

Nestedness and degree distributions are necessarily linked in mutualist systems

Enrique Burgos¹, Horacio Ceva¹, Roberto P.J. Perazzo²,
Mariano Devoto³, Diego Medán³, Martín Zimmermann⁴, Mariana Delbue⁵

¹*Departamento de Física, Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica,
Avda. del Libertador 8250, 1429 Buenos Aires, Argentina*

²*Departamento de Investigación y Desarrollo,
Instituto Tecnológico de Buenos Aires,
Avda. E. Madero 399, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

³*Cátedra de Botánica, Facultad de Agronomía, Universidad de Buenos Aires,
Avda. San Martín 4454, 1417DSE Buenos Aires, Argentina*

⁴*Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales,
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Pab. 1 Ciudad Universitaria, Buenos Aires, Argentina*

⁵*Departamento de Economía, Facultad de Ciencias
Sociales y Económicas, Universidad Católica Argentina,
Av. A. Moreau de Justo 1400, 1107 Buenos Aires, Argentina*

Abstract

It has been observed that the adjacency matrices associated to real mutualistic bipartite networks are nested. In addition, the degree distributions associated to the two kinds of species that are involved in these types of networks approximately follow a truncated power law. We show how these two seemingly disconnected features are in fact two ways of looking to the same data. Thus, nestedness can never appear without a truncated power law for the degree distributions and vice versa. We also show that the cumulative degree distributions provide a direct experimental measure of the extinction curve of the system. As a consequence of these considerations we show that the truncation of the degree distributions are a finite size effect and should not be attributed to any biological reason.

I. INTRODUCTION

The co-existence and interaction of plants and animals on Earth has given rise to mutual adaptations of the most variegated type. A particularly important type is that of mutualistic interactions in which species may play an important role on each other. For example, birds feed from fruits while they disperse the seeds; insects feed from the nectar of flowers pollinating them in the process [1].

A great amount of research has been devoted to study mutualism as a community-level phenomenon [2]. In traditional studies, the interaction of all active plant and animal species is recorded within a restricted geographical extension [3]; [4]. A standard graphical description of these systems can be made through bipartite networks in which nodes (species) are linked (interact) only with nodes of the opposite guild (plants with animals and vice versa) [5]. These networks may also be mathematically depicted by an adjacency matrix where rows and columns represent respectively the two guilds of species, and a 1 in the intersection of a row and a column indicates that the corresponding species interact, and alternatively a 0 indicates they do not.

The network-level pattern of interactions among the mutualist species can also be described through the degree distribution, i.e., the number of nodes for every degree value (number of links). In graph theory, this distribution plays a key role because it provides valuable hints about the internal structure of the network and, hence, about some behavioural pattern of the species represented by its nodes [5].

When analysed through the two above elements, real mutualistic networks display a remarkable degree of internal organization. On the one hand, the adjacency matrix displays what is known as nestedness [6], [7]. This corresponds to a concentration of the 1's in one corner of the matrix, provided that rows and columns have been reordered by increasing number of links. On the other hand, most observed degree distributions fit a power-law or truncated power-law function [8]. Both features indicate that mutualistic networks are far from being a random collection of nodes and links. If this were the case, all the 1's of the contact matrix should appear randomly distributed and the degree distribution should fit a Poisson distribution.

Both power-law degree distributions as well as nestedness have been associated to a high tolerance of pollination networks to species extinctions [3] [9] and unexpected perturbations

[7]. However, the underlying causes of both features have not yet been properly established. A remarkable fact of nestedness and power-law (including its truncated variants) patterns is that both always co-occur: nested systems tend to have power-law degree distributions of links and vice versa, suggesting that both features are, in fact, “two sides of the same coin”. Supporting this view, we showed in a previous paper that both features of bipartite mutualistic networks simultaneously emerge as a consequence of a simple model in which species are allowed to reshape their pattern of interactions following a given criteria. In addition the model has been successfully benchmarked against a number of real mutualistic systems [10].

