



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/119310/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Liao, J., Bearup, D.J. and Blasius, B. (2017) Food web persistence in fragmented landscapes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284 (1859). 20170350. ISSN: 0962-8452

<https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0350>

© 2017 The Author(s). This is an author produced version of a paper subsequently published in *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*: Liao J, Bearup D, Blasius B. 2017 Food web persistence in fragmented landscapes. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 284: 20170350. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0350>. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

PROCEEDINGS B

Food web persistence in fragmented landscapes

Journal:	<i>Proceedings B</i>
Manuscript ID	RSPB-2017-0350.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	18-May-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Liao, Jinbao; Jiangxi Normal University, Key lab of Poyang lake wetland and watershed research Bearup, Daniel; University of Sheffield; University of Oldenburg, ICBM Blasius, Bernd; Carl Von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, ICBM
Subject:	Ecology < BIOLOGY, Theoretical biology < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	food webs, species dispersal, patch fragmentation, competition-dispersal tradeoff, patch-dynamic model
Proceedings B category:	Ecology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

13 **Abstract**

14 Habitat destruction, characterized by patch loss and fragmentation, is a key driver of biodiversity
15 loss. There has been some progress in the theory of spatial food webs, however to date
16 practically nothing is known about how patch configurational fragmentation influences multi-
17 trophic food web dynamics. We develop a spatially extended patch-dynamic model for different
18 food webs by linking patch connectivity with trophic-dependent dispersal (i.e. higher trophic
19 levels displaying longer-range dispersal). Using this model, we find that species display different
20 sensitivities to patch loss and fragmentation, depending on their trophic position and the overall
21 food web structure. Relative to other food webs, omnivory structure significantly increases
22 system robustness to habitat destruction, as feeding on different trophic levels increases the
23 omnivore's persistence. Additionally, in food webs with a dispersal-competition tradeoff
24 between species, intermediate levels of habitat destruction can enhance biodiversity by creating
25 refuges for the weaker competitor. This demonstrates that maximizing patch connectivity is not
26 always effective for biodiversity maintenance, as in food webs containing indirect competition
27 doing so may lead to further species loss.

28 **Keywords:** food webs, species dispersal, patch fragmentation, competition-dispersal tradeoff,
29 patch-dynamic model.

30

31

32 **Introduction**

33 Ecological communities across the world are under threat from ongoing habitat destruction, a
34 leading driver of biodiversity loss [1]. Resulting from land use change, pollution, over-
35 exploitation and climate change, habitat destruction can be characterized into two components:
36 patch loss and patch fragmentation [2]. The first, patch loss, is simply a decrease in the total
37 habitable area, which naturally reduces population sizes and thus increases the probability of
38 species extinction. The latter, patch fragmentation, is the division of the habitable area into
39 disconnected or poorly connected sub-patches [3], which is also known to increase species
40 extinction risk, as the resulting sub-patches are smaller and the sub-populations inhabiting them
41 are more isolated [2-5]. Drivers of patch fragmentation also include natural barriers (e.g. rivers
42 and deserts) as well as anthropogenic barriers (e.g. roads, dams, and fences) [6-8].

43 While it is clear that ecological communities are damaged by habitat destruction, its precise
44 impact on a community is much harder to predict. There has been extensive research,
45 encompassing both empirical and theoretical studies, into the separate effects of patch loss and
46 fragmentation [2-5,9,10], while studies on their interactive effects are relatively rare.
47 Additionally, it is readily apparent that the effects of fragmentation on a given species strongly
48 depend on its dispersal ability [2,11-16]. In particular, species with greater dispersal capability
49 are less affected by patch fragmentation, as greater dispersal range allows wider barriers to be
50 bypassed, directly counteracting the effects of fragmentation [17]. Furthermore, the interactions
51 between species in a given community can be a key determinant for the effects of habitat
52 destruction [1,18-22]. It has often been found that species at higher trophic levels are the first to
53 go extinct undergoing habitat loss [23-26], in accordance with the trophic rank hypothesis [27].
54 But omnivorous species do not necessarily follow this paradigm [28,29] and indirect interactions

55 between species in lower trophic levels, such as exploitative or apparent competition, may also
56 modify the sensitivity of their predators to habitat destruction [29-32].

57 To get insights into trophically-linked communities in fragmented landscapes, further
58 theoretical study should address all of these factors: patch loss and fragmentation, variation in
59 species dispersal characteristics, and the trophic structure. Pillai *et al.* [31] developed a
60 modelling framework for complex food web structures to describe the patch dynamics of the
61 various trophic links instead of individual species. However, their framework is spatially implicit,
62 in which any species can access to any habitat patch with prey species. Habitat destruction
63 creates spatial fragmented landscapes for which this spatially implicit framework is insufficient.
64 Hiebeler [11] has already characterized such landscapes in terms of the densities of two habitat
65 types (suitable and unsuitable) and their clumping degrees, thus allowing the effects of habitat
66 loss and habitat fragmentation to be investigated separately by using a pair approximation
67 approach [33-37]. In addition, Liao *et al.* [12,13,38] used this approach to explore how a species
68 dispersal capability affects its survival in landscapes subject to habitat destruction. Thus, there
69 exist modelling techniques to fully describe the effects of landscape fragmentation on complex
70 trophically-linked communities, yet very few studies have done so to date.

71 In this study we develop a spatially extended patch-dynamic model for different food webs in
72 fragmented landscapes, based on the existing modelling frameworks of Pillai *et al.* [31]. Since it
73 is not feasible to consider the full diversity of possible food web structure, we restrict our
74 attention to four common trophic modules consisting of three species: a simple food chain,
75 omnivory, exploitative competition, and apparent competition (figure 1). These typical modules
76 describe the most important interaction types among species and form a basis for studying more
77 complex food webs. In addition, we assign species dispersal ranges to reflect the common

78 observation that a species' dispersal range increases with its trophic level [39-42]. Using this
 79 model, we first investigate how patch loss and fragmentation separately and interactively affect
 80 the persistence of species embedded in each of these trophic structures, and then explore whether
 81 species feeding preference/pressure can modify the effects of landscape fragmentation on
 82 community patterns.

