

Bounds on transient instability for complex ecosystems

F. Caravelli

*London Institute of Mathematical Sciences, 35a South Street, London W1K 2XF, UK
Invenia Technical Computing, 135 Innovation Drive, Winnipeg, MB R3T 6A8, Canada and
Department of Computer Science, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK*

P.P.A. Staniczenko

*Centre for Biodiversity and Environment Research,
Department of Genetics, Evolution and Environment,
University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK*

Stability is a desirable property of complex ecosystems. If a community of interacting species is at a stable equilibrium point then it is able to withstand small perturbations without any adverse effect. In ecology, the Jacobian matrix evaluated at an equilibrium point is known as the community matrix, which represents the population dynamics of interacting species. The system's asymptotic short- and long-term behaviour can be determined from eigenvalues derived from the community matrix. Here we use results from the theory of pseudospectra to describe intermediate, transient dynamics. We show that the transition from stable to unstable dynamics includes a region of transient instability, where the effect of a small perturbation is amplified before ultimately decaying. The shift from stability to transient instability depends on the magnitude of a perturbation, and we show how to determine lower and upper bounds to the maximum amplitude of perturbations. Of five different types of community matrix, we find that amplification is least severe with predator-prey interactions. This analysis is relevant to other systems whose dynamics can be expressed in terms of the Jacobian matrix. Through understanding transient instability, we can learn under what conditions multiple perturbations—multiple external shocks—will irrecoverably break stability.

I. INTRODUCTION

From the perspective of local stability analysis, an ecosystem is either at a stable equilibrium point or it is not [1]. If it is, then the effect of a small perturbation, such as the loss of individuals from a population, will eventually decay and the system will return to its original equilibrium point. If not, the perturbation will lead to the system settling at a new equilibrium point, possibly with fewer individuals or even species. Ecosystems with large numbers of species and interactions are expected to be unstable [2]. However, we observe many ecosystems all over the world with vast biodiversity [3]. Reconciling this finding with local stability analysis has motivated ecologists for over 40 years [4].

Recently, stability criteria were extended from randomly assembled communities to include those with more realistic compositions of mutualistic, competitive and predator-prey interactions [5]. These criteria showed that communities in which predator-prey interactions dominate are more likely to be stable. It was then shown, using empirical food webs, that the distribution and correlation of interaction strengths had a greater effect on stability than topology—how species interact with one another is more important than who they interact with [6].

Stability is a long-term concept: it indicates whether a system will, at some point in the future, return to the same state as before a perturbation. Reactivity, on the other hand, indicates how a system will respond immediately after a perturbation has been applied [7–9]. A stable system can be non-reactive, meaning that a perturbation dies down immediately, or reactive, meaning

that a perturbation is first amplified before eventually decaying. Reactivity criteria for large ecosystems show that communities on the verge of instability exhibit reactive dynamics [10].

The starting point for deriving criteria for both stability and reactivity is the community matrix [2, 11]. A spectral decomposition of the community matrix provides information on the asymptotic behaviour of the system for stability ($t \rightarrow \infty$) and reactivity ($t \rightarrow 0$). But so far, no information has been extracted regarding transient dynamics: how the system evolves after a perturbation and before it either returns to equilibrium or becomes unstable.

If the community matrix is a *normal* matrix, then only asymptotic behaviour is important and dynamics are completely described by matrix eigenvalues [12]. But if it is *non-normal*, as is usually the case in analyses of real ecosystems, then transient dynamics will differ entirely from the asymptotic behaviour suggested by eigenvalues. The dynamics implied by non-normal matrices are described by pseudospectra, which detail the neighbourhood of eigenvalues in the complex plane for perturbations of different magnitude [13].

Here we formalise the transition from stability to instability in terms of pseudospectra. We describe critical values for ecosystem properties separating three regimes: stable and non-reactive dynamics, stable and reactive dynamics—transient instability—and unstable and reactive dynamics. At the boundary between non-reactive stability and transient instability, resulting dynamics depend on the magnitude of a perturbation. We also provide upper and lower bounds to the maximum amplitude

of perturbations during transient instability. This allows us, using only the community matrix, to sketch out the transient dynamics of complex ecosystems.

