

The species-area relationship and evolution

Daniel Lawson and Henrik Jeldtoft Jensen*

Imperial College London, South Kensington Campus, London SW7 2AZ

March 6, 2019

Abstract

Models relating to the Species-Area curve are usually defined at the species level, and concerned only with ecological timescales. We examine an individual-based model of co-evolution on a spatial lattice based on the Tangled Nature model, and show that reproduction, mutation and dispersion by diffusion in an interacting system produces power-law Species-Area Relations as observed in ecological measurements at medium scales. We find that co-evolutionary habitats form, allowing high diversity levels in a spatially homogenous system, and these are maintained for exponentially increasing time when increasing system size.

1 Introduction

The number of species in a given region is a product of the evolutionary history of speciation, extinction and migration to that region. A model that hopes to capture the essence of why species area curves form in the way that they do must encompass not just the regions occupied by species in that area but also how species form, spread and become extinct, a phenomenon that is currently only understood at the level of individuals - although non-evolutionary distribution models [1] exist at the species level. Neutral models [2, 3, 4] provide a good match with observation, but rely on the unrealistic assumption that all species are equivalent and non-interacting and it is not yet understood why this level of accuracy is achieved. Thus, we will discuss an interacting individual-based model which incorporates both evolution and large timescales for the construction of the Species-Area Relation (SAR). We will show that species form many ‘patches’, with patch sizes of all scales, and that this automatically gives rise to power-law like SARs. The time taken to reach an equilibrium of a single patch diverges exponentially with area.

The relationship between the number of species observed in an area and the area’s size is one of the most basic questions in ecology but it is still the subject of much debate. The number of species found in an area could increase with area size simply because more individuals are counted, and the form of this relation may be very different depending on the counting method used and details of the area [5, 6]. For most measurement scales on

non-island systems it seems that a power-law - (*diversity*) \propto (*area*)^z - may be an accurate description, for the majority of fauna and flora types. However, for other scales and for some data, other forms have been successfully fit [7].

Previous work has generally ignored the effects of the evolutionary history when considering species distribution, which is a significant part of the mechanism constructing the observed SAR, as habitat diversification may occur by co-evolution. For example, if a single insect type becomes locally extinct at one of two otherwise identical habitats, to a bird that relies on that insect the habitats are very different and hence they are different to all species competing with that bird and insect. In this sense, habitats and niches are dynamic entities which may or may not vary in the absence of geographical differences, and may effect the SAR.

There are many models available for addressing the SAR but these usually address the question from a time and evolution independent, species orientated point of view [7]. As such, there is no account given for dynamics arising from individuals or allowing for varying species number and properties with time. This simplified ‘static’ ecosystem can still give good insight into observed patterns, e.g. Harte and collaborators [1] show that self-similarity in the abundance of a species and fractal distribution patterns gives rise to a power-law SAR. This idea is tested in [8] with real data from birds in the Czech Republic, and it is shown that this average level of self similarity does appear to hold. In neutral models patches of varying size also form and produce the observed SAR, but it is unclear whether in nature this is important relative to geographical variation in determining patch bound-

*Author for correspondence (h.jensen@imperial.ac.uk)

aries. We allow for interactions and varying populations in an attempt to link neutral models to real interacting systems, and show that co-evolutionary habitats should be significant.

The model we will use in this paper is an extension to the Tangled Nature (TaNa) model, as defined by Christensen et al. [9, 10]. The original model has no spatial component, which we introduce by running copies of the model concurrently on a square lattice, allowing for interaction between lattice-points by migration. The interaction between sites is therefore indirect, and the spatial aspect is discrete. However, we can easily compare our results to that of the original model which has stability properties known to be close to observed systems [11, 10, 12].

We begin with a recap on the non-spatial Tangled Nature model and its major features. Then we detail our simple extension to the model introducing spatial dimensions using a square lattice of models, comparing the results with real data.

