



HAL
open science

Spatial heterogeneity of interaction strength has contrasting effects on synchrony and stability in trophic metacommunities

Pierre Quévrex, Bart Haegeman, Michel Loreau

► To cite this version:

Pierre Quévrex, Bart Haegeman, Michel Loreau. Spatial heterogeneity of interaction strength has contrasting effects on synchrony and stability in trophic metacommunities. 2023. hal-03829838v2

HAL Id: hal-03829838

<https://hal.science/hal-03829838v2>

Preprint submitted on 11 Jan 2023 (v2), last revised 27 Jan 2023 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Spatial heterogeneity of interaction strength has contrasting effects on synchrony and stability in trophic metacommunities

Pierre Quévreux¹, Bart Haegeman¹, and Michel Loreau¹

¹*Theoretical and Experimental Ecology Station, UAR 2029, CNRS, 09200 Moulis, France*

Abstract

Spatial heterogeneity is a fundamental feature of ecosystems, and ecologists have identified it as a factor promoting the stability of population dynamics. In particular, differences in interaction strengths and resource supply between patches generates an asymmetry of biomass turnover with a fast and a slow patch. The coupling of these two energy channels by mobile predators has been identified to increase stability at different scales by promoting the asynchrony of population dynamics between each patch. Here, we demonstrate that asymmetry has a contrasting effect on the stability of metacommunities receiving localised perturbations. We built a model of an asymmetric metacommunity with two patches linked by the dispersal of predators and in which prey receive stochastic perturbations only in one patch. Perturbing prey in the fast patch synchronises the dynamics of prey biomass between the two patches and destabilises predator dynamics by increasing their temporal variability. Conversely, perturbing prey in the slow patch decreases the synchrony of their dynamics and stabilises predator dynamics. This discrepancy between the responses is due to the asymmetric transmission of perturbations caused by the different distributions of biomass between the fast and the slow patch. Consequently, the fast patch drives the dynamics of the metacommunity and imposes synchrony while the slow patch does not. Therefore, local perturbations can have opposite consequences at the regional scale depending on the characteristics of the perturbed patch. Our results have strong implications for conservation ecology and suggest reinforcing protection policies in fast patches to dampen the effects of perturbations and promote the stability of population dynamics at the regional scale.

Key words

source-sink, stochastic perturbations, food chain, dispersal, asymmetry, conservation

28 Introduction

29 Since May (1972) demonstrated that stability was not an inherent property of ecological interac-
30 tion networks, ecologists have been relentlessly looking for the mechanisms ensuring ecosystem stability.
31 Spatial heterogeneity has long been identified as one of the main factors promoting the mechanisms un-
32 derlying the maintenance of biodiversity and the stability of ecosystems. For instance, in competitive
33 metacommunity models, spatial heterogeneity provides local favourable conditions to each species of the
34 regional pool (Holt, 1984; Chesson, 2000; Amarasekare and Nisbet, 2001), which in turn ensures species
35 persistence in less favourable patches by source-sink dynamics (Mouquet and Loreau, 2002, 2003; Loreau
36 et al., 2003). The stability of the temporal dynamics of species biomass is ensured by the asynchrony of
37 the dynamics between patches, which leads to compensatory dynamics (Loreau et al., 2003; Loreau and
38 de Mazancourt, 2008). In trophic metacommunities, spatial heterogeneity has also been identified as a
39 stabilising factor (Steele, 1974; Hastings, 1977, 1978), but the underlying mechanisms are more complex
40 due to the interplay between trophic and spatial dynamics.

41 Inspired by the description of fast and slow energy channels by soil ecologists (*i.e.*, in terms of biomass
42 turnover), Rooney et al. (2006) noted the stabilising effect of the asymmetry of energy flows in ecosystems
43 with a food web model consisting of one mobile predator feeding on two energy channels. In their model,
44 the asymmetry of energy flow is generated by different interaction strengths between predators and prey
45 (*i.e.* increased attack rate in one energy channel compared to the other one, see Figure 1) and different
46 consumption rates of a common resource by the two basal species, which in turn promotes the asynchrony
47 of prey biomass dynamics in response to perturbations. Although synchrony patterns are tightly linked
48 to stability patterns, because the asynchrony of local population dynamics leads to more stable dynamics
49 (low biomass CV) at higher scales due to compensatory dynamics (Loreau et al., 2003; Gonzalez and
50 Loreau, 2008; Loreau and de Mazancourt, 2013; Wilcox et al., 2017), subsequent studies suggested
51 that increased asymmetry does not necessarily leads to increased stability. For example Ruokolainen
52 et al. (2011) presented a model in which biomass fluctuations can become more variable with increasing
53 asynchrony. Hence, the relationship between asymmetry and stability is not trivial and the mechanisms
54 governing asynchrony through the difference in energy flow between the fast and slow channels are not well

corresponding author: pierre.quevreux@cri-paris.org

55 **understood.** To fill this gap, we propose to consider the effects of asymmetry from the metacommunity
56 perspective since recent theoretical studies were able to accurately explain the synchrony and stability
57 patterns in metacommunities (Quévreux et al., 2021a,b).

58 Metacommunities embody the spatial dimension of interaction networks: they consist of distant patches
59 connected by the dispersal of the organisms living in each patch (Leibold et al., 2004; Leibold and Chase,
60 2017). The metacommunity framework is particularly suitable to represent the spatial heterogeneity ob-
61 served in ecosystems because each community has its own characteristics such as biomass turnover. Fol-
62 lowing Rooney et al.'s (2006) model, many studies implemented spatial heterogeneity through the asym-
63 metry of interaction strength and/or resource supply to manipulate the difference in biomass turnover
64 between the energy channels hosted by each patch (Goldwyn and Hastings, 2009; Ruokolainen et al.,
65 2011; Anderson and Fahimipour, 2021). In particular, interaction strength is key in community dynam-
66 ics because it governs food web structure, stability (Neutel et al., 2002) and biomass distribution (Barbier
67 and Loreau, 2019) by simultaneously determining predator growth and prey mortality. Therefore, its sig-
68 nificant variations observed in nature, often reported as predation risk by prey in field studies (Table 1),
69 should lead to dramatic variations in community functioning across space.

70 In addition to the asymmetry of interaction strength, Rooney et al. (2006) highlighted the importance
71 of mobile predators coupling two different energy channels, a keystone role in ecosystem functioning
72 largely reported by empirical studies (Schindler and Scheuerell, 2002; Vadeboncoeur et al., 2005; Schmitz,
73 2004; Olf et al., 2009; Dolson et al., 2009; Schmitz et al., 2010). In Rooney et al.'s (2006) model, the
74 perturbation of the mobile predator leads to an asynchronous response of prey, which stabilises the food
75 web. However, Quévreux et al. (2021a) showed that the perturbation and dispersal of particular trophic
76 levels govern synchrony and stability in symmetric metacommunities. In asymmetric metacommunities,
77 the perturbation of particular patches should lead to different synchrony and stability patterns at the
78 metacommunity scale because of the different dynamics in each patch in response to perturbations. **In**
79 **parallel to the keystone role of mobile predators, keystone communities (*sensus* Mouquet et al. (2013),**
80 **which are equivalent to keystone patches), should have a major influence on synchrony and stability**
81 **patterns.** Therefore, we expect that asymmetry is not a generic stabilising factor, as claimed by Rooney
82 et al. (2006), but strongly depends on which patch is perturbed according to its characteristics. To explore
83 this statement, we consider a simple metacommunity model of two patches hosting a predator-prey couple
84 and with asymmetric interaction strength and resource supply. The stability of the metacommunity is
85 assessed by the response at different scales (e.g. CV of the biomass of a species at the local and regional

Table 1: Approximative relative increase in predation risk between low-risk and high-risk environments (equivalent to the asymmetry of interaction strength γ in Figure 1). See Gorini et al. (2012) for an extended review and more references.

Predator	Prey	γ	Reference
American marten	Vole species	1.6	Andruskiw et al., 2008
Wolf	Moose	14-100	Gervasi et al., 2013
Wolf	Roe deer	2.5-8	Gervasi et al., 2013
Wolf	Elk	10	Kauffman et al., 2007
Savannah predators	Savannah ungulates	1.5-4.5	Thaker et al., 2011
Artificial gecko	Australian predators	2.8	Hansen et al., 2019
Lynx	Roe deer	2	Gehr et al., 2020
Puma	Vicuña	1.6	Donadio and Buskirk, 2016




Figure 1: The metacommunity model consists of two patches, each sustaining a predator-prey couple linked by predators, which disperse at a very high scaled rate d_2 . Prey grow at a rate g/D and have a positive effect ϵa on predators, while predators have a negative effect $m a$ on prey. Each species population is also limited by self-regulation D (negative intraspecific interactions). Spatial heterogeneity is embodied by the asymmetry of resource supply (green) and the interaction strength (purple), which are higher in patch #1 by factors ω and γ , respectively. Consistent with Rooney et al. (2006), patch #1 is called the fast patch, and patch #2 is called the slow patch. Prey receive stochastic perturbations either in patch #1 or in patch #2 (red arrows).

86 scales) when prey receive stochastic perturbations in one of the two patches. We show contrasting effects
 87 of asymmetry: perturbing prey in the fast patch (equivalent to the fast channel defined by Rooney and
 88 McCann, 2012) promotes prey synchrony and decreases predator stability at the metapopulation scale
 89 while perturbing the slow patch has the opposite effects.

