

Preventing extinction and mass outbreaks in irregularly fluctuating populations

Frank M. Hilker^{1,2,*} and Frank H. Westerhoff³

¹ Gulbenkian Institute of Science, Apartado 14, 2781-901 Oeiras, Portugal

² Centre for Mathematical Biology, Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, CAB 501, University of Alberta, T6G 2G1 Edmonton Canada

³ Department of Economics, University of Osnabrück, 49069 Osnabrück, Germany

September 20, 2006

Abstract

Irregular fluctuations in population dynamics can generate extremely small or large abundances that might cause extinction and mass outbreaks, respectively. We present a simple method that can guide management efforts to prevent crashes, peaks or any other undesirable state. At the same time, the irregularity of the dynamics can be preserved (technically known as chaos maintenance, confinement, anti-control). The algorithm is easy to implement since it relies on time series information only. It is effective even with few available data, in the presence of noise as well as in higher dimensional systems.

Key words: Population dynamics, extinction, population crash, mass outbreak, chaos, chaos anti-control, conservation, control of pest species, nonlinear dynamics, time series

Introduction

The observation by May (1974) that simple models of population growth can generate irregular oscillations in population abundance has made chaos of considerable interest among ecologists (Costantino et al., 1997; Perry et al., 2000; Cushing et al., 2003; Turchin, 2003; Becks et al., 2005). Chaotically fluctuating populations may reach low densities, where their probability of extinction must be high (Thomas et al., 1980; Berryman and Millstein, 1989). There is a variety of mechanisms that especially threaten small populations (e.g. Soulé, 1987; Lande, 1988; Pimm et al., 1988): demographic stochasticity, environmental stochasticity, natural catastrophes, genetic inbreeding, edge effects (Lande, 1987), anti-rescue effect (Harding and McNamara, 2002; Hovestadt and Poethke, 2006) and the Allee effect (Allee, 1931; Stephens et al., 1999). This led to the concept of a *minimum viable population*, a deterministic threshold size, below which a population is regarded to be particularly vulnerable to extinction (Shaffer, 1981; Gilpin and Soulé, 1986).

Belovsky et al. (1999) have recently demonstrated that nonlinear dynamics increases the likelihood of extinction in experimental populations of the brine shrimp (*Artemia franciscana*). Investigating time series of 758 species (including lepidopteran species, mammals, birds and fish), Fagan et al. (2001) found that the majority of populations without immigrations or refuge mechanisms exhibit a tendency to fluctuate severely enough to possibly go extinct. As many species are increasingly threatened due to, e.g., habitat fragmentation/degradation, biological invasions and emerging or preexisting diseases, it is important to understand the dynamics of small populations as well as to explore effective management measures to preserve them (Lande,

*Corresponding author. Centre for Mathematical Biology, Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, CAB 501, University of Alberta, T6G 2G1 Edmonton Canada. Tel.: +1 780 492-0215, fax: +1 780 492-8373, e-mail: fhilker@math.ualberta.ca

1988). Conservation biologists, for instance, have developed the framework of population viability analysis (cf. Boyce, 1992) that estimates the future population size, assesses the extinction risk of an endangered species and allows to explore appropriate management scenarios.

In this paper we present a method that allows to regulate chaotic population dynamics and can prevent the population from going extinct. We emphasize that our aim is to *regulate* the chaotic system rather than to *control* it. I.e., we only avoid certain unwanted fluctuations, namely those in which the population would decline below its minimum viable size. The particularity of our approach is that the dynamics still remains chaotic, but it is “less harmful”. Unlike methods to suppress chaos (chaos control, e.g. Ott et al., 1990), the maintenance of chaos may be desirable for various reasons. For example, chaos has been shown to reduce the probability of global extinction in metapopulations (Allen et al., 1993; Ruxton, 1994), to be an optimal regime for biological systems from an evolutionary perspective (Ferrière and Gatto, 1993) and to favour biodiversity in species communities (Huisman and Weissing, 1999).

The idea of our method is quite simple. In chaotic time series one can often observe repeating “crash patterns“. Therefore, we first collect enough data to identify certain trajectories of population sizes that would lead to a crash. Then, we implement an intervention at these critical points to avoid bigger crashes in the near future (cf. so-called chaos anti-control algorithms that can be traced back to Yang et al., 1995). The advantages of the method are obvious. The only requirement is time series information, which means that no knowledge about the underlying law of motion (e.g. model equations) is needed. Furthermore, only occasional interventions of moderate size are sufficient, and we will show that they work well even for noisy and relatively short data sets as is typical for ecological time series.