83

84 **Methods**

85 *Landscape structure*

86 We model the landscape as an infinite lattice of cells (i.e. sites), each representing a patch that
 87 can be either empty or occupied by a specific set of trophically linked species. To introduce
 88 habitat destruction, we assume the landscape consists of two types of habitat patch: suitable (s)
 89 and unsuitable (u), where only s -patches (s – patch availability) can permit species colonization,
 90 while u -patches (u – patch loss) are unsuitable for any species establishment ($s+u=1$). According
 91 to Hiebeler [11], the clustering degree of a given patch (for example s) can be characterized by
 92 the local density $q_{s/s}$ (so-called patch connectivity), representing the conditional probability that
 93 the neighbour of a randomly chosen s -patch is also an s -patch, with $q_{s/s} = \rho_{ss} / \rho_s$. The pair
 94 density ρ_{ss} denotes the probability that a randomly chosen pair of neighbouring patches are both
 95 s -patches. Thus, the fragmentation degree of s -patches is inversely related to the clustering
 96 degree, defined as $1 - q_{s/s}$. According to the orthogonal neighbouring correlation method for
 97 landscape generation (using von Neumann neighbourhood; see details in Hiebeler [11,43]), we
 98 have

$$99 \quad 2 - 1/s < q_{s/s} < 1. \quad (1)$$

100 In particular, the suitable patches are randomly distributed at $s = q_{s/s}$.

101 *Coupling dispersal range to trophic level*

102 We consider four trophic modules containing three species (species 1, 2 and 3; illustrated in
103 figure 1): a simple food chain (basal species 1 \rightarrow intermediate consumer 2 \rightarrow top predator 3), a
104 food web with an omnivorous top predator (omnivory), two competing species feeding on one
105 prey species (exploitative competition), and one species feeding on two competing prey species
106 (apparent competition). To reflect the fact that species dispersal range increases with trophic
107 level/body size (as commonly observed in [39-42]), we assign each species a different dispersal
108 mode: (i) species 1 can only colonize the neighbouring s -patches (neighbour dispersal; using von
109 Neumann neighbourhood with $z=4$); (ii) species 2 has uniform probability to colonize any s -
110 patch within a habitat fragment (so-called patch cluster that consists of a group of connected
111 patches; within fragment dispersal), thus species 2's dispersal range is highly correlated with
112 patch connectivity; (iii) species 3 has uniform probability to colonize any s -patch in the
113 landscape (global dispersal). As such, the u -patches as barriers (e.g. rivers, roads, dams and
114 fences) can only limit the dispersal of species 1 and 2, while the spread of species 3 is not
115 affected. Therefore, we can describe the dynamics of: (i) species 1 with a pair approximation
116 (PA) model, which has already proven qualitatively useful in characterizing spatial correlation
117 between neighbours in lattice-structured landscapes [11-13,33-38,43-47]; (ii) species 2 with a
118 modified mean-field approximation (MFA) incorporating patch clustering degree $q_{s/s}$ (as
119 demonstrated in [38]); and (iii) species 3 with a MFA model [31].

120 Following Liao *et al.* [38], we can describe the patch dynamics of a simple food chain subject
121 to the colonization-extinction-predation processes (models for other trophic modules shown in
122 appendix A, electronic supplementary material)

$$123 \quad \frac{d\rho_1}{dt} = \underbrace{c_1(\rho_1 - \rho_{1u} - \rho_{11})}_{\text{Neighbour dispersal}} - \underbrace{e_1\rho_1}_{\text{Extinction}} - \underbrace{\mu_{21}\rho_{(1,2)}}_{\text{Predation}}, \quad (2)$$

$$124 \quad \frac{d\rho_{(1,2)}}{dt} = \underbrace{c_2\rho_{(1,2)}(\rho_1 - \rho_{(1,2)})q_{s/s}}_{\text{Within fragment dispersal}} - \underbrace{(e_1 + e_2)\rho_{(1,2)}}_{\text{Extinction}} - \underbrace{(\mu_{21}\rho_{(1,2)} + \mu_{32}\rho_{(2,3)})}_{\text{Predation}}, \quad (3)$$

$$125 \quad \frac{d\rho_{(2,3)}}{dt} = \underbrace{c_3\rho_{(2,3)}(\rho_{(1,2)} - \rho_{(2,3)})}_{\text{Global dispersal}} - \underbrace{(e_1 + e_2 + e_3)}_{\text{Extinction}} + \underbrace{(\mu_{21} + \mu_{32})}_{\text{Predation}}\rho_{(2,3)}, \quad (4)$$

126 where all parameters are interpreted in Table 1 (see details in [38]). Note that this model mainly
 127 focuses on describing the patch occupancy of trophic links or subcommunities (i.e. 1, 1→2, or
 128 1→2→3) rather than those of individual species [31].

129 Here we emphasize that: (i) species 1 is restricted to colonizing its adjacent s -patches,
 130 represented in equation (2) by taking the pair density of neighbouring patches (1- s) available for
 131 colonization equal to $\rho_{1s} = (\rho_1 - \rho_{1u} - \rho_{11})$, as there are three possible neighbour states for an
 132 occupied 1-patch: 1, u or s . In order to construct a closed system, we further derive the dynamics
 133 of ρ_{11} and ρ_{1u} as shown in equations (B5-B6) (electronic supplementary material, appendix B).
 134 (ii) In the equation (3) for 1→2 links, we multiply the colonization term by the patch clustering
 135 coefficient $q_{s/s}$ to estimate the limited dispersal of species 2, which has proven effective in
 136 spatially correlated landscapes [38]. The coefficient $q_{s/s}$ can be regarded as a measure of the
 137 average size of habitat fragment (i.e. an area of connected s -patches) [12,13,33,34]. Thus, our
 138 modified term can be interpreted as allowing species 2 to disperse only within habitat fragments.
 139 (iii) The equation (4) for 2→3 links is unmodified from the framework of Pillai *et al.* [31], as
 140 species 3 disperses globally.

