

Community fluctuations and local extinction in a planktonic food web

Journal:	Ecology Letters
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Letters
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Segura, Angel; Universidad de la Republica Uruguay - Centro Universitario de la Region Este - Sede Rocha, Rocha Calliari, Danilo; Universidad de la Republica, Facultad de Ciencias, Ecologiia, Seccion Oceanografiia Lan, Leong; Monash University, School of Science Fort, Hugo; Universidad de la República, Institute of Physics Widdicombe, Claire; PML, MLSS Harmer, Rachel; PML, MLSS Arim, Matias; Centro Universitario Regional Este (CURE), Universidad de la República, Ecología Teórica y Aplicada; Facultad de Ciencias, universidad de la República, Ecología y Evolución
Key Words:	macroecology, plankton, food web, fluctuations, Station L4, English channel

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts



Ecology Letters

2		
3 4 5	1	Community fluctuations and local extinction in a planktonic food web
6		
7 8	2	Short title: Fluctuations and extinction in the plankton
9 10 11	3	Authors: Segura, A.M. ^a , Calliari, D. ^a , Lan, B.L. ^{b,c} , Fort, H. ^b , Widdicombe, C.E. ^d Harmer, R. ^{d,e} , Arím,
12 13	4	M. ^a
14 15	5	Running title: Community stability and local extinction
16 17		Affiliations
18 19 20	6	^a Universidad de la República, Centro Universitario Regional Este
20 21 22	7	^b Universidad de la República, Physics Institute, Complex systems group, Montevideo, Uruguay
23 24	8	^c Electrical and Computer Systems Engineering, School of Engineering, Monash University, 47500 Bandar Sunway,
25 26	9	Malaysia
27 28	10	^d Plymouth Marine Laboratory, Prospect Place, West Hoe, Plymouth PL1 3DH, United Kingdom
29 30	11	^e Institut für Hydrobiologie und Fischereiwissenschaft, Universität Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
31 32		Corresponding author:
33 34		Angel M. Segura
35 36 37		Centro Universitario Región Este, Ruta 9 y 15, P.C. 27000, Rocha, Uruguay
38 39		e-mail: <u>asegura@cure.edu.uy</u>
40 41		Type: Letter
42 43 44		# of words: 3023 in abstract: 251
45 46		# Figures: 4
47 48 49		# Citations: 41
50 51		Authorship: A.M.S. Designed and performed analysis and wrote a first draft. H.F. and L.B.
52 53		Contributed with analytical tools. C.W. and R.H. generated the database. M.A. and D.C. and L.B.
J 4		

discussed results. All authors contributed to the writing of the paper.

Data accessibility statement:

Station L4 data are archived at the British Oceanographic data centre <u>www.bodc.ac.uk</u> and are freely available upon request to Dr Angus Atkinson <u>aat@pml.ac.uk</u>

Abstract

Determining statistical patterns irrespective of interacting agents (*i.e.* macroecology) is useful to explore the mechanisms driving population fluctuations and extinctions in natural food webs. Here, we tested four predictions of a neutral model on the distribution of community fluctuations (CF) and the distributions of persistence times (APT). Novel predictions for the food web were generated by combining i) body size-density scaling, ii) Taylor's law and iii) low efficiency of trophic transference. Predictions were evaluated on Fan exceptional dataset of plankton with 15 years of weekly samples encompassing ~250 planktonic species from three trophic levels, sampled in the western English Channel. Highly symmetric non-Gaussian distributions of CF supports zero-sum dynamics. Variability of CF decreased while a change from an exponential to a power-law distribution of APT from basal to upper trophic positions was detected. Results suggest a predictable but profound effect of trophic position on fluctuations and extinction in natural communities.