Although the above evidence strongly suggests that nestedness and power-laws are not independent, to our knowledge no effort has been made so far to link them conceptually or, even less, analytically. However, some partial conceptual explanations have been developed. It has been proposed that the occurrence of a power-law may result from the assembly of the network through a preferential attachment criterion, namely that new species added tend to establish interactions preferentially with already well-connected species of the opposite guild [11]. Moreover, it has been hypothesized that truncation of the power-law may be due to the presence either of random interactions [9] or of forbidden links [8], i.e., interactions that can not take place because of some biological impossibility such as morphological mismatch or lack of phenological overlap between a given pair of species.

We analytically demonstrate here, for the first time, that a system can not show a nested pattern of interaction without presenting at the same time a truncated power law for the degree distribution, and vice versa. In addition, we show how the cumulative degree distributions can be used to derive a direct measure of the degree of nestedness of the network instead of resorting to less straightforward geometrical criteria which, albeit being intuitively sound, are not directly deducible from the network properties (see [10] and [12]). Our analysis also helps to understand why the power laws that are experimentally observed appear to be truncated and provides a mathematical explanation for it without resorting to any other ad hoc hypothesis. Finally, we also show that in general, the degree distributions of either plant and animal species of a given mutualist system are not independent, therefore, once one is known the other can be derived from pure mathematical relations. This feature provides an important check for the consistency of the experimental observations.

II. THE NESTEDNESS OF A NETWORK AND THE EXTINCTION CURVE

A widely used tool to measure the degree of nestedness of a mutualistic network was developed by Atmar & Patterson [12] who originally conceived it to describe how an array of various species were distributed in a set of islands of different sizes. They found a pattern in which bigger islands hosted a larger number of species and, in turn, smaller islands hosted fewer species but in such a way that the species found in smaller islands represented a subset of those species found in larger ones. Such pattern was thus defined as “nested” and, as described in the previous section, is represented by an approximately triangular shape of the distribution of 1’s in the adjacency matrix. In addition, perfect nestedness is achieved when all 1’s are within a region of the matrix delimited by an extinction curve.

By quantifying the departure from this perfectly nested theoretical matrix, A&P proposed a measure of the disorder of a real network, expressed as a temperature, which has been widely used both in biogeography and community ecology. However, although the extinction curve represents an intuitively sound and apparently straightforward approximation to a perfectly nested distribution, on a closer view some caveats arise concerning its utility as a tool to analyze interaction networks. The curve is said to be a function of the number of islands, the number of species and the probability of contact between them, but its mathematical definition is not clearly linked to any biological or statistical consideration.

If n and m are respectively the number of columns and rows of the matrix and ϕ is the probability of a contact between both kinds of species, a perfectly ordered matrix is expected to concentrate the $nm\phi$ 1’s in a region similar to the one limited by the two straight lines UW_1 and UW_2 shown in Fig. 1, where U is the point of coordinates $(n\phi, m\phi)$. The extinction curve is however not expected to involve straight lines or vertices [12]. It is therefore represented by a function that is a continuous modification of the straight segments.

We provide below an analytic expression of the extinction curve. In Ref. [12] neither the derivation of the curve nor its analytic expression are provided. In spite of the fact that the our curve has all the same properties as that of Ref. [12], we can not prove that both are exactly the same. The only evidence that we can obtain is numerical. The self organization model presented in Ref.[10] asymptotically approaches a configuration having zero temperature as provided by the “Nestedness Calculator” [13] that uses the unknown extinction curve




FIG. 1: A matrix of n columns and m rows is shown together with the extinction curve that corresponds to a probability of contact ϕ between the two mutualistic species. The area limited by each branch of the curve is $nm\phi/2$ and it is the same as either of that the two triangles $T_1 \equiv OUW_1$ and $T_2 \equiv OUW_2$. The extinction curve is a smooth distortion of the two straight lines UW_1 and UW_2 . The segment d is parallel to the diagonal of the matrix and indicates the way in which is measured the distance of any point of the straight lines to the sides of the matrix.

of Ref. [12]. This means that such asymptotic, perfectly ordered system coincides with it. On the other hand, such ordered pattern of contacts coincides with the presently derived extinction curve thus proving that, except for possible numerical uncertainties, both curves are the same. We describe the extinction curve in terms of the two continuous variables a ($0 \leq a \leq n$) and p ($0 \leq p \leq m$) that can be assimilated respectively to the columns (animal species) and rows (plant species) of the adjacency matrix. This approximation may be considered to be exact in the limit of very large systems.