Understanding transient dynamics is especially important during times of rapid environmental change [14]. If a perturbation to a stable and reactive system is followed by additional perturbations during the amplification period, then the system may not return to its original equilibrium point. At best it may move to a comparable stable state, but it may also move through a period of instability that results in the permanent loss of species and biodiversity.

II. METHODS

A. Local stability analysis

Following Tang & Allesina [10], consider an ecological community composed of S species whose population densities at time t are denoted by the vector $\mathbf{Y}(t)$. Species dynamics are typically modelled by a system of autonomous, coupled ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Y}}{dt} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{Y}) \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{f} = [f_1, f_2 \dots, f_S]^T$ is a set of non-linear functions. A feasible equilibrium point of the system is a non-negative vector \mathbf{Y}^* such that

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{Y}^*) = \mathbf{0} \quad (2)$$

The community matrix \mathbf{M} is defined as

$$M_{ij} = \left. \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial Y_j} \right|_{\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{Y}^*} \quad (3)$$

which is the Jacobian matrix evaluated at an equilibrium point. An equilibrium point is (locally asymptotic) stable if any infinitesimally small perturbation, $\Delta\mathbf{Y}(0)$, eventually decays to zero, i.e., $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta\mathbf{Y}(t) = 0$. If $\Lambda(\mathbf{M})$ is the set of eigenvalues of \mathbf{M} , then the equilibrium point is stable if all eigenvalues have negative real part [2, 5].

B. Generative models for community matrices

A community matrix can be parameterised using four quantities: S , C , μ and σ ; where S is the number of species, C is the connectance or fraction of realised interactions between species, μ is the strength of intraspecific interactions and σ is the standard deviation of interspecific interactions. We assume that populations are self-regulating and so $M_{ii} = -\mu$, where $\mu > 0$. Non-normal community matrices with different types of interaction are generated by sampling off-diagonal entries (M_{ij} , interspecific interactions) from different bivariate distributions. Having specified a particular distribution,

stability criteria can be expressed in terms of S , C , μ and σ . Based on these criteria, predator-prey community matrices are the most stable, followed by random, competition, mixture and mutualism [5]. Generative models for these community matrices are described below.

Random. Each off-diagonal entry is sampled independently from a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ with probability C , and otherwise $M_{ij} = 0$ with probability $1 - C$.

Mutualism. Each off-diagonal pair (M_{ij}, M_{ji}) is sampled from a half-normal distribution $|\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)|$ with probability C , and both entries are zero otherwise. These community matrices have a $(+, +)$ sign structure for off-diagonal pairs.

Competition. Each off-diagonal pair (M_{ij}, M_{ji}) is sampled from a half-normal distribution $-\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ with probability C , and both entries are zero otherwise. These community matrices have a $(-, -)$ sign structure for off-diagonal pairs.

Mixture of mutualism and competition. Each off-diagonal pair (M_{ij}, M_{ji}) is sampled from a half-normal distribution $|\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)|$ with probability $C/2$ or $-\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ with probability $C/2$, and both entries are zero otherwise. These community matrices have a $(+, +)$ or $(-, -)$ sign structure for off-diagonal pairs.

Predator-prey. The first entry in an off-diagonal pair is sampled from a half-normal distribution $|\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)|$ and the second entry from $-\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma)$ with probability $C/2$, or with the half-normal distributions reversed with probability $C/2$, and both entries are zero otherwise. These community matrices have a $(+, -)$ or $(-, +)$ sign structure for off-diagonal pairs.