Key words: macroecology, plankton, food web, fluctuations, Station L4, English channel

28 INTRODUCTION

The macroecological perspective represents a fruitful and complementary approach to traditional methods in ecology which may provide novel insights on patterns and process shaping biodiversity (John Maynard Smith 1974; Maurer 1999; Harte 2011; Hatton *et al.* 2015). Such a macroscopic approach could be particularly suitable for the analysis of community dynamics involving hundreds of interacting species. The aggregation of population fluctuations $r_s=log_e(N_{t+1}/N_t)$ of multiple species results in a distribution of community fluctuations (CF) that departs from Gaussian but follows a Laplace probability distribution (Keitt & Stanley 1998):

 $P(r_s) = \frac{1}{(2\Phi)} e^{\frac{-|r_s - \mu|}{\Phi}}$

(eq. 1)

where μ is the mean and $2\Phi^2$ is the variance (σ_r^2) . The distribution extended several orders of magnitude, was symmetric and centered on zero suggesting that demographic gains and losses by all the species were balanced over the study period (Marquet et al. 2007). That analysis combined species spanning a wide range of body-sizes feeding at multiple trophic levels. Consistent relationship of trophic position with body size (Arim 2007; Segura et al. 2015), and the association of body size with decreased growth rate (Brown et al. 2004) increased scale of perception (Ritchie 2010; Borthagaray et al. 2012) and coupling of energy channels (Rooney et al. 2006; Arim et al. 2010; Rooney & McCann 2012) are expected to drive systematic trends in population fluctuation and trophic position. Moreover, while the propagation of community fluctuations through the food web has been a cornerstone of community ecology (Stouffer & Bascompte 2011; Thompson et al. 2012) its connection with the distribution of populations' fluctuation has not been considered so far.

Ecology Letters

The distribution of species aggregated persistence time (APT) has been proposed as a novel macroecological pattern that reflects important ecological processes (Bertuzzo et al. 2011; Suweis et al. 2012). Persistence time of a species was defined as the time span between local colonization and extinction in a given geographic region. APT showed a power-law scaling with exponential cut-off for bird communities and a qualitative relationship between CF and APT was proposed, but no formal link was suggested (Keitt & Stanley 1998). Recently, a formal connection between APT and CF was proposed for neutral systems (Pigolotti et al. 2005; Bertuzzo et al. 2011). Under neutral dynamics, it was demonstrated that APT distribution followed a power law with an exponential cut-off of the form (Bertuzzo et al. 2011):

 $P(t) \sim t^{-\alpha} e^{-\nu t}$

(eq. 2)

60 When dispersal is unlimited, the scaling exponent (α) equals 2 and P(t) depends solely on the 61 immigration or speciation rate (v). Ecosystem dimensionality and spatial constraints on dispersal 62 modify the scaling exponent in the range α =1.5 -2 (Pigolotti *et al.* 2005; Bertuzzo *et al.* 2011) as was 63 observed for breeding birds, herbaceous plants and marine fishes (Bertuzzo *et al.* 2011; Suweis *et al.* 64 2012). Although the supporting evidence is compelling, the neutral model is limited to explain patterns 65 in trophically equivalent neutral species.

A way towards advancing our understanding of food web dynamics relies on the evaluation of hypotheses under the macroscopic lens. First, the integration of multiple energetic pathways by predators, was shown to be a powerful mechanism to stabilize predator dynamic and the whole food web (Rooney *et al.* 2006; Rooney & McCann 2012). Second, the negative scaling of body size and population variance (*i.e.* variance mass allometry, VMA) predicts a smaller variance in large-sized species (Cohen *et al.* 2012). Assuming a size structured food web, and low efficiency of energy

transference between trophic levels, a relatively lower population variance in predators with respect to preys is expected. Both mechanisms, the coupling of multiple energy channels and the negative scaling of variance with body size are not mutually exclusive and predict a systematic decrease in community fluctuations and colonization and extinction at higher trophic levels. A main limitation for the evaluation of these predictions in particular and the empirical analysis of fluctuations and persistence distribution in general, is the lack of appropriate information. A proper representation of both persistence times and fluctuations require data for multiple species during long time periods, typically several generations, which is seldom available, but plankton is the exception.

