

1 ***Additional background information to***

2 **Reconciling complexity with stability in naturally assembling food webs**

3 **Anje-Margriet Neutel, Johan A. P. Heesterbeek, Johan van de Koppel, Guido**
4 **Hoenderboom, An Vos, Coen Kaldewey, Frank Berendse & Peter. C. de Ruiter**
5 ***Nature* 449, 599 - 602 (2007)**

6 ***This information is provided to facilitate the calculation of the (Jacobian)***
7 ***community matrices analysed in the Letter.***

8
9 In the Supplementary Information of this Letter¹, no biomass data were given of the
10 two basal food-web compartments: Roots and Detritus. These were not measured in
11 the soil samples (see also ref 2). Following ref 2, we used values for Root biomass of
12 900 kg ha⁻¹ in all webs with roots present. We used values for Detritus biomass of 4,
13 25, 250 and 2500 kg ha⁻¹ for the successional stages 1 to 4 respectively, of both series
14 (roughly corresponding to the increase in organic matter along the productivity
15 gradients). We assumed the same values for the replicates within each stage.
16 (Exception: in the one replicate in stage 1 (Schiermonnikoog) where phytophagous
17 nematodes were present, basal values of stage 2 were used.) The choice of these
18 particular values by no means affects our key findings.

19 The data to do the stability analyses are either directly provided in the Letter or
20 the Supplementary Information to the Letter, or they can be obtained through
21 references in the Letter (ref 2 and 17). To make this latter information easier
22 accessible, we here present the estimated physiological parameter values (Added
23 Table 1), the matrix of feeding relations and prey preferences (Added Table 2), and
24 formalisation of detritus feedbacks. We also provide the Jacobian matrix of one of the
25 food webs, as an example (Added Table 3).

26

27 Added Table 1 gives the estimated values of specific natural (i.e. non-predatory) death
28 rates, assimilation efficiencies, and production efficiencies. The conversion efficiency
29 used to calculate feeding rates (see Methods of our Letter¹) and interaction strengths,
30 is the product of the assimilation efficiency and production efficiency: $e_i = e_i^{ass} e_i^{prod}$.
31 Assimilation efficiencies were used to determine the fraction of unassimilated food in
32 each predator-prey interaction, needed to calculate the feedbacks to detritus (see
33 below).

34 Added Table 2 specifies the diet choice in terms of prey preferences p_{ij} of predators
35 (columns) for their prey (rows). For the use of these preference factors in the
36 calculation of feeding rates, see Methods of our Letter¹. Note that in Fig. 1 of the
37 Letter an arrow is missing between Bacterivorous Nematodes (nr. 5) and Predatory
38 Collembolans (nr.17). This is a typographic error. Supplementary Table 1 of the
39 Letter¹ (biomass data of the observed groups) can be used to determine the structure
40 of each web; for groups not present the corresponding rows and columns in Added

1 Table 2 are to be deleted. Biomass densities of Detritus and Roots are not given in
 2 Supplementary Table 1; Detritus was present in all webs, and Roots were present in
 3 the webs where Phytophageous Nematodes were present (see for illustration also
 4 Figure 1 of the Letter¹).

5 The parameter values given in Added Table 1 and 2 are those as used by De Ruiter *et*
 6 *al.*².

7 Added Table 3 presents an example of a community matrix. The procedure for
 8 deriving the matrix element values referring to the effects of predators on their prey
 9 and vice versa (the interaction strengths in the food web) is explained in Methods.
 10 Biomasses of the trophic groups are given in Supplementary Table 1. Note that the
 11 diagonal elements referring to intra-specific competition of the organisms were not
 12 determined from the observations, but modelled as a fraction (s) of total natural mass-
 13 specific death (d_i), where s was determined in the stability calculations. In the
 14 example in Table 3, the total mass-specific death rates are given as the (baseline)
 15 diagonal elements (i.e. $-d_i$).

16 Feedbacks to detritus were modelled as in De Ruiter *et al.*², with a modified Lotka-
 17 Volterra equation for detritus³, sensu DeAngelis *et al.*⁴:

$$18 \quad \frac{dX_D}{dt} = R_D + \sum_{i=1}^n d_i X_i + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - e_j^{ass}) c_{ij} X_i X_j - \sum_{j=1}^n c_{Dj} X_D X_j, \quad (1)$$

19 where X_i is the density of species i , R_D is the input of allochthonous material, e_j^{ass} is the
 20 assimilation efficiency of group j ($0 < e_j^{ass} < 1$), c_{ij} is the coefficient of predation on
 21 group i by group j , d_i is the specific non-predatory death rate of group i , $i \neq j$ and all
 22 parameters are defined to be positive. Elements of the community matrix referring to
 23 the feedbacks to detritus are the partial derivatives of equation (1) with respect to this
 24 trophic group, near equilibrium.