C. Pseudospectra and transient instability

Non-normal community matrices can exhibit amplification of perturbations. In general, the eigenvalues of \mathbf{M} satisfy the following definition:

$$\Lambda(\mathbf{M}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \det(zI - \mathbf{M}) = 0\} \quad (4)$$

meaning that if z is an eigenvalue of \mathbf{M} then by convention we define the norm of $(zI - \mathbf{M})^{-1}$ to be infinity. But if $\|(zI - \mathbf{M})^{-1}\|$ is finite and very large, as is often the case with perturbed non-normal matrices, then we must consider the pseudospectrum of \mathbf{M} . The ϵ -pseudospectrum has several equivalent definitions that describe the eigenvalues of a matrix subject to perturbations of magnitude ϵ [12]. We consider the following definition:

$$\Lambda_\epsilon(\mathbf{M}) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \|(zI - \mathbf{M})^{-1}\| \geq \epsilon^{-1}\} \quad (5)$$

If a matrix is normal then its ϵ -pseudospectrum (henceforth just *pseudospectrum*) consists of closed balls of radius ϵ surrounding the original eigenvalues of \mathbf{M} . For non-normal matrices, pseudospectra can be much larger




FIG. 1: *Top*: Pseudospectrum of a random community matrix with $S = 100$, $C = 0.1$, $\mu = 1$ and $\sigma = 0.3$, which is asymptotically stable. Contours in the complex plane illustrate the effect on eigenvalues of perturbations of magnitude $\epsilon = 10^r$. The contour for $\epsilon = 0.1$ crosses the imaginary axis, implying that the pseudospectral abscissa is positive and so transient instability is observable. *Bottom*: System dynamics when a perturbation $\epsilon = 0.1$ is applied (solid curve) and when $\epsilon < 0.1$ (dashed curve).

and much more intricate¹. Consider the pseudospectrum of a stable system (Fig. 1). Very small perturbations have a negligible effect on the dynamics implied by eigenvalues and perturbations begin decaying immediately. As perturbations increase in magnitude, the effect on eigenvalues is more pronounced and dynamics are no longer consistent with the traditional picture of long-term asymptotic stability: perturbations are amplified, reach a maximum amplitude, then decay, as before, but with a very different temporal profile.

Local asymptotic stability is determined in the same way for normal and non-normal matrices. The *spectral abscissa* of \mathbf{M} is defined as

$$\alpha(\mathbf{M}) = \sup_{z \in \Lambda(\mathbf{M})} \operatorname{Re}(z) \quad (6)$$

where the supremum (sup) selects for the largest (real-part) eigenvalue in the set $\Lambda(\mathbf{M})$. Stability is guaranteed for $\alpha(\mathbf{M}) < 0$. If \mathbf{M} is normal, then $\|e^{\mathbf{M}t}\| = e^{\alpha(\mathbf{M})t}$ and dynamics are completely described by $\alpha(\mathbf{M})$. Otherwise,

dynamics can be more complicated:

$$e^{\alpha(\mathbf{M})t} \leq \|e^{\mathbf{M}t}\| \leq \kappa(\mathbf{V})e^{\alpha(\mathbf{M})t} \quad (7)$$

where $\kappa(\mathbf{V}) = \|\mathbf{V}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{V}^{-1}\|$ is known as the conditioning of matrix \mathbf{V} , which is built from the eigenvectors of \mathbf{M} [15]. The conditioning provides a bound from above—an upper bound—to the maximum amplitude of perturbations.

In complement to stability is reactivity, which describes the behaviour of a system close to $t = 0$. The *numerical abscissa* of \mathbf{M} is defined as

$$\omega(\mathbf{M}) = \frac{d}{dt} \|e^{\mathbf{M}t}\| \Big|_{t=0} = \sup_{z \in \Lambda(\mathbf{H})} \operatorname{Re}(z) \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{H} = \frac{\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{M}^t}{2}$ [7–9]. The numerical abscissa is the maximum initial amplification rate following an infinitesimally small perturbation. Dynamics are surely non-reactive if $\omega(\mathbf{M}) < 0$ and may be reactive if $\omega(\mathbf{M}) \geq 0$. A stable system can either be reactive or non-reactive, but an unstable system must be reactive. With non-normal matrices, the transition from stable and non-reactive to stable and reactive is not covered by Eqn (8) and, as discussed above, depends on the magnitude of a perturbation.

