

A conceptual predator-prey model with super-long transients

Misha Chai^{1,*} and Holger Kantz¹

¹Max Planck Institute for the Physics of Complex Systems, Nöthnitzer Str. 38, D 01189, Germany

*Corresponding author. Email: chaimisha@pks.mpg.de

ABSTRACT

Drawing on the understanding of the logistic map, we propose a simple predator-prey model where predators and prey adapt to each other, leading to the co-evolution of the system. The special dynamics observed in periodic windows contribute to the coexistence of multiple time scales, adding to the complexity of the system. Typical dynamics in ecosystems, such as the persistence and coexistence of population cycles and chaotic behaviors, the emergence of super-long transients, regime shifts, and the quantifying of resilience, are encapsulated within this single model. The simplicity of our model allows for detailed analysis, including linear analysis, reinforcing its potential as a conceptual tool for understanding ecosystems deeply. Additionally, our results suggest that longer lifetimes in ecosystems might come at the expense of reduced populations due to limited resources.

There is a growing recognition that long-term or asymptotic behavior is rare, and that focusing on transients might be a more effective approach to understanding the complexity in ecosystems¹⁻⁶. Moreover, many models and observations suggest that transients may persist over a super-long period of time^{1,2,7,8}, during which cyclic and chaotic behaviors appear repeatedly. These cyclic dynamics are one of the most notable phenomena in population biology, particularly in predator-prey systems where the predator and prey coexist in recurring cyclic patterns over indefinitely long periods of time. The Lotka-Volterra model, a cornerstone in mathematical biology and ecology, provides a fundamental framework for understanding cyclic dynamics in predator-prey interaction. Further simplification can be achieved by the discretization of time. Logistic map⁹, for example, a well-known discrete-time model, has been used to describe the population of a single species influenced by carrying capacity, showcasing a spectrum of behaviors from stable equilibrium to periodic oscillations and chaos determined by its growth rate. A much more complex behavior can be achieved by introducing competition models^{7,10,11}. It has been extensively used to analyze population dynamics and to understand the biodiversity¹²⁻¹⁴ in ecosystems. One of the most classic topics is the study of the complexity and biodiversity of plankton species^{10,11,15,16}, aimed at understanding the famous “paradox of the plankton”¹⁷. In the other ecosystems, such as Forage fish¹⁸, insects¹⁹, grass community²⁰, and Dungeness crabs²¹, various methods have also been used to understand different types of systems. However, due to the complexity and high dimensionality of these models, unraveling the complicated dynamics in ecosystems is challenging, let alone conducting linear analysis. Therefore, a simple conceptual model that contains most of typical features of real-world population, while still being amenable to theoretical or linear analysis, is extremely important!




Fig. 1. The cattle-grass system. There are three generations of cattle and grass. The grass consumed by the cattle in each generation is represent by (x, y) - equations. New cattle (yellow) and the leave of cattle (red) happen at the end of the year.

Predator-prey model Here based on the logistic map $x_{n+1} = rx_n(1 - x_n)$, where $x_n \geq 0$ is a dimensionless measure of the population in the n th generation and $r \geq 0$ is the intrinsic growth rate—reflecting population changes under ideal conditions without external factors—we propose a simple predator-prey model in which the prey responds to predation. Thus, the evolution of the prey can influence predator dynamics, which in turn affects prey evolution. These dynamics can lead to the continuous co-evolution of predators and prey in response to each other’s adaptations. It displays rich dynamical complexity, such as the persistence and coexistence of population cycles and chaotic behaviors^{1,7,8}, the emergence of super-long transient^{2,4,6}, and regime shift (a sudden change that usually results in the extinction of species and the loss




Fig. 2. The (x, y) -plane of Eq. (1). **A**, $r_n = \text{const}$ (i.e., $a = 0$). **B**, $r_n \neq \text{const}$ (in this case, $a = 0.005$). The orange curve indicates points move upward; the purple curve indicates points move downward. The zoom-in region near $y = 0$ also has been shown.

of biodiversity)⁵. It can help us understand the complexity of realistic ecosystems.