90 Methods

91 Metacommunity model

We use the model proposed by Quévieux et al. (2021a) based on the food chain model developed by Barbier and Loreau (2019). The model consists of two patches that each sustain a food chain with

Lotka-Volterra predator-prey interactions (equations (1a) and (1b)).

$$\frac{1}{D} \frac{dB_1^{(1)}}{dt} = B_1^{(1)} \left(\omega \frac{g}{D} - B_1^{(1)} - \gamma ma B_2^{(1)} \right) \quad (1a)$$

$$\frac{1}{mD} \frac{dB_2^{(1)}}{dt} = \underbrace{B_2^{(1)} \left(-B_2^{(1)} + \gamma \epsilon a B_1^{(1)} \right)}_{\text{intra-patch dynamics}} + \underbrace{d_2 \left(B_2^{(2)} - B_2^{(1)} \right)}_{\text{dispersal}} \quad (1b)$$

$B_1^{(k)}$ and $B_2^{(k)}$ are the biomasses of prey and predators, respectively, in patch k . Prey have a positive effect ϵa on predators (ϵ is the conversion efficiency and a is the interspecific interaction rate relative to intraspecific interactions), and predators have a negative effect ma on prey (m is the predator to prey metabolic rate ratio)(Figure 1). The time scale of the system is rescaled by the metabolic rate of prey, and biologic rates of each species i are rescaled by its intraspecific interaction rate D_i . Therefore, we obtain the relative growth rate g/D and the scaled dispersal rate d_i . Considering scaled parameters and aggregated parameters (ϵa and ma) enables us to explore a wide range of ecological situations. We refer to Appendix S1-1 for a detailed description of the food chain model and analysis methods. All the necessary information to fully understand our results are in the main text and the supplementary information only serves to give additional technical elements to fully reproduce our work and proofs of the robustness of our results. Parameters and their values are summarised in Table 2.

We reproduce the two main features of Rooney et al.'s (2006) model. First, predators disperse at a very high scaled rate $d_2 = 10^6$, while prey are immobile ($d_1 = 0$), and strongly couple the two patches. Slightly mobile prey ($0 < d_1 \ll d_2$) should not change the results because Quévieux et al. (2021a) showed that the species for which dispersal has the strongest influence drives the coupling between the two patches. Second, resource supply and interaction strength are asymmetric between patches since they are higher in patch #1 by factors γ and ω respectively (Figure 1). Patch #1 corresponds to the fast energy channel, in which biomass has a high turnover, while patch #2 corresponds to the slow channel. Therefore, we call patch #1 the fast patch and patch #2 the slow patch. We set $\gamma = \omega$ to ensure species persistence over the entire range of parameters (see Figure S2-6 in the supporting information) but varying them independently does not qualitatively change the results (see Figure S2-14 in the supporting information). In the following, we only refer to γ for the sake of simplicity and only consider $\gamma \geq 1$ because $\gamma \leq 1$ just swaps the roles of patches #1 and #2.

115 Response to stochastic perturbations

116 We use the same methods as Quévreux et al. (2021a) to study the response of metacommunities to
 117 stochastic perturbations. Indeed, recent studies advocate for the use of the temporal variability of biomass
 118 (Haegeman et al., 2016; Arnoldi et al., 2018), which is measured by the coefficient of variation (CV), and
 119 can be easily measured experimentally. In addition, Wang and Loreau (2014, 2016), Wang et al. (2019),
 120 and Jarillo et al. (2022) showed that CVs scale up from local populations to community, regional and
 121 metacommunity levels, therefore providing a comparison of stability at different scales. Here, we provide
 122 only a brief description of the main concepts, but a thorough description is available in Appendix S1.

Prey in the fast or slow channel receive stochastic perturbations that are represented by equation (2).

$$dB_i = \underbrace{f_i(B_1, \dots, B_S)dt}_{\text{Deterministic}} + \underbrace{\sigma_i \sqrt{B_i^*} dW_i}_{\text{Perturbation}} \quad (2)$$

123 $f_i(B_1, \dots, B_S)$ represents the deterministic part of the dynamics of species i , as described by equations (1a)
 124 and (1b)). Stochastic perturbations are defined by their standard deviation σ_i and dW_i , a white noise
 125 term with a mean of 0 and variance of 1. Perturbations also scale with the square root of the biomass at
 126 equilibrium B_i^* of the perturbed population. Such scaling makes the perturbations similar to demographic
 127 stochasticity (from birth-death processes) that evenly affect each species regardless of abundance (Arnoldi
 128 et al., 2019). In other words, the ratio of mean species biomass variance to perturbation variance is roughly
 129 independent of biomass, which disentangles the effect of asymmetry on perturbation transmission from
 130 its effect on species abundance. Therefore, for different perturbations affecting different species with
 131 the same value of standard deviation σ_i , we generate a similar variance at the metacommunity scale
 132 regardless the abundance of the perturbed species and excite the entire metacommunity with the same
 133 intensity (see Figure S2-3 in the supporting information).

134 In the following, we assess the temporal variability of the biomass of each population induced by
 135 stochastic perturbations affecting the metacommunity. Therefore, we linearise the system in the vicinity
 136 of equilibrium to obtain equation (3) where $X_i = B_i - B_i^*$ is the deviation from equilibrium.

$$\frac{d\vec{X}}{dt} = J\vec{X} + T\vec{E} \quad (3)$$

137 J is the Jacobian matrix, which represents the linearised direct effects between populations in the
 138 vicinity of equilibrium, and T defines how the perturbations $E_i = \sigma_i dW_i$ apply to the system (*i.e.*, which
 139 species they affect and how they scale with biomass, where T is a diagonal matrix whose terms are
 140 $T_{ii} = \sqrt{B_i^*}$).

141 **Because the system is at steady state, the stationary variance-covariance matrix C^* of species biomasses**
 142 **(variance-covariance matrix of \vec{X} , see the demonstration in Appendix S1-5)** can be calculated from
 143 the variance-covariance matrix of perturbations V_E (variance-covariance matrix of \vec{E}) by solving the
 144 Lyapunov equation (4) (Arnold, 1974; Wang et al., 2015; Arnoldi et al., 2016; Quévreur et al., 2021a).

$$JC^* + C^*J^\top + TV_ET^\top = 0 \quad (4)$$

145 The expressions for V_E and T and the method to solve the Lyapunov equation are detailed in Ap-
 146 pendix S1-6. From the variance-covariance matrix C^* , we compute the coefficient of correlation of the
 147 biomass dynamics between the two populations of each species (see equation (22) in the supporting infor-
 148 mation) and we measure the stability with the coefficient of variation (CV) of the biomass. In addition,
 149 biomass CVs can be measured at different scales: population scale (*e.g.*, biomass CV of prey in patch #1),
 150 metapopulation scale (*e.g.*, CV of the total biomass of prey) and metacommunity scale (*e.g.*, CV of the
 151 total biomass of predator and prey put together) to assess the effects of asymmetry at local and regional
 152 scales (Figure 3A and see Appendix S1-7). Finally, we quantify the synchrony of the dynamics of the dif-
 153 ferent populations with the coefficient of correlation, which is also computed from the variance-covariance
 154 matrix C^* (Appendix S1-7).

155 **Results**

156 **Effects on stability**

157 We describe how the asymmetry of interaction strength γ shapes metacommunity stability at different
 158 scales. Since predators have a very high scaled dispersal rate ($d_2 = 10^6$), their populations are perfectly
 159 correlated and display the same dynamics. Our main result is that prey become more correlated when
 160 they are perturbed in patch #1 (fast channel in which $\gamma > 1$), while they become more anticorrelated when
 161 they are perturbed in patch #2 (Figure 2). Increasing γ amplifies the difference in correlation between

Table 2: Table of parameters. σ_i is set very small to keep the system in the vicinity of equilibrium. More combinations of εa and ma are tested in the supporting information. d_2 is set very high to emphasise the high mobility of predators and their ability to couple prey populations. ω is set equal to γ . $r = 0$ removes the energetic limitations of the food chain and makes interactions the dominant factors determining biomass distribution and stability patterns, as in Barbier and Loreau (2019).

parameter	interpretation	value
σ_i	standard deviation of stochastic noise	10^{-3}
g	net growth rate of prey	1
r	death rate of predators	0
D	self-regulation	1
ϵ	conversion efficiency	0.65
m	predator/prey metabolic rate ratio	0.65
a	attack rate	1.54,
εa	positive effect of prey on predators	1
ma	negative effect of predators on prey	1
d_2	scaled dispersal rate of predators	10^6
ω	asymmetry of resource supply	[1,10]
γ	asymmetry of interaction strength	[1,10]




Figure 2: Spatial correlation between the populations of each species depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ when predators disperse and prey are perturbed in patch #1 or #2. The dashed line emphasises the value of the correlation of prey populations without asymmetry ($\gamma = 1$). Note that the curves for predators overlap because their high dispersal that perfectly correlates their dynamics regardless of the perturbed patch.

162 these two scenarios, and this pattern qualitatively holds for various combinations of the physiological and
 163 ecological parameters εa and ma (see Figure S2-9 in the supporting information).

164 Increasing the asymmetry of interaction strength γ has contrasting effects on biomass CV at different
 165 scales as well (Figure 3A). At the population scale, it increases the biomass CV of each population when
 166 prey are perturbed in the fast patch (Figure 3B). When prey are perturbed in the slow patch, increasing
 167 γ slightly alters the biomass CV of prey in patch #1, increases the biomass CV of prey in patch #2
 168 and decreases the biomass CV of predators. This discrepancy can be attributed to the strong effect of

169 γ on prey biomass in patch #2 (Figure 4): prey biomass strongly decreases with γ in patch #2, which
170 increases their biomass CV.