Chaotic populations dynamics do not only exhibit very small densities, but also recurrent peaks in population numbers. These outbreaks continue to be a problem in both aquatic (e.g. algal blooms, Scheffer, 1991; Hallegraeff, 1993) as well as terrestrial ecosystems (e.g. insect outbreaks, Berryman, 1987; Desharnais et al., 2001; Dwyer et al., 2004). Our method is general enough to prevent also those peaks of pest species or, more generally, any undesirable region of population states. We exemplarily demonstrate this with the flour beetle *Tribolium castaneum*.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, we introduce our method by applying it to time series data from the Ricker (1954) map, test its robustness against the length of the available data sets and investigate its effectiveness. Here, the aim is to prevent species extinction. Then we confront our method with an ecologically more realistic situation, namely with a stage-structured population of the flour beetle (Costantino et al., 1997; Cushing et al., 2003; Costantino et al., 2005). The aim is now to prevent recurrent outbreaks. Finally, we discuss the applicability of this method as well as its limitations.

The method – preventing population extinction

A typical time series of a chaotically fluctuating population is shown in Fig. 1a. It has been obtained by iterating the Ricker map (Ricker, 1954)

$$x_{t+1} = x_t \exp \left\{ r \left(1 - \frac{x_t}{K} \right) \right\} =: f(x_t), \quad (1)$$

where x_t denotes population size (or density) at time t and parameters $r > 0$ and $K > 0$ describe the intrinsic growth rate and carrying capacity, respectively. Assuming there is a minimum viable population size, we set a threshold x^* (dashed line in Fig. 1a) below which we regard the population to be especially endangered. For an arbitrary value of x^* , we can see that the population in Fig. 1a falls below this critical value eight times (marked by circles). In the long run (10,000 generations), the proportion of these crashes is 8.7%.




Figure 1: (a) Chaotic time series generated by the Ricker map (1) with $r = 3$, $K = 1$, $x_0 = 0.1$. The dashed line marks the threshold value $x^* = 0.05$. The circles indicate population crashes. (b) Alert zones obtained from 10,000 observations (containing 867 crash paths). A crash is defined as a drop below the threshold value. (c) Simulation of the dynamics with intervention as in Eq. (2) with $I = 0.3$. Each intervention is marked by a point in the top. The alert zone is $2.27251 \leq x_t \leq 2.46302$. Other parameters as in (a).

Since these crashes can be harmful, we define the interval of population states $0 \leq x_t \leq x^*$ as the *undesirable (crash) region* U (termed “loss region” in Yang et al., 1995). Our method starts with finding the paths of trajectories that end in this crash region (*risk trajectories*). This allows us to implement an intervention mechanism which perturbs risk trajectories slightly, so that they follow a different path.

Step 1: Identifying alert zones

Detecting risk trajectories in our method is straightforward: whenever the population x_t falls into the crash region U , we simply scan the time series to collect the previous m states $x_{t-1}, x_{t-2}, \dots, x_{t-m}$. In other words, we trace back the crash paths by considering the successive preiterates of x_t and combine them to obtain $\{Z_i\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &= \bigcup_{x_t \in U} x_{t-1}, \\ Z_2 &= \bigcup_{x_{t-1} \in Z_1} x_{t-2} = \bigcup_{x_t \in U} x_{t-2}, \\ &\vdots \\ Z_m &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{x_{t-m+1} \in Z_{m-1}} x_{t-m} = \bigcup_{x_t \in U} x_{t-m}. \end{aligned}$$

A collection of crash paths is illustrated in Fig. 1b. The set of population states Z_m can be interpreted as *alert zones*: when the population is within the interval spanned by Z_m , it will crash in m time steps. We can observe that the alert zones initially consist of single intervals, but are then composed of an increasing number of smaller state intervals. Generally, for increasing m , the width of the alert zone tends to shrink in the unstable direction (as a consequence of the exponential divergence due to chaos, cf. Yang et al., 1995).