141

142 *Numerical simulations*

143 Using this spatially extended model, we first investigate how patch loss and fragmentation
144 separately affect species persistence in trophically linked communities. In these food webs where
145 species compete, we introduce a tradeoff between competition and dispersal range (as commonly
146 used in ecological models to analyze species coexistence [29,32]), i.e. the species with a greater
147 dispersal range is a poorer competitor and vice versa (scenarios with no competition-dispersal
148 tradeoff shown in electronic supplementary material, figures S5-S6 in appendix D). When
149 species 3 can feed on both species 1 and 2, we assume species 3 prefers to consume species 2 if
150 both prey species are present in a local patch. We quantify this preference by comparing the
151 intrinsic extinction rate of species 3 when preying on species 1 or 2, $\psi = e_{31} / e_{32} \geq 1$ ($e_{31} \geq e_{32}$;
152 see Table 1). Additionally, when species 2 and 3 compete for feeding on the same prey species 1,
153 species 3 is assumed to require a larger nutrient input than species 2, reflecting the body size
154 gradient that is commonly observed in food webs [39-42,48]. To represent this, we assume there
155 is a higher feeding pressure on species 1 when consumed by species 3 than by species 2,
156 quantified by comparing the top-down extinction rate of species 1 in such links $\omega = \mu_{31} / \mu_{21} \geq 1$
157 ($\mu_{31} \geq \mu_{21}$). Thus, we further consider how species 3's feeding preference, ψ , and the feeding
158 pressure on species 1, ω , modify the effects of habitat destruction on spatial food web dynamics.

159 Here we use numerical methods to derive the non-trivial stable equilibrium states for system
160 simulations, therefore determining which species can be expected to survive and which to go
161 extinct. Note that our results are qualitatively robust for a broad range of parameter combinations
162 (electronic supplementary material, figures S1-S14 in appendices C-F) and that, as such, we use
163 symmetrical parameter combinations as a representative reference parameter set throughout.

164 **Results**

165 *Effects of patch availability and connectivity on species persistence in food webs*

166 We find that species' responses to patch availability and connectivity depend on their trophic
167 position and the food web structure (figure 2). In simple food chains (figure 2a), increasing patch
168 availability or connectivity increases species persistence and thus system robustness (i.e. higher
169 patch occupancy; electronic supplementary material, figure S1 in appendix C). Species at higher
170 trophic levels display higher sensitivity to patch loss and fragmentation, which go extinct first
171 when patch availability and connectivity decrease due to trophic cascading effect.

172 Similarly in the food web with an omnivorous top predator (figure 2b), all species can persist
173 at high levels of patch availability and connectivity. However, in contrast to the simple food
174 chain, as patch connectivity decreases, species 2 becomes extinct before species 3. In this case,
175 both species 2 and 3 can feed directly on species 1 and thus have similar vulnerability to trophic
176 cascading effects (bottom-up control). Yet, the dispersal superiority of species 3 allows it to
177 survive in more fragmented landscapes where species 2 with limited dispersal is unable to persist.
178 Thus, the maximum patch occupancy of 1→3 links occurs at intermediate patch availability and
179 connectivity, more precisely along a boundary where species 2 just goes extinct (electronic
180 supplementary material, figure S2 in appendix C). In highly connected landscapes, the dispersal
181 advantage of species 3 diminishes, so species extinctions are once again predicted by the trophic
182 rank hypothesis (that species at higher trophic levels go extinct sooner), as observed in simple
183 food chains.

184 Unlike the food webs above, when species 2 and 3 compete for the same prey species 1
185 (species 3 with a greater dispersal range is a poorer competitor), species 3 becomes extinct at
186 high levels of patch availability and connectivity (figure 2c). In such situations, species 3 has no

187 dispersal advantage over species 2, but the competitive disadvantage of species 3 leads to its
188 extinction. At intermediate patch connectivity, all species can survive as species 3's superior
189 dispersal allows it to find patches where the dispersal-limited species 2 cannot access. Further
190 decreasing patch connectivity causes species 2 to go extinct before species 3, as in omnivory
191 food webs. Again, the patch occupancy of the 1→3 link (in this case equivalent to the patch
192 occupancy of species 3) peaks at the extinction threshold of species 2 (electronic supplementary
193 material, figure S3 in appendix C).

194 In the food web with apparent competition between species 1 and 2, species 1 outcompetes
195 species 2 in most landscape types because of its competitive superiority (figure 2d). Species 2 is
196 able to survive only in a relatively small region of the landscape space characterized by low
197 connectivity (around $q_{s/s} = 0.2$) and intermediate patch availability (around $s = 0.5$) (electronic
198 supplementary material, figure S4 in appendix C). Species 3 persists in landscapes with
199 sufficiently high habitat availability as it can easily switch preys between species 1 and 2, again
200 reflecting its sensitivity to a trophic cascade (bottom-up control).

201 Comparing system robustness to habitat destruction across these trophic structures, we find
202 that the omnivory food web allows the complete community to survive on the widest range of
203 landscape types. This range decreases for the simple food chain and the food web with
204 exploitative competition. The food web with apparent competition has the smallest region where
205 all species can survive.