171 At the metapopulation scale, the asymmetry of interaction strength γ increases the biomass CV of
172 prey in both scenarios of perturbation (Figure 3C). However, this result is not true for all values of εa and
173 ma (Figure S2-10A in the supporting information) because of the various responses of prey biomass to
174 γ among patches (Figure S2-8A in the supporting information). The biomass CV of predators is higher
175 when prey are perturbed in the fast patch (patch #1) compared to the case in which prey are perturbed
176 in the slow patch (#2) (Figure 3C), which is consistent for all values of εa and ma (see Figure S2-10A
177 in the supporting information).

178 Finally, stability at the metacommunity scale depends on the distribution of biomass and CV among
179 species. In our particular case ($\varepsilon a = 1$ and $ma = 1$), predators have the largest total biomass (Figure 4)
180 and drive the biomass CV at the metacommunity scale for low values of asymmetry of interaction strength
181 γ (Figure 3D). For high values of γ , when prey are perturbed in patch #2, the CV of total biomass
182 increases with γ because it is driven by prey in patch #2, whose biomass CV is much higher than the
183 biomass CV of predators, which compensates for their lower biomass. **Other values of εa and ma lead to**
184 **other distributions of biomass and CV among species, which can make prey to drive the stability at the**
185 **metacommunity scale (see Figures S2-8 and S2-10 in the supporting information).**

186 **Underlying mechanisms**

187 To unveil the mechanisms governing the stability of heterogeneous metacommunities, we look deeper
188 into the dynamics after a pulse perturbation (Figure 5A) and explain them with the direct effects between
189 species quantified by the Jacobian matrix (see equation (3)). When the perturbation of prey occurs in
190 patch #1, the strong direct effect of prey on predators (and vice versa) in patch #1 due to γ (Figure 5B)
191 leads to a strong response of predators ①, which in turn drives the response of the two prey popu-
192 lations ②. In detail, predator biomass in patch #1 first increases because of the abundance of prey.
193 Then, predators deplete prey biomass in both patches and correlate their dynamics, which explains why
194 asymmetry of interaction strength γ increases prey correlation when prey are perturbed in patch #1.

195 When the perturbation of prey occurs in patch #2, the weak direct effect of prey on predators (Fig-
196 ure 5B) leads to a small response of predators ③. In turn, the very low direct effect of predators on
197 prey in patch #2 does not allow perturbations to ripple back to patch #2 where prey slowly respond
198 from the initial perturbation ④ (Figure 5B). This slow response is emphasised by the source-sink dy-




Figure 3: Stability at different scales depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ when predators disperse and prey are perturbed in patch #1 or #2. **A)** The temporal variability in the metacommunity is assessed by the coefficient of variation (CV) of biomass at different scales: population scale (biomass CV of one species in one patch), metapopulation scale (CV of the total biomass of one species across patches) and metacommunity scale (CV of the total biomass of the entire metacommunity). **B)** Biomass CV at the population scale. Note that the curves for predators overlap because their high dispersal perfectly balances their biomass distribution between the two patches. **C)** Biomass CV at the metapopulation scale. **D)** Biomass CV at the metacommunity scale.




Figure 4: Distribution of the biomass of each species among patches depending on the asymmetry of interaction strength γ . Note that the curves for predators overlap because their high dispersal that perfectly balances their biomass between the two patches.




Figure 5: **A**) Time series of biomasses rescaled by their value at equilibrium after an increase of 20% in prey biomass in patch #1 (left panel) or patch #2 (right panel) for a value of interaction strength asymmetry $\gamma = 3$. **B**) Direct effect of prey on predator (and vice versa) depending on interaction strength asymmetry γ . Direct effects correspond to the terms of the Jacobian matrix and the dashed line emphasises the null direct effects. On the central schema, the numbers are the numeric values of the terms of the Jacobian matrix corresponding to each arrow for $\gamma = 3$.

199 namics in the metacommunity (Figure 4 and Figure S2-5 in the supporting information), which leads to a
200 lower biomass of prey in patch #2 compared to a metacommunity without dispersal, therefore decreasing
201 biomass flows in patch #2 and its response speed. This difference in response speed between patches #1
202 and #2 leads to the anti-correlation of prey populations because it increases the time interval in which
203 they have opposite variations: an increase in the biomass of prey in patch #1, which follows the initial
204 decrease due to predation, and a slow decrease in prey biomass in patch #2.

205 Discussion

206 We have shown that the asymmetry of interaction strength has contrasting effects on stability de-
207 pending on which patch is perturbed. Perturbing prey in the fast patch (in which interaction strength
208 is the highest) tends to synchronise the dynamics of prey biomass and increases the temporal variability
209 of predator dynamics at the metapopulation scale, while perturbing prey in the slow patch **decreases the**
210 **synchrony of** prey dynamics and the temporal variability predator dynamics. This discrepancy between
211 the responses is due to asymmetric transmission of perturbations within each patch, itself caused by differ-
212 ent biomass distributions and interaction strengths between the two patches. Perturbations are strongly
213 transmitted from the fast patch to the slow patch, while the reverse transmission is weak. Consequently,
214 the fast patch drives the dynamics of the metacommunity and synchronises prey dynamics, while the
215 slow patch does not, and the almost independent respond from perturbation in each patch **decreases the**
216 **synchrony of** prey dynamics.

217 Stability in a heterogeneous world

218 Our results show that spatial heterogeneity, which is represented by the asymmetry of interaction
219 strength and resource supply as in Rooney et al. (2006), generates mechanisms that alter local and re-
220 gional dynamics, which deeply changes the synchrony of population dynamics and the stability of the
221 metacommunity at different scales. **Quévrex et al. (2021a) showed that, in a homogenous metacom-**
222 **munity, the spatial correlations between patches can be obtained from the within-patch correlations, the**
223 **dispersing species making the link between the two (see Figure S2-28 for a summary of the results of**
224 **Quévrex et al., 2021a).** In other words, knowledge of the dynamics at the local scale is enough to under-
225 stand the stability pattern at the metacommunity scale. In a heterogeneous metacommunity, a similar
226 approach does not work because patches do not contribute equally to the dynamics. In a heterogeneous

227 metacommunity, a similar approach does not work because patches do not contribute equally to the dy-
228 namics. In particular, a patch with fast energy flow can have an overwhelming impact (see Figure S2-7
229 in the supporting information). Clearly, the dynamics at the metacommunity scale cannot be assessed
230 by the dynamics at the local scale, as in Quévieux et al. (2021a), and they are an emergent property
231 resulting from the tight interplay between the strength of perturbation transmission in each patch.

232 Rooney et al. (2006) verbally explained that each patch has dynamics with different speeds: the fast
233 channel (with higher interaction rates and resource supplies) enables a quick response after a perturbation
234 while the slow channel dampens the dynamics in the long term and prevents the system from overshooting.
235 By considering the stability at different scales, our results contrast with this explanation. On the one
236 hand, the asynchrony of prey dynamics, when they are perturbed in patch #2 (Figure 2), stabilises the
237 dynamics of predators because their resource supplies are asynchronous. On the other hand, the dynamics
238 of prey at the metapopulation scale are not stabilised by their asynchrony (Figure 3C) because of the
239 low local stability in patch #2 (Figure 3B), which decreases the overall stability of prey. The potential
240 stabilising effect of asymmetry depends both on the perturbed patch and the considered trophic level.
241 Therefore, the overall stability at the metacommunity scale is governed by the relative contributions
242 of the various populations in response to local perturbations, and asymmetry *per se* does not have a
243 stabilising effect.

244 Our description of the mechanisms underlying the apparent stabilising effects of spatial heterogeneity
245 should enlighten the results of previous theoretical studies. Goldwyn and Hastings (2009) and Ruoko-
246 lainen et al. (2011) found that the asymmetry of interaction rate leads to asynchrony by generating
247 out-of-phase dynamics in a system with endogenous oscillations. In particular, Ruokolainen et al. (2011)
248 found a U-shaped relationship: for moderate asymmetry, the spatial asynchrony of predator and prey
249 populations is maximal, which leads to optimum stability at the metacommunity scale. Our results sug-
250 gest that moderate asymmetry would alter the phase of the oscillations in each patch while keeping the
251 amplitude of oscillations equivalent, therefore promoting asynchrony. Conversely, a strong asymmetry
252 would increase the imbalance between oscillation amplitude and enable the fast patch to take over the
253 slow patch, which would bring back synchrony. However, their results rely on phase-locking (Jansen,
254 1999; Lloyd and May, 1999; Goldwyn and Hastings, 2008; Vasseur and Fox, 2009), which is the coupling
255 of the phase of oscillators embodied by predator-prey pairs in each patch. Although our results provide
256 interesting insight into metacommunity dynamics, they cannot grasp the fine mechanisms underlying
257 nonlinear phenomena such as phase-locking and further studies are needed to identify these mechanisms.

258 **Generality of the effects of asymmetry on stability**

259 Our main results is that asymmetry is stabilising when the slow patch is perturbed, while it is desta-
260 bilising when the fast patch is perturbed. This result is strikingly robust to several deviations from the
261 original model we have described. First, we show that the described mechanisms are valid for a wide range
262 of ecological and physiological parameters leading to various distributions of biomass among predators
263 and prey (see Figures S2-8 and S2-9 in the supporting information). In addition, we observe the same
264 results for longer food chains as long as prey populations are directly coupled by the dispersing predator
265 (see Figures S2-18 and S2-19 in the supporting information). Currently, we do not identify a clear pat-
266 tern for species lower in the food chain over a wide range of ecological and physiological parameters but
267 further studies are needed to investigate the potential indirect effects propagating across the food chain.
268 Second, the mechanisms are not restricted to prey populations coupled by a mobile predator but also
269 apply to predator populations coupled by a mobile prey (see Figure S2-22 in the supporting information).
270 Therefore, we anticipate that mobile predators are not the only major drivers of synchrony and stability
271 in ecosystems (Schindler and Scheuerell, 2002; Vadeboncoeur et al., 2005; Dolson et al., 2009; Olf et al.,
272 2009; Rooney and McCann, 2012), and resource species may also have an equivalent impact. Taken
273 together, these two points strongly suggest that the mechanisms underlying stability and synchrony in
274 response to perturbations should be general to metacommunities regardless of the ecological parameters,
275 biomass distribution and dispersal among species.