It is convenient to consider separately the two branches of the extinction curve, lying respectively below (branch 1) and above (branch 2) the diagonal of the adjacency matrix (see Fig.1).

To begin with, we write the coordinates (a', p') of each point of the segment UW_1 as $a' = \beta + d \cos \theta = \beta + d n/D$, and $p' = d \sin \theta = d m/D$, where the segment d is parallel to the main diagonal, $D = \sqrt{n^2 + m^2}$, and β is a parameter ($0 < \beta < n$). Next, we map each point (a', p') of the segment UW_1 into the corresponding point (a_1, p_1) on the branch-1; we do

this by means of a continuous stretching or shortening of each segment d . More specifically, this amounts to multiply d by a factor $(d/d_0)^\mu$, where d_0 is the d -segment associated with the crossing point of branch-1 and UW_1 . Hence, using $d/\phi D = (n - \beta)/n$, the Cartesian coordinates a_1 and p_1 of the points of branch-1, are:

$$a_1 = \beta + \frac{n}{D}d [d/d_0]^\mu = \beta + \phi (n - \beta) \left(\phi D \frac{n - \beta}{n d_0} \right)^\mu \quad (1)$$

$$p_1 = \frac{m}{D}d [d/d_0]^\mu = m\phi \frac{(n - \beta)}{n} \left(\phi D \frac{n - \beta}{n d_0} \right)^\mu \quad (2)$$

A completely analogous set of equations can be found for branch 2. We use for this case the parameter η ($0 < \eta < m$) playing a role analogous to β in the previous expression:

$$a_2 = \frac{n}{D}d [d/d_0]^\mu = n\phi \frac{(m - \eta)}{m} \left(\phi D \frac{m - \eta}{m d_0} \right)^\mu \quad (3)$$

$$p_2 = \eta + \frac{m}{D}d [d/d_0]^\mu = \eta + \phi (m - \eta) \left(\phi D \frac{m - \eta}{m d_0} \right)^\mu \quad (4)$$

The constants d_0 and μ are determined by imposing that the area limited by the extinction curve is $nm\phi$ and that both branches of the curve match at the diagonal with continuity of its derivative. The two conditions correspond to:

$$1 = \phi(\mu + 1)(\mu + 2) \quad (5)$$

$$d_0^\mu = (\phi D)^\mu 2\phi(\mu + 1) \quad (6)$$

that completely specify the extinction curve. Therefore, we have built up a couple of parametric equations for each branch, with parameters β and η , respectively.

III. THE EXTINCTION CURVE AND THE DEGREE DISTRIBUTION

The extinction curve presented above contains also the information of the two degree distributions for rows and columns. This is so because it tells which is the number of contacts of each species with its mutualist counterparts. In graph theory parlance this is the degree of each node of the bipartite graph. One further step is needed to link the extinction curve to the degree distribution because the latter measures *how many* animal or plant species have the *same* degree (in what follows for shortness we will omit the word species, and refer to plants and animals).

To trace the relationship of the extinction curve with the degree distributions of plants or animals (rows and columns), we write it as $p = p(a)$. We assume that all plants p and

animals a have been ordered in such a way that $p(a)$ is a monotonous decreasing function. A different way of reading this curve is by realizing that a point (a_o, p_o) (see Fig.2) is directly related to the degree of animals and plants. Indeed the value p_o indicates the degree of the animal a_o and vice versa, a_o indicates the degree of the plant p_o . Since the curve is monotonous, a_o is also the number of animals that are connected to p_o *or more* plants (shaded area in Fig.2) and, equivalently, p_o is the number of plants that are connected to a_o *or more* animals (shaded area in Fig.2). This indicates that the extinction curve can also be read as a *cumulative degree distribution*.