206 *Species feeding preference/pressure modifying community patterns in fragmented landscapes*

207 While increasing species feeding preference ($\psi = e_{31}/e_{32} > 1$ in both omnivory and apparent
208 competition) or feeding pressure ($\omega = \mu_{31}/\mu_{21} > 1$ in both omnivory and exploitative competition)
209 slightly increases the extinction risk of species 2 (despite the fact that species 2 is not directly

210 affected by either of changes), it greatly accelerates the extinction of species 3 following habitat
211 destruction (figures 3 and 4). This is explained by the fact that the extinction of species 1 can
212 cascade and cause the extinction of species 3. However, these negative effects of increasing
213 feeding preference or pressure are reduced when species 3 is an omnivore, as it feeds primarily
214 on species 2 rather than species 1 at low levels of habitat destruction. In the food webs with
215 exploitative or apparent competition, we do not observe this moderating effect when increasing
216 feeding pressure or preference respectively. In the case of exploitative competition this is due to
217 the fact that species 3 must consume species 1 and consequently increasing feeding pressure
218 always increases species 3's sensitivity to the trophic cascade (bottom-up control), leading to a
219 significant shrink in its survival region of landscape space (figure 4*d*). For apparent competition
220 the mechanism is similar: species 1 outcompeting species 2 in the majority of landscapes results
221 in species 3 only feeding on prey species 1 (figure 3*d*).

222

223 **Discussion**

224 Traditional metacommunity theory for food webs mostly considers models of the relative
225 occurrence of species within patches across a landscape (i.e. spatially implicit patch models)
226 while ignoring the details of local dispersal and patch connectivity. Here we propose a spatially
227 extended patch-dynamic model for food webs by incorporating patch connectivity with trophic-
228 dependent dispersal (i.e. species at higher trophic levels displaying longer-range dispersal [39-
229 42]). Our model provides a new approach to study trophic networks in space. Using this model,
230 we demonstrate that dispersal across space can play a critical role in maintaining trophic
231 complexity. For example, the dispersal-competition tradeoff allows the competing species to

232 coexist on the regional scale (despite competitive exclusion on the local scale) in fragmented
233 landscapes (figure 2c, 2d).

234 Ignoring trophic interactions, previous metapopulation models predicted that species with poor
235 dispersal ability are more likely to become extinct in fragmented landscapes [5,12,13,49]. In our
236 model, however, incorporating trophic interaction into the metacommunity system may reverse
237 this prediction, resulting in different species sensitivities to habitat destruction (figure 2). In a
238 simple food chain, species at higher trophic levels are found to be more vulnerable to patch loss
239 and fragmentation despite of their dispersal superiority (figure 2a), in accordance with the
240 trophic rank hypothesis (a trophic cascade [27,50-52]). In the omnivory structure, however, the
241 intermediate consumer with limited dispersal has greatest sensitivity to patch fragmentation,
242 while the omnivorous top predator with dispersal superiority is able to persist in more
243 fragmented landscapes by switching feeding on the basal species. But in highly connected
244 landscapes, the intermediate consumer has very similar dispersal abilities to the top predator and
245 consequently we observe a return to the typical paradigm where the top predator is most
246 sensitive to habitat loss. Interestingly, in the exploitative competition, species 2 monotonously
247 decreases with habitat destruction, whereas species 3 displays diverse (positive as well as
248 negative) responses. In particular, species 3 does not survive in highly connected landscapes due
249 to competitive exclusion; instead it can persist at intermediate patch loss and fragmentation
250 because of a dispersal-competition tradeoff. In the apparent competition, species 2 is
251 competitively excluded by species 1 in most landscapes types, resulting in a bi-trophic system
252 where species 3 shows more sensitivity to habitat destruction than species 1. In summary, the
253 sensitivity of species to habitat fragmentation is not always monotonic with its dispersal ability

254 [16], but instead is a complex function of species dispersal and interactions (e.g. competition and
255 predation) with other species in the community.

256 By extension, our results suggest that system robustness, defined as the ability of a trophic
257 community to tolerate habitat destruction without suffering species extinctions, depends strongly
258 on the trophic structure of that community. As we would expect, competition between species
259 significantly reduces robustness of the overall system, since it prevents all species from surviving
260 on the same patch. In contrast, increased diet breadth for higher trophic-level species, e.g. the
261 module with an omnivorous top predator, significantly increases system robustness, as the
262 typically more vulnerable species is allowed to survive by switching their feeding behavior
263 (adaptive feeding behavior). This indicates that the omnivore can modify its diet dependent on
264 prey availability, either by switching prey or by adjusting the proportion of each in a mixed diet
265 in response to patch fragmentation [53]. Essentially, feeding on different trophic levels
266 (omnivory) increases the number of available habitat patches accessible to the omnivorous top
267 predator, thus offering more opportunities for its survival [29,32].

268 In the food webs with exploitative or apparent competition, we find that intermediate
269 landscape fragmentation maximizes species diversity while low or high fragmentation leading to
270 the loss of one or more species (figure 2c and d). The peak observed in species richness at
271 intermediate patch fragmentation represents a compromise between competition and dispersal
272 mediated by patch fragmentation. In particular, when species compete for the same resource,
273 high levels of habitat fragmentation severely limit the colonization opportunities and therefore
274 patch occupancy of poor dispersers, allowing the inferior competitor with longer range dispersal
275 to survive on the landscape. By contrast, in highly connected landscapes, species even with short
276 range dispersal are able to access to most of the available habitat and, as such, the poor

277 competitor is driven to extinction. If this tradeoff holds in nature, moderate patch fragmentation
278 could promote the survival of long-range dispersers (e.g. increased patch occupancy of species 3
279 in figure S3). This suggests habitat heterogeneity as a critical factor for biodiversity maintenance,
280 as it can provide refuges for the poor competitor (via long-range dispersal) that the strong
281 competitor with dispersal limitation is unable to access (i.e. a competition-dispersal tradeoff
282 commonly used in traditional metapopulation models [29,32,54,55]).

283 This is one example of a more general paradigm that landscape boundaries promote
284 biodiversity, which has been observed frequently on the global scale [56-58]. An obvious
285 example is the loss of biodiversity in Australia and the south Pacific that followed colonization
286 from Europe due, in part, to the introduction of superior competitors from that continent [59,60].
287 Our results show that this paradigm extends to the smaller scale of an individual landscape, and
288 thus increasing patch connectivity is not always the optimal strategy for biodiversity
289 conservation. Indeed it may result in further species loss. This refutes previous suggestions that
290 maximizing the connectivity of good-quality habitat patches is always an effective way to
291 promote species diversity [4,5,9,61,62]. Instead, landscape fragmentation may, in some cases,
292 lead to increases in species richness especially at modest levels, despite ultimately causing the
293 collapse of the food web at more extreme levels (as shown by previous spatially implicit
294 modelling studies [29,32]).