276 Spatial heterogeneity has often been presented as a generic condition generating mechanisms ensuring
277 stability, but our results contradict this statement. The models focusing on the asymmetric feeding of
278 consumers on different energy channels or different patches showed that it promotes the existence of
279 stable equilibria (McCann et al., 1998), greater asymptotic resilience (Rooney et al., 2006), asynchrony
280 of prey in response to predator perturbation (Rooney et al., 2006) and out-of-phase limit cycles (Gold-
281 wyn and Hastings, 2009; Ruokolainen et al., 2011). All these studies considered measures of stability
282 aiming to capture the general stability properties of metacommunities and miss the targeted effects of
283 perturbations as we explained earlier. Although asymmetry does not necessarily promote stability, our
284 results show that general mechanisms drive the response of metacommunities to localised perturbations,
285 therefore providing a valuable framework to assess the response of ecosystems to localised perturbations
286 due to human activity. Additionally, these mechanisms enable us to understand the effect of environ-
287 mental perturbations affecting all patches. As demonstrated by Arnoldi et al. (2019), environmental

288 perturbations affect abundant populations the most, which is the prey population in the fast patch in
289 our case (see Figure S2-25 in the supporting information). Therefore, we anticipate that the fast patch
290 will govern the dynamics of metacommunities in which all populations are perturbed (see Figure S2-27
291 in the supporting information).

292 **Implications for conservation**

293 The metacommunity framework has long been used in conservation ecology (Johnson et al., 2013;
294 Schiesari et al., 2019; Patrick et al., 2021). Conservation efforts are usually concentrated on particular
295 locations and useful management must consider the ecological processes acting at the landscape scale (Van
296 Teeffelen et al., 2012; Chase et al., 2020). For instance, spatial heterogeneity is key to ensuring species
297 coexistence and diversity at the regional scale, which ultimately provides important ecosystem services
298 in agricultural landscapes (Bennett et al., 2006). A large corpus of theoretical studies explored the local
299 response of communities in a landscape receiving perturbations (Mouquet et al., 2011; Economo, 2011;
300 Holyoak et al., 2020; Jacquet et al., 2022). However, these studies focus on extinction events recovered
301 by dispersal events in a patch dynamics framework, and little is known about the effect of moderate or
302 small perturbations. In this context, the present study provides valuable insight into fine-scale dynamics
303 in response to perturbations.

304 Our results show that species interactions are a major driver of synchrony in heterogeneous metacom-
305 munities. Even if the species of interest does not disperse significantly, the synchrony of the dynamics
306 of its different populations can strongly depend on the interactions with another species with a higher
307 dispersal across the landscape. For instance, Howeth and Leibold (2013) showed that predatory fish
308 promote the asynchrony of oscillating populations of zooplankton in a mesocosm experiment. Therefore,
309 species endorsing this role are called "mobile link organisms" (Lundberg and Moberg, 2003) and are par-
310 ticularly targeted by conservation policy because they have major impacts on community dynamics and
311 ecosystem functioning (Soulé et al., 2005; Brodie et al., 2018). Such a species can be considered keystone
312 species (Mills and Doak, 1993) and must be clearly identified to properly manage the conservation of the
313 other interaction species. However, our results show that mobile link organisms are not the only driver
314 of metacommunity stability, and the patch being perturbed also has a major impact. The concept of a
315 keystone community, defined by Mouquet et al. (2013) for communities whose destruction causes species
316 extinction or a decrease in biomass production, can be applied to better assess the stability of metacom-
317 munities. **Keystone communities are usually identified as those patches that are strongly connected to**

318 other patches in the spatial network (Resetarits et al., 2018), but our results suggest that the dynamical
319 properties of each patch can be important as well. For instance, the fast patch can be identified as a
320 keystone patch because of its ability to synchronise the dynamics of the other patches. Therefore, identi-
321 fying the communities living in fast and slow patches should be key for conservation management aiming
322 to mitigate the effects of perturbations.

323 According to our results, mitigating the effects of perturbations affecting the patch in which interaction
324 strength is the highest is critical to avoid the synchrony of prey dynamics (Figure 2) and ensure predator
325 stability (Figure 3C). Then, the patch in which the interaction strength between the species of interest
326 and the mobile link organism is the highest must be identified. Conservation policies usually target
327 preserved areas because they are characterised by high species richness but identifying them as fast or
328 slow patches is not trivial. Urban ecology is a relevant example because many species dwell in cities and
329 less anthropised ecosystems (*e.g.*, agricultural and natural landscapes). Urban areas can be considered
330 fast patches because of the abundance of resources (parameters ω in our model) for opportunistic species,
331 but they can also be considered slow patches because of the reduced predation pressure (parameter γ in
332 our model), cities acting as safe spaces (see Shochat et al. (2006) and Shochat et al. (2010) for review).
333 Typically, birds and rodents can find plenty of food due to human wastes, public parks and feeding while
334 experiencing less predation (Rebolo-Ifrán et al., 2017). Therefore, focusing conservation efforts on urban
335 areas to mitigate the perturbations affecting their ecosystem may be as important as protecting wild
336 areas to protect species at the metapopulation scale.

337 Conclusion

338 Asymmetry of interaction strength, and spatial heterogeneity in general, is not stabilising factor *per*
339 *se* because perturbing prey in the fast patch leads to the synchrony of the dynamics of prey populations
340 and increases the temporal variability of the mobile predator linking the two patches. Therefore, the
341 response of metacommunities to perturbations is strongly context dependent, *i.e.*, a good knowledge of
342 the characteristics of each patch relative to each other is required to assess stability at the metacommunity
343 scale. Based on our findings, we advocate for conservation efforts to target key patches not only according
344 to species richness or biomass density but also according to the distribution of interaction strength across
345 the metacommunity.

346 Acknowledgements

347 This work was supported by the TULIP Laboratory of Excellence (ANR-10-LABX-41) and by the
348 BIOSTASES Advanced Grant, funded by the European Research Council under the European Union's
349 Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (666971).

350 Data accessibility

351 The R codes to reproduce the results and the figures are available on GitHub ([https://github.com/
352 PierreQuevreur/model_metacommunity_spatial_heterogeneity](https://github.com/PierreQuevreur/model_metacommunity_spatial_heterogeneity)).

353 References

- 354 Amarasekare, P., & Nisbet, R. M. (2001). Spatial heterogeneity, source-sink dynamics, and the local coexistence of competing
355 species. *The American Naturalist*, *158*(6), 572–584. <https://doi.org/10.1086/323586>
- 356 Anderson, K. E., & Fahimipour, A. K. (2021). Body size dependent dispersal influences stability in heterogeneous meta-
357 communities. *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 17410. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-96629-5>
- 358 Andruskiw, M., Fryxell, J. M., Thompson, I. D., & Baker, J. A. (2008). Habitat-mediated variation in predation risk by the
359 american marten. *Ecology*, *89*(8), 2273–2280. <https://doi.org/10.1890/07-1428.1>
- 360 Arnold, L. (1974). *Stochastic differential equations: Theory and applications*. Wiley.
- 361 Arnoldi, J.-F., Bideault, A., Loreau, M., & Haegeman, B. (2018). How ecosystems recover from pulse perturbations: A
362 theory of short- to long-term responses. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *436*, 79–92. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.
363 jtbi.2017.10.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2017.10.003)
- 364 Arnoldi, J.-F., Loreau, M., & Haegeman, B. (2016). Resilience, reactivity and variability: A mathematical comparison of
365 ecological stability measures. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *389*, 47–59. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.10.
366 012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.10.012)
- 367 Arnoldi, J.-F., Loreau, M., & Haegeman, B. (2019). The inherent multidimensionality of temporal variability: How common
368 and rare species shape stability patterns (J. Chase, Ed.). *Ecology Letters*, *22*(10), 1557–1567. [https://doi.org/10.
369 1111/ele.13345](https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13345)
- 370 Barbier, M., & Loreau, M. (2019). Pyramids and cascades: A synthesis of food chain functioning and stability. *Ecology
371 Letters*, *22*(2), 405–419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13196>
- 372 Bennett, A. F., Radford, J. Q., & Haslem, A. (2006). Properties of land mosaics: Implications for nature conservation in
373 agricultural environments. *Biological Conservation*, *133*(2), 250–264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.06.
374 008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.06.008)
- 375 Brodie, J. F., Redford, K. H., & Doak, D. F. (2018). Ecological function analysis: Incorporating species roles into conser-
376 vation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *33*(11), 840–850. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.08.013>

377 Chase, J. M., Jeliaskov, A., Ladouceur, E., & Viana, D. S. (2020). Biodiversity conservation through the lens of metacommunity ecology. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1469(1), 86–104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nyas.14378>

378

379 Chesson, P. (2000). Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 31(1),

380 343–366. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.343>

381 Dolson, R., McCann, K., Rooney, N., & Ridgway, M. (2009). Lake morphometry predicts the degree of habitat coupling by

382 a mobile predator. *Oikos*, 118(8), 1230–1238. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2009.17351.x>