These cumulative distributions are reported in the literature with no reference to the extinction curve, and are usually normalized to 1. In Fig.3 we show an example of the direct comparison of the extinction curve with the two possible cumulative degree distributions for plants and animals. The example is taken from a real system as reported by Robertson in [14]. In order to compare them with the extinction curve the two cumulative degree distributions are *not* normalized as they are usually shown in the literature; in addition the distribution of the degrees of plants must be read as referred to the vertical axis, while the one of animals must be referred to the horizontal axis. The endpoint at $a \simeq 300; p \simeq 1$ (indicated with an arrow in Fig.3 indicates that there are no plants that are connected to more than 300 animals. Analogously, the endpoint at $a \simeq 1; p \simeq 240$ indicates that there are no animals with a degree greater than 240. In a perfectly ordered system, i.e. one with vanishing temperature, both degree distributions would have reached the two corners of the matrix, namely $a = 456; p = 1$ and $a = 1; p = 1428$.

From the above arguments one can readily see that the regular degree distributions can be related to either of the two possible derivatives of the extinction curve $dp(a)/da$ or $da(p)/dp$ where $a(p)$ is the inverse function of $p(a)$. Alternatively this can be seen by approximating the extinction curve by a stair-like function obtained by dividing the a -axis into equal bins of a width Δa (see Fig.2). The extinction curve may thus be replaced by a stair-like line in which all steps have the same width Δa and a varying height. Within this approximation all the plants belonging to the same step of the stair are Δp in number, and have the same degree that is equal to the value a_o that is at the center of the interval Δa . Since $\Delta p \simeq \Delta a |dp(a)/da|$ it follows that, in the limit in which $\Delta a \simeq 1 \ll a_{max}$, the stair-like curve approaches the extinction curve and the (ordinary) degree distribution of the animals can well be approximated by the derivative $|dp(a)/da|$ as anticipated above. The absolute




FIG. 2: Example of an extinction curve for an arbitrary adjacency matrix of 1500 animal species (columns) and 500 plant species (rows) and $\phi = 0.2$. The shaded area with lines from top right to bottom left indicates the number of animal species with degree p_o or more and the shaded area with lines top left to bottom right indicates the number of plant species with degree a_o or more. A discrete stair-like approximation with steps of constant width Δa is included in order to obtain the degree distribution of the animal species (columns).

value is inserted to insure that the degree distribution is a positive number. A completely similar argument can be made for plants, reading the extinction curve as $a = a(p)$ and approximating it by a stair-like curve with steps of equal height Δp and varying widths Δa .

In the left panel of Fig 4 we show as an example the log-log plot of the analytic expressions of both degree distributions for an experimentally observed adjacency matrix [14]. As can readily be seen both have the shape of truncated power laws. Within the present derivations it is not necessary to resort to forbidden links or any other biological justification to explain the truncation of the power law of the degree distribution. This is seen to be due only to the finite size of the adjacency matrix. For an infinite, nested bipartite network such truncation would never appear. For a finite matrix a truncation must instead necessarily appear in the degree distributions because the degree of a column species can never exceed the number of




FIG. 3: We show the experimental data of the two possible cumulative degree distributions for animal species (circles) and plant species (black triangles) for the system described in Ref. [14]. It involves 1428 animals and 456 plants and the adjacency matrix has $\phi = .023$. The continuous curve is the extinction curve obtained with the analytic expressions reported above. The endpoints of the cumulative degree distributions are indicated by arrows. Since both distributions are referred respectively to the horizontal and vertical axis, circles should be read from right to left, and triangles from top to bottom.

row species and vice versa.