295 In our model, we have made two simplifying assumptions. Firstly, we only considered three
296 ideal types of dispersal scaling (i.e. neighbour dispersal, dispersal within fragments and global
297 dispersal), with higher trophic level displaying longer-range dispersal (as commonly observed in
298 [39-42]). In such case, species dispersal ranges are essentially categorical, which is relatively
299 restrictive as species in nature show a broad range of movement behaviors [42,63-65]. Such

300 categorical description can be naturally linked to the effects of fragment size and patch
301 connectivity, but it does eliminate the effect of distance between fragments [2-5,42]. Thus, this
302 omission could be further explored by comparing our predictions with those models using more
303 realistic dispersal ranges. A second simplification used in this model is the division of habitat
304 into suitable and unsuitable habitats. In fact, real landscapes rarely consist of neatly divided
305 patches of “habitat” and “non-habitat” [9,13], instead habitat degradation coincides with
306 reduction in habitat quality, so that most landscapes display at least some level of habitat
307 variegation (i.e. varying suitability for species). To account for this, future study could include
308 the range of possible habitat types, and apply more complex metrics to characterize the overall
309 spatial landscape structure.

310

311 **Conclusions**

312 We develop a spatially extended patch-dynamic model to include spatial heterogeneity in order
313 to investigate how trophic communities, characterized by different food webs, differ in their
314 responses to habitat destruction. Each module produces unique species survival patterns in
315 fragmented landscapes. As such, we suggest that, in conservation efforts, the community
316 structure to be preserved must be considered in combination with habitat configurational
317 fragmentation [10,14-16,62,66]. In particular, we find that, in food webs with a dispersal-
318 competition tradeoff between species, the greatest species diversity is achieved at intermediate
319 levels of habitat destruction. Thus, the common recommendation to mitigate negative impacts of
320 landscape fragmentation on biodiversity by increasing habitat connectivity [61,67], could, in fact,
321 be detrimental to some communities. This calls for particular caution when designing

322 conservation strategies for biodiversity maintenance in trophically-linked communities, as
323 species loss resulting from habitat management will simultaneously influence multiple species
324 across trophic levels, possibly resulting in the collapse of the entire community. Our model
325 further demonstrates that differential sensitivities to patch loss and fragmentation are closely
326 related to species traits (e.g. dispersal, competition and trophic position), thus identification of
327 these traits from empirical data would contribute to the setting of conservation priorities in
328 applied ecology. Experimental tests of these predictions could be performed in natural or
329 laboratory-based model systems (e.g. microcosms and field observations) that allow the direct
330 manipulation of metacommunity size and patch connectivity [14,15,66,68]. Overall, our
331 extended modelling framework offers a promising way to advance the spatial food web theory in
332 fragmented landscapes and provides new insights into biodiversity conservation.

333

334 **Authors' contributions**

335 J.L. conceived the study; J.L. and D.B. performed the analysis and discussed the results; J.L.
336 wrote the manuscript; and D.B. and B.B improved the manuscript.

337

338 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

339

340 **Funding**

341 This study was supported by the DFG through grant FOR 1748, the Opening Fund of Key
342 Laboratory of Poyang Lake Wetland and Watershed Research (Jiangxi Normal University),
343 Ministry of Education (No. PK2015004 and TK2016002), Jiangxi Provincial Education
344 Department (No. GJJ160274), and the Doctoral Scientific Research Foundation of Jiangxi
345 Normal University (No. 12017778).

346

347 **Acknowledgements**

348 We would like to thank Kevin S. McCann, Jordi Bascompte and Shaopeng Wang for their useful
349 comments on early versions of the manuscript.

350

351 **Supplementary Material**

352 Electronic supplementary material accompanies this manuscript is also supplied.

353 **References**

- 354 1. Pimm SL, Raven P. 2000 Biodiversity: extinction by numbers. *Nature* **403**, 843-845.
355 (doi:10.1038/35002708)
- 356 2. Fahrig L. 2003 Effects of habitat fragmentation on biodiversity. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **34**,
357 487-515. (doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.34.011802.132419)
- 358 3. Fahrig L, *et al.* 2011 Functional landscape heterogeneity and animal biodiversity in
359 agricultural landscapes. *Ecol. Lett.* **14**, 101-112. (doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01559.x)
- 360 4. Fahrig L. 2002 Effect of habitat fragmentation on the extinction threshold: a synthesis. *Ecol.*
361 *Appl.* **12**, 346-353. (doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2002)012[0346:EOHFOT]2.0.CO;2)
- 362 5. Ewers RM, Didham RK. 2006 Confounding factors in the detection of species responses to
363 habitat fragmentation. *Biol. Rev.* **81**, 117-142. (doi:10.1017/S1464793105006949)
- 364 6. Andrews A. 1990 Fragmentation of habitat by roads and utility corridors: a review. *Aust. Zool.*
365 **26**, 130-141. (doi:10.7882/AZ.1990.005)
- 366 7. Jaeger JAG, Fahrig L. 2004 Effects of road fencing on population persistence. *Conserv. Biol.*
367 **18**, 1651-1657. (doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2004.00304.x)
- 368 8. Di Giulio M, Holderegger R, Tobia S. 2009 Effects of habitat and landscape fragmentation on
369 humans and biodiversity in densely populated landscapes. *J. Environ. Manage.* **90**, 2959-
370 2968. (doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2009.05.002)
- 371 9. Mortelliti A, Amori G, Boitani L. 2010 The role of habitat quality in fragmented landscapes: a
372 conceptual overview and prospectus for future research. *Oecologia* **163**, 535-547.
373 (doi:10.1007/s00442-010-1623-3)
- 374 10. Legrand D, *et al.* 2017 Eco-evolutionary dynamics in fragmented landscapes. *Ecography* **40**,
375 9-25. (doi:10.1111/ecog.02537)
- 376 11. Hiebeler D. 2000 Populations on fragmented landscapes with spatially structured
377 heterogeneities: landscape generation and local dispersal. *Ecology* **81**, 1629-1641.
378 (doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2000)081[1629:POFLWS]2.0.CO;2)
- 379 12. Liao J, *et al.* 2013a Modelling plant population size and extinction thresholds from habitat
380 loss and fragmentation: effects of neighbouring competition and dispersal strategy. *Ecol.*
381 *Model.* **268**, 9-17. (doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.07.021)
- 382 13. Liao J, *et al.* 2013b Species persistence in landscapes with spatial variation in habitat quality:
383 a pair approximation model. *J. Theor. Biol.* **335**, 22-30. (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2013.06.015)
- 384 14. Carrara F, Altermatt F, Rodriguez-Iturbe I, Rinaldo A. 2012 Dendritic connectivity controls
385 biodiversity patterns in experimental metacommunities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**,
386 5761-5766. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1119651109)
- 387 15. Carrara F, Rinaldo A, Giometto A, Altermatt F. 2014 Complex interaction of dendritic
388 connectivity and hierarchical patch size on biodiversity in river-like landscapes. *Am. Nat.* **183**,
389 13-25. (doi:10.1086/674009)
- 390 16. Cote J, *et al.* 2017 Evolution of dispersal strategies and dispersal syndromes in fragmented
391 landscapes. *Ecography* **40**, 56-73. (doi:10.1111/ecog.02538)