383 Donadio, E., & Buskirk, S. W. (2016). Linking predation risk, ungulate antipredator responses, and patterns of vegetation

384 in the high Andes. *Journal of Mammalogy*, 97(3), 966–977. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyw020>

385 Economo, E. P. (2011). Biodiversity conservation in metacommunity networks: Linking pattern and persistence. *The American Naturalist*, 177(6), E167–E180. <https://doi.org/10.1086/659946>

386

387 Gehr, B., Bonnot, N. C., Heurich, M., Cagnacci, F., Ciuti, S., Hewison, A. J. M., Gaillard, J.-M., Ranc, N., Premier, J.,

388 Vogt, K., Hofer, E., Ryser, A., Vimercati, E., & Keller, L. (2020). Stay home, stay safe—Site familiarity reduces

389 predation risk in a large herbivore in two contrasting study sites (L. Prugh, Ed.). *Journal of Animal Ecology*,

390 89(6), 1329–1339. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13202>

391 Gervasi, V., Sand, H., Zimmermann, B., Mattisson, J., Wabakken, P., & Linnell, J. D. C. (2013). Decomposing risk:

392 Landscape structure and wolf behavior generate different predation patterns in two sympatric ungulates. *Ecological Applications*, 23(7), 1722–1734. <https://doi.org/10.1890/12-1615.1>

393

394 Goldwyn, E. E., & Hastings, A. (2008). When can dispersal synchronize populations? *Theoretical Population Biology*, 73(3),

395 395–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tpb.2007.11.012>

396 Goldwyn, E. E., & Hastings, A. (2009). Small heterogeneity has large effects on synchronization of ecological oscillators. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 71(1), 130–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11538-008-9355-9>

397

398 Gonzalez, A., & Loreau, M. (2008). The causes and consequences of compensatory dynamics in ecological communities. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 40(1), 393–414. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173349)

399 [39.110707.173349](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173349)

400

401 Gorini, L., Linnell, J. D. C., May, R., Panzacchi, M., Boitani, L., Odden, M., & Nilsen, E. B. (2012). Habitat heterogeneity

402 and mammalian predator-prey interactions: Predator-prey interactions in a spatial world. *Mammal Review*, 42(1),

403 55–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.2011.00189.x>

404 Haegeman, B., Arnoldi, J.-F., Wang, S., de Mazancourt, C., Montoya, J. M., & Loreau, M. (2016). Resilience, invariability,

405 and ecological stability across levels of organization. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/085852>

406 Hansen, N. A., Sato, C. F., Michael, D. R., Lindenmayer, D. B., & Driscoll, D. A. (2019). Predation risk for reptiles is

407 highest at remnant edges in agricultural landscapes (T. M. Lee, Ed.). *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 56(1), 31–43.

408 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13269>

409 Hastings, A. (1977). Spatial heterogeneity and the stability of predator-prey systems. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 12(1),

410 37–48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-5809\(77\)90034-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-5809(77)90034-X)

411 Hastings, A. (1978). Spatial heterogeneity and the stability of predator-prey systems: Predator-mediated coexistence. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 14(3), 380–395. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-5809\(78\)90015-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-5809(78)90015-1)

412

413 Holt, R. D. (1984). Spatial heterogeneity, indirect interactions, and the coexistence of prey species. *The American Naturalist*,

414 124(3), 377–406. <https://doi.org/10.1086/284280>

415 Holyoak, M., Caspi, T., & Redosh, L. W. (2020). Integrating disturbance, seasonality, multi-year temporal dynamics, and
416 dormancy into the dynamics and conservation of metacommunities. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 8, 571130.
417 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2020.571130>

418 Howeth, J. G., & Leibold, M. A. (2013). Predation inhibits the positive effect of dispersal on intraspecific and interspecific
419 synchrony in pond metacommunities. *Ecology*, 94(10), 2220–2228. <https://doi.org/10.1890/12-2066.1>

420 Jacquet, C., Munoz, F., Bonada, N., Datry, T., Heino, J., & Jabot, F. (2022). Temporal variation of patch connectivity
421 determines biodiversity recovery from recurrent disturbances. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.01.02.474736>

422 Jansen, V. A. A. (1999). Phase locking: Another cause of synchronicity in predator–prey systems. *Trends in Ecology &*
423 *Evolution*, 14(7), 278–279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(99\)01654-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01654-7)

424 Jarillo, J., Cao-García, F. J., & De Laender, F. (2022). Spatial and ecological scaling of stability in spatial community
425 networks. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 10, 861537. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2022.861537>

426 Johnson, P. T. J., Hoverman, J. T., McKenzie, V. J., Blaustein, A. R., & Richgels, K. L. D. (2013). Urbanization and wetland
427 communities: Applying metacommunity theory to understand the local and landscape effects (M. Cadotte, Ed.).
428 *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 50(1), 34–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12022>

429 Kauffman, M. J., Varley, N., Smith, D. W., Stahler, D. R., MacNulty, D. R., & Boyce, M. S. (2007). Landscape heterogeneity
430 shapes predation in a newly restored predator–prey system. *Ecology Letters*, 10(8), 690–700. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01059.x>

431 [1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01059.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01059.x)

432 Leibold, M. A., & Chase, J. M. (2017). *Metacommunity Ecology* (Vol. 59). Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1wf4d24>

433 [2307/j.ctt1wf4d24](https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1wf4d24)

434 Leibold, M. A., Holyoak, M., Mouquet, N., Amarasekare, P., Chase, J. M., Hoopes, M. F., Holt, R. D., Shurin, J. B., Law,
435 R., Tilman, D., Loreau, M., & Gonzalez, A. (2004). The metacommunity concept: A framework for multi-scale
436 community ecology. *Ecology Letters*, 7(7), 601–613. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2004.00608.x>

437 Lloyd, A. L., & May, R. M. (1999). Synchronicity, chaos and population cycles: Spatial coherence in an uncertain world.
438 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 14(11), 417–418. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(99\)01717-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01717-6)

439 Loreau, M., Mouquet, N., & Gonzalez, A. (2003). Biodiversity as spatial insurance in heterogeneous landscapes. *Proceedings*
440 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(22), 12765–12770. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2235465100>

441 Loreau, M., & de Mazancourt, C. (2008). Species synchrony and its drivers: Neutral and nonneutral community dynamics
442 in fluctuating environments. *The American Naturalist*, 172(2), E48–E66. <https://doi.org/10.1086/589746>

443 Loreau, M., & de Mazancourt, C. (2013). Biodiversity and ecosystem stability: A synthesis of underlying mechanisms.
444 *Ecology Letters*, 16, 106–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12073>

445 Lundberg, J., & Moberg, F. (2003). Mobile link organisms and ecosystem functioning: Implications for ecosystem resilience
446 and management. *Ecosystems*, 6(1), 0087–0098. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-002-0150-4>

447 May, R. M. (1972). Will a large complex system be stable? *Nature*, 238(5364), 413–414. <https://doi.org/10.1038/238413a0>

448 McCann, K. S., Hastings, A., & Huxel, G. R. (1998). Weak trophic interactions and the balance of nature. *Nature*, 395(6704),
449 794–798. <https://doi.org/10.1038/27427>

450 Mills, L. S., & Doak, D. F. (1993). The keystone-species concept in ecology and conservation. *BioScience*, 43(4), 219–224.
451 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1312122>

- 452 Mouquet, N., Gravel, D., Massol, F., & Calcagno, V. (2013). Extending the concept of keystone species to communities and
453 ecosystems (B. Blasius, Ed.). *Ecology Letters*, 16(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12014>
- 454 Mouquet, N., & Loreau, M. (2002). Coexistence in metacommunities: The regional similarity hypothesis. *The American*
455 *Naturalist*, 159(4), 420–426. <https://doi.org/10.1086/338996>
- 456 Mouquet, N., & Loreau, M. (2003). Community patterns in source-sink metacommunities. *The American Naturalist*, 162(5),
457 544–557. <https://doi.org/10.1086/378857>
- 458 Mouquet, N., Matthiessen, B., Miller, T., & Gonzalez, A. (2011). Extinction debt in source-sink metacommunities (T.
459 Romanuk, Ed.). *PLoS ONE*, 6(3), e17567. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0017567>
- 460 Neutel, A.-M., Heesterbeek, J. A. P., & De Ruiter, P. C. (2002). Stability in real food webs: Weak links in long loops.
461 *Science*, 296(5570), 1120–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1068326>
- 462 Olf, H., Alonso, D., Berg, M. P., Eriksson, B. K., Loreau, M., Piersma, T., & Rooney, N. (2009). Parallel ecological
463 networks in ecosystems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 364(1524), 1755–
464 1779. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0222>
- 465 Patrick, C. J., Anderson, K. E., Brown, B. L., Hawkins, C. P., Metcalfe, A., Saffarinia, P., Siqueira, T., Swan, C. M.,
466 Tonkin, J. D., & Yuan, L. L. (2021). The application of metacommunity theory to the management of riverine
467 ecosystems. *WIREs Water*, 8(6). <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1557>
- 468 Quévreur, P., Barbier, M., & Loreau, M. (2021a). Synchrony and perturbation transmission in trophic metacommunities.
469 *The American Naturalist*, 714131. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714131>
- 470 Quévreur, P., Pigeault, R., & Loreau, M. (2021b). Predator avoidance and foraging for food shape synchrony and response
471 to perturbations in trophic metacommunities. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 528, 110836. [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2021.110836)
472 [1016/j.jtbi.2021.110836](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2021.110836)
- 473 Rebolo-Ifrán, N., Tella, J. L., & Carrete, M. (2017). Urban conservation hotspots: Predation release allows the grassland-
474 specialist burrowing owl to perform better in the city. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), 3527. [https://doi.org/10.1038/](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-03853-z)
475 [s41598-017-03853-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-03853-z)
- 476 Resetarits, E. J., Cathey, S. E., & Leibold, M. A. (2018). Testing the keystone community concept: Effects of landscape, patch
477 removal, and environment on metacommunity structure. *Ecology*, 99(1), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2041>
- 478 Rooney, N., & McCann, K. S. (2012). Integrating food web diversity, structure and stability. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*,
479 27(1), 40–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.09.001>
- 480 Rooney, N., McCann, K. S., Gellner, G., & Moore, J. C. (2006). Structural asymmetry and the stability of diverse food
481 webs. *Nature*, 442(7100), 265–269. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04887>
- 482 Ruokolainen, L., Abrams, P. A., McCann, K. S., & Shuter, B. J. (2011). The roles of spatial heterogeneity and adaptive
483 movement in stabilizing (or destabilizing) simple metacommunities. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 291, 76–87.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2011.09.004>
- 485 Schiesari, L., Matias, M. G., Prado, P. I., Leibold, M. A., Albert, C. H., Howeth, J. G., Leroux, S. J., Pardini, R., Siqueira,
486 T., Brancalion, P. H., Cabeza, M., Coutinho, R. M., Diniz-Filho, J. A. F., Fournier, B., Lahr, D. J., Lewinsohn,
487 T. M., Martins, A., Morsello, C., Peres-Neto, P. R., ... Vázquez, D. P. (2019). Towards an applied metaecology.
488 *Perspectives in Ecology and Conservation*, 17(4), 172–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecon.2019.11.001>