We study the pseudospectrum of a matrix to understand dynamics between the limits of reactivity and stability. The ϵ -*pseudospectral abscissa* of \mathbf{M} is defined as

$$\alpha_\epsilon(\mathbf{M}) = \sup_{z \in \Lambda_\epsilon(\mathbf{M})} \operatorname{Re}(z). \quad (9)$$

which is the largest real-part eigenvalue of the pseudospectrum of \mathbf{M} (for a given ϵ). The ϵ -pseudospectral abscissa provides a bound from below—a lower bound—to the maximum amplitude of perturbations [13]:

$$\sup_{\epsilon \geq 0} \frac{\alpha_\epsilon(\mathbf{M})}{\epsilon} \leq \sup_{t \geq 0} \|e^{\mathbf{M}t}\| \quad (10)$$

and therefore the function

$$f_{\mathbf{M}}(\epsilon) = \frac{\alpha_\epsilon(\mathbf{M})}{\epsilon} \quad (11)$$

is useful for understanding transient dynamics². For a given community matrix, as the size of a perturbation is increased from zero there may be some critical value, ϵ^* , at which $f_{\mathbf{M}}(\epsilon^*) = 1$. In the pseudospectrum, the ϵ^* -contour has crossed the imaginary axis and perturbations begin to be amplified.

¹ Software for computing pseudospectra are available at <http://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/pseudospectra/software.html>.

² Eqns (10) and (11) are also valid for bounding normal matrices with positive spectral abscissa. As $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $\alpha_\epsilon(\mathbf{M})$ converges to the spectral abscissa. If \mathbf{M} has a positive spectral abscissa, then $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \alpha_\epsilon(\mathbf{M})/\epsilon \rightarrow \infty$, which confirms that the norm is unbounded and the equilibrium point is unstable.

For a stable and non-reactive system, perturbations will not be amplified and the system returns to its original equilibrium point. For an unstable and necessarily reactive system, perturbations will be amplified and the system moves to a new equilibrium point. But for a stable and reactive system, perturbations will first be amplified before the system returns to its original equilibrium point—this is transient instability. Now that we can compute upper and lower bounds for amplifications, we are in a position to sketch out the transient dynamics associated with non-normal community matrices.

III. RESULTS

We generated multiple sets of community matrices with $C = 0.1$, $\mu = 1$ and various combinations of S and σ for the five different generative models. We first consider lower and upper bounds to the maximum amplitude of perturbations for random community matrices, before turning our attention to the other types of interaction.

A. Lower bound for random community matrices

Consider the ensemble of community matrices generated with random interaction type, $S = 100$ and $\sigma = 0.3$, which is just below the threshold for instability ($\sigma_c = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{SC}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \approx 0.31$). The average value of $f_{\mathbf{M}}(\epsilon)$ monotonically increases as a function of ϵ and eventually saturates. At $\epsilon^* \approx 0.085$ the curve crosses one, at which point perturbations are amplified and transient instability is observable. The function $f_{\mathbf{M}}(\epsilon)$ converges for all asymptotically stable community matrices considered in this paper.

In general, we can identify regions of stability, transient instability and instability by plotting $\sup_{\epsilon > 0} \frac{\alpha_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{M})}{\epsilon}$ (Eqn 10; in practice, $f_{\mathbf{M}}(\epsilon)$ for large values of ϵ) as σ is varied (Fig. 2). Similar regions can be identified as S is varied while σ is held constant (results not shown). In the stable region, there is no perturbation that is large enough (which can still be considered infinitesimally small) to make $\sup_{\epsilon > 0} \frac{\alpha_{\epsilon}(\mathbf{M})}{\epsilon} > 1$, and so perturbations are never amplified. At some critical point, σ_{ti} , there is a magnitude $\epsilon = \epsilon^*$ above which perturbations are amplified before decaying. As σ increases in the region of transient instability, ϵ^* decreases until it reaches zero at σ_c , at which point systems are guaranteed to be asymptotically unstable and any infinitesimally small perturbation is amplified. In the unstable region, $f_{\mathbf{M}}(\epsilon)$ diverges and corresponding values for the lower bound should be treated with caution.