The constancy of growth rate in the logistic map does describe the properties of some simple systems or toy models well, for example, a single-species algae population with one limiting resource^{22,23}. However, in realistic systems, the introduction of new species (e.g., through invasion from other parts of the globe or by mutation) and the extinction of species both change the dimension of the phase space and affect the quality of the dynamics. Thus, the growth rate cannot be constant anymore but changes along with the system's evolution. This motivates us to introduce $r + y_n$ as the new growth rate. Here, r represents the intrinsic and fixed birth and death rate of the predator under limiting resources and we fixed $r = 3$ at the point where the bifurcation occurs in the paper. The term y_n reflects the changes of limiting resources, which directly affects and adapts to changes in the predator population, as seen in plant-consumer and host-parasite systems. Here we use plant-consumer systems as an example, but the dynamics can be applied to most systems where resources are the prey, and predators and prey in response to each other's adaptation directly.

Assume that there are x_{n-1} cattle and y_{n-1} grass in generation $n - 1$, and x_n and y_n in generation n , as shown in Fig. 1. The new cattle (yellow) and the leave of cattle (red) occur at the end of the year, and every individual is identical. As we can see, x_{n-1} of cattle consumed $y_n - y_{n-1}$ grass in generation $n - 1$. Since the same amount of cattle consume the same amount of grass, x_n can be rewritten as $x_n = x_{n-1} + (x_n - x_{n-1})$. The x_n is divided into two parts: x_{n-1} , where the corresponding grass consumption is $y_n - y_{n-1}$; and $x_n - x_{n-1}$, which reflects the population changes with the corresponding grass consumption being $a(x_n - x_{n-1})$. The control parameter a scales the relationship between predator and prey. In the cattle-grass system, this can be understood as the weight of grass each cattle consumes. Thus in generation $n + 1$, the grass is $y_n - (y_n - y_{n-1}) - a(x_n - x_{n-1}) = y_{n-1} - a(x_n - x_{n-1})$. The

generalized logistic map hence reads:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{n+1} &= (3 + y_n)x_n(1 - x_n) \\ y_{n+1} &= y_{n-1} - a(x_n - x_{n-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

When $x_n - x_{n-1} > 0$, indicating an increase in the predator population, this can lead to a decrease in the prey population, i.e., y_{n+1} , which in turn results in a subsequent decline trend in the predator population in next generation, denoted as x_{n+2} . Correspondingly, if $x_n - x_{n-1} < 0$, indicating a decrease in the predator population, this can lead to an increase in the prey population y_{n+1} , resulting in a subsequent rise trend of x_{n+2} . If the predator population remains constant, i.e., $x_n - x_{n-1} = 0$, the prey population also remains constant, i.e., $y_{n+1} = y_{n-1}$. Since this map involves x_{n-1} and y_{n-1} , suggesting it resembles a delay map. Consequently, its phase space would appear to be 4-dimensional. Nonetheless, Eq. (1) can actually be derived from a 2-dimensional system, which includes an additional variable $sgn_n : sgn_n = (-1)^n$ and an instantaneous update $y_{n+1} = y_n + sgn_n \cdot a(x_n - 0.5)$. The x -dynamics remain consistent with Eq. (1). Therefore, given x_1 and y_1 as initial conditions, the whole trajectory is uniquely determined. This representation of our map reveals that its phase space is the direct product of the (x, y) -plane and the set $\{-1, 1\}$. In the graphical representations of the attractor, we will focus solely on projections onto the (x, y) -plane.