The base of oceanic food webs is composed of microscopic unicellular producers (*e.g.* diatoms) which are consumed by a complex array of predators including unicellular protists (e.g. cilliates) and crustacean metazoans (e.g. copepods) (Segura et al. 2013). Plankton dynamics regulate the flux of matter and energy towards upper trophic levels that in turn support fisheries and the exchange of CO2 with the atmosphere. Empirical evidence suggests that planktonic predators integrate different energetic pathways (Rooney et al. 2008), show similarities in scaling relationships to terrestrial organisms (DeLong & Vasseur 2012; Hatton et al. 2015) and present a wide range of dispersal strategies. Here, using the western English Channel Station L4 data composed of fifteen years of weekly information $(\sim 800 \text{ weeks})$ on abundance and size of more than 250 planktonic species, we tested the validity of the following predictions of the Neutral theory: 1) the distribution of community fluctuations (CF) at different trophic levels conformed to a symmetric distribution, 2) community fluctuations variance decreased with trophic level, 3) the aggregated persistence times distribution (APT) follows a truncated power law distribution with scaling exponent between 1.5 and 2.0, and 4) the existence of a negative relationship between CF and APT.

MATERIAL and METHODS

Sampling and species counting

Sampling for the planktonic community (phyto-, microzoo- and zooplankton) at Station L4 in the western English Channel was conducted weekly from 1988 (Eloire et al. 2010; Widdicombe et al. 2010). However a gap in phytoplankton sampling between 1994 and 1995 meant that we started our series analysis with data from 1995 to 2012 (~800 weeks). Species were grouped in three coarse trophic groups i) primary producers, ii) consumers and iii) predators. Primary producers (diatoms and dinoflagellates) and consumers (ciliates and heterotrophic dinoflagellates) were identified and enumerated using settlement microscopy (Utermöhl, 1958) while predators (*i.e.* copepods) were identified and counted using a dissecting microscope. For a detailed description of sampling and counting methods we refer to (Widdicombe et al. 2010) for primary producers and consumers and (Eloire et al. 2010) for predators. Diatoms and dinoflagellates are microbial producers ranging from 5 to 100 µm in spherical equivalent diameter (ESD), while ciliates and heterotrophic dinoflagellates are mostly heterotrophic unicellular predators ranging from 20 to 200 µm ESD. It is worth to mention that most of these organisms are mixotrophic. Copepods are multi-cellular crustaceans with complex life cycles and size ranging from 200 to 1000 µm ESD. As copepods present several feeding modes (Hansen *et al.* 1994) they can be classified in several trophic levels. For copepods, we performed the analysis twice; i) using all recorded species and ii) using only those species known to be omnivorous 48 112 after excluding carnivorous and parasitic species which can present different dynamics (Eloire et al. 2010). From here onwards we will refer to the groups (*i.e.* diatoms, copepods) as functional groups. Overall, we analyzed CF and APT of populations including a vast range of sizes, life history traits and trophic groups.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5]
6	1
7	1
8	1
9	
10	1
11	
12 13	1
14	
15	
16	1
17 18	1
19	1
20	1
21	1
22	
23	1
24	1
25	
26]
27	
28	1
29	
30	1
31	1
32	
33	1
34	
35	1
36	1
37	
38	1
39	
40	1
41	
42	1
43	1
44 15	
46]
47	
48	1
49	
50	1
51	
52	1
53	1
54	
55	1
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

117 Data analysis

16

18

19

20

21

22

Population fluctuations (r_s) were estimated for each species by dividing abundance (N_{t+1}) by abundance in the preceding week (N_t) and taking the logarithm of the ratio as in (Segura *et al.* 2013):

$$r_{s} = \log(N_{t+1}/N_{t})$$
 (eq. 3)

23 Next, we aggregated the population fluctuations of all species belonging to the same functional group 24 into a single vector. These aggregated population fluctuations or community fluctuations (CF) were 25 fitted with a Laplace distribution (eq. 1) where the location (μ) and scale ($\Phi > 0$) were estimated with 26 the VGAM package (Yee 2010) in statistical software R (R Core Team 2013). We evaluated if the 27 distribution conformed to a Laplace by means of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. In order to evaluate 28 zero sum dynamics, we tested if zero was included in the 95% confidence interval of μ . We evaluated 29 symmetry around the median of the CF distribution with the Miao, Gel and Gastwirth (MGG) test 30 (Miao *et al.* 2006) as implemented in the package lawstat (Gastwirth *et al.* 2015).