The critical point for transient instability with $S = 100$ is $\sigma_{ti} \approx 0.22$. This is very close to the value given by reactivity criteria based on the numerical abscissa: $\sigma_R = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2SC}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{20}}$ [10]. Indeed, both approaches determine whether perturbations are amplified based on




FIG. 2: Regions of stability, transient instability and instability for a random community matrix with $S = 100$, $C = 0.1$ and $\mu = 1$ as σ is varied. The y-axis is the lower bound of the maximum amplitude (Eqn 10). Transient instability is observable as the curve crosses one at $\sigma_{ti} \approx 0.22$ and instability is reached at $\sigma_c = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{SC}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \approx 0.31$. At the threshold of instability, the lower bound of the maximum amplitude is $\text{LB}(\sigma_c) = 1.046 \pm 0.006$ (mean \pm std). The shaded area represents the standard error over 100 realisations.

eigenvalues related to \mathbf{M} . As a point of difference, however, the pseudospectral approach takes into account the magnitude of a perturbation. For a given set of parameters, the numerical abscissa only tells you if amplification is possible, while the pseudospectrum, through the ϵ -pseudospectral abscissa, allows you to determine the minimum size of a perturbation for it to be amplified.

B. Upper bound for random community matrices

We plot the frequency distribution of $\kappa(\mathbf{V})$ (Eqn 7) for various combinations of S and σ to investigate the upper bound to the maximum amplitude of perturbations. In general, distributions are strongly peaked and fat-tailed (Fig. 3). This indicates that very large amplification is possible even for potentially very small perturbations. The location of the peak changes very little as σ increases, but shifts rightwards as S increases (results not shown). The slope of the tail does not change much as either S or σ is varied. With $S = 100$ and $\sigma = \sigma_c = 0.31$, the peak upper bound is $\text{UB}_{\text{peak}}(\sigma_c) \approx 95$ and the maximum value in the tail is $\text{UB}_{\text{tail}}(\sigma_c) \sim 1000$. When a power law is fit to the tail, $f(x) \propto x^{-\alpha}$, we find that the exponent is $\alpha \approx 2.9$.




FIG. 3: Distribution of upper bounds of the maximum amplitude for random community matrices generated with $S = 100$, $C = 0.1$ and $\mu = 1$ and various σ (10,000 realisations). Distributions are fat-tailed and the slope of the tail does not change with σ .

TABLE I: Properties of community matrices with $S = 100$, $C = 0.1$, $\mu = 1$.

Type	σ_{ti}	σ_c	$LB(\sigma_c)$	$UB_{peak}(\sigma_c)$	$UB_{tail}(\sigma_c)$	α
Mutualism	0.11	0.16	1.02	100	~ 1000	3
Mixture	0.17	0.19	1.02	77	~ 1000	2.7
Competition	0.17	0.20	1.02	100	~ 1000	3
Random	0.22	0.31	1.03	95	~ 1000	2.9
Predator-prey	0.37	0.87	1.10	60	~ 500	3.4

C. Community matrices with different types of interaction

The region of transient instability varies for different types of interaction, as do lower and upper bounds for amplification (Table I). Transient instability becomes observable with smallest σ_{ti} with mutualism, followed by mixture, competition, random and predator-prey. This order is the same as for the threshold for instability, σ_c . However, the size of the region of transient instability, $\sigma_c - \sigma_{ti}$, has a different order: predator-prey is largest, followed by random, mutualism, competition and mixture. The pattern is similar as S is varied while σ is held constant (results not shown). As expected, these findings are consistent with earlier results based on the numerical abscissa and the correlation between off-diagonal entries

in a community matrix [10].

