	Vega-Cendejas & Arreguin-Sanchez 2001 [89]	marine	20	0.53	10.33	0.63

## 2.2 References

1. Okey, T. & Pauly, D. A Mass-Balanced Model of Trophic Flows in Prince William Sound: Decompartmentalizing Ecosystem Knowledge. *Ecosystem Approaches for Fisheries Management*, 621–635 (June 1999).
2. Morales-Zárate, M., Arregun-Sánchez, F., López-Martnez, J. & Lluch-Cota, S. Ecosystem trophic structure and energy flux in the Northern Gulf of California, México. *Ecological Modelling* **174**, 331–345. ISSN: 03043800 (June 2004).
3. Jarre-teichmann, A. A. *et al.* in *Antarctic communities: species, structure and survival* (eds Valencia, J., Walton, D. & Battaglia, B.) (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
4. Bucharý, E. & Alder, J. The Use of Ecosystem Models to Investigate Multispecies Management Strategies for Capture Fisheries. *Fisheries Centre Research Reports* **10** (2002).
5. Ainsworth, C., Ferriss, B & Leblond, E. in *Fisheries impacts on North Atlantic Ecosystems: Models and Analyses* (eds Guénette, S, Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 271–313 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports, 2001).
6. Rybarczyk, H., Elkaim, B., Ochs, L. & Loquet, N. Analysis of the trophic network of a macrotidal ecosystem: the Bay of Somme (Eastern Channel). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **58**, 405–421. ISSN: 02727714 (Nov. 2003).
7. Orek, H. An application of mass balance Ecopath model to the trophic structure in the Black Sea after anchovy collapse. *Ms. In Marine Science, Middle East Technical University, Turkey* (2000).
8. Silvestre G, Selvanathan S, S. A. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 300–306 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
9. Vega-Cendejas, M. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 206–213 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
10. Manickchand-Heileman, S, Soto, L. & Escobar, E. A Preliminary Trophic Model of the Continental Shelf, South-western Gulf of Mexico. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **46**, 885–899. ISSN: 02727714 (June 1998).
11. Stobberup, K., Ramos, V. & Coelho, M. Ecopath model of the Cape Verde coastal ecosystem. *West African marine ecosystems: models and fisheries impacts. Fisheries Centre Research Reports*, 39–56 (2004).
12. Morissette, L, Kaschner, K. & Gerber, L. R. Whales eat fish? Demystifying the myth in the Caribbean marine ecosystem. *Fish and Fisheries* **11**, 388–404. ISSN: 14672960 (Dec. 2010).
13. Chavez, E., Garduno, M. & Sanchez, F. English. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 186–192 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
14. Vasconcellos, M. & Watson, R. in *West African Marine Ecosystems: Models and Fisheries Impact*. (eds Pauly, D & Palomares, M) 171–204 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports, 2004).
15. Neira, S., Arancibia, H. & Cubillos, L. Comparative analysis of trophic structure of commercial fishery species off Central Chile in 1992 and 1998. *Ecological Modelling* **172**, 233–248. ISSN: 03043800 (Mar. 2004).