- 489 Schindler, D. E., & Scheuerell, M. D. (2002). Habitat coupling in lake ecosystems. *Oikos*, *98*(2), 177–189. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.980201.x)
490 [10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.980201.x](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.980201.x)
- 491 Schmitz, O. J. (2004). Perturbation and abrupt shift in trophic control of biodiversity and productivity: Perturbation and
492 regime shift. *Ecology Letters*, *7*(5), 403–409. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2004.00592.x>
- 493 Schmitz, O. J., Hawlena, D., & Trussell, G. C. (2010). Predator control of ecosystem nutrient dynamics. *Ecology Letters*,
494 *13*(10), 1199–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01511.x>
- 495 Shochat, E., Warren, P., Faeth, S., Mcintyre, N., & Hope, D. (2006). From patterns to emerging processes in mechanistic
496 urban ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *21*(4), 186–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2005.11.019>
- 497 Shochat, E., Lerman, S. B., Anderies, J. M., Warren, P. S., Faeth, S. H., & Nilon, C. H. (2010). Invasion, competition, and
498 biodiversity loss in urban ecosystems. *BioScience*, *60*(3), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2010.60.3.6>
- 499 Soulé, M. E., Estes, J. A., Miller, B., & Honnold, D. L. (2005). Strongly interacting species: Conservation policy, manage-
500 ment, and ethics. *BioScience*, *55*(2), 168. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2005\)055\[0168:SISCPM\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2005)055[0168:SISCPM]2.0.CO;2)
- 501 Steele, J. H. (1974). Spatial heterogeneity and population stability. *Nature*, *248*(5443), 83–83. [https://doi.org/10.1038/](https://doi.org/10.1038/248083a0)
502 [248083a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/248083a0)
- 503 Thaker, M., Vanak, A. T., Owen, C. R., Ogden, M. B., Niemann, S. M., & Slotow, R. (2011). Minimizing predation risk in a
504 landscape of multiple predators: Effects on the spatial distribution of African ungulates. *Ecology*, *92*(2), 398–407.
505 <https://doi.org/10.1890/10-0126.1>
- 506 Vadeboncoeur, Y., McCann, K. S., Zanden, M. J. V., & Rasmussen, J. B. (2005). Effects of multi-chain omnivory on the
507 strength of trophic control in lakes. *Ecosystems*, *8*(6), 682–693. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-003-0149-5>
- 508 Van Teeffelen, A. J., Vos, C. C., & Opdam, P. (2012). Species in a dynamic world: Consequences of habitat network dynamics
509 on conservation planning. *Biological Conservation*, *153*, 239–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2012.05.001>
- 510 Vasseur, D. A., & Fox, J. W. (2009). Phase-locking and environmental fluctuations generate synchrony in a predator–prey
511 community. *Nature*, *460*(7258), 1007–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08208>
- 512 Wang, S., Haegeman, B., & Loreau, M. (2015). Dispersal and metapopulation stability. *PeerJ*, *3*, e1295. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1295)
513 [10.7717/peerj.1295](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1295)
- 514 Wang, S., Lamy, T., Hallett, L. M., & Loreau, M. (2019). Stability and synchrony across ecological hierarchies in heteroge-
515 neous metacommunities: Linking theory to data. *Ecography*, *0*(0). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.04290>
- 516 Wang, S., & Loreau, M. (2014). Ecosystem stability in space: α , β and γ variability. *Ecology*
517 *Letters*, *17*(8), 891–901. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12292>
- 518 Wang, S., & Loreau, M. (2016). Biodiversity and ecosystem stability across scales in metacommunities (F. Jordan, Ed.).
519 *Ecology Letters*, *19*(5), 510–518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12582>
- 520 Wilcox, K. R., Tredennick, A. T., Koerner, S. E., Grman, E., Hallett, L. M., Avolio, M. L., Pierre, K. J. L., Houseman, G. R.,
521 Isbell, F., Johnson, D. S., Alatalo, J. M., Baldwin, A. H., Bork, E. W., Boughton, E. H., Bowman, W. D., Britton,
522 A. J., Cahill, J. F., Collins, S. L., Du, G., . . . Zhang, Y. (2017). Asynchrony among local communities stabilises
523 ecosystem function of metacommunities. *Ecology Letters*, *20*(12), 1534–1545. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12861>

524 S1 Complementary material and methods

525 S1-1 Model description

The model has been originally developed by Barbier and Loreau (2019), who considered a food chain model with a simple metabolic parametrisation. Their model corresponds to the "intra-patch dynamics" part of equations (5a) and (5b) to which we graft a dispersal term to consider a metacommunity with two patches.


$$\frac{dB_1^{(1)}}{dt} = B_1^{(1)}(\omega_1 g_1 - D_1 B_1^{(1)} - \gamma_1 \alpha_{2,1} B_2^{(1)}) + \delta_1 (B_1^{(2)} - B_1^{(1)}) \quad (5a)$$

$$\frac{dB_i^{(1)}}{dt} = \underbrace{B_i^{(1)}(-r_i - D_i B_i^{(1)} + \gamma_1 \epsilon \alpha_{i,i-1} B_{i-1}^{(1)} - \gamma_1 \alpha_{i+1,i} B_{i+1}^{(1)})}_{\text{intra-patch dynamics}} + \underbrace{\delta_i (B_i^{(2)} - B_i^{(1)})}_{\text{dispersal}} \quad (5b)$$

526 $B_i^{(1)}$ is the biomass of trophic level i in the patch #1, ϵ is the biomass conversion efficiency and $\alpha_{i,j}$ is the
 527 interaction strength between consumer i and prey j . Species i disperses between the two patches at rate
 528 δ_i . The density independent net growth rate of primary producers g_i in equations (5a), the mortality
 529 rate of consumers r_i in equations (5b) and the density dependent mortality rate D_i scale with species
 530 metabolic rates m_i as biological rates are linked to energy expenditure.

$$g_1 = m_1 g \quad r_i = m_i r \quad D_i = m_i D \quad (6)$$

In order to get a broad range of possible responses, we assume the predator-prey metabolic rate ratio m and the interaction strength to self-regulation ratio a to be constant. These ratios
 531 capture the relations between parameters and trophic levels. This enables us to consider contrasting situations while keeping the model as simple as possible.



$$m = \frac{m_{i+1}}{m_i} \quad a = \frac{\alpha_{i,i-1}}{D_i} \quad d_i = \frac{\delta_i}{D_i} \quad (7)$$

Varying m leads to food chains where predators have faster or slower biomass dynamics than their prey and varying a leads to food chains where interspecific interactions prevail or not compared with intraspecific interactions. As all biological rates are rescaled by D_i , we also define d_i , the dispersal rate relative to self-regulation (referred as scaled dispersal rate in the rest of the study), in order to keep the

values of the dispersal rate relative to the other biological rates consistent across trophic levels. Finally, the time scale of the system is defined by setting the metabolic rate of the primary producer m_1 to unity. Thus, we can transform equations (5a) and (5b) into:

$$\frac{1}{D} \frac{dB_1^{(1)}}{dt} = B_1^{(1)} \left(\omega \frac{g}{D} - B_1^{(1)} - \gamma ma B_2^{(1)} \right) + d_1 (B_1^{(2)} - B_1^{(1)}) \quad (8a)$$

$$\frac{1}{m^{i-1}D} \frac{dB_i^{(1)}}{dt} = \underbrace{B_i^{(1)} \left(-\frac{r}{D} - B_i^{(1)} + \gamma \epsilon a B_{i-1}^{(1)} - \gamma ma B_{i+1}^{(1)} \right)}_{\text{intra-patch dynamics}} + \underbrace{d_i (B_i^{(2)} - B_i^{(1)})}_{\text{dispersal}} \quad (8b)$$

532 Thus, ϵa and ma defines the positive effect of the prey on its predator and the negative effect of the
 533 predator on its prey, respectively. These two synthetic parameters define the overall behaviour of the
 534 food chain and will be varied over the interval $[0.1, 10]$ to consider a broad range of possible responses.
 535 Finally, the mortality rate is set to zero ($r = 0$) to remove the energetic limitations of the food chain
 536 and make interactions the dominant factors determining biomass distribution and stability patterns, as
 537 in Barbier and Loreau (2019).