When $y_n = \text{const}$ (achieved in the limit $a \rightarrow 0$), Eq. (1) becomes a one-dimensional logistic map. The bifurcation diagram then reveals the transitions from stable equilibrium through period-doubling bifurcations and eventually into chaotic dynamics as y increases, shown in Fig. 2A. In the whole paper, initial conditions are chosen randomly. One of the most intriguing features of the bifurcation diagram is the occurrence of period- p windows that contain the critical point x_c , the maximum of the function $f(x) = rx(1 - x)$. The periodic- p orbit contains x_c satisfies

$$(f_r^p)'(x_c) = 0$$




Fig. 3. The survival probability with varying a . Background colors green, pink, and blue indicate three different *Regime I*, *II* and *III* correspondingly. Their survival probabilities respectively follow the exponential decay with a high escape rate (the zoom-in graph in **A**), the power law decay with an exponent of $\alpha = -0.5011$ (the zoom-in graph and red dash line in **B**), and the exponential decay with a smaller escape rate (the zoom-in graph in **C**). Especially *Regime III*, the survival probability has different escape rates with varying a . The bigger a with bigger escape rates are in **A**; the smaller a with smaller escape rates are in **B**. In **C**, the changes between them have been shown. In **D**, lifetime gets bigger with the decrease of a . Especially, when a is even smaller, lifetime grows exponentially with an exponent $\eta = -7073$.

, making the orbit super-attracting (super stable), as exemplified by the well-known period-3 window, where occurs near $3.8284... \leq r \leq 3.8415...$ ²⁴.

When $y_n \neq const.$, i.e., $a \neq 0$, the system maintains similar dynamics at each value of the growth rate. Hence, for small a (slow change of growth rate), the resulting phase space diagram strongly resembles the bifurcation diagram of the logistic map, shown in Fig. 2B. But the essential difference is that Eq. (1) is an intermittent system, exhibiting various intermittency behaviors on different time scales at different values of the growth rates, and that all trajectories become transient. The latter is a consequence of the fact that $3 + y_n$ is not bound to be smaller or equal to 4, and if $3 + y_n > 4$, then the x -dynamics map points outside of the interval $[0, 1]$, causing them to escape towards infinity (∞), which, as noted by May⁹, implies that the population becomes extinct. When this happens, we stop the iteration, considering the trajectory as having escaped.

Since all trajectories will eventually escape from the finite phase space, we now focus on the survival probability, which is related to the distribution of lifetimes. Initiating our trajectories with random values for x_1 and setting $y_1 = 1$, they

exhibit quite different behaviors as a function of the lifetime.

Regime I. A certain fraction of them moves near $y = 1$. These escape after a relatively short time in an exponential way. It is highlighted by the green background, and the zoom-in graph is shown in Fig. 3A.

Regime II. From those which stay longer but do not drop into the period- p window, their lifetimes are characterized by a power-law distribution. This distribution has an exponent close to $-1/2$, $P(\tau > T) \propto T^{-1/2}$, where τ represents the time until the escape of an individual trajectory. The exponent $1/2$ can be easily explained: In the equation for y_n as shown in Eq.(1), the increments $x_n - x_{n-1}$ behave similarly to white noise, as long as the x -dynamics for the given y value is chaotic. Actually, if we disregard the nonlinear dependence of x_n on x_{n-1} and assume that they are independent, then the probability distribution for the difference $x_n - x_{n-1}$ will be symmetric around 0, even if the distribution of x_n is not. Consequently, the mean value of these increments is 0, so that for strongly chaotic x , they do not impose a systematic drift on y . But if the increments behave like white noise, then y_n behaves like a Brownian path. For a Brownian path, it is well known that the probability of crossing a specific value

(in this case, $y = 1$) in the next step drops like $t^{-3/2}$, where t is the time since the last crossing of this value. Since we start from $y_1 = 1$, the time till reaching $y_n > 1$ asymptotically then follows the law $t^{-1/2}$. In our numerical experiments, where the empirical value of the exponent is $\alpha = -0.5011$ (the red dash line shown in Fig. 3B), we well reproduce the power close to $1/2$. The slight deviation of this numerical value from $1/2$ is attributed to some trajectories being stuck in period- p windows for a super-long period of time. It is highlighted by the pink background, and the zoom-in graph of the survival probability is shown in Fig. 3B.