16. Arregun-Sánchez, F., Arcos, E. & Chávez, E. Flows of biomass and structure in an exploited benthic ecosystem in the Gulf of California, Mexico. *Ecological Modelling* **156**, 167–183 (2002).
17. Kitchell, J. F., Essington, T. E., Boggs, C. H., Schindler, D. E. & Walters, C. J. The Role of Sharks and Longline Fisheries in a Pelagic Ecosystem of the Central Pacific. *Ecosystems* **5**, 202–216. ISSN: 1432-9840 (Mar. 2002).
18. Christensen, V., Beattie, A. & Buchanan, C. *Fisheries Ecosystem Model of the Chesapeake Bay : Methodology, Parameterization, and Model Exploration* **October**, 147 (2009).
19. Martin, J. *The distribution, abundance and trophic ecology of the fishes of Darwin Harbour mangrove habitats* PhD thesis (Charles Darwin Univeristy, Darwin, Australia, 2005).
20. Bundy, A. *Mass balance models of the eastern Scotian Shelf before and after the cod collapse and other ecosystem changes* tech. rep. (Canadian Technical Reports of Fisheries et al., 2004), 193.
21. Olson, R. & Watters, G. A model of the pelagic ecosystem in the eastern tropical pacific ocean. *Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission Bulletin* **22**, 219 (2003).
22. Palomares, M., Horton, K. & Moreau, J. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 153–158 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
23. Mendy, A. A trophic model of the Gambian continental shelf system in 1986. *Trophic models of Northwest African ecosystems*. 57–72 (2003).
24. Mendy, A. Addendum: the Gambian continental shelf ecosystem in 1992 and 1995. *Fisheries Centre Research Reports* **12**, 89–94 (2004).
25. Lobry, J. *Quel référentiel de fonctionnement pour les écosystèmes estuariens?* PhD thesis (University of Bordeaux, France., 2004).
26. Wolff, M., Hartmann, H. & Koch, V. A pilot trophic model for Golfo Dulce, a fjord-like tropical embayment, Costa Rica. *Revista de Biología Tropical* **44**, 215–231 (1996).
27. Guénette, S & Diallo, I. *Addendum: Modèles de la côte Guinéenne, 1985 et 1998*. tech. rep. (West African marine ecosystems: models and fisheries impacts. Fisheries Centre Research Reports., 2004), 124–159.
28. Amorim, P, Duarte, G, Guerra, M, Morato, T & Stobberup, K. in *West African Marine Ecosystems: Models and Fisheries Impact*. (eds Palomares, M. & Pauly, D) 95–112 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports, 2003).
29. Duarte, L. O. & Garca, C. B. Trophic role of small pelagic fishes in a tropical upwelling ecosystem. *Ecological Modelling* **172**, 323–338. ISSN: 03043800 (Mar. 2004).
30. Blanchard, J., Pinnegar, J. & Mackinson, S. *Exploring marine mammal-fishery interactions using Ecopath with Ecosim: modelling the Barents Sea ecosystem*. tech. rep. 117 (CEFAS Science Series Technical Report No. 117, 2002).
31. Zetina-Rejón, M. Exploration of harvesting strategies for the management of a Mexican coastal lagoon fishery. *Ecological Modelling* **172**, 361–372. ISSN: 03043800 (Mar. 2004).
32. Buchary, E. Preliminary reconstruction of the Icelandic marine ecosystem in 1950 and some predictions with time series data. *Guénette, S., Christensen, V., and D. Pauly (eds.) Fisheries impacts ofn the North Atlantic ecosystems: Models and analyses. Fisheries Centre Research Reports* **9**, 198–206 (2001).

33. V.H., G.-P. *Impacto de la pesca en la estructura, funcion y productividad del ecosistema de la plataforma continental de las costas de Jalisco y Colima, Mexico*. PhD thesis (Instituto Politécnico National, Mexico., 2005).
34. Liew, H. & Chan, E. Ecopath model of a tropical shallow-water community in Malaysia. *Fisheries and Marine Science Centre, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia, Kuala Terengganu*. (1987).
35. Lin, H., Shao, K. & Hwang, J. A trophic model for Kuosheng Bay in northern Taiwan. *Journal of Marine Science and Technology* **12**, 424–432 (2004).
36. Lin, H., Shao, K.-t., Kuo, S. & Hsieh, H. A trophic model of a sandy barrier lagoon at Chiku in southwestern Taiwan. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **48**, 575–588 (1999).
37. Opitz, S. *Trophic interactions in Caribbean coral reefs* tech. rep. (ICLARM Technical Report 43, 1996).
38. Delos Reyes, M. *Geoecology of Laguna de Bay, Philippines: long-term alterations of a tropical-aquatic ecosystem 1820-1992* PhD thesis (University of Hamburg, 1995).
39. Delos Reyes, M. & Martens, R. Geoecology of Laguna de Bay, Philippines I. Techno-commercial impact on the trophic level structure of the Laguna de Bay aquatic ecosystem 1968-1980. *Ecological Modelling* **75-76**, 497–509. ISSN: 03043800 (Sept. 1994).
40. Reyes-Marchant, P, Jamet, J., Lair, N, Taleb, H & Palomares, M. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (ed Pauly, D., Christensen, V) 95–101 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
41. Moreau, J., Christensen, V & Pauly, D. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 124–129 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
42. Machena, C., Kolding, J. & Sanyanga, R. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 130–137 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
43. Walline, P., Pisanty, S, Gophen, M. & Berman., T. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Pauly, D. & Christensen, V.) 103–109 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
44. Degnbol, P. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Pauly, D. & Christensen, V.) 110–115 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
45. Nsiku, E. *Changes in the fisheries of Lake Malawi, 1976-1996: Ecosystem-based analysis* PhD thesis (University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada., 1999).
46. Moreau, J., Nyakageni, B, Pearce, M & Petit, P. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Pauly, D & Christensen, V) 138–143 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
47. Kolding, J. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 116–123 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
48. Moreau, J., Ligtvoet, W. & Palomares, M. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 144–152 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
49. Venier, J. & Pauly, D. Trophic dynamics of a Florida Keys coral reef ecosystem. *Proceedings of the 8th International Coral Reef Symposium* **1**, 915–920 (1997).
50. Cruz-Aguero, G. D. L. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Pauly, D. & Christensen, V) 193–196 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).