Implementing interventions

The identification of alert zones suggests that we proceed by fixing a value of m and intervene each time the trajectory falls into an alert zone Z_m . By way of example, we present an intervention that takes place one time step before the identified crash (i.e., $m = 1$). This may be easy to implement in practice, because we note that a crash is preceded by an immediate peak in population size, cf. Fig. 1b. In ecological terms, this reflects scramble competition between individuals. We choose an intervention that affects directly the population state (e.g., by removing/harvesting/culling a constant number of individuals $I > 0$). The corresponding mathematical description is

$$x_{t+1} = \begin{cases} f(x_t - I) & \text{if } x_t \in Z_1 \\ f(x_t) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In order to assess the effect of this intervention, Fig. 1c shows a simulation of Eq. (2) in which each intervention is marked by a point in the top. Population crashes are fully prevented; in a long-run simulation of 10,000 time steps they do not occur a single time. This can be explained by taking a closer look at the dynamical map that results when incorporating the interventions. Fig. 2 shows the map (2) in thick line, superimposed on the uncontrolled Ricker map in dashed line. One can readily see that the map in the alert zone is replaced by a part of the map that has been shifted from the left-hand side. As a result, the trajectory does not reach the crash region. The alert zone in Fig. 2 has been determined analytically and the decisive lower bound of the exact alert zone (2.272153...) is very close to the one estimated from 500 observations (2.27251).




Figure 2: The intervention in the alert zone $x_t \in Z_1 \approx [2.27, 2.46]$ prevents the dynamics to reach the crash region $x_{t+1} \in U = [0, x^*]$. This map has been obtained from 10,000 iterations of Eq. (2). The dashed line corresponds to the unperturbed Ricker map. Parameters as in Fig. 1.

In principle, any intervention can be applied as long as it forces the trajectory to leave the crash path. Alternatively, knowledge of the crash paths can also be used to induce crashes or other phenomena (Hilker and Westerhoff, unpublished manuscript). Possible intervention examples can be found in the collection of references in Solé et al. (1999) and Hilker and Westerhoff (2006). Generally, we can choose not only when to intervene, but also the delay before the intervention perturbs the state of the system effectively. For example, if the intervention is to be effective in the next time step, then

$$x_{t+1} = f(x_t) - I \quad \text{for } x_t \in Z_1,$$

which would correspond to a *conditionally applied constant depletion* (cf. Sinha and Parthasarathy, 1996; Schreiber, 2001) or, if $I < 0$, to a *conditionally applied constant feedback control* (cf. McCallum, 1992; Stone, 1993; Parthasarathy and Sinha, 1995). When choosing intervention size I , we need to be careful for two reasons. First, I should be sufficiently large to kick the trajectory out of the alert zone (and not into the alert zone of another time step, either). Second, it is well-known from the above references that too large a choice of I may result in the suppression of chaotic dynamics, undesirable for the reasons stated in the introduction. As a rule of thumb, we therefore choose I slightly larger than the length of the alert zone. Because of the exponential decay of alert zone interval lengths, the required intervention sizes become smaller the earlier we intervene. Were it be possible to implement really long-sighted monitoring, alert zones would become rather thin and one could exploit the sensitivity of chaotic dynamics on initial conditions, whereby only tiny interventions would be required. However, from the applied point of view, the unfolding of alert zones in several intervals complicates a straightforward management rule. Moreover, the method is probably more practical with later interventions, especially because noise might additionally perturb the intervened system in the meantime.




Figure 3: Effectiveness of the intervention method (2) to prevent crashes in the general population model of the Ricker map with demographic stochasticity. Parameters: $r = 3, K = 1$.

Effectiveness

Let us now explore the effectiveness of our intervention method in relation to the length of the time series. Generally, the more observations and crashes are present in the available time series, the more accurate the identification of alert zones and the less crashes are expected to occur. Again, we synthetically generate time series of various lengths in order to estimate the effectiveness of interventions, and perform long-term simulations with the alert zones identified. In the top row of Fig. 3, we plot the proportion of population crashes in the simulation, based on population size declining below the threshold value, against intervention size I . From left to right, we use 100, 200, 500 and 1,000 observations to calculate the alert zones. The results for each value of I are presented for 20 replicates with 10,000 simulation iterations each. Since initial conditions may influence both proportion of crashes and estimation of alert zones, we choose for each simulation different initial conditions. Baseline scenarios are shown for comparison ($I = 0$ equivalent to no intervention).

The results are striking. For 100 observations it is already possible to reduce the proportion of population crashes significantly. The intervention is especially beneficial if I exceeds the length of the alert zone (here approximately 0.19). Crash occurrences are more than halved. With increasing number of observations, intervention performance obviously continues to improve. For 500 and 1,000 observations, crashes can be reduced by one order of magnitude in most simulations. Note that a wide range of I -values has been chosen; $I = 0.8$ induces a periodic cycle. Furthermore, we can observe that some intervention sizes are more effective than others. Around $I = 0.4$, intervention effectiveness seems to be centrally distributed. This can be easily explained from the perturbed Ricker map shown in Fig. 2. The second iterate after the intervention is situated around the hump, which is itself mapped into vicinity of the crash region. In this case interventions might be less effective, if the alert zone is only poorly approximated due to insufficient observations.