The two degree distributions for rows and columns are related to the two possible derivatives of the extinction curve, namely one in which a is the independent variable and the other in which p plays that role. A way to relate the derivative $dp(a)/da$ with that of the inverse function $da(p)/dp$ is by realizing that both functions are related to each other in the same way as branch-1 (in Eqs.(1,2)) and branch-2 (in Eqs.(3,4)). In fact the function $a(p)$ can be mapped into $p(a)$ in the same way. This can be made by setting $\eta/m = \beta/n$ and realizing that then $a_1; p_1; a_2$ and p_2 fulfill:

$$ma_2 = np_1 \quad ; \quad np_2 = ma_1 \quad (7)$$

By choosing first a as the independent variable and next p , the degree distributions are

$$\frac{dp_1}{da_1} = \frac{dp_1/d\beta}{da_1/d\beta} \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{da_2}{dp_2} = \frac{da_2/d\eta}{dp_2/d\eta} \quad (9)$$

and, by using Eq.(7), both remain related as

$$\frac{da_2}{dp_2} = \left(\frac{n}{m}\right)^2 \frac{dp_1}{da_1}; \quad \frac{da_1}{dp_1} = \left(\frac{n}{m}\right)^2 \frac{dp_2}{da_2} \quad (10)$$

These equations indicate that if both distributions are plotted as usually in a log-log plot (using in each case the proper independent variable), they show the same slope, thus approaching a power law with the same exponent ν . According to the above equations both curves can be made to collapse into each other. This requires to stretch the x-axis of one of the degree distributions by a factor equal to the ratio of the two dimensions of the adjacency matrix (as suggested by Eq.(7), and, next one must divide the resultant distribution by the square of the same factor as indicated in Eq.(10).

This mapping is exactly fulfilled only by the analytic curves but is only approximately fulfilled by the empirical data. In Fig (4) we show the experimental degree distributions of rows and columns of the Robertson matrix together with the distributions obtained from the derivatives of the extinction curve. The comparatively small departures that can be observed between empirical data and the theoretical curves are to be attributed to the fact that the real system does not correspond to a perfectly nested bipartite network. The agreement should be expected to improve for systems with a greater nestedness.

In the right panel we show how the two degree distributions collapse into each other after the renormalization of the column data following the prescription explained above. The two analytic curves are exactly superimposed. The empirical data of rows and columns are seen to show quite similar slope as predicted by the theory. In spite of the fact that both degree distributions show sizable fluctuations for large degrees, are seen to be quite consistent with each other once the renormalization procedure is carried over.

The exponent ν of the power law associated to the degree distributions can also be discussed with the aid of Eqs.(2) through (6). In the limit $a/n \rightarrow 0$ the degree distribution approaches the power law $(a/n)^{-\mu/(\mu+1)}$. On the other hand from Eq.(6) it follows that μ is the positive root of the equation $1 = \phi(\mu + 1)(\mu + 2)$. We therefore conclude that $\nu = -\mu/(\mu + 1)$ is only a function of the probability of contacts between mutualist counterparts and is therefore independent of the number of species involved in the system.




FIG. 4: Left panel: The empirical degree distributions for rows (open squares) and columns (filled triangles) for the adjacency matrix of the Robertson system, are shown together with the corresponding distributions derived from the extinction curve (rows: continuous line; columns: dashed line) for a matrix with the same dimensions and probability of contact ϕ than those empirically observed. Right panel: The same as in the left panel but in which the data for columns is renormalized according to the prescription given in the text.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The two distinct features of mutualistic networks, namely its nestedness and the truncated power law for the degree distribution have been hitherto considered in the literature to be independent features. We have shown that both are actually two ways of looking at the same data and they therefore should not be considered to be unrelated. In fact one can never occur without the other and the same biological arguments should be applied to understand both features. Both are in turn the evidence of the internal ordering of the mutualistic network. This order or rather, its disorder, can quantitatively be estimated through a temperature parameter introduced in Ref.[12] that measures how a real system departs from the perfect ordering implied in the extinction curve.