2 Definition of the Model

We now define the Tangled Nature model. We will be constructing the model on a periodic square lattice of length X . Specific points on the lattice are referred to by their co-ordinates (x, y) . Each point on the lattice may contain any number of individuals who, on any given time step, may migrate with probability P_{move} to a neighbouring lattice point (our neighbourhood includes diagonals, and therefore is 8 lattice-points). On each lattice point we run a TaNa summarised below and described in [9, 10], with interaction between lattice points via migration.

The Tangled Nature model represents individuals as a vector $\mathbf{S}^\alpha = (S_1^\alpha, S_2^\alpha, \dots, S_L^\alpha)$ in genotype space \mathcal{S} . The S_i^α take the values ± 1 , and we use $L = 20$ throughout. Each \mathbf{S}^α string represents an entire species with unique, uncorrelated interactions, i.e. genotype space is coarse-grained. The small value of L is necessary for computational reasons as all organisms exist *in potentia* and have a designated interaction with all other species.

We refer to individuals by Greek letters $\alpha, \beta, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, N(t)$ for a specific lattice point (x, y) . Points in genotype space are referred to as $\mathbf{S}^a, \mathbf{S}^b, \dots$, and many individuals (from any real-space location) may belong to a point in genotype space \mathbf{S}^a .

In the TaNa model, The ability of an individual α to reproduce is controlled by $H(\mathbf{S}^\alpha, t)$:

$$H(\mathbf{S}^\alpha, t) = \frac{1}{cN(t)} \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{S}} J(\mathbf{S}^\alpha, \mathbf{S})n(\mathbf{S}, t) - \mu N(t) \quad (1)$$

Where c is a control parameter, $N(t)$ is the total number of individuals at time t and $n(\mathbf{S}, t)$ is the number of individuals with genotype \mathbf{S} at that point. The *interaction matrix* $J(\mathbf{S}^\alpha, \mathbf{S})$ represents all possible couplings between all genotypes, each generated randomly in the range $(-1, 1)$, being non-zero with probability Θ . Since the functional form of $J(\mathbf{S}^a, \mathbf{S}^b)$ does not affect the dynamics, provided that it is non-symmetric with mean 0, we choose a form of the interaction matrix that speeds computation [9]. In the spatial version, we use the same \mathbf{S} but allow the individuals to be located at a point in space, such that $\alpha = \alpha(x, y)$, $N = N(x, y, t)$ and $n = n(x, y, \mathbf{S}, t)$.

Reproduction occurs asexually, and on a successful reproduction attempt a daughter organism is produced which will be mutated with probability p_{mut} . When an individual is chosen for processing, it will reproduce with probability:

$$p_{off}(\mathbf{S}^\alpha, t) = \frac{\exp[H(\mathbf{S}^\alpha, t)]}{1 + \exp[H(\mathbf{S}^\alpha, t)]} \in (0, 1) \quad (2)$$

Each \mathbf{S}_i^α is mutated (flipped from 1 to -1, or from -1 to 1) with probability p_{mut} . Thus mutations are equivalent to moving to an adjacent corner of the L -dimensional hypercube in genotype space, as discussed in [9].

A time-step consists of choosing of a spatial lattice point with probability proportional to the population of the lattice point $N(x, y, t)$. Then an individual¹ α is chosen randomly from that lattice point.

- α is allowed to reproduce with probability p_{rep} .
- α is killed with probability p_{kill} .
- If the killing attempt was unsuccessful, α is moved to an adjacent lattice point with probability p_{move} . Thus the effective $p_{move}^{eff} = (1 - p_{kill})p_{move}$.

We define a generation as the amount of time for all individuals to have been killed, on average, once. For a stable population size, this is also the time for all individuals to have reproduced once, on average.

3 Behaviour of the model

We will first review the behaviour of an isolated system, and then use this to help interpret the re-

¹In previous versions a different individual was chosen for reproduction and killing actions. Here we select only one individual and process it for reproduction, killing and movement for code efficiency reasons - above the level of fluctuations the two methods are equivalent.

sults on an X by X square lattice with periodic boundary conditions.