31 In order to estimate persistence time, we interpolated linearly for each species the abundance 32 time series as some samplings were not performed exactly every seven days. For each species, we 33 estimated species persistence time as the number of weeks (Δt) the species was present (N_t > 0) after 34 being locally extinct ($N_{t+\Lambda t}=0$), where t refers to the time of the first positive record. Then, we pooled together the persistence times for all species within a functional group and the aggregated data was 35 used to fit parameters from a power-law with exponential cut-off (Eq. 2). We used maximum likelihood 36 37 estimators as calculated in the R codes provided by <u>http://tuvalu.santafe.edu/~aaronc/powerlaws/</u>. 38 Characteristic timescale (τ) was defined as the inverse of the decay rate parameter ($\tau = 1/\nu$). We

1 2 3		
4 5 6	139	evaluated the power law distribution with exponential cut-off excluding the probability of observing a
0 7 8	140	persistence of 1 week.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 12 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 11 32 33 44 55 46 17 18 19 20 12 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 11 32 33 44 55 46 47 48 49 50 15 25 35 45 56 57 58 59 60	141	<page-footer></page-footer>

23 150 28 152 36 155 41 157 ⁴³ 158 46 159 56 163

RESULTS

A total of 38695 abundances were recorded in the study period. Community fluctuations were calculated for 253 species classified in five phylogenetic groups including 128 Diatoms, 38 Dinoflagellates, 30 Ciliates, 38 Heterotrophic Dinoflagellates and 35 Copepod species. They were aggregated into three functional groups: primary producers, consumers and predators. CF in all functional groups were long-tailed and visually conformed to a Laplace distribution (Fig. 1) although formal tests rejected this hypothesis (K-S; D > 2; p > 0.05). Mean over all groups was not different from zero (average (s.d.) = 0.001 (0.006)) and the distributions were symmetric around the median (MGG test, p > 0.05) for all groups except for the heterotrophic dinoflagellates (MGG test, p < 0.01). As expected in our working hypothesis, we found a consistent trend in community variability decreasing from primary producers (Diatoms $\sigma_r^2 = 2.89$; Dinoflagellates $\sigma_r^2 = 2.57$), to consumers (Ciliates $\sigma_r^2 = 2.89$; Dinoflagellates $\sigma_r^2 = 2.57$). 1.78; Heterotrophic dinoflagellates $\sigma_r^2 = 1.45$), to predators (Copepods $\sigma_r^2 = 1.39$ and Omnivorous copepods $\sigma_r^2 = 1.25$).

A power-law distribution with an exponential cut-off, Eq. 2, adequately described aggregated persistence times (APT) for all functional groups (Fig. 2). The APT scaling exponent (α) systematically increased across trophic levels and ranged from 0.58 to 1.19, values that are lower than predictions based on neutral models (Bertuzzo *et al.* 2011). We found a strong negative correlation of the APT scaling exponent (α) with the exponential decay rate (v) (Pearson's r=-0.98; P<0.01; N=6). Consequently, the shape of the persistence times distribution shifted from an exponential regime at lower trophic levels towards a power law regime at higher trophic levels, and the characteristic persistence time (τ =1/v) increased systematically from producers to predators (Fig. 3).

There was a strong correlation between community fluctuations variability (σ_r^2) and decay rate

(v) (Pearson's r= 0.92, p< 0.01; N=6). This implies that populations at lower trophic levels tend to be less persistent and more fluctuating than those at higher trophic levels (Fig. 3). Average group's body-size partially explained the difference in the variability and persistence between large-sized copepods and unicellular species. However, as predicted by our working hypothesis, trophic level alone also explained a significant fraction of the differences in fluctuations and persistence time distributions among similar-sized species (e.g. dinoflagellates, ciliates and heterotrophic dinoflagellates; Fig. 4).

170 DISCUSSION

We showed a consistent increase in community stability (decreased variability) and persistence times towards higher trophic levels in the species rich planktonic food web of the western English Channel. Three remarkable patterns were documented among trophic levels, i) the symmetry in populations fluctuations, ii) the decrease in variance of community fluctuations with body size and trophic level and iii) the systematic shift in the shape of the persistence times distribution with increasing trophic level. Consequently, the macroecological distributions herein analyzed provides a complementary support for current food web hypotheses (Hubbell 2001; Otto *et al.* 2007; Bertuzzo *et al.* 2011; McCann 2012).