- 392 17. Prugh LR, Hodges KE, Sinclair AR, Brashares JS. 2008 Effect of habitat area and isolation
393 on fragmented animal populations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 20770-20775.
394 (doi:10.1073/pnas.0806080105)
- 395 18. Holt RD. 2002 Food webs in space: on the interplay of dynamic instability and spatial
396 processes. *Ecol. Res.* **17**, 261-273. (doi:10.1046/j.1440-1703.2002.00485.x)
- 397 19. Amarasekare P. 2008 Spatial dynamics of food webs. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **39**, 479-500.
398 (doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173434)
- 399 20. McCann KS, Rooney N. 2009 The more food webs change, the more they stay the same.
400 *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. B* **364**, 1789-1801. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2008.0273)
- 401 21. Gonzalez A, Rayfield B, Lindo Z. 2011 The disentangled bank: how loss of habitat
402 fragments and disassembles ecological networks. *Am. J. Bot.* **98**, 503-516.
403 (doi:10.3732/ajb.1000424)
- 404 22. Hagen M, *et al.* 2012 Biodiversity, species interactions and ecological networks in a
405 fragmented world. *Adv. Ecol. Res.* **46**, 89-210. (doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-396992-7.00002-2)
- 406 23. Dobson A, *et al.* 2006 Habitat loss, trophic collapse, and the decline of ecosystem services.
407 *Ecology* **87**, 1915-1924. (doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[1915:HLTCAT]2.0.CO;2)
- 408 24. Cagnolo L, Valladares G, Salvo A, Cabido M, Zak M. 2009 Habitat fragmentation and
409 species loss across three interacting trophic levels: Effects of life - history and food - web
410 traits. *Conserv. Biol.* **23**, 1167-1175. (doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01214.x)
- 411 25. Fenoglio MS, Salvo A, Videla M, Valladares GR. 2010 Plant patch structure modifies
412 parasitoid assemblage richness of a specialist herbivore. *Ecol. Entomol.* **35**, 594-601.
413 (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2311.2010.01218.x)
- 414 26. Valladares G, Cagnolo L, Salvo A. 2012 Forest fragmentation leads to food web contraction.
415 *Oikos* **121**, 299-305. (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19671.x)
- 416 27. Kruess A, Tschardt T. 1994 Habitat fragmentation, species loss, and biological control.
417 *Science* **264**, 1581-1584. (doi:10.1126/science.264.5165.1581)
- 418 28. Patterson BD. 1984 Mammalian extinction and biogeography in the Southern Rocky
419 Mountains. In: *Extinctions* (ed. Nitecki M) University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 247-
420 293.
- 421 29. Melián CJ, Bascompte J. 2002 Food web structure and habitat loss. *Ecol. Lett.* **5**, 37-46.
422 (doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2002.00280.x)
- 423 30. Fox JW, Olsen E. 2000 Food web structure and the strength of transient indirect effects.
424 *Oikos* **90**, 219-226. (doi:10.1034/j.1600-0706.2000.900202.x)
- 425 31. Pillai P, Loreau M, Gonzalez A. 2010 A patch-dynamic framework for food web
426 metacommunities. *Theor. Ecol.* **3**, 223-237. (doi:10.1007/s12080-009-0065-1)
- 427 32. Pillai P, Gonzalez A, Loreau M. 2011 Metacommunity theory explains the emergence of
428 food web complexity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 19293-19298.
429 (doi:10.1073/pnas.1106235108)