51. Silva, R, Sousa, M. & Caramelo, A. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Pauly, D. & Christensen, V) 214–223 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
52. Okey, T. & Pugliese, R. in *Fisheries Impacts on North Atlantic Ecosystems: Models and Analyses*. (eds Guenette, S., Christensen, V. & Pauly, D.) 167–181 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports, 2001).
53. Olivieri, R., Cohen, A & Chavez, F. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Pauly, D. & Christensen, V) 315–322 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
54. Arias- Gonzalez, J., Delesalle, B., Salvat, B. & Galzin, R. Trophic functioning of the Tiahura reef sector, Moorea Island, French Polynesia. *Coral Reefs* **16**, 231–246. ISSN: 0722-4028 (Dec. 1997).
55. Stanford, R & Pitcher, T. *Ecosystem simulations of the English Channel: climate and trade-offs* tech. rep. (Fisheries Centre, University of British Columbia, 2004).
56. Heymans, S. & Pitcher, T. in *Ecosystem models of Newfoundland for the time periods 1995, 1985, 1900 and 1450*. (eds Pitcher, T., Heymans, J. & Vasconcellos, M.) 44–71 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports 10(5)., 2002).
57. Bundy, A. Fishing on ecosystems: the interplay of fishing and predation in Newfoundland Labrador. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **58**, 1153–1167 (2001).
58. Heymans, S. & Pitcher, T. in *Ecosystem models of Newfoundland for the time periods 1995, 1985, 1900 and 1450*. (eds Pitcher, T., Heymans, J. & Vasconcellos, M.) 5–43 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports 10(5)., 2002).
59. Mendoza, J. in *Trophic models of aquatic ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 285–297 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
60. Morissette, L, Kaschner, K & Gerber, L. Ecosystem models clarify the trophic role of whales off Northwest Africa. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **404**, 289–302. ISSN: 0171-8630 (Apr. 2010).
61. Ceccarelli, R, Moretti, F, Bardi, A, Piazzini, A & Giunti, M. in *5th European Vertebrate Pest Management Conference - Budapest September 2005* (Budapest, 2005).
62. Carrer, S. & Opitz, S. Trophic network model of a shallow water area in the northern part of the Lagoon of Venice. *Ecological Modelling* **124**, 193–219. ISSN: 03043800 (Dec. 1999).
63. Betito, R. Comparacao da complexidade das adaptacoes bioecologicas de dois peixes (*Jenynsia multidentata* e *Poecilia vivipara*) (cyprinodontiformes) no estuario da Lagoa dos Patos (RS - Brasil). *Revista Didatica Sistematica, Rio Grande* **3**, 71–100 (2006).
64. Jarre-teichmann, A. A. The Potential Role of Mass Balance Models for the Management of Upwelling Ecosystems. *Ecological Applications* **8**, 93–103 (1998).
65. Gamito, S. & Erzini, K. Trophic food web and ecosystem attributes of a water reservoir of the Ria Formosa (south Portugal). *Ecological Modelling* **181**, 509–520. ISSN: 03043800 (Feb. 2005).
66. Pauly, D. in *The Gulf of Guinea Large Marine Ecosystem*. (eds Cury, P., Korateng, K., Hardman-Mountford, N. & McGlade, M.) Cury, P. K, 289–295 (Elsevier Science, 2002).
67. Campos, W. in *Assessment, management and future directions for coastal fisheries in Asian countries* (eds Silvestre, G. et al.) Polovina 1984, 353–364 (WorldFish Center Conference Proceedings 67, 2003).