As expected, we found a systematic decrease in the variance of community fluctuations with body size and increasing trophic level (Cohen et al. 2012). Such patterns can be explained in terms of three main ecological principles: i) the Taylor law, which asserts that the variance of the population density of a set of populations is a power-law function of the mean population density (Taylor 1961), ii) the body size-density power law, according to which the mean population density of a set of populations is a negative power law of the organism body size (Peters & Wassenberg 1983; Kruk et al. 2010) and iii) the fraction of energy lost at each trophic transference (Lindeman 1942) following the second law of thermodynamics. The former two were combined recently by Cohen et al., (Cohen et al., 2012) who coined the term variance-mass allometry (VMA) predicting a negative scaling of variance with body size within a single trophic level. Cohen et al., (Cohen et al. 2012) stated that "if VMA [is] applied to marine or freshwater food webs, population densities of smaller-bodied species should be expected to be more variable spatially or temporally than population densities of larger bodied species". Here we found that this trend hold, with larger copepods being less variable than small diatoms. Remarkably, the fluctuations and persistence for similar-sized species were determined by their trophic level as was observed for autotrophic and heterotrophic dinoflagellates or ciliates (Fig. 1

& 2). This result expands the VMA for multiple trophic levels accounting for the fact that for similarly sized species, an increase in trophic level implies a decrease in average abundance (Widdicombe *et al.* 2010) and a reduction in the populations fluctuations and an increase in persistence. The progressive addition of energy channels with increasing body size represent a plausible mechanism to drive this pattern (Rooney *et al.* 2006; Arim *et al.* 2010; McCann 2012).

The negative relationship between persistence times of populations and community fluctuations supports previous predictions (Keitt & Stanley 1998; Pigolotti et al. 2005; Bertuzzo et al. 2011). It is intuitive that species with large fluctuations will face higher extinction risks, but the specific shape of the distribution of persistence times is also significant. Unexpectedly, we found that the shape of persistence time distribution varied systematically with trophic position (Fig. 3). The evidence of zero-sum dynamics at all levels together with the decrease of characteristic persistence timescale (τ ; Fig. 3) towards producers suggests that the recruitment and extinction rates are higher at the base and decreases towards the top of the food web as expected (Bertuzzo et al. 2011). However, the slope of the power law (α) was significantly shallower than expected by any of the predictions of the neutral model, irrespective of the structure of the spatial interaction network (Bertuzzo et al. 2011) This point to a profound effect of trophic dynamics in the shape of the persistence times distribution. Such changes in the shape of the distribution had not been described previously because analyses had been conducted either pooling occurrence data from trophically heterogeneous species (Keitt & Stanley 1998; Bertuzzo et al. 2011) or were based on single trophic level populations data from different systems (Suweis et al. 2012). It was suggested that the exponential term could be a statistical artifact caused by the short window of observation of the phenomenon (Keitt & Stanley 1998; Bertuzzo et al. 2011). Current results based on 200 (copepods) to 500 generations (primary producers) indicate otherwise. Also, the

exponential term (v) decreased with trophic position where most persistent groups showed the minimum value. The systematic change in the persistence time distribution with trophic position deserves further scrutiny both in theoretical and empirical grounds.

The prevalence of symmetric and long tailed distributions of population fluctuations across trophic levels and phylogentic groups reported here points to a universal set of driving processes (Fig. 1). These distributions further support the prevalence of balancing processes (*i.e.* zero-sum dynamics), in which a decline in one population is offset by an increase in other, at least at the large temporal scale of present observations (Hubbell 2001: Labra et al. 2008). This pattern is general within and among trophic levels and seems to be independent of species richness. Previous time series analyses determined that compensatory dynamics, a special case of balancing processes, were common in the plankton, but synchrony (*i.e.*, non-compensatory) was also recorded at specific scales of analyses (Vasseur & Gaedke 2007). The use of community fluctuations describe balancing processes without 33 227 specifying the mechanisms (e.g. compensation, statistical averaging). However, community fluctuations represents a complete description of the concept of asynchrony in resource populations fluctuations (e.g. slow vs fast channels). The simplifying dichotomy of slow and fast channels involving asynchronous dynamics is expanded here to the whole food web, and evidenced by the observed compensatory dynamics, a prerequisite for food web stability (Rooney et al. 2006).