Unless otherwise stated, the parameters used will be: $\Theta = 0.25$, $c = 0.05$, $\mu = 0.05$, $p_{mut} = 0.01$ and $p_{kill} = 0.1$; see [9] for more details. These are chosen to keep the population of the entire system from exceeding about 30000, keeping computation to reasonable levels and allowing for averaging. The population of a specific lattice point is low compared with previous studies (around 300), increasing the strength of stochastic effects - hence the other parameters are chosen to cancel out this effect to some degree.

3.1 The isolated TaNa model

We briefly review the behaviour of a single TaNa model as given by [9, 11]. The model exhibits a number of quasi-evolutionary stable strategies (q-ESS's) in which the frequency distribution in genotype space remains constant (with some small fluctuations); these q-ESSs are also observed in differential equation style models [13]. We operate with parameters that give a reasonable number of q-ESS switches within the first 50000 generations - most of the work analysing this region was done in [10]. During these q-ESSs, a number of genotypes (the 'wildtypes') are highly occupied - other genotypes are only present due to mutation from the wildtypes, and are frequently eliminated by stochastic events (see Figure 1). As our genotype space is coarse-grained, these 'sub-species' do not inherit interaction properties from a wildtype. Thus our diversity measure is the 'wildtype diversity': simply the number of wildtypes in the system. Wildtypes are defined as genotypes with occupancy of eight or greater. We have tested other diversity measures such as the Shannon-Wiener Index and our results are qualitatively the same regardless of measure used, but these are primarily designed to avoid sampling problems [14] and so are less relevant to computer simulations.

In [11], it is shown that the average q-ESS length increases with time, due to increasing stability in the network of active interactions, increased population size and hence increased diversity (as larger populations are more likely to be stable to stochastic fluctuations, and q-ESS interactions tend to be positive). Note that these effects occur only *on average* - it is possible for the system to move to a less stable, smaller population after a disordered phase, and it is also not always true that higher populations are more stable (or more diverse), just that they are on average.

More detail is available from [12], which focuses on the network properties of the Tangled Nature




Figure 1: Species abundance, or relative occupancy of points in genotype space, averaged over all 50000 generations and 380 runs. There is a distinct difference between those genotypes with occupancy less than about 6 and those with an occupancy greater than 16, with only a very small amount in between, most of which come from transition period species.

model, and [11] which looks at the time dependence of many of the observables in the system. Similar work by Zia and Rikvold [15, 16] deals with a simplification of the non-spatial case. In both models the q-ESS wildtypes are characterised as different to transition period wildtypes because their mutants do not interact favourably with the q-ESS population, and so are suppressed.

3.2 The Tangled Nature Model on a spatial lattice

Unlike the non-spatial version of the model, initial conditions are relevant. All possible starting configurations reduce to one of the following two initial conditions:

1. Individuals are generated with a random genotype and placed on a random lattice point until the total starting population is reached.
2. A single lattice point is allowed to evolve as a separate system until a q-ESS is formed. This q-ESS is copied to all other lattice points to give a quasi-stable, identical initial starting condition at all points.

As the initial q-ESS stability differs greatly, procedure 2 introduces a high stochastic variation resulting in a (sometimes sharp, sometimes smooth) diversity increase after an initial (possibly very long) wait. After this time, the two procedures are equivalent; hence in our analysis we shall consider only initial random seeding, i.e. procedure 1. We then allow the system to evolve for a long time (40000 generations) before observation to allow an ecology to form.




Figure 2: (a) SAR Data for Hertfordshire plants taken from [7] (Fig 2.2) plotted with simulated data, assuming 1 lattice-point is a 0.4ha plot ($P_{move} = 0.025$) evolved for 40000 generations. (b) Effects of changing system size, illustrating how the systems diverge with time. The diversity decreases as a power-law, with an exponent that depends system size and p_{move} . The time taken to expect only a single q-ESS state (i.e. for the diversity to reduce to 7) is 120MGen, 52MGen and 11MGen for 10x10, 9x9 and 8x8 systems respectively.

We now introduce a square spatial grid of length X , each containing a TaNa model, and allow the lattice-points to interact by migration; migration probability refers to the chance of moving to *any* neighbouring site, chosen randomly from the 8 nearest neighbours, and we assume a periodic boundary. Just this simple addition to the basic TaNa model gives rise to naturally occurring Species-Area Relations, or SARs.