Regime III. The most significant behavior occurs near those y -values where the stable period-3 window happens in the logistic map. Specifically, once trajectories come to the period-3 window, they first move along it until reaching its boundary, where there is a possibility for the trajectories to escape outside of the window for an extremely short time of chaos. But there is also a high possibility that it will be quickly attracted back to the period-3 window again, repeating similar dynamics for a super-long period of time, resulting in the occurrence of super-long transients. The smaller the a is, the slower the motion in the y -direction. Consequently, many suitable y_n have been generated near the period-3 window. Even with a small probability, y_n could move upward or downward, leaving the window. However, due to the slow movement, y_n remains extremely close to the period-3 window. Then, because of the stability of the period-3 window, y_n is attracted back to the period-3 window again. As a result, trajectories spend an exceptionally long period of time near the period-3 window, which results in a significant impact on the global properties of the system.

The ability of the system bounce back to the period-3 window after chaotic behavior is known as "resilience"²⁵⁻²⁷, which has been defined as the capacity to tolerate perturbations without collapsing. Particularly under environmental changes, measuring, quantifying, and maintaining the resilience becomes critically important. In our model, a as a control parameter, decides the resilience of the system.

In Fig. 4, the transient x -dynamics have been shown in the time domain. And for different values of a we show exemplarily typical trajectories x_n . As we can see from the first 3 panels, when a is bigger, cyclic and chaotic behavior (similar to perturbations in realistic systems) appear repeatedly until regime shift suddenly changes the dynamics and lead trajectories go to infinity, which indicates the extinction of species. In this process, even though trajectories can be quickly attracted to the period-3 window after perturbation, the frequent occurrence of perturbation significantly increases the probability of the escaping of trajectories, resulting in their faster leaving the phase space, which also means the loss of resilience. When a gets smaller, as shown in the last 2 panels, cyclic behavior becomes more pronounced and perturbations become increasingly rare, which indicates the period-3 window becomes more attractive. As a result, it is difficult for trajectories to escape from the period-3 window, even under




Fig. 4. The (t, x) -plane of Eq. (1) with varying a . When a is big (i.e., $a = 0.010$ and $a = 0.008$), cyclic and chaotic behaviors frequently recur until the escape of trajectories. With the decrease of a , chaotic behavior becomes rarer, and the persistence of cyclic behavior becomes more significant. Consequently, trajectories cannot escape in a short period anymore (for instance, $a = 0.004$ and $a = 0.002$), indicating the occurrence of the super-long transient.

perturbation, which indicates stronger resilience of the system. Consequently, trajectories are stuck in a period-3 window for a super-long period of time, indicating the occurrence of super-long transients.

Another quite interesting dynamic in our model is the coexistence of multiple time scales. As we know, the stability of the period-3 window causes trajectories to spend a super-long period of time on it, which is one of the significant time scales. However, there are other periodic windows as well. For example, as a gets smaller, trajectories may also pass through the period-5 window. Although it is less attractive than the period-3 window, it can still capture points for a long time of period. As a continues to decrease, more periodic windows become significant, contributing to systems' complexity.

The survival probabilities of *Regime III* with variable control parameter a are shown in Fig. 3. It is highlighted by the blue background, and the zoom-in graph of the survival probability is shown in Fig. 3C. In Fig. 3A and Fig. 3B, we observed that the escape rate gets smaller with the decrease of a . Starting from a critical point $a_c \in (0.0050, 0.0060)$, as a becomes

even smaller, the escape rate becomes super sensitive to the a , as seen in Fig. 3D. The lifetime ($lifetime = 1/escape\ rate$) follows an exponential law with the variation of a . And the exponent is $\eta = -7073$. This is a kind of super-transient behavior, previously observed in other systems⁹: The transition occurs near stable dynamics without escape, and lifetimes have been observed to depend exponentially on a control parameter. Here, we are unable to obtain the escape rate or lifetime numerically in the limit of $a \rightarrow 0$, but we can see from Fig. 3D that the lifetime grows to extremely huge as $a \rightarrow 0$, which indicates the existence of super-long transient. In Fig. 3C, by choosing parameters in the interval $a \in (0.0050, 0.0060)$, the emergence of the super-long transient tail has been shown with the decrease of a .