25 In terms of mass-specific predation rates in equilibrium f_{ij} and observed biomass
 26 densities B_i (see Methods), the effect of a population i on detritus is

$$27 \quad \alpha_{Di} = d_i + \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - e_i^{ass}) f_{ji} + \sum_{j=1}^n (1 - e_j^{ass}) f_{ij} \frac{B_j}{B_i} - f_{Di}. \text{ The effect of detritus on itself}$$

$$28 \quad (\text{diagonal element}) \text{ is } \alpha_{DD} = - \sum_{j=1}^n e_j^{ass} f_{Dj} \frac{B_j}{B_D}.$$

29

30 **References**

31 1. Neutel A. M., Heesterbeek, J.A.P., van de Koppel, J., et al. Reconciling complexity
 32 with stability in naturally assembling food webs. *Nature* **449** (7162): 599-602 (2007).

33 2. de Ruiter, P. C., Neutel, A. M. & Moore, J. C. Energetics, patterns of interaction
 34 strengths, and stability in real ecosystems. *Science* **269**, 1257-1260 (1995).

35 3. Moore, J. C., de Ruiter, P. C. & Hunt, H. W. Influence of productivity on the
 36 stability of real and model ecosystems. *Science* **261**, 906-908 (1993).

37 4. DeAngelis, D. L., Mulholland, P. J. & Palumbo A. V, Steinman, Huston, A. D. et
 38 al. Nutrient dynamics and food-web stability. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Sys.* **20**, 71-95 (1989).

39

1 **Added Table 1. Estimated values of physiological parameters**

<i>Functional group</i>	Specific death rate d_i (year ⁻¹)	Assimilation efficiency e_i^{ass}	Production efficiency e_i^{prod}
Predatory mites	1.84	0.60	0.35
Predatory collembolans	1.84	0.50	0.35
Nematode feeding mites	1.84	0.90	0.35
Predatory nematodes	3.00	0.50	0.37
Amoebae	6.00	0.95	0.40
Collembolans	1.84	0.50	0.35
Cryptostigmatic mites	1.20	0.50	0.35
Noncryptostigmatic mites	1.84	0.50	0.35
Fungivorous nematodes	1.92	0.38	0.37
Bacteriophageous mites	1.84	0.50	0.35
Bacteriophageous nematodes	2.68	0.60	0.37
Flagellates	6.00	0.95	0.40
Phytophageous Nematodes	1.08	0.25	0.37
Saprophytic fungi	1.20	1.00	0.30
Bacteria	1.20	1.00	0.30
Roots	1.00	-	-
Detritus	N/A	N/A	N/A

2

1 **Added Table 2. Feeding relations and prey preferences**

	Pmi	Prco	Nemi	Prne	Amoe	Coll	Cryp	Ncry	Fune	Bami	Bane	Flag	Phne	Fung	Bact	Root	Detr
Pmi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prco	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nemi	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prne	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Amoe	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coll	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cryp	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ncry	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fune	1	1	1	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bami	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bane	1	1	1	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flag	0	0	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Phne	1	1	1	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fung	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bact	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Root	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Detr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0

2

3 For explanation of abbreviated names, see Added Table 1 (The order of the groups is as in Added Table 1).

4

5

1 Added Table 3. Community matrix of Schiermonnikoog, Stage 3, replicate food web nr 2 (example)

	Pmi	Nemi	Prne	Amoe	Coll	Cryp	Ncry	Fune	Bane	Flag	Phne	Fung	Bact	Root	Detr
Pmi	-1.84	0.13	0.063	0	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.063	0.063	0	0.063	0	0	0	0
Nemi	-0.11	-1.84	0.011	0	0	0	0	0.011	0.011	0	0.011	0	0	0	0
Prne	-0.12	-0.78	-3.00	0.0031	0	0	0	0.31	0.31	0.0031	0.31	0	0.00031	0	0
Amoe	0	0	-0.24	-6.00	0	0	0	0	0	0.052	0	0	0.052	0	0
Coll	-2.3	0	0	0	-1.84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.65	0	0	0
Cryp	-1.4	0	0	0	0	-1.20	0	0	0	0	0	0.30	0	0	0
Ncry	-3.8	0	0	0	0	0	-1.84	0	0	0	0	1.1	0	0	0
Fune	-0.29	-1.8	-3.9	0	0	0	0	-1.9	0	0	0	0.27	0	0	0
Bane	-0.81	-5.1	-11	0	0	0	0	0	-2.68	0	0	0	0.018	0	0
Flag	0	0	-0.073	-0.041	0	0	0	0	0	-6.00	0	0	0.016	0	0
Phne	-0.0011	-0.0068	-0.015	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1.08	0	0	0.00000021	0
Fung	0	0	0	0	-14	-10	-14	-28	0	0	0	-1.20	0	0	0.014
Bact	0	0	-2.8	-16	0	0	0	0	-21	-16	0	0	-1.20	0	0.068
Root	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-33	0	0	-1.00	0
Detr	5.3	2.9	12	6.8	9.0	6.6	9.0	20	12	6.8	27	-41	-3.6	1.0	-0.27

2

3 For explanation of abbreviated names, see Added Table 1 (The order of the groups is as in Added Table 1).