- 430 33. Matsuda H, Ogita N, Sasaki A, Sato K. 1992 Statistical mechanics of population: the lattice
431 Lotka-Volterra model. *Progr. Theor. Phys.* **88**, 1035-1049. (doi:10.1143/ptp/88.6.1035)
- 432 34. Harada Y, Iwasa Y. 1994 Lattice population dynamics for plants with dispersing seeds and
433 vegetative propagation. *Res. Popul. Ecol.* **36**, 237-249. (doi:10.1007/BF02514940)
- 434 35. Levin SA, Durrett R. 1996 From individuals to epidemics. *Philos. T. Roy. Soc. B* **351**, 1615-
435 1621. (doi:10.1098/rstb.1996.0145)
- 436 36. Ives AR, Turner MG, Pearson SM. 1998 Local explanations of landscape patterns: Can
437 analytical approaches approximate simulation models of spatial processes? *Ecosystems* **1**, 35-
438 51. (doi:10.1007/s100219900004)
- 439 37. Ovaskainen O, Sato K, Bascompte J, Hanski I. 2002 Metapopulation models for extinction
440 threshold in spatially correlated landscapes. *J. Theor. Biol.* **215**, 95-108.
441 (doi:10.1006/jtbi.2001.2502)
- 442 38. Liao J, Chen J, Ying Z, Hiebeler DE, Nijss I. 2016a An extended patch-dynamic framework
443 for food chains in fragmented landscapes. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 33100. (doi:10.1038/srep33100)
- 444 39. Peters RH. 1983 *The Ecological Implications of Body Size*. Cambridge University Press,
445 Cambridge.
- 446 40. McCann KS, Rasmussen JR, Umbanhowar J. 2005 The dynamics of spatially coupled food
447 webs. *Ecol. Lett.* **8**, 513-523. (doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00742.x)
- 448 41. Greenleaf SS, Williams NM, Winfree R, Kremen C. 2007 Bee foraging ranges and their
449 relationship to body size. *Oecologia* **153**, 589-596. (doi:10.1007/s00442-007-0752-9)
- 450 42. Stevens VM, *et al.* 2014 A comparative analysis of dispersal syndromes in terrestrial and
451 semi-terrestrial animals. *Ecol. Lett.* **17**, 1039-1052. (doi:10.1111/ele.12303)
- 452 43. Hiebeler D. 2007 Competing populations on fragmented landscapes with spatially structured
453 heterogeneities: improved landscape generation and mixed dispersal strategies. *J. Math. Biol.*
454 **54**, 337-356. (doi:10.1007/s00285-006-0054-6)
- 455 44. Boots M, Sasaki A. 2000 The evolutionary dynamics of local infection and global
456 reproduction in host-parasite interactions. *Ecol. Lett.* **3**, 181-185. (doi:10.1046/j.1461-
457 0248.2000.00139.x)
- 458 45. Ying Z, *et al.* 2014 Species coexistence in a lattice-structured habitat: Effects of species
459 dispersal and interactions. *J. Theor. Biol.* **359**, 184-191. (doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2014.05.048)
- 460 46. Liao J, *et al.* 2015 Species extinction thresholds in the face of spatially correlated periodic
461 disturbance. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 15455. (doi:10.1038/srep15455)
- 462 47. Liao J, *et al.* 2016b Coexistence of species with different dispersal across landscapes: a
463 critical role of spatial correlation in disturbance. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B* **283**, 20160537.
464 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.0537)
- 465 48. Brose U, *et al.* 2006 Consumer-resource body-size relationships in natural food webs.
466 *Ecology* **87**, 2411-2417. (doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[2411:CBRINF]2.0.CO;2)
- 467 49. Hanski I, Ovaskainen O. 2000 The metapopulation capacity of a fragmented landscape.
468 *Nature* **404**, 755-758. (doi:10.1038/35008063)

- 469 50. Kruess A, Tscharrntke T. 2000 Species richness and parasitism in a fragmented landscape:
470 experiments and field studies with insects on *Vicia sepium*. *Oecologia* **122**,129-137.
471 (doi:10.1007/PL00008829)
- 472 51. Terborgh J, *et al.* 2001 Ecological meltdown in predator-free forest fragments. *Science* **294**,
473 1923-1926. (doi:10.1126/science.1064397)
- 474 52. Scheid BE, Thies C, Tscharrntke T. 2011 Enhancing rape pollen beetle parasitism within
475 sown flower fields along a landscape complexity gradient. *Agr. Entomol.* **13**, 173-179.
476 (doi:10.1111/j.1461-9563.2010.00516.x)
- 477 53. Kratina P, Lecraw RM, Ingram T, Anholt BR. 2012 Stability and persistence of food webs
478 with omnivory: is there a general pattern? *Ecosphere* **3**, 794-804. (doi:10.1890/ES12-00121.1)
- 479 54. Hastings A. 1980 Disturbance, coexistence, history and competition for space. *Theor. Pop.*
480 *Biol.* **163**, 491-504. (doi:10.1016/0040-5809(80)90059-3)
- 481 55. Tilman D. 1994 Competition and biodiversity in spatially structured habitats. *Ecology* **75**,
482 685-700. (doi:10.2307/1939377)
- 483 56. Quinn JF, Harrison SP. 1988 Effects of habitat fragmentation and isolation on species
484 richness: evidence from biogeographic patterns. *Oecologia* **75**, 132-140.
485 (doi:10.1007/BF00378826)
- 486 57. Tscharrntke T, Steffan-Dewenter I, Kruess A, Thies C. 2002 Contribution of small habitat
487 fragments to conservation of insect communities of grassland-cropland landscapes. *Ecol.*
488 *Appl.* **12**, 354-363. (doi:10.1890/1051-0761(2002)012[0354:COHFT]2.0.CO;2)
- 489 58. Fahrig L. 2017 Ecological responses to habitat fragmentation *per se*. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*
490 **48**, in press. (doi:10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110316-022612)
- 491 59. Elton CS. 2000 *The ecology of invasions by animals and plants*. University of Chicago Press.
- 492 60. Davis MA. 2003 Biotic globalization: does competition from introduced species threaten
493 biodiversity? *Bioscience* **53**, 481-489.
494 (doi:10.1641/00063568(2003)053[0481:BGDCFI]2.0.CO;2)
- 495 61. Fischer J, Lindenmayer DB. 2007 Landscape modification and habitat fragmentation: a
496 synthesis. *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.* **16**, 265-280. (doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2007.00287.x)
- 497 62. Thompson PL, Rayfield B, Gonzalez A. 2017 Loss of habitat and connectivity erodes species
498 diversity, ecosystem functioning, and stability in metacommunity networks. *Ecography* **40**,
499 98-108. (doi:10.1111/ecog.02558)
- 500 63. Johst K, Brand R, Eber S. 2002 Metapopulation persistence in dynamic landscapes: the role
501 of dispersal distance. *Oikos* **98**, 263-270. (doi:10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.980208.x)
- 502 64. Bertuzzo E, *et al.* 2011 Spatial effects on species persistence and implications for
503 biodiversity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **108**, 4346-4351. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1017274108)
- 504 65. Fennell M, Murphy JE, Armstrong C, Gallagher T, Osborne B. 2012 Plant spread simulator:
505 a model for simulating large-scale directed dispersal processes across heterogeneous
506 environments. *Ecol. Model.* **230**, 1-10. (doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2012.01.008)
- 507 66. Altermatt F. 2013 Diversity in riverine metacommunities: a network perspective. *Aquat.*
508 *Ecol.* **47**, 365-377. (doi:10.1007/s10452-013-9450-3)