538 S1-2 Biomass at equilibrium when top predators populations are perfectly 539 coupled

The system can be easily solved if we consider the total population of top predator instead of two populations connected by dispersal. Since the two populations are perfectly coupled by dispersal, top predator i biomass is constant across patches and we have $B_i^{(1)*} = B_i^{(2)*} = 0.5B_i^{tot*}$. Thus we have the following system at equilibrium for the two top species (the equations for the other species are the same as the symmetric case):

$$0 = -\frac{r}{D} - B_i^{*tot} + \epsilon a \left(\gamma B_{i-1}^{*(1)} + B_{i-1}^{*(2)} \right) \quad (9a)$$

$$0 = -\frac{r}{D} - B_{i-1}^{*(1)} + \gamma \epsilon a B_{i-2}^{*(1)} - \gamma ma \frac{B_i^{*tot}}{2} \quad (9b)$$

$$0 = -\frac{r}{D} - B_{i-1}^{*(2)} + \epsilon a B_{i-2}^{*(2)} - ma \frac{B_i^{*tot}}{2} \quad (9c)$$

542 **S1-4 Linearisation of the system**

The system of equations (1a) and (1b) can be linearised in the vicinity of equilibrium:

$$\frac{dB_i}{dt} = \underbrace{f_i(B_1^*, \dots, B_S^*)}_{=0} + \sum_{j=1}^S \left(\left. \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial B_j} \right|_{B^*} (B_j - B_j^*) \right) \quad (13)$$

Thus, by setting $X_i = B_i - B_i^*$ the deviation from equilibrium, we have:

$$\frac{dX_i}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^S J_{ij} X_j \quad (14)$$

Then, we can consider small perturbations defined by \vec{E} whose effects on \vec{X} are defined by the matrix T (Arnoldi et al., 2016). We get the linearised version of equation (2):

$$\frac{d\vec{X}}{dt} = J\vec{X} + T\vec{E} \quad (15)$$

543 The elements of \vec{E} are defined by stochastic perturbations $E_i = \sigma_i dW_i$ with σ_i their standard deviation
 544 and dW_i a white noise term with mean 0 and variance 1. In our model, each species i in each patch k can
 545 receive demographic perturbations scaling with the square root of their biomass at equilibrium. Thus,
 546 \vec{E} contains the white noise term $\sigma_i^{(k)} dW_i^{(k)}$ for each population of each species, T is a diagonal matrix
 547 whose terms are $\sqrt{B_i^{*(k)}}$ and the matrix product $T\vec{E}$ results in the product of the white noise and the
 548 biomass scaling as in equation (2) in the main text.

549 **S1-5 Demonstration of the Lyapunov equation**

The following demonstration of the Lyapunov equation has been taken from Oku and Aihara (2018).
 The continuous-time dynamics from equation (15) can be converted to a discrete-time dynamics by using
 Euler-Maruyama method:

$$\vec{X}_{t+\Delta t} = \vec{X}_t + \Delta t J \vec{X}_t + \sqrt{\Delta t} T \vec{E}_t \quad (16)$$

$C^* = \mathbb{E}[\vec{X}_t \vec{X}_t^\top]$ (the expected value of the product \vec{X}_t and its transpose \vec{X}_t^\top) is the stationary variance-covariance matrix of the system, therefore $dC^*/dt = 0$. We also have the following relation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dC^*}{dt} &= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}[\vec{X}_{t+\Delta t} \vec{X}_{t+\Delta t}^\top] - \mathbb{E}[\vec{X}_t \vec{X}_t^\top]}{\Delta t} \\
&= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}[(\vec{X}_t + \Delta t J \vec{X}_t + \sqrt{\Delta t} T \vec{E}_t)(\vec{X}_t + \Delta t J \vec{X}_t + \sqrt{\Delta t} T \vec{E}_t)^\top] - \mathbb{E}[\vec{X}_t \vec{X}_t^\top]}{\Delta t} \\
&= \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\Delta t \mathbb{E}[\vec{X}_t \vec{X}_t^\top J^\top] + \Delta t \mathbb{E}[J \vec{X}_t \vec{X}_t^\top] + \Delta t^2 \mathbb{E}[J \vec{X}_t \vec{X}_t^\top J^\top] + \Delta t \mathbb{E}(T \vec{E}_t \vec{E}_t^\top T^\top)}{\Delta t} \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\vec{X}_t \vec{X}_t^\top J^\top] + \mathbb{E}[J \vec{X}_t \vec{X}_t^\top] + \mathbb{E}[T \vec{E}_t \vec{E}_t^\top T^\top] \\
&= C^* J^\top + J C^* + T V_E T^\top = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

550 Because $\mathbb{E}[\vec{X}_t] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\vec{E}_t] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\vec{X}_t \vec{E}_t^\top] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\vec{E}_t \vec{X}_t^\top] = 0$ and $V_E = \mathbb{E}[\vec{E}_t \vec{E}_t^\top]$ the variance-covariance
551 matrix of stochastic perturbations.

552 S1-6 Resolution of the Lyapunov equation

In the vicinity of equilibrium, the Lyapunov equation links the variance-covariance matrix V_E of the perturbation vector \vec{E} to the variance-covariance matrix C^* of species biomasses (see the appendix of Wang et al. (2015) for more details on the Lyapunov equation).

$$J C^* + C^* J^\top + T V_E T^\top = 0 \tag{18}$$

The diagonal elements of V_E are equal to σ_i^2 (variance of the white noises) and the non-diagonal elements are equal to zero because perturbations are independent. \top is the transpose operator. C^* can be calculated using a Kronecker product (Nip et al., 2013). The Kronecker product of an $m \times n$ matrix A and a $p \times q$ matrix B denoted $A \otimes B$ is the $mp \times nq$ block matrix given by:

$$A \otimes B = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}B & \cdots & a_{1n}B \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{m1}B & \cdots & a_{mn}B \end{pmatrix}$$

We define C_s^* and $(TV_ET^\top)_s$ the vectors stacking the columns of C^* and TV_ET^\top respectively. Thus, equation (18) can be rewrite as:

$$\begin{aligned} (J \otimes I + I \otimes J)C_s^* &= -(TV_ET^\top)_s \\ C_s^* &= -(J \otimes I + I \otimes J)^{-1}(TV_ET^\top)_s \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

553 S1-7 Coefficient of variation and correlation

Our different metrics of stability can be easily computed from the elements of the variance-covariance matrix C^* defined by elements $w_{i^{(k)}j^{(\ell)}}$ that are the covariance between species i in patch k and species j in patch ℓ .

$$C^* = \begin{pmatrix} w_{1^{(1)}1^{(1)}} & \cdots & w_{1^{(1)}S^{(1)}} & \cdots & w_{1^{(n)}1^{(n)}} & \cdots & w_{1^{(n)}S^{(n)}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w_{S^{(1)}1^{(1)}} & \cdots & w_{S^{(1)}S^{(1)}} & \cdots & w_{S^{(n)}1^{(n)}} & \cdots & w_{S^{(n)}S^{(n)}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ w_{1^{(n)}1^{(1)}} & \cdots & w_{1^{(n)}S^{(1)}} & \cdots & w_{1^{(n)}1^{(n)}} & \cdots & w_{1^{(n)}S^{(n)}} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w_{S^{(n)}1^{(1)}} & \cdots & w_{S^{(n)}S^{(1)}} & \cdots & w_{S^{(n)}1^{(n)}} & \cdots & w_{S^{(n)}S^{(n)}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

The temporal variability of the metacommunity is assessed with the coefficient of variation (CV) of biomass at different scales: **population scale** $CV_i^{(k)}$, which is the biomass CV of species i in patch k , **metapopulation scale** CV_i , which is the biomass CV of the total biomass of species i across patches and **metacommunity scale** CV_{MC} , which is the total biomass of the entire metacommunity (Wang and Loreau, 2014; Wang et al., 2019; Jarillo et al., 2022).

$$CV_i^{(k)} = \frac{\sqrt{w_{i^{(k)}i^{(k)}}}}{\mu_i^{(k)}} \quad CV_i = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{k\ell} w_{i^{(k)}j^{(\ell)}}}}{\sum_k B_i^{*(k)}} \quad CV_{MC} = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{ijk\ell} w_{i^{(k)}j^{(\ell)}}}}{\sum_{ik} B_i^{*(k)}} \quad (21)$$

$$C^* = \begin{pmatrix}
w_{1(1)1(1)} \cdots w_{1(1)S(1)} \cdots w_{1(n)1(n)} \cdots w_{1(n)S(n)} & & & & \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
w_{S(1)1(1)} \cdots w_{S(1)S(1)} \cdots w_{S(n)1(n)} \cdots w_{S(n)S(n)} & & & & \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
w_{1(n)1(1)} \cdots w_{1(n)S(1)} \cdots w_{1(n)1(n)} \cdots w_{1(n)S(n)} & & & & \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
w_{S(n)1(1)} \cdots w_{S(n)S(1)} \cdots w_{S(n)1(n)} \cdots w_{S(n)S(n)} & & & &
\end{pmatrix}$$

$CV_i^{(k)}$
 CV_i
 CV_{MC}

Figure S1-1: Elements of the variance-covariance matrix C^* used to compute the biomass CV at different scales defined in equation (21).