68. Rybarczyk, H. & Elkam, B. An analysis of the trophic network of a macrotidal estuary: the Seine Estuary (Eastern Channel, Normandy, France). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **58**, 775–791. ISSN: 02727714 (Dec. 2003).
69. Samb, B & Mendy, A. in *Trophic models of Northwest African ecosystems: models and fisheries impacts*. (eds Palomares, M & Pauly, D) 57–70 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports, 2003).
70. Heymans, S. & Vakily, J. in *Trophic models of Northwest African ecosystems*. (eds Pauly, D., Palomares, M. & Vakily, J.) (Systeme d'Information et d'Analyses des Peches SIAP/EP/DT/03, 2002).
71. Vasconcellos, M. & Gasalla, M. a. Fisheries catches and the carrying capacity of marine ecosystems in southern Brazil. *Fisheries Research* **50**, 279–295. ISSN: 01657836 (Mar. 2001).
72. Savenkoff, C *et al.* *Input data and parameter estimates for ecosystem models of the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence (mid-1980s and mid-1990s)*. tech. rep. (Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences., 2004).
73. Vivekanandan, E., Srinath, M., Pillai, V., Immanuel, S. & Kurup., K. in *Assessment, management and future directions for coastal fisheries in Asian countries* (eds Silvestre, G *et al.*) 281–298 (WorldFish Center Conference Proceedings 67, 2003). ISBN: 9832346223.
74. Moreau, J., Villanueva, M., Amarasinghe, U. & Schiemer, F. in *Reservoir and Culture-based Fisheries: Biology and Management*. (ed De Silva, S) February 2000 (ACIAR, Canberra, Australia., 2001).
75. Martell, S., Beattie, A., Walters, C. J., Nayar, T. & Briese., R. in *The use of ecosystem models to investigate multispecies management strategies for capture fisheries* (eds Pitcher, T. & Cochrane, K.) 16–23 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports 10(2), 2002).
76. Bradford-Grieve, J. M. *et al.* Pilot trophic model for subantarctic water over the Southern Plateau, New Zealand: a low biomass, high transfer efficiency system. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **289**, 223–262. ISSN: 00220981 (May 2003).
77. Abarca-Arenas, L. & Valero-Pacheco, E. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V. & Pauly, D.) (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
78. Walters, C. J., Christensen, V, Martell, S. & Kitchell, J. Possible ecosystem impacts of applying MSY policies from single-species assessment. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **62**, 558–568. ISSN: 10543139 (May 2005).
79. Rosado-Solórzano, R & del Prío, S. G. Preliminary trophic structure model for Tampamachoco lagoon, Veracruz, Mexico. *Ecological Modelling* **109**, 141–154 (1998).
80. Rivera-Arriaga, E., Lara-Domínguez, A. L., Villalobos-Zapata, G. & Yáñez Arancibia, A. Trophodynamic ecology of two critical habitats (seagrasses and mangroves) in Términos Lagoon, southern Gulf of Mexico. *Fisheries Centre Research Reports* **11**, 245 (2003).
81. Angelini, R. & Agostinho, A. Food web model of the Upper Paraná River Floodplain: description and aggregation effects. *Ecological Modelling* **181**, 109–121. ISSN: 03043800 (Jan. 2005).
82. Aravindan, C. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Pauly, D & Christensen, V.) 87–89 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).

83. Pedersen, S. & Zeller, D. in *Fisheries impacts on North Atlantic Ecosystems: Models and Analyses* (eds Guenette, S., Christensen, V. & Pauly, D) 11–127 (Fisheries Centre Research Reports 9(4), 2001).
84. Garces, L. & Alias, M. in *Assessment, Management and Future Directions for Coastal Fisheries in Asian Countries*. (eds G, S. et al.) 6, 333–352 (WorldFish Center Conference Proceedings, 2003).
85. Martell, S. *Variation in pink shrimp populations off the west coast of Vancouver Island: oceanographic and trophic interactions* PhD thesis (University of British Columbia, 2002).
86. Pedersen, S. Multispecies interactions on the offshore West Greenland shrimp grounds. *International Council for the Exploration of the Sea CM*, 2 (1994).
87. Aydin, K., Lapko, V., Radchenko, V. & Livingston, P. *A comparison of the eastern Bering and western Bering Sea shelf and slope ecosystems through the use of mass- balance food web models*. tech. rep. July (U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-130, 2002), 78 p.
88. Arreguín-Sánchez, F. in *Trophic Models of Aquatic Ecosystems*. (eds Christensen, V & Pauly, D) 197–205 (ICLARM. Conf. Proc., Manila, 1993).
89. Vega-Cendejas, M. Energy fluxes in a mangrove ecosystem from a coastal lagoon in Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico. *Ecological Modelling* **137**, 119–133 (2001).