Distributions of fluctuations failed a formal test of Laplace, a fact previously mentioned (Keitt & Stanley 1998) and recently evaluated (Kalyuzhny et al. 2014). In spite of formal test rejection, given the relatively good visual fit (Fig. 1) and parsimony principle, it is suggested to keep the Laplace distribution as a good statistical model to explore community fluctuations at large scales. A plausible explanation of the failure relies on the fact that Laplace is the result of mixing random iterates from

normal distributions whose variances follow an exponential distribution (Kotz et al. 2001). If variances of constituent distribution are not distributed exactly as an exponential distribution or constituent distributions are fat tailed (Segura et al. 2013), a mixture between Gaussian and Lapace distribution is expected as it seems to be the case here. In this sense, we caution the use of Central Limit Theorem to anticipate a Gaussian distribution as the default null model. Indeed, the deviations from Gaussian expectations can give insight into the driving ecological mechanisms. An exponential distribution of variances of population fluctuations implies the existence of many populations with reduced variability and a few populations with large fluctuations. This is congruent with the existence of fast and slow energy channels in plankton dynamics (Rooney et al. 2006, 2008; McCann 2012). Populations within the fast channel are expected to show large fluctuation in opposition to the expected dynamics on the slow channel, with an overall strong role on the stabilization of food webs (Rooney & McCann 2012).

The empirical data should encompass the scale at which hypothetical mechanisms are expected to operate (Levin 1992). The analysis of statistical distribution of populations' dynamics, represented in fluctuations and persistence times, requires a large set of populations and a time span of several generations (Keitt & Stanley 1998). The database of plankton in the western English Channel notably fulfills these requirements. Congruently, clear distributions of populations' fluctuations and persistence times were observed. Further, it was possible to relate the structure of these distributions with the body size and trophic position of the functional groups considered. More importantly, the observed patterns provide complementary support for sound theories previously analyzed with other approaches. That is the case for the variance-mass scaling of Cohen et al., (Cohen et al. 2012) and the stabilization of populations and food web dynamics through the integration of asynchronous energy channels of Rooney et al., (Rooney et al. 2006). Further, novel trends are suggested as the change from an

1 2		
3 4 5	259	exponential to a power-law distribution of persistence time from basal to upper trophic positions which
6 7	260	should be further explored. The framework provides explicit evaluation of community dynamics and
9 10	261	brings novel explicit predictions by the integration of divergent hypotheses that should be evaluated
11 12	262	theoretically and empirically.
13 14 15	263	
16 17	264	Acknowledgment
190 201 222 222 222 222 222 222 222 222 22	265	This research was funded by a grant to AMS (ANII-FCE_3_2013_1_100394).
52 53		
54 55 56		
57 58		
59 60		16

266 REFERENCES

1.

Arim, M., Abades, S., Laufer, G., Loureiro, M. & Marquet, P.A. (2010). Food web structure and body size: trophic position and resource acquisition. *Oikos*, 119, 147–153.

2.

Arim, M., Bozinovic, F. & Marquet, A. (2007). On the relationship between trophic position, body mass and temperature: reformulating the energy limitation hypothesis. *Oikos*, 116, 1524–1530.

3.

Bertuzzo, E., Suweis, S., Mari, L., Maritan, A., Rodríguez-Iturbe, I. & Rinaldo, A. (2011). Spatial effects on species persistence and implications for biodiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108, 4346–4351.

4.

Borthagaray, A.I., Arim, M. & Marquet, P.A. (2012). Connecting landscape structure and patterns in body size distributions. *Oikos*, 121, 697–710.

5.

Brown, J.H., Gillooly, J.F., Allen, A.P., Savage, V.M. & West, G.B. (2004). Toward a metabolic theory of ecology. *Ecology*, 85, 1771–1789.

6.

Cohen, J.E., Xu, M. & Schuster, W.S.F. (2012). Allometric scaling of population variance with mean body size is predicted from Taylor's law and density-mass allometry. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109, 15829–15834.