Predator-prey community matrices are not only relatively stable, but also exhibit the largest range of parameter values for transient instability. The lower bound also reaches its largest value among the five types of interaction for predator-prey community matrices. However, the peak in the distribution of upper bounds is at lower amplification and the slope of the tail is steeper (Table I). This implies that perturbations are typically amplified less severely compared to the other types of interaction and the very largest possible amplitudes are not as large.

Mutualism (+, +) and competition (-, -) have different critical points for transient instability and instability, but similar bounds to the maximum amplitude of perturbations. Interestingly, the peak in the distribution of upper bounds is at lower amplification for community matrices with a mixture of these two interactions. The largest upper bound, $UB_{tail}(\sigma_c)$, however, is similar, so the exponent is shallower.

IV. DISCUSSION

Here we assumed a random topology of interactions between species. And while the correlation between interaction strengths—and therefore the predominant type of interaction in a community matrix—may be more important than topology for stability [6], it remains to be seen whether this is the case with transient instability. Nevertheless, it is likely that the particular trajectory of a perturbed system is sensitive to topology, and, of course, the direction of initial perturbation. Understanding transient dynamics at this level of detail requires analysis of pseudoeigenvectors in addition to pseudoeigenvalues [13].

Stability, in principle, promises a degree of certainty that biodiversity will not be lost. Reactivity has been suggested as a possible early-warning signal for the onset of instability. Transient instability not only reveals more about these two concepts, but also highlights new consequences of environmental change. The longer the period of transient instability and the larger the amplification of perturbations, the more susceptible an ecosystem is to multiple perturbations. One perturbation may drive a stable system into a period of transient instability that eventually dissipates; but two or three perturbations in quick succession may force the system to a new, unknown equilibrium point. Pseudospectra can be used to investigate which ecosystems are at risk of instability, and what could be done to mitigate that risk.

[1] Pimm, S.L. The complexity and stability of ecosystems. *Nature* 307 (1984): 321–326.
 [2] May, R.M. Will a large complex system be stable? *Nature* 238 (1972): 413–414.

[3] MacCann, K.S. The diversity-stability debate. *Nature* 405 (2000): 228–233.
 [4] Allesina, S. and Tang, S. The stability-complexity relationship at age 40: a random matrix perspective. *Popu-*

- lation Ecology 57 (2015): 63–75.
- [5] Allesina, S. and Tang, S. Stability criteria for complex ecosystems. *Nature* 483 (2012): 205–208.
- [6] Tang, S., Pawar, S. and Allesina, S. Correlation between interaction strengths drives stability in large ecological networks. *Ecology Letters* 17 (2014): 1094–1100.
- [7] Neubert, M.G. and Caswell, H. Alternatives to resilience for measuring the responses of ecological systems to perturbations. *Ecology* 78 (1997): 653–665.
- [8] Caswell, H. and Neubert, M.G. Reactivity and transient dynamics of discrete-time ecological systems. *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications* 11 (2005): 295–310.
- [9] Verdy, A. and Caswell, H. Sensitivity analysis of reactive ecological dynamics. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 70 (2008): 1634–1659.
- [10] Tang, S. and Allesina, S. Reactivity and stability of large ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 2 (2014): 21.
- [11] Levins, R. *Evolution in Changing Environments: Some Theoretical Explorations* (1968). Princeton, NJ. Princeton University Press.
- [12] Trefethen, L.N. Pseudospectra of linear operators. *SIAM Review* 39 (1997): 383–406.
- [13] Trefethen, L.N. and Embree, M. *Spectra and Pseudospectra: The Behavior of Nonnormal Matrices and Operators* (2005). Princeton, NJ. Princeton University Press.
- [14] Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005). *Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Biodiversity Synthesis*. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC.
- [15] Trefethen, L.N. and Bau, D. *Numerical Linear Algebra* (1997). SIAM. Philadelphia, PA.