- 509 67. Heller NE, Zavaleta ES. 2009 Biodiversity management in the face of climate change: a
510 review of 22 years of recommendations. *Biol. Conserv.* **142**, 14-32.
511 (doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2008.10.006)
- 512 68. Chisholm C, Lindo Z, Gonzalez A. 2011 Metacommunity diversity depends on connectivity
513 and patch arrangement in heterogeneous habitat networks. *Ecography* **34**, 415-424.
514 (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.2010.06588.x)
- 515

516 **Figure captions**

517 **Figure 1.** Four types of food web structures: (a) a simple food chain, (b) an omnivory food web,
518 (c) exploitative competition, (d) apparent competition (arrow – predation and dotted line –
519 competition). Each food web consists of three interacting species but with different dispersal
520 traits: species 1 with neighbour dispersal, species 2 having random dispersal within habitat
521 fragments, and species 3 with global dispersal.

522
523 **Figure 2.** Interactive effects of patch availability and patch connectivity on species regional
524 coexistence in different food webs, simultaneously considering species dispersal (1 – neighbour
525 dispersal, 2 – within fragment dispersal, and 3 – global dispersal). Four food web structures are
526 included: (a) a simple food chain, (b) omnivory, (c) exploitative competition, and (d) apparent
527 competition. Invalid region: see equation (1). Parameter values: species colonization rate $c_i=c_{ji}=1$,
528 intrinsic extinction rate $e_i=e_{32}=0.05$ and species feeding preference cost $\psi=e_{31}/e_{32}=3$, top-
529 down extinction rate $\mu_{ji}=0.025$ ($i, j=1, 2, 3$).

530
531 **Figure 3.** Effect of variation in species feeding preference cost ($\psi=e_{31}/e_{32}=1, 3, 5, 7$ at fixed
532 $e_{32}=0.05$) on species extinction risk in omnivory versus apparent competition, simultaneously by
533 varying both patch availability and patch connectivity. Again, species dispersal ranges: 1 –
534 neighbour dispersal, 2 – within fragment dispersal, and 3 – global dispersal. Invalid region: see
535 equation (1). Other parameter values seen in figure 2.


536
537 **Figure 4.** Effect of variation in species top-down extinction rate ($\omega=\mu_{31}/\mu_{21}=1, 3, 5, 7, 9$ at fixed
538 $\mu_{21}=0.025$) on species persistence in omnivory versus exploitative competition, while again
539 varying both patch availability and connectivity. Species dispersal ranges: 1 – neighbour
540 dispersal, 2 – within fragment dispersal, and 3 – global dispersal. Other parameter values: see
541 figure 2. Invalid region seen in equation (1).

542

543 **Tables**544 **Table 1.** Parameter interpretation


Parameter	Interpretation
u	Fraction of unsuitable patches (habitat patch loss)
s	Fraction of suitable patches (patch availability)
c_i	Colonization rate of species i
e_i	Intrinsic extinction rate of species i
c_{ji}	Colonization rate of species j when feeding on prey species i
e_{ji}	Intrinsic extinction rate of species j when feeding on prey species i
μ_{ji}	The top-down extinction rate of species i eaten by species j
ρ_i	Global patch occupancy of species i ($i=1,2,3$)
$\rho_{(i,j)}$	Patch occupancy by the trophic link $i \rightarrow j$, with “ (i, j) ” indicating species j feeding on species i within a local patch
ρ_{ij}	Probability of a randomly chosen pair of neighbouring patches that one is i and another is j (i.e. pair density; $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, u, s\}$)
q_{ss}	Clustering degree of suitable patches (i.e. patch connectivity), indirectly indicating mean patch cluster size and habitat fragmentation
q_{ij}	Conditional probability that the neighbour of a j -patch is an i -patch (i.e. local density; $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, u, s\}$)

545




Four types of food web structures: (a) a simple food chain, (b) an omnivory food web, (c) exploitative competition, (d) apparent competition (arrow – predation and dotted line – competition). Each food web consists of three interacting species but with different dispersal traits: species 1 with neighbour dispersal, species 2 having random dispersal within habitat fragments, and species 3 with global dispersal.

201x264mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Interactive effects of patch availability and patch connectivity on species regional coexistence in different food webs, simultaneously considering species dispersal (1 – neighbour dispersal, 2 – within fragment dispersal, and 3 – global dispersal). Four food web structures are included: (a) a simple food chain, (b) omnivory, (c) exploitative competition, and (d) apparent competition. Invalid region: see equation (1).

201x264mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Effect of variation in species feeding preference cost on species extinction risk in omnivory versus apparent competition, simultaneously by varying both patch availability and patch connectivity. Again, species dispersal ranges: 1 – neighbour dispersal, 2 – within fragment dispersal, and 3 – global dispersal.

201x288mm (300 x 300 DPI)



Effect of variation in species top-down extinction rate on species persistence in omnivory versus exploitative competition, while again varying both patch availability and connectivity. Species dispersal ranges: 1 – neighbour dispersal, 2 – within fragment dispersal, and 3 – global dispersal.

201x288mm (300 x 300 DPI)