In this section we are mainly concerned with calculating the SAR: the relationship between the number of species found in an area and the size of the area. We distinguish between the two size measures: the *scale* as the sub-area measurement of a system with *size* X .

SARs come in many forms, depending on the measuring system used. Specifically, quoting [5], there are 3 main properties : “(1) the pattern of quadrats or areas sampled (nested, contiguous, noncontiguous, or island); (2) whether successively larger areas are constructed in a spatially explicit fashion or not; and (3) whether the curve is constructed from single values or mean values”. We obtain nested, successive, mean value data. Thus, for all scales, measurement squares are contained within a larger scales’ measurement square, no shapes other than square are considered and we are averaging over all possible measuring squares from a specific scale. [5] and [6] discuss the implications for this.

Approximate SAR power-laws are often encountered in real systems at ‘medium’ scales: that is, for areas that are smaller than the continent/land-mass that they are found on, but large enough to obtain a reasonable sample. Good examples are plant species in Surrey, UK, ([7], page 9) or bird species

in the Czech Republic [8]. When looking at other scales different SARs can be obtained; the distinction between scales is one that varies with environment and habitat types, and many functional forms of SAR can be found somewhere. A general rule (p277 of [7]) is that inter-provincial relations follow power-law SARs with exponent larger than intra-provincially; islands inside a province will also have a larger exponent than the whole province itself (thus having smaller diversities). A single run in our model corresponds to a single isolated province as it is spatially homogenous and self-contained.

Real systems have z -values between 0.15 and 0.4 depending on the details of the system [7]. Figure 2(a) illustrates real SAR data from Hertfordshire plants and shows a sample simulation SAR. Both describe a power-law as are they are linear in log-log space, $\log S = z \log A + \log \alpha$, hence the slope of this line (the z -value) is the major controlling factor in how quickly diversity grows with area. For example purposes, we have chosen the area of a lattice-point arbitrarily as 0.4ha. However the true size of a lattice-point in our model is not well defined as the TaNa model implicitly assumes all species are of equal spatial extension. Hence we are now concerned only with the scaling relation: the form of the SAR being close to a power-law and the value of the exponent in that power-law.

As each run is a separate instance with its own evolutionary history, the diversity and z -value variation between runs is high unless the size is much larger than the species range; however, the power-law rule holds for all instances.

The simulated data in Figure 2(a) has a slightly reduced tail from the expected power-law values, due to the finite area of the simulation. If we con-

consider the diversity as a function of time (Figure 2(b)) then initially system size is independent of the diversity per site as there has been no migration. As the communication in smaller systems is relatively greater, the equilibration time is shorter and diversity decreases more quickly, as illustrated in Figure 2(b), with the periodic boundary causing a diversity drop at large scales. The decrease with time follows a power-law, with exponent that decreases in magnitude with increasing system size. By holding a fixed system size (chosen to be the maximum we can simulate with sufficient averaging ability) and varying p_{move} as in Figure 3, we can understand these cutoffs more fully.




Figure 3: z -value calculated from the wildtype diversity evaluated between 40000 and 50000 generations, showing individual z -values from runs (on a 10×10 lattice). Note from the standard error that the variation is very high, and that the number of runs that have z -values of near zero increases after $p_{move} = 0.013$.

Figure 3 shows the individual values of z for varying values of p_{move} together with the average. The values are distributed about some mean, which decreases with increasing p_{move} , but at $p_{move} = 0.12$ we observe that one of the runs gives a near-zero z -value, i.e. a constant SAR curve. With increasing p_{move} the average patch size of each q-ESS increases, and thus the probability of finding a patch the size of the system increases. Thus if we wish to model the average behaviour of an area the size of Hertfordshire, we need to model the entire of England and then throw away data from larger scales than Hertfordshire. This is not just true in our model - it is a real effect in nature as we must always consider migration from outside of the desired area. In non-evolutionary models, this is achieved by considering migration from a 'pool' of constant species makeup [17] but in evolving systems the pool must be modelled explicitly.