Effect of noise

Lastly, let us consider the effect of noise. Since we are primarily interested in the dynamics of small populations prone to extinction, we consider a demographic stochastic version of the Ricker map that adds a random variable E_t on the square root scale

$$x_{t+1} = \left(\sqrt{f(x_t)} + E_t \right)^2, \quad (3)$$

with $f(x_t)$ as in Eq. (1), E_t being a normal random variable with mean 0 and a constant standard deviation σ and E_0, E_1, E_2, \dots being uncorrelated. In the very rare case in which $\sqrt{f(x_t)} + E_t$ is negative, we replace it by 0 (cf. Cushing et al., 2003).

The proportion of population crashes observed for different standard deviations is shown in separate rows in Fig. 3. First of all, we observe that the proportion of crashes in the baseline scenario ($I = 0$) becomes more variable with increasing noise variance. It should be noted that the plots are therefore shown using slightly different ordinate scales. Once more, we see that the number of population crashes can already be effectively reduced based on 100 observations. For small noise ($\sigma = 0.01$), the general pattern looks very similar to the deterministic case: (i) With a greater number of observations, the method becomes increasingly effective. (ii) There is a critical intervention size that approximately corresponds to the width of the alert zone. However, the lengths of alert zones become wider in the stochastic case. As a consequence, the sharp transition observed around $I = 0.2$ in the deterministic scenario cannot be seen here. Noise tends to make all intervention sizes above the critical value equally effective. For intermediate noise levels ($\sigma = 0.05$), the clear distinction between super- and subcritical intervention sizes completely vanishes. Intervention effectiveness seems to scale exponentially with I (for long observations).




Figure 4: (a) Chaotic attractor of the deterministic LPA model (4-6). (b) Alert zones obtained from reconstructing outbreak paths in the state space leading to $A_{t'} > A^*$, using 10,000 observations. Parameter values: $b = 10.45$, $c_{EL} = 0.01731$, $c_{EA} = 0.0131$, $\mu_L = 0.2$, $\mu_A = 0.96$, $c_{PA} = 0.35$, $E_t = 0$, $A^* = 100$.

In the presence of strong noise ($\sigma = 0.1$), crashes appear to decrease linearly with intervention size. However, since alert zones become wider and wider with increasing noise variability, even large intervention sizes might fail to kick the trajectory out of the alert zone. Consequently, the “linearly” distributed effectiveness observed for large noise is the initial part of the scaling that in fact decreases exponentially with I (not shown here). Interestingly, intervention effectiveness becomes relatively independent of the number of observations available for stronger noise.

Application to a stage-structured insect population – preventing outbreaks

In this section, we apply the previously described method to a well-parameterized and investigated three-dimensional population model of the flour beetle *Tribolium castaneum* (Costantino et al., 1997; Cushing et al., 2003; Costantino et al., 2005, e.g.). The model is stage-structured and distinguishes between feeding larvae (L_t), nonfeeding larvae, pupae and callow adults (P_t) and sexually mature adults (A_t). Model equations with demographic stochasticity,




Figure 5: Effectiveness of the intervention method to prevent outbreaks of the stochastic LPA model (4-6). The outbreak proportion gives the fraction of states with $A_t > A^*$. The alert zones in which a number I of adults are added have been estimated with a number of available observations as indicated. Parameters as in Fig. 4 except $E_t \neq 0$ with $\Sigma_{11} = 2.332, \Sigma_{22} = 0.2364$ and all other entries of Σ being equal to 0 (Desharnais et al., 2001). Each of the 20 replicates has been started with different initial condition.

henceforth called LPA model, read (Desharnais et al., 2001)

$$L_t = \left(\sqrt{bA_{t-1} \exp(-c_{EL}L_{t-1} - c_{EA}A_{t-1})} + E_{1t} \right)^2, \quad (4)$$

$$P_t = \left(\sqrt{L_{t-1}(1 - \mu_L)} + E_{2t} \right)^2, \quad (5)$$

$$A_t = \left(\sqrt{P_{t-1} \exp(-c_{PA}A_{t-1}) + A_{t-1}(1 - \mu_A)} + E_{3t} \right)^2, \quad (6)$$

where b describes the number of larval recruits per adult, μ_L and μ_A mortality of larvae and adults, respectively, and c_{EL} and c_{EA} cannibalism of eggs by both larvae and adults and cannibalism of pupae by adults, respectively. The parameter c_{PA} denotes survival probability of pupae. Vector $E_t = (E_{1t}, E_{2t}, E_{3t})^T$ is made up by random noise terms with joint normal probability distribution with a mean vector of zeros and a variance-covariance matrix Σ . The deterministic version of system (4-6) can be obtained by setting $\Sigma = 0$ or, equivalently, $E_{1t} = E_{2t} = E_{3t} = 0$. For a certain range of parameter values the deterministic model shows chaotic oscillations that have also been obtained experimentally (Costantino et al., 1997). Fig. 4a shows the chaotic attractor of the deterministic LPA model, including distinct recurrent peaks of all state variables.