7.

DeLong, J.P. & Vasseur, D.A. (2012). Size-density scaling in protists and the links between consumerresource interaction parameters. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 81, 1193–1201.

8.

Eloire, D., Somerfield, P.J., Conway, D.V.P., Halsband-Lenk, C., Harris, R. & Bonnet, D. (2010). Temporal variability and community composition of zooplankton at station L4 in the Western Channel: 20 years of sampling. *Journal of plankton research*, 32, 657 – 679.

9.

Gastwirth, J.L., Gel, J.R., Wallace, W.L., Miao, W. & Noguchi, K. (2015). *lawstat: Tools for Biostatistics, Public Policy, and Law. R package version 2.5. http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lawstat.*

10.

Hansen, B., Bjorsen, P.K. & Hansen, P.J. (1994). The size ratio between planktonic predators and their prey. Limnology and Oceanography, 39, 395–403.

11.

Harte, J. (2011). Maximum entropy and ecology: a theory of abundance, distribution, and energetics. Oxford series in ecology and evolution. Oxford University Press, Oxford; New York.

12.

Hatton, I.A., McCann, K.S., Fryxell, J.M., Davies, T.J., Smerlak, M., Sinclair, A.R.E., et al. (2015). The predator-prey power law: Biomass scaling across terrestrial and aquatic biomes. Science, 349, aac6284aac6284.

13.

Hubbell, S.P. (2001). The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

14.

John Maynard Smith. (1974). *Models in ecology*. University Press, Cambridge [Eng.].

15.

Kalyuzhny, M., Seri, E., Chocron, R., Flather, C.H., Kadmon, R. & Shnerb, N.M. (2014). Niche versus Neutrality: A Dynamical Analysis. The American Naturalist, 184, 439-446.

16.

Keitt, H.T. & Stanley, H.E. (1998). Dynamics of North American breeding bird populations. Nature, 393, 257-260.

17.

Kotz, S., Kozubowski, T.J. & Podgórski, K. (2001). The Laplace Distribution and Generalizations. A *Revisit with Applications to Communications, Economics, Engineering, and Finance.*

18.

Kruk, C., Huszar, V.L.M., Peeters, E.T.H.M., Bonilla, S., Costa, L., LüRling, M., et al. (2010). A morphological classification capturing functional variation in phytoplankton. Freshwater Biology, 55, 614–627.

19.

Labra, F., Marquet, P.A. & Bozinovic, F. (2008). Scaling metabolic rate fluctuations. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 104, 10900–10903.

20.

Levin, S.A. (1992). The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. *Ecology*, 73, 1943:1967.

21.

Lindeman, R.L. (1942). The Trophic-Dynamic Aspect of Ecology. *Ecology*, 23, 399–417.

22.

Marquet, P.A., Abades, S.R. & Labra, F.A. (2007). Biodiversity power laws. In: *Scaling Biodiversity* (ed. D. Storch, P.A.M.J.H.B.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge., pp. 441–461.

23.

Maurer, B.A. (1999). *Untangling ecological complexity: the macroscopic perspective*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

24.

McCann, K.S. (2012). Food Webs. Princeton University Press, Oxford and Princeton.

25.

Miao, W., Gel, Y.R. & Gastwirth, J.L. (2006). A New Test of Symmetry about an Unknown Median. In: *Random Walk, Sequential Analysis and Related Topics - A Festschrift in Honor of Yuan-Shih Chow* (ed. Agnes Hsiung, C.-H.Z., and Zhiliang Ying). World Scientific Publisher, Singapore., Singapore.

26.

Otto, S.B., Rall, B.C. & Brose, U. (2007). Allometric degree distributions facilitate food-web stability. *Nature*, 450, 1226–1229.

27.

Peters, R.H. & Wassenberg, K. (1983). The effect of body size on animal abundance. *Oecologia*, 6, 60–89.

28.

Pigolotti, S., Flammini, A., Marsili, M. & Maritan, A. (2005). Species lifetime distribution for simple models of ecologies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102, 15747–15751.

29.

R Core Team. (2013). *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing;, Vienna, Austria.