In Fig. 3B, additional fascinating dynamics are observed that align well with trade-offs²⁸ in ecosystems. As seen, with the decrease in a , the escape rate decreases, indicating a longer lifetime. However, at the same time, the population size also diminishes. This suggests that it is not possible to maximize both lifetime and population size simultaneously. A longer lifetime of ecosystems might have to come at the expense of a reduced population. This reminds us of the evolutionary trade-offs: a trait increases in fitness at the expense of decreased fitness in another trait due to limited resources. The balance between different traits contributes to the success of natural systems.

Moreover, the survival probability here closely aligns with the numerical result on plankton species richness that Michael J. Behrenfeld illustrates in Fig. 1 of his paper¹⁶. In the paper, neutral theory²⁹ as a method aimed to explain the diversity and abundance of species in ecosystems, has been used to explore the role of stochastic processes. In Fig. 1¹⁶, the survival probability initially exhibits an exponential decay, then undergoes a stochastic process, resulting in different tails (population size) based on the strength of immigration (external factors). This closely resembles our results. The only difference is that our data show different transient tails based on variations in parameter a . This can be explained as follows: in our model, prey (resources) respond to predation, while changes in resources are caused by external factors. The control parameter a , as a scale between resource changes and predation, also indirectly reflects the strength of external factors. This confirms that our results align closely with Behrenfeld's findings, further reinforcing our confidence that our model can serve as a conceptual tool to help ecologists and physicists understand the complexities in ecosystems.

After trajectories leave the period-3 window and are not attracted back quickly, they either move upward towards $y = 1$ which have the possibility to escape in a short time, or move downward towards smaller y -values. Once they move downward within the periodic regime, the values of y systematically decrease, causing the trajectory to follow an inverse period-doubling process along the purple curve in Fig. 2B until it reaches $3 + y = 3$ which acts as a reflecting boundary. Subsequently, the trajectory will be bounced back to the period-3

window or chaotic region again, following the orange curve. All those processes have the chance to repeat again and again until the trajectory eventually leaves the phase space through $3 + y > 4$. The upper endpoint of the orange curve is dependent on the control parameter a . The larger the value of a is, the further the curve extends. By initializing $2 < 3 + y_n < 3$, in Fig. 2B, all trajectories following the orange curve move upwards into the region from which they have the chance to escape through $3 + y > 4$. For trajectories with $3 + y_n < 2$, they move to minus infinity. Our paper mainly focuses on trajectories that leave the phase space through $3 + y > 4$.

Conclusion The evolution of predators is influenced by their prey, meanwhile, prey adapts to predators. This continuous co-evolution of predators and prey contributes to the complicated dynamics in our system. Among these, the most intriguing dynamics occur during periodic windows: i) The existence of super-long transients. For example, trajectories spend a long period of time on the period-3 window, which contributes to the occurrence of super-long transient, but at the same time, also indicates that the time scale on the period-3 window differs from others. ii) The coexistence of multiple time scales. There are many periodic windows, such as the period-3 and the period-5 window. Since trajectories spend different amounts of time on each, this indicates the multiple time scales in our system when a gets even smaller. The cyclic behaviors on periodic windows are similar to cyclic population dynamics in ecosystems. As we know, with the fading out of population cycles in ecosystems becoming increasingly common, the collapse of these cycles has become a very interesting topic and attracts a lot of attention³. In our model, a as the control parameter, scaling the relationship between predators and prey, determines the persistence of population cycles. This promotes us to ask whether the scale between predators and prey in real-world systems might influence the persistence of population cycles. Moreover, due to the simplicity of our model, this gives us the chance to further explore what contributes to the persistence of population cycles? Until a sudden regime shift broke the population cycles and led the system to extinction, the question arises: Does the cumulative behavior of the system lead to the occurrence of a regime shift^{26,30}? And are there any early warning signals for a regime shift^{31,32}? Additionally, the coexistence with chaotic behaviors makes us think about the role chaos plays in transient behaviors³³. Our model gives us the chance to analyze all those topics or even conduct linear analysis.