T. castaneum is a significant agricultural pest. Therefore, we aim to prevent it from attaining those ranges of the chaotic attractor that correspond to mass outbreaks. In contrast to the previous section, the undesirable regions are now large, instead of small, population sizes. However, we similarly confine desirable areas of the attractor by setting appropriate thresholds for the observable state variables. By way of example, we arbitrarily choose $A^* = 100$ and define system states (L_t, P_t, A_t) with $A_t > A^*$ as outbreaks. The next step in our method is to learn the paths that lead to an outbreak, i.e. to identify alert zones. Alert zones are now embedded in a three-dimensional state space. They actually turn out to be small bands of moderate length as shown in Fig. 4b for the deterministic case.

A point where intervention can be applied is the time step that immediately precedes the next outbreak, because the alert zone is very compact. We model the intervention by adding a certain number I of adult individuals. This technique to manipulate laboratory populations has been used in the experiments by Desharnais et al. (2001). In order to assess the impact and effectiveness of this intervention, we again use the LPA model (4-6) to simulate the dynamics and record the resulting fraction of outbreaks. Results are shown in Fig. 5 for time series of various lengths. Without any interventions, an average of almost 12% of measurements correspond to outbreaks of the flour beetle. This fraction declines significantly already for small intervention




Figure 6: Bifurcation diagram of the deterministic LPA model (4-6) with varying intervention sizes I (added number of adult individuals when the population state falls into the alert zone (L_t, P_t, A_t) with $0.218775 \leq L_t \leq 0.347568$, $168.265 \leq P_t \leq 218.44$, $1.07764 \leq A_t \leq 2.10249$ that has been estimated from 10,000 observations. Displayed are the asymptotic population numbers of adults after an initial period of 100 iterations. Model parameters as in Fig. 4.

sizes I . Surprisingly, our method can already be very effective and halve the number of mass outbreaks for as few as 50 observations. Even though intervention effectiveness is quite variable, there are only few instances in which there is no improvement. The longer the time series available for estimating the alert zone, the greater the reliability of these interventions. For 100 observations, most outbreaks can be reduced at least to three quarters and sometimes to a half, and for 200 or more observations, outbreaks can be reduced to a third or half at least. Moreover, intervention effectiveness becomes less variable and thus more reliable.

When there are enough observations to estimate the alert zones accurately, it is possible to identify a critical value for intervention size around $I = 2$, above which intervention effectiveness reaches a plateau. Again, this critical intervention size is a good approximation to the interval length of the A -component in the estimated alert zones.

Fig. 6 shows a bifurcation diagram of the LPA model (4-6) with $E_t = 0$ for varying intervention sizes I . It reveals the dynamics of the underlying deterministic system. In particular, it demonstrates that the system might abandon the chaotic regime following on intervention. A broad range of parameters generates cyclical fluctuations of various periodicities. We thus need to be very careful of whether the intervention may change the dynamics from chaos to periodicity, even if it is very successful in preventing outbreaks. For a substantial range of reasonable intervention sizes I , our method effectively inhibits outbreaks $A_t > A^* = 100$. For I sufficiently larger than the width of the A -interval in the alert zone, there are actually no outbreaks. Only for large values of I , roughly from $I = 8$ on, outbreaks occur again. This is probably due to a relocation of the perturbed system to a different dynamical regime. For interventions with such substantial sizes, the attractor, or parts of it, can be shifted in such a way that outbreaks are not covered by the alert zones originally estimated. However, this effect only occurs for intervention sizes that are not advisable anyway, since they are much larger than the minimum required size. Furthermore, this sudden deterioration of the intervention effectiveness does not occur in the stochastic system. Noise generally induces wider alert zones, which therefore also cover additionally emerging outbreak paths of the perturbed system. This is actually a beneficial effect for the performance of the presented method.