In a preceding paper [10] we have shown that nestedness as well as the truncated power-law degree distribution can be attributed to a pattern of internal organization by which species tend to concentrate their contacts with more heavily contacted counterparts. Thus, the power law for the degree distribution may be regarded as the signature of a kind of

(bipartite) preferential attachment.

We have shown that the cumulative degree distributions provide a direct measure of the extinction curve provided that they are not normalized as are usually presented in the literature. The normal degree distributions for rows and columns can therefore be related to the derivatives of the extinction curve. We have also proved that the two degree distributions of a same contact matrix are very closely related to each other. In fact a very simple geometric trick can be used to map one set of data into the other thus checking the consistency of the empirical observations, or to put it into a different language, to achieve a more significant statistical significance of the experimental data.

We also show that the fact that both the degree distributions and the extinction curve approach a truncated power law can in fact be proven mathematically. The exponent of such power laws can also be deduced for perfectly nested systems and only depends upon the probability of contacts between the mutualists. This is a universal property that allows a direct comparison between different systems. On the other hand, these considerations help to understand also the widely observed truncation of the power law adjusting the degree distribution. This should in general not be attributed to any particular phenological reason but rather to the fact that real, mutualistic networks are far from being infinite and its statistical features bear very strong finite size effects.

-
- [1] Herrera, C.M. and O. Pellmyr (eds.). 2002. Plant-animal interactions. An evolutionary approach. Oxford, Blackwell Science.
 - [2] Waser N. and Ollerton J. (eds.). 2006. Plant-pollinator interactions. From specialization to generalization. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
 - [3] Memmott J., Waser N.M. & Price M.V. 2004. Tolerance of pollination networks to species extinctions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 271: 2605-2611.
 - [4] Medan, D., N.H. Montaldo, M. Devoto, A. Mantese, V. Vasellati, G.G. Roitman & N.H. Bartoloni 2002. Plant-pollinator relationships at two altitudes in the Andes of Mendoza, Argentina. *Arctic, Antarctic and Alpine Research* [ISSN: 1523-0430] 34: 233-241.
 - [5] Albert A. & Barabási A.-L. (2002). Statistical mechanics of complex networks *Rev. of Modern Physics* 74: 47-97

- [6] Petanidou T. & Ellis W.N. 1993. Pollinating fauna of a phryganic ecosystem: composition and diversity. *Biodiversity Letters* 1: 9-22.
- [7] Bascompte J., Jordano P., Melián C.J. & Olesen J.M. 2003. The nested assembly of plant-animal mutualistic networks. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* 100: 9383-9387.
- [8] Jordano P., Bascompte J. & Olesen J.M. 2003. Invariant properties in coevolutionary networks of plant-animal interactions. *Ecol. Letters* 6: 69-81.
- [9] Vázquez D.P. Degree distribution in plant animal mutualistic networks: forbidden links or random interactions? *Oikos* 108: 421-427.
- [10] Medan D., Perazzo R.P.J., Devoto M., Zimmermann, Ceva. H, Burgos E., Delbue A.M. Nestedness in mutualistic networks emerges from a modified rule of preferential attachment. [q-bio.PE/0605026](https://arxiv.org/abs/q-bio/0605026)
- [11] Guimarães Jr P.R, Aguiar M.A.M., Bascompte J., Jordano P. & Furtado dos Reis S. 2005. Random initial condition in small Barabasi-Albert networks and deviations from the scale-free behavior. *Physical Review E* 71.037101
- [12] Atmar W. & Patterson B.D. 1993. The measure of order and disorder in the distribution of species in fragmented habitat. *Oecologia* 96: 373-382.
- [13] Atmar W. & B.D. Patterson 1995. 'The nestedness temperature calculator'. AICS Research Inc., University Park, NM and The Field Museum, Chicago, Ill.
- [14] Robertson C. 1929. *Flowers and insects: lists of visitors to four hundred and fifty-three flowers.* Carlinville, C. Robertson.