Furthermore, the existence of the evolutionary trade-off in our model further supports its credibility. More importantly, the survival probability shown in our model aligns with the findings of Michael J. Behrenfeld¹⁶.

All of those indicate that our model, as a conceptual framework, combines most of the dynamic features of ecosystems. This integration might provide us with the opportunity to deeply understand, analyze, and unify these topics within a single model.

References

1. Hastings, A. Transient dynamics and persistence of ecological systems. *Ecol. Lett.* **4**, 215-220(2001). doi: [10.1046/j.1461-0248.2001.00220.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2001.00220.x)
2. Hastings, A. Transients: the key to long-term ecological understanding?. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **19**, 39-45(2004). doi: [10.1016/j.tree.2003.09.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2003.09.007)
3. Ims, R. A., Henden, J. A. & Killengreen, S. T. Collapsing population cycles. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **23**, 79-86(2008). doi: [10.1016/j.tree.2007.10.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.10.010)
4. Morozov, A. Yu., Banerjee, M. & Petrovskii, S. V. Long-term transients and complex dynamics of a stage-structured population with time delay and the Allee effect. *J. Theor. Biol.* **396**, 116-124(2016). doi: [10.1016/j.jtbi.2016.02.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2016.02.016)
5. Hastings, A., et al. Transient phenomena in ecology. *Science*. **361**, eaat6412(2018). doi: [10.1126/science.aat6412](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat6412)
6. Morozov, A., et al. Long transients in ecology: Theory and applications. *Phys. Life Rev.* **32**, 1-40(2020). doi: [10.1016/j.plrev.2019.09.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plrev.2019.09.004)
7. Hastings, A. & Higgins, K. Persistence of transients in spatially structured ecological models. *Science*. **263**, 1133-1136(1994). doi: [10.1126/science.263.5150.1133](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.263.5150.1133)
8. Blasius, B., Rudolf, L., Weithoff, G., Gaedke, U. & Fussmann, G. F. Long-term cyclic persistence in an experimental predator-prey system. *Nat.* **577**, 226-230(2020). doi: [10.1038/s41586-019-1857-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1857-0)
9. May, R. M. Simple mathematical models with very complicated dynamics. *Nat.* **261**, 459-467(1976). doi: [10.1038/261459a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/261459a0)
10. Tilman, D. Resource Competition between Plankton Algae: An Experimental and Theoretical Approach. *Ecol.* **58**, 338-348(1977). doi: [10.2307/1935608](https://doi.org/10.2307/1935608)
11. Huisman, J. & Weissing, F. J. Biodiversity of plankton by species oscillations and chaos. *Nat.* **402**, 407-410(1999). doi: [10.1038/46540](https://doi.org/10.1038/46540)
12. Tilman, D., May, R. M., Lehman, C. & Nowak, M. Habitat destruction and the extinction debt. *Nat.* **371**, 65-66(1994). doi: [10.1038/371065a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/371065a0)
13. Chesson, P. Mechanisms of Maintenance of Species Diversity. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **31**, 343-366(2000). doi: [10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.343](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.343)
14. McCann, K. S. The diversity-stability debate. *Nat.* **405**, 228-233(2000). doi: [10.1038/35012234](https://doi.org/10.1038/35012234)
15. Telesh, I. V., et al. Chaos theory discloses triggers and drivers of plankton dynamics in stable environment. *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 20351(2019). doi: [10.1038/s41598-019-56851-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-56851-8)
16. Behrenfeld, M. J., O'Malley, R., Boss, E., Karp-Boss, L. & Mundt, C. Phytoplankton biodiversity and the inverted paradox. *ISME Commun.* **1**, 52(2021). doi: [10.1038/s43705-021-00056-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43705-021-00056-6)