Discussion

chaotic fluctuations in population abundance may threaten ecosystem integrity by driving populations down (leading even to population extinctions) or up (corresponding to mass outbreaks with a multiplicity of possibly adverse effects). Controlling this situation seems to be intricate due to the erratic aspect of chaotic dynamics, but it is well-known that even complex dynamics obey some simple rules (cf. Rinaldi et al., 2001). We have presented an easy-to-implement method that can prevent both population crashes and outbreaks, or, more generally, any undesirable region of a chaotic attractor. This method consists of two steps. First, a time series of the population is analyzed to identify paths that lead to crashes or outbreaks. This elucidates and defines alert zones: whenever population abundance reaches one of these areas, it is very likely to attain an undesirable size within the near future. The second step is to manipulate population abundance to force it out of the dangerous path that would otherwise lead to the harmful state.

Our method has been tested in intensive numerical simulations of a general one-dimensional population model (Ricker map). It turns out to be also very effective in a more realistic and complicated model of the flour beetle that has been well parameterized in the laboratory. The applicability of our intervention, i.e., addition of adult individuals, has already been experimentally demonstrated by Desharnais et al. (2001). These authors were interested in the general effect of perturbations and identified “hot regions” of the attractor by calculating the local derivatives of the model equations – information that is usually hardly available in practice. In contrast, the method presented here just needs sampled abundances. Experimental addition of adults, however, turned out to dramatically dampen the oscillations. Further empirical evidence for successful interventions affecting population cycles has been provided recently in large-scale field experiments. The reduction of a certain amount of vertebrate predators (by live-trapping and removal of nest sites) prevented crashes of small rodents in Finland (Korpimäki and Norrdahl, 1998). Similarly, the elimination of parasites in red grouse (by treatment with anthelmintics) prevented population crashes in northern England (Hudson et al., 1998).

Theoretical work, that is related to this study, is by Yang et al. (1995) and Dhamala and Lai (1999) as well as Shulenburg et al. (1999). Their attention, however, was focused on the case of transient chaos, i.e., when the chaotic attractor has actually lost its stability. Piccardi (2004) presented an interesting approach using time series analysis to reduce outbreak size in a chaotic epidemiological model. However, the results presented here are, to our knowledge, the first systematic investigation in an ecologically applicable context. In particular, we take into account the amount of available data as well as varying intervention sizes. Our method is robust in the presence of noise and does not require any knowledge of the system equations.

There are, however, some possible limitations of our method. First, the available data need to contain a certain amount of crashes or outbreaks, so that one can identify a sufficient number of risk paths. The less frequent those events are, the longer the time series needs to be. To overcome this difficulty, one might modify risk threshold definitions or implement a stronger perturbation. Second, the alert zone would ideally be rather small but its definition depends on data availability. One might wish to apply interventions not too frequently, e.g. for economical or conservationist reasons. For example, noise generally widens alert zones which increases the intervention effectiveness, but requires to intervene more often. Within this paper, we investigated intervention sizes, but not the intervention frequency. Implementation of this method will also face the problem of determining exact abundance or imperfect application of an intervention. In multi-species systems, not all species might be accessible for observation or intervention. However, even in this case phase space methods such as delay and other embeddings still allow to reconstruct attractor dynamics (Kantz and Schreiber, 2004).

The approach presented here is not only highly effective in avoiding undesired events, but can also maintain chaotic dynamics. We found that there is a critical intervention size that depends

on the width of the estimated alert zone, and a good choice would be an intervention size just larger than this width. However, the maintenance of chaos is not guaranteed for all intervention sizes, i.e., the dynamics might get stabilized to fixed points or periodic oscillations. Though this can be beneficial in some situations, this might be undesirable in others, cf. the introduction. A simple refinement might solve this problem: varying intervention size over time so that the system maintains chaotic dynamics. Therefore we outline two possible research directions. First, environmental and demographic noise could be used to smooth out sharp dynamical transitions and may induce chaos in parameter regions where there is no chaos otherwise (Crutchfield et al., 1982). Lai et al. (2003) have shown that there is a critical noise level above which there is an intermittent behaviour in which the trajectory visits an unstable chaotic saddle coexisting in a periodic window. Second, there is a number of algorithms that can be used to sustain chaos (In et al., 1995; Nagai and Lai, 1995; Parmananda and Eiwirth, 1996) and that might be utilized for the current situation. However, to apply them to practical ecological situations, they should be adapted to perform with small data sets only and to require neither any knowledge of the system dynamics nor the existence of certain dynamical regimes.