30.

Ritchie, M.E. (2010). *Scale, heteogeneity, and the structure and diveristy of ecological communities.* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

31.

Rooney, N. & McCann, K.S. (2012). Integrating food web diversity, structure and stability. Trends in

Ecology & Evolution, 27, 40–46.

32.

Rooney, N., McCann, K.S., Gellner, G. & Moore, J.C. (2006). Structural asymmetry and the stability of diverse food webs. *Nature*, 442, 265–269.

33.

Rooney, N., McCann, K.S. & Moore, J.C. (2008). A landscape theory for food web architecture. *Ecology letters*, 11, 867–881.

34.

Segura, A.M., Calliari, D., Fort, H. & Lan, B.L. (2013). Fat tails in marine microbial population fluctuations. *Oikos*, 122, 1739–1745.

35.

Segura, A.M., Franco-Trecu, V., Franco-Fraguas, P., Arim, M. & Tonn, W. (2015). Gape and energy limitation determine a humped relationship between trophic position and body size. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 72, 198–205.

36.

Stouffer, D.B. & Bascompte, J. (2011). Compartmentalization increases food-web persistence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108, 3648–3652.

37.

Suweis, S., Bertuzzo, E., Mari, L., Rodriguez-Iturbe, L., Maritan, A. & Rinaldo, A. (2012). On Species Persistence-Time Distributions. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 303, 15–24.

38.

Taylor, L.R. (1961). Aggregation, variance and the mean. *Nature*, 189, 732–735.

39.

Thompson, R.M., Brose, U., Dunne, J.A., Hall, R.O., Hladyz, S., Kitching, R.L., *et al.* (2012). Food webs: reconciling the structure and function of biodiversity. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 27, 689–697.

40.

Vasseur, D.A. & Gaedke, U. (2007). Spectral analysis unmasks synchronous and compensatory dynamics in plankton communities. *Ecology*, 88, 2058–2071.

41.

Widdicombe, C.E., Eloire, D., Harbour, D., Harris, R.P. & Somerfield, P.J. (2010). Long-term phytoplankton community dynamics in the Western English Channel. *Journal of plankton research*, 32, 643–655.

1 2 3 4	
5 6 7 8 9 10 267	42. Yee, T.W. (2010). The VGAM package for categorical data analysis. <i>Journal of Statistical Software</i> , 32, 1–34.
 ³ 267 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 	
54 55 56 57 58	
59 60	21





FIGURES



Figure 1.- Segura et al.

Ecology Letters







1 2		
3 4	281	FIGURE LEGENDS
5 6	282	
7 8	283	Figure 1 - Aggregated population fluctuations for each functional group at Station I.4 in the western
9 10	284	English Channel. Lines are the fitted models to original data and circles represent the middle point of
11	285	the histogram and was generated for visual purposes only.
13	286	
14 15 16	287	Figure 2 Aggregated persistence time (APT) distribution for groups within each trophic level. The
17	288	circles are the observed frequency distribution and the solid line is the fitted model (P(t)= C t ^{-α} e ^{-νt}),
19 20	289	where C is a normalization constant. Note the increase in the scaling exponent (α) and the
21	290	characteristic timescale ($\tau=1/\nu$) from producers to predators. Lines are the models fitted to original data
23	291	and circles represent the middle point of the histogram and was generated for visual purposes only.
24 25	292	
26 27	293	Figure 3 Left, Negative relationship between variability and characteristic timescale times in the
28 29	294	Station L4 planktonic food web. The solid line is the best fit least squares non-linear regression [τ = 10/
30 31	295	(σ^2 -1.14); N=6]. Right: schematic representation of the associated changes in the shape of the
32 33	296	persistence times distribution among trophic levels.
34 35	297	
36	298	Figure 4 Body size distributions of producers and consumers in the English Channel L4 Station. Same
37 38	299	letter "b" represents no differences among groups according to a log likelihood ratio test. Diatoms
39 40	300	presented different size structure according to a log-likelihood ratio test (p<0.05).
41 42	301	
43 44	302	
45	303	
46 47	304	
48 49	305	
50 51		
52 53		
54		
55 56		
57 58		
59 60		26