17. Hutchinson, G. E. The paradox of the plankton. *Am. Nat.* **95**, 137-145(1961). doi: [10.1086/282171](https://doi.org/10.1086/282171)
18. Frank, K. T., Petrie, B., Fisher, J. A. D. & Leggett, W. C. Transient dynamics of an altered large marine ecosystem. *Nat.* **477**, 86-89(2011). doi: [10.1038/nature10285](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10285)
19. Ludwig, D., Jones, D. D. & Holling, C. S. Qualitative analysis of insect outbreak systems: the spruce budworm and forest. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **47**, 315-332(1978). doi: [10.2307/3939](https://doi.org/10.2307/3939)
20. Fukami, T., Martijn Bezemer, T., Mortimer, S. R. & van der Putten, W. H. Species divergence and trait convergence in experimental plant community assembly. *Ecol. Lett.* **8**, 1283-1290(2005). doi: [10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00829.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00829.x)
21. Higgins, K., Hastings, A., Sarvela, J. N. & Botsford, L. W. Stochastic dynamics and deterministic skeletons: population behavior of Dungeness crab. *Science*. **276**, 1431-1435(1997). doi: [10.1126/science.276.5317.1431](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.276.5317.1431)
22. Scheffer, M., et al. *Ecology of Shallow Lakes*(Chapman & Hall, London, 1998).
23. Yang, J. S., et al. Mathematical model of *Chlorella minutissima* UTEX2341 growth and lipid production under photoheterotrophic fermentation conditions. *Bioresour. Technol.* **102**, 3077-3082(2011). doi: [10.1016/j.biortech.2010.10.049](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2010.10.049)
24. Strogatz, S. H. *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos*(CRC press, 2018).
25. Holling, C. S. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **4**, 1-23(1973). doi: [10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245)
26. Scheffer, M., Carpenter, S., Foley, J. A., Folke, C. & Walker, B. Catastrophic shifts in ecosystems. *Nat.* **413**, 591-596(2001). doi: [10.1038/35098000](https://doi.org/10.1038/35098000)
27. Scheffer, M., et al. Quantifying resilience of humans and other animals. *PNAS*. **115**, 11883-11890(2018). doi: [10.1073/pnas.1810630115](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1810630115)
28. Stearns, S. C. Trade-offs in life-history evolution. *Funct. Ecol.* **3**, 259-268(1989). doi: [10.2307/2389364](https://doi.org/10.2307/2389364)
29. Hubbell, S. P. *The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography (MPB-32)*(Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 2011)
30. Scheffer, M & Carpenter, S. R. Catastrophic regime shifts in ecosystems: linking theory to observation. *TREE*. **18**, 648-656(2003). doi: [10.1016/j.tree.2003.09.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2003.09.002)
31. Scheffer, M., et al. Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nat.* **461**, 53-59(2009). doi: [10.1038/nature08227](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08227)
32. Carpenter, S. R., et al. Early Warnings of Regime Shifts: A Whole-Ecosystem Experiment. *Science*. **332**, 1079-1082(2011). doi: [10.1126/science.1203672](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1203672)

33. Hastings, A., Hom, C. L., Ellner, S., Turchin, P. & Godfray, H. C. J. Chaos in Ecology: Is Mother Nature a Strange Attractor?. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **24**, 1-33(1993). doi:[10.1146/annurev.es.24.110193.000245](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.24.110193.000245)

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for stimulating discussions with Christian Beck, Peter Grassberger, and Jin Yan.

Author Contributions

Both authors developed the model system together. Misha Chai performed the numerical simulations and created the figures. All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results and to writing the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

Correspondence

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to chaimisha@pks.mpg.de.