Notably, 50 observations yield sufficient information of the system to implement adequate interventions aimed to reduce flour beetle outbreaks. This amount of information is typically available in ecological time series. Full population viability analyses of endangered species, in contrast, continue to demand datasets that are only rarely available (e.g. Coulson et al., 2001). We therefore find the results of the presented approach encouraging to stimulate further refinements and to be tested in real situations. Our method might prove useful in resource management and contribute to improve regulation of population crashes, extinctions and outbreaks, thus aiding areas as seemingly disparate as conservation biology, control of pest species, biological invasions and risk analysis.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Natalia Mantilla-Beniers, Nico Stollenwerk, Ned Corron, Thomas Hillen and Horst Malchow for helpful discussions and comments on the manuscript. FMH acknowledges support from a Marie Curie, Alberta Ingenuity and Honorary Killam postdoctoral fellowship.

References

- Allee, W. C. (1931). *Animal aggregations: A study in general sociology*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Allen, J. C., Schaffer, W. M., Rosko, D. (1993). Chaos reduces species extinction by amplifying local population noise. *Nature* 364, 229–232.
- Becks, L., Hilker, F. M., Malchow, H., Jürgens, K., Arndt, H. (2005). Experimental demonstration of chaos in a microbial food web. *Nature* 435, 1226–1229.
- Belovsky, G. E., Mellison, C., Larson, C., Van Zandt, P. A. (1999). Experimental studies of extinction dynamics. *Science* 286, 1175–1177.
- Berryman, A. A. (1987). The theory and classification of outbreaks. In *Insect outbreaks* (Barbosa, P., Schultz, J. C., eds.). Academic Press, San Diego, pp. 3–30.
- Berryman, A. A., Millstein, J. A. (1989). Are ecological systems chaotic - and if not, why not? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 4(1), 26–28.

- Boyce, M. S. (1992). Population viability analysis. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 23, 481–506.
- Costantino, R. F., Desharnais, R. A., Cushing, J. M., Dennis, B. (1997). Chaotic dynamics in an insect population. *Science* 275, 389–391.
- Costantino, R. F., Desharnais, R. A., Cushing, J. M., Dennis, B., Henson, S. M., King, A. A. (2005). Nonlinear stochastic population dynamics: The flour beetle *Tribolium* as an effective tool of discovery. *Advances in Ecological Research* 37, 101–141.
- Coulson, T., Mace, G. M., Hudson, E., Possingham, H. (2001). The use and abuse of population viability analysis. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 16(5), 219–221.
- Crutchfield, J. P., Farmer, J. D., Huberman, B. A. (1982). Fluctuations and simple chaotic dynamics. *Physics Reports* 92(2), 45–82.
- Cushing, J. M., Costantino, R. F., Dennis, B., Desharnais, R. A., Henson, S. M. (2003). *Chaos in ecology. Experimental nonlinear dynamics*. Academic Press, San Diego.
- Desharnais, R. A., Costantino, R. F., Cushing, J. M., Henson, S. M., Dennis, B. (2001). Chaos and population control of insect outbreaks. *Ecology Letters* 4, 229–235.
- Dhamala, M., Lai, Y.-C. (1999). Controlling transient chaos in deterministic flows with applications to electrical power systems and ecology. *Physical Review E* 59(2), 1646–1655.
- Dwyer, G., Dushoff, J., Yee, S. H. (2004). The combined effects of pathogens and predators on insect outbreaks. *Nature* 430, 341–345.
- Fagan, W. F., Meir, E., Prendergast, J., Folarin, A., Karieva, P. (2001). Characterizing population vulnerability for 758 species. *Ecology Letters* 4, 132–138.
- Ferrière, R., Gatto, M. (1993). Chaotic population dynamics can result from natural selection. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 251, 33–38.
- Gilpin, M. E., Soulé, M. E. (1986). Minimum viable populations: the process of species extinctions. In *Conservation biology: The science of scarcity and diversity* (Soulé, M. E., ed.). Sinauer, Sunderland, pp. 13–34.
- Hallegraeff, G. M. (1993). A review of harmful algal blooms and their apparent global increase. *Phycologia* 32(2), 79–99.
- Harding, K. C., McNamara, J. M. (2002). A unifying framework for metapopulation dynamics. *The American Naturalist* 160(2), 173–185.
- Hilker, F. M., Westerhoff, F. H. (2006). Paradox of simple limiter control. *Physical Review E* 73(5), 052901.
- Hovestadt, T., Poethke, H. J. (2006). The control of emigration and its consequences for the survival of populations. *Ecological Modelling* 190, 443–453.
- Hudson, P. J., Dobson, A. P., Newborn, D. (1998). Prevention of population cycles by parasite removal. *Science* 282, 2256–2258.
- Huisman, J., Weissing, F. J. (1999). Biodiversity of plankton by species oscillations and chaos. *Nature* 402, 407–410.