In the absence of geographical heterogeneity, the number of co-evolutionary habitats (or more strictly, the number of different q-ESS's) will tend

towards one. The time taken depends on the total area and can be very long indeed - 0.5MGen (million generations) for the data from 2(a) ($p_{move} = 0.025$), increasing to 120MGen for the same size plot with $p_{move} = 0.01$. Thus, z -value will decrease with the time since a geographical area was defined, and this decrease occurs on geographic and evolutionary timescales. This extinction curve is observed when climate change isolates mammals on mountaintops surrounded by desert [7, 18], as diversity on each mountaintop is initially equal (approx. ten thousand years ago) but smaller mountaintops have a faster diversity loss with time, leading to a power-law SAR observed today.

In the Spatial TaNa model, illustrated in Figure 4, the spatial distribution of species is confined to a contiguous patch. Non-contiguous patches are rare and transient as patches are more easily invaded at patch corners due to the positive self-reinforcement of a q-ESS type in the centre. Species will generally coexist with a specific set of other species, forming fairly distinct q-ESS states of 3-8 species (shaded regions). However, there are many cases where the majority of q-ESS members remain constant but one species is swapped out for another. Thus in some cases there is a smooth transition spatially between one q-ESS type and a completely different q-ESS type, with many transients along the way containing subsets of each (e.g. dense forest fading to woodlands then to grassland). In other cases the coexistence is more essential and there will be a distinct line between one species set and another.




Figure 4: Spatial distribution of species on a small (5×5) periodic lattice after 50000 generations, with background shading for each point representing the basic q-ESS members and symbols representing all genotypes that do not completely fit into a q-ESS category. Some of these genotypes are active in more than one q-ESS state (e.g. black circle) and others operate in subsets of a specific q-ESS state (e.g. grey triangle). All species are located in contiguous lattice-points, and it is possible for some patches to span the entire area.

In toroid geometry, any observations of greater than half the total size are affected unaccountably by the periodic boundary so we restrict conclusions from scales less than $X/2$, which do appear to be truly power law related (tested for up to $X = 20$).

4 Discussion

The Tangled Nature model on a spatial lattice reproduces many of the observed features in real systems without making any *a-priori* assumptions about the nature of species spatial distributions, as has always been required in previous non-neutral models. Instead, the spatial distributions are allowed to form naturally by co-evolution from simple rules applied only to individuals. Unfortunately, the model is currently too computer intensive to allow simulation of the very large scales (and higher migration rates) expected in real systems. However, a power law is clearly produced as a simple result of species forming patches of many sizes, themselves the product of diffusive dispersion with reproduction and mutation when local interaction is permitted.

The addition of a spatial component increases the importance of history to a simulation run. The system has a ‘memory’ in the average logarithmic decrease in diversity: although it is possible for diversity to increase through q-ESS transitions by entering a previously unseen q-ESS state it is more likely to enter a state corresponding to one of the neighbouring sites. The average stability of the system grows with time, but all q-ESS states are vulnerable to invasion from mutation or migration from another q-ESS state, and hence diversity may increase at any time. The world is constantly changing on geological timescales - which means the interaction strengths in our model would also change - hence dominant q-ESS states will become destabilised, balancing re-population with extinction events.

There appears to be a ‘correlation length’ (an average distance over which a single species is still likely to be found) for the system, that increases logarithmically in time with speed related to p_{move} . When the correlation length is significantly smaller than the system size, then the system is ‘self-averaging’. As spatial scales approach the lattice size, this averaging is lost and artifacts due to small lattice size become more prominent, causing the possibility of a single q-ESS type dominating.

The spatial Tangled Nature model links neutral ecology [2, 3, 19, 20] to interacting systems found in the real world, and relaxes the fixed population requirement. The properties of diffusive dispersion, reproduction and mutation are sufficient to produce

the naturally observed SAR, with interactions reducing the species dispersion rates from the individual dispersion rates.

