

University of Groningen

How superdiffusion gets arrested

de Jager, Monique; Bartumeus, Frederic; Kölzsch, Andrea; Weissing, Franz; Hengeveld, Geerten M.; Nolet, Bart A.; Herman, Peter M.J.; van de Koppel, Johan

Published in:

Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences

DOI:

[10.1098/rspb.2013.2605](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.2605)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2014

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

de Jager, M., Bartumeus, F., Kölzsch, A., Weissing, F. J., Hengeveld, G. M., Nolet, B. A., ... van de Koppel, J. (2014). How superdiffusion gets arrested: Ecological encounters explain shift from Lévy to Brownian movement. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 281(1774), [20132605]. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2013.2605

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.


How superdiffusion gets arrested: Ecological encounters explain shift from Lévy to Brownian movement

Supplementary table and figures


Suppl. Table 1: Best fits of exponential distributions (e.g. Brownian walks) and Pareto distributions (e.g. Lévy walks) to individual movement trajectories. The last column indicates whether a Brownian walk better represents the observed step length distribution than a Lévy walk (0 = LW fits better than BW; 1 = BW fits better than LW). Here, we used variable lower boundary estimates (l_{min}) and corrected for sample size in order to compare Akaike Information Criteria (AIC).

Density (kg m ⁻²)	Mussel nr	Brownian walk			Lévy walk			Brownian walk fits best?
		l_{min}	lambda	AIC	l_{min}	mu	AIC	
0	1	0.10	1.57	113.29	0.10	1.83	19.93	0
0	2	0.10	0.58	313.33	0.10	1.56	217.65	0
0	3	0.05	0.59	309.22	0.10	1.57	208.16	0
0	4	0.95	6.99	-183.09	0.95	8.72	-187.19	0
0	5	0.05	0.89	226.23	0.05	1.55	88.24	0
0	6	0.15	8.66	-227.78	0.15	3.10	-228.12	0
0	7	0.10	5.33	-130.63	0.10	2.20	-126.66	1
0	8	0.15	5.53	-137.87	0.15	2.55	-133.99	1
0	9	0.05	3.88	-67.40	0.05	1.87	-139.78	0
0	10	0.20	1.52	120.85	0.20	1.98	90.12	0
0	11	0.10	11.09	-277.17	0.05	2.35	-307.42	0
0	12	0.05	1.23	162.13	0.05	1.77	-85.90	0
0	13	0.05	0.47	357.08	0.05	1.44	219.35	0
0	14	0.05	0.18	549.22	0.05	1.38	330.15	0
0	15	0.05	0.99	205.15	0.05	1.68	-24.44	0
0	16	0.05	20.17	-396.88	0.10	3.74	-385.31	1
0	17	0.10	11.60	-286.20	0.10	3.19	-322.56	0
0	18	0.05	1.28	154.34	0.05	1.59	45.46	0
Average	18	0.13	4.59	44.66	0.14	2.45	-40.13	0.17
1.3	1	1.05	0.37	404.29	2.10	2.64	374.86	0
1.3	2	2.65	0.46	357.43	2.65	3.12	340.23	0
1.3	3	3.70	0.71	268.58	3.70	4.76	251.28	0
1.3	4	0.50	0.43	373.52	1.05	2.11	374.15	1
1.3	5	3.15	0.77	252.67	3.15	4.15	264.69	1
1.3	6	2.65	0.80	246.31	2.65	3.99	244.23	0
1.3	7	2.10	1.02	198.75	2.10	4.06	192.39	0
1.3	9	2.35	0.40	388.00	2.65	2.92	373.05	0
1.3	10	2.10	0.43	373.62	2.10	2.87	334.09	0
Average	9	2.25	0.60	318.13	2.46	3.40	305.44	0.22


Density (kg m ⁻²)	Mussel nr	Brownian walk			Lévy walk			Brownian walk fits best?
		l _{min}	lambda	AIC	l _{min}	mu	AIC	
2	1	0.75	0.33	427.68	1.05	1.98	422.09	0
2	2	2.15	0.44	369.44	2.15	2.68	372.77	1
2	3	2.65	0.53	327.30	2.65	3.29	317.86	0
2	4	2.85	0.26	469.67	2.40	2.28	481.10	1
2	7	2.10	0.48	348.91	2.10	2.70	359.88	1
2	8	3.10	0.37	400.85	3.10	2.93	397.65	0
2	10	1.05	0.35	416.77	1.50	2.26	397.66	0
Average	7	2.09	0.39	394.37	2.14	2.59	392.72	0.43
3.3	1	1.50	0.60	305.88	2.10	3.08	302.72	0
3.3	2	2.65	0.52	336.43	2.65	3.14	339.95	1
3.3	3	1.60	0.44	369.10	1.60	2.49	351.46	0
3.3	5	3.15	1.20	165.97	3.15	5.58	171.03	1
3.3	6	2.65	0.88	228.29	2.65	4.13	232.45	1
3.3	8	2.10	0.61	302.65	2.65	3.63	281.23	0
3.3	10	2.10	0.60	302.02	2.10	3.13	292.17	0
Average	7	2.25	0.69	287.19	2.41	3.60	281.57	0.43
5.2	1	1.05	1.25	157.25	1.05	3.18	148.01	0
5.2	2	2.10	0.88	228.71	2.10	3.63	234.94	1
5.2	3	3.00	0.89	227.34	3.00	4.53	227.91	1
5.2	4	3.15	0.76	257.64	3.15	4.19	261.18	1
5.2	5	3.70	1.12	180.00	3.70	5.99	182.54	1
5.2	7	3.15	0.78	251.06	3.15	4.28	254.33	1
5.2	9	3.70	1.00	201.04	3.70	5.60	201.87	1
5.2	10	2.65	0.75	261.99	2.65	3.86	258.35	0
Average	8	2.81	0.93	220.63	2.81	4.41	221.14	0.75



Suppl. Figure 1: Individual movement trajectories of 18 mussels in solitary treatment.




Suppl. Figure 2: Individual movement trajectories of 10 mussels in low density treatment (1.3 kg m⁻²).




Suppl. Figure 3: Individual movement trajectories of 10 mussels in intermediate density treatment (2.0 kg m^{-2}).

Mussel density = 3.3 kg m⁻²



Suppl. Figure 4: Individual movement trajectories of 10 mussels in high density treatment (3.3 kg m⁻²).

Mussel density = 5.2 kg m⁻²



Suppl. Figure 5: Individual movement trajectories of 10 mussels in high density treatment (5.2 kg m⁻²).