- In, V., Mahan, S. E., Ditto, W. L., Spano, M. L. (1995). Experimental maintenance of chaos. *Physical Review Letters* 74(22), 4420–4423.
- Kantz, H., Schreiber, T. (2004). *Nonlinear time series analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd edition.
- Korpimäki, E., Norrdahl, K. (1998). Experimental reduction of predators reverses the crash phase of small-rodent cycles. *Ecology* 79(7), 2448–2455.
- Lai, Y.-C., Liu, Z., Billings, L., Schwartz, I. B. (2003). Noise-induced unstable dimension variability and transition to chaos in random dynamical systems. *Physical Review E* 67, 026210.
- Lande, R. (1987). Extinction thresholds in demographic models of territorial populations. *The American Naturalist* 130(4), 624–635.
- Lande, R. (1988). Genetics and demography in biological conservation. *Science* 241, 1455–1460.
- May, R. M. (1974). Biological populations with nonoverlapping generations: stable points, stable cycles, and chaos. *Science* 186, 645–647.
- McCallum, H. I. (1992). Effects of immigration on chaotic population dynamics. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 154, 277–284.
- Nagai, Y., Lai, Y.-C. (1995). Selection of a desirable chaotic phase using small feedback control. *Physical Review E* 51(5), 3842–3848.
- Ott, E., Grebogi, C., Yorke, J. A. (1990). Controlling chaos. *Physical Review Letters* 64(11), 1196–1199.
- Parmananda, P., Eiswirth, M. (1996). Suppressing large excursions to a chaotic attractor using occasional feedback control. *Physical Review E* 54(2), R1036–R1039.
- Parthasarathy, S., Sinha, S. (1995). Controlling chaos in unidimensional maps using constant feedback. *Physical Review E* 51(6), 6239–6242.
- Perry, J. N., Smith, R. H., Woivod, I. P., Morse, D. R. (eds.) (2000). *Chaos in real data. Analysis of non-linear dynamics from short ecological time series*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Piccardi, C. (2004). On the control of chaotic systems via symbolic time series analysis. *Chaos* 14(4), 1026–1034.
- Pimm, S. L., Jones, H. L., Diamond, J. (1988). On the risk of extinction. *The American Naturalist* 132(6), 757–785.
- Ricker, W. E. (1954). Stock and recruitment. *Journal of Fisheries Research Board of Canada* 11, 559–623.
- Rinaldi, S., Candaten, M., Casagrandi, R. (2001). Evidence of peak-to-peak dynamics in ecology. *Ecology Letters* 4, 610–617.
- Ruxton, G. D. (1994). Low levels of immigration between chaotic populations can reduce system extinctions by inducing asynchronous regular cycles. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 256, 189–193.

- Scheffer, M. (1991). Should we expect strange attractors behind plankton dynamics - and if so, should we bother? *Journal of Plankton Research* 13(6), 1291–1305.
- Schreiber, S. J. (2001). Chaos and population disappearances in simple ecological models. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 42, 239–260.
- Shaffer, M. L. (1981). Minimum population sizes for species conservation. *BioScience* 31(2), 131–134.
- Shulenburger, L., Lai, Y.-C., Yalçinkaya, T., Holt, R. D. (1999). Controlling transient chaos to prevent species extinction. *Physics Letters A* 260(1-2), 156–161.
- Sinha, S., Parthasarathy, S. (1996). Unusual dynamics of extinction in a simple ecological model. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 93, 1504–1508.
- Solé, R. V., Gamarra, J. G. P., Ginovart, M., López, D. (1999). Controlling chaos in ecology: from deterministic to individual-based models. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 61, 1187–1207.
- Soulé, M. E. (1987). *Viable populations for conservations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Stephens, P. A., Sutherland, W. J., Freckleton, R. P. (1999). What is the Allee effect? *Oikos* 87(1), 185–190.
- Stone, L. (1993). Period-doubling reversals and chaos in simple ecological models. *Nature* 365, 617–620.
- Thomas, W. R., Pomerantz, M. J., Gilpin, M. E. (1980). Chaos, asymmetric growth and group selection for dynamical stability. *Ecology* 61(6), 1312–1320.
- Turchin, P. (2003). *Complex population dynamics. A theoretical/empirical synthesis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton NJ.
- Yang, W., Ding, M., Mandell, A. J., Ott, E. (1995). Preserving chaos: Control strategies to preserve complex dynamics with potential relevance to biological disorders. *Physical Review E* 51(1), 102–110.