The correlation matrix R^* of the system, whose elements $\rho_{i^{(k)}j^{(\ell)}}$ are defined by:

$$\rho_{i^{(k)}j^{(\ell)}} = \frac{w_{i^{(k)}j^{(\ell)}}}{\sqrt{w_{i^{(k)}i^{(k)}}} \sqrt{w_{j^{(\ell)}j^{(\ell)}}}} \tag{22}$$

554 S1-8 Asymptotic resilience

555 In addition to the response to stochastic perturbations, we consider asymptotic resilience to measure
556 the long term return time of the metacommunity. Asymptotic resilience is measured by the opposite of
557 the real part of the dominant eigenvalue λ_{dom} of Jacobian matrix J ($-\Re(\lambda_{dom})$). Since the dominant
558 eigenvalue is the eigenvalue with the largest real part and we only consider ecosystems at equilibrium
559 (*i.e.* all eigenvalues have negative real parts), the lower the real part of the dominant eigenvalue, the
560 faster the long term return time.

561 Moreover, we can assess the influence of each species on asymptotic resilience by comparing the absolute
562 value of the real part of each element e_i of the dominant eigenvector (E_{dom}). Because e_i is the contribution
563 of species i to E_{dom} , $|e_i| / \sum_{j=1}^n |e_j|$ is the relative weight of species i in the dynamics of long term return
564 to equilibrium (with n the number of populations in the metacommunity).

565 References

- 566 Arnoldi, J.-F., Loreau, M., & Haegeman, B. (2016). Resilience, reactivity and variability: A mathematical comparison of
567 ecological stability measures. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 389, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2015.10.012>
568
569 Barbier, M., & Loreau, M. (2019). Pyramids and cascades: A synthesis of food chain functioning and stability. *Ecology*
570 *Letters*, 22(2), 405–419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13196>

- 571 Jarillo, J., Cao-García, F. J., & De Laender, F. (2022). Spatial and ecological scaling of stability in spatial community
572 networks. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, *10*, 861537. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2022.861537>
- 573 Nip, M., Hespanha, J. P., & Khammash, M. (2013). Direct numerical solution of algebraic Lyapunov equations for large-
574 scale systems using Quantized Tensor Trains. *52nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, 1950–1957. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC.2013.6760167>
- 575
- 576 Oku, M., & Aihara, K. (2018). On the covariance matrix of the stationary distribution of a noisy dynamical system.
577 *Nonlinear Theory and Its Applications, IEICE*, *9*(2), 166–184. <https://doi.org/10.1587/nolta.9.166>
- 578 Wang, S., Haegeman, B., & Loreau, M. (2015). Dispersal and metapopulation stability. *PeerJ*, *3*, e1295. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1295)
579 [10.7717/peerj.1295](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1295)
- 580 Wang, S., Lamy, T., Hallett, L. M., & Loreau, M. (2019). Stability and synchrony across ecological hierarchies in heteroge-
581 neous metacommunities: Linking theory to data. *Ecography*, *0*(0). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.04290>
- 582 Wang, S., & Loreau, M. (2014). Ecosystem stability in space: α , β and γ variability. *Ecology*
583 *Letters*, *17*(8), 891–901. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12292>

584 **S2 Complementary results**

585 **S2-1 General description of parameters**




Figure S2-1: Distribution of parameters and their effects on an isolated food chain. **A)** Biomass distribution depending on the positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and the negative effect of predator on prey $m a$. **B)** Value of the ratio of predator to prey metabolic rate $m = m_{i+1}/m_i$ for each combination of ϵa and $m a$.




Figure S2-2: Distribution of biomass in an isolated predator-prey system (without dispersal) depending on interaction strength a relative to self-regulation. Increasing the asymmetry of the interaction strength γ is equivalent to increasing a ($m = 0.65$).

586 Increasing the interaction strength a relative to self-regulation decreases the biomass of prey because
 587 of the increased mortality due to predation (Figure S2-2). However, the biomass of predators follows a
 588 hump-shaped relationship: it first increases due to the increased resource consumption and then decreases
 589 because of prey overexploitation.

The effect of perturbations of populations within a community of S species can be assessed by the

ratio of the mean variance of species biomass B_j to the variance of perturbations σ_k :

$$\frac{\frac{1}{S} \sum_j^S \text{Var}(B_j)}{\frac{1}{S} \sum_k^S \sigma_k^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{S} \sum_j^S \text{Var}(B_j)}{\sigma_i^2} \quad \text{because we only consider one perturbation effecting species } i \quad (23)$$

590 As demonstrated by Arnoldi et al. (2019), exogenous perturbations affect more rare species, demographic
 591 perturbations evenly affect species regardless on the biomass distribution and environmental perturbations
 592 affect more abundant populations. Therefore, we consider demographic perturbations to perturb the
 593 entire community with the same intensity regardless on the biomass variations caused by varying γ
 594 (Figure S2-3).




Figure S2-3: Ratio of the mean variance of species biomass to the mean variance of environmental perturbations (see equation (23)) depending on the biomass of the perturbed species. Three types of perturbations with different scaling with the equilibrium biomass of the perturbed species i (B_i^{*z}) are tested: exogenous perturbations ($z = 0$), demographic perturbations ($z = 0.5$) and environmental perturbations ($z = 1$).

595 **S2-2 Dispersal of predators and perturbation of prey**

596 **S2-2-1 Source-sink effect**




Figure S2-4: **A)** Distribution of the biomass of each species among patches depending on the asymmetry of interaction strength γ . **B)** Distribution of biomasses scaled by their value in a metacommunity without dispersal ($B_{scaled} = B_{d_2>0}/B_{d_2=0}$).




Figure S2-5: The asymmetry of interaction strength alters the biomass distribution between the two patches. Increased the interaction strength in patches #1 enhances the biomass production of predators that spillover patches from patch #1 to patch #2, therefore increasing prey biomass in patch #1 and decreasing it in patch #2 ($\gamma = 3$). Plain rectangles represent the biomass of each population, while dashed rectangles represent the same population in a metacommunity without dispersal (no spillover effect)

597 Varying the asymmetry of interaction strength γ is equivalent to varying the interaction strength a
598 in patch #1 and has the same effects on species biomass: first increasing γ increases predator biomass
599 by increasing prey consumption, then it decreases predator biomass because of resource overexploitation
600 (Figure S2-2). This leads to different biomass distributions in patches #1 and #2 (Figure S2-4A).
601 Predator biomass increases with γ and is the same in both patches because their high dispersal rate
602 balances any difference. Prey biomass is higher in patch #1 than in patch #2, and both decrease with γ ,
603 except in patch #1, where we first observe a small increase for $\gamma < 2$. This response is due to source-sink
604 effects: the increase in prey consumption in patch #1 increases predator biomass (source) that spills over
605 patch #2 (sink) due to dispersal (Figure S2-4B and Figure S2-5). Therefore, predator biomass is lower in
606 patch #1 and higher in patch #2 compared to what we expect in the same food chains in isolation (*i.e.*,
607 without dispersal). This also prevents predators from overexploiting prey in patch #1 by spreading the
608 increased predator biomass across the metacommunity, which explains why we do not observe a decrease
609 in predator biomass for high values of γ , as shown in Figure S2-2. Conversely, the distribution of prey
610 biomass across the two patches is opposite (higher in patch #1 and lower in patch #2).

611 S2-2-2 Conditions of coexistence

612 Asymmetry and dispersal lead to competition, apparent competition and source-sink dynamics that
613 can rescue or drive local populations to extinction. Therefore, we consider limit cases in which dispersal
614 is infinite (well mixed populations across the metacommunity) to analytically calculate biomasses at
615 equilibrium and determine the range of values of ω and γ enabling the coexistence of all populations of
616 each species.

We consider the total biomass of predators $B_2^{tot} = B_2^{(1)} + B_2^{(2)}$ and because the very high dispersal of
predators equally distributes its biomass among the two patches, we have $B_2^{*tot} = 2 \times B_2^{*(1)}$. Then, we
can define the system:

$$\frac{dB_1^{(1)}}{dt} = DB_1^{(1)} \left(\frac{\omega g}{D} - B_1^{(1)} - \gamma ma \frac{B_2^{tot}}{2} \right) \quad (24a)$$

$$\frac{dB_1^{(2)}}{dt} = DB_1^{(2)} \left(\frac{g}{D} - B_1^{(2)} - ma \frac{B_2^{tot}}{2} \right) \quad (24b)$$

$$\frac{dB_2^{tot}}{dt} = mD \frac{B_2^{tot}}{2} \left(-\frac{r}{D} - B_2^{tot} + \varepsilon a (\gamma B_1^{(1)} + B_1^{(2)}) \right) \quad (24c)$$

Since $r = 0$, we remove it from the equations for the sake of simplicity. We define $\lambda = \varepsilon ma^2$, which is

the intensity of top-down control defined by Barbier and Loreau (2019). At equilibrium, we obtain:

$$B_1^{(1)*} = \frac{g}{D} \left(\frac{2\omega + \omega\lambda - \gamma\lambda}{2 + \lambda(\gamma^2 + 1)} \right) \quad (25a)$$

$$B_1^{(2)*} = \frac{g}{D} \left(\frac{\lambda\gamma^2 - \omega\lambda\gamma + 2}{2 + \lambda(\gamma^2 + 1)} \right) \quad (25b)$$

$$B_2^{tot*} = \frac{2\varepsilon ag(1 + \omega\gamma)}{D(2 + \varepsilon a^2 m(\gamma^2 + 1))} \quad (25c)$$

Prey biomass in patch #1 $B_1^{*(1)}$ is positive only if:

$$\gamma < \frac{\omega(2 + \lambda)}{\lambda} \xrightarrow{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \omega \quad (26)$$