Co-evolutionary forces are sufficient to allow habitat differentiation (as shown in the co-habitation of competing E.coli strains in [21]) and thus power-law SARs (as it is the number of habitats, not the area, that drives the diversity increase with area [7]), over long but limited timescales and in the absence of geographical differences. Thus, evolutionary history relates to the production and z -value of power-law like SARs, and should be considered carefully for systems whose diversity has not equilibrated [7]. Our model allows us to probe these systems for evolutionary timescales and therefore consider large ‘island’ areas on which diversity loss occurs on the same scale as speciation.

Acknowledgements

We thank Andy Thomas for providing assistance with processing the model, and the EPSRC for the studentship funding this work.

References

- [1] John Harte, Tim Blackburn, and Annette Ostling. Self-similarity and the relationship between abundance and range size. *Am. Nat.*, 157:374–386, 2001.
- [2] Stephen Hubbel. *The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography*. Princeton University Press, 41 William Street, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, 2001.
- [3] Igor Volkov, Jayanth R. Banavar, Stephen P. Hubbell, and Amos Marita. Neutral theory and relative species abundance in ecology. *Nature*, 424:1035–1037, 2003.
- [4] Ricard V. Solé, David Alonso, and Alan McKane. Self-organised instability in complex ecosystems. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B*, 357:667–681, 2002.
- [5] Samuel M. Scheiner. Six types of species-area curves. *Glob. Ecol. & Biogeog.*, 12:441–447, 2003.
- [6] Even Tjørve. Shapes and functions of species-area curves: a review of possible models. *J. of Biogeog.*, 30:827–835, 2003.
- [7] Michael L. Rosenzweig. *Species diversity in space and time*. Cambridge University Press, The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, 1995.
- [8] Arnošt L. Šizling and David Storch. Power-law species-area relationships and self-similar species distributions within finite areas. *Ecology Let.*, 7:60–68, 2004.
- [9] Kim Christensen, Simone A. di Collobiano, Matt Hall, and Henrik J. Jensen. Tangled nature: A model of evolutionary ecology. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 216:73–84, 2002.
- [10] Simone Avogadro di Collobiano, Kim Christensen, and Henrik Jeldtoft Jensen. The tangled nature model as an evolving quasi-species model. *J. Phys A*, 36:883–891, 2003.
- [11] Matt Hall, Kim Christensen, Simone A. di Collobiano, and Henrik Jeldtoft Jensen. Time-dependent extinction rate and species abundance in a tangled-nature model of biological evolution. *Phys. Rev. E*, 66, 2002.
- [12] Paul Anderson and Henrik Jeldtoft Jensen. Network properties, species abundance and evolution in a model of evolutionary ecology. *Condensed Matter*, 2003.
- [13] Egbert H. van Nes and Marten Scheffer. Large species shifts triggered by small forces. *Am. Nat.*, 164:255–266, 2004.
- [14] Anne E. Magurran. *Measuring Biological Diversity*. Blackwell Science Limited, 108 Cowley Road, Oxford, OX4 1JF, 2004.
- [15] Per Arne Rikvold and R. K. P. Zia. Punctuated equilibria and $1/f$ noise in a biological coevolution model with individual-based dynamics. *Phys. Rev. E*, 68, 2003.

- [16] R K P Zia and Per Arne Rikvold. Fluctuations and correlations in an individual-based model of evolution. *J. Phys. A*, 37:5135–5155, 2004.
- [17] R. H. MacArthur and E. O. Wilson. *The Theory of Island Biogeography*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, USA, 1967.
- [18] James H. Brown. Mammals on mountaintops: Nonequilibrium insular biogeography. *Am. Nat.*, 105:467–478, 1971.
- [19] Graham Bell. Neutral macroecology. *Science*, 293:2413–2418, 2001.
- [20] B. Houchmandzadeh and M. Vallade. Clustering in neutral ecology. *Phys. Rev. E*, 68, 2003.
- [21] Akiko Kashiwagi, Wataru Noumachi, Masato Katsuno, Mohammad T. Alam, Itaru Urabe, and Tetsuya Yomo. Plasticity of fitness and diversification process during an experimental molecular evolution. *J. Molec. Evol.*, 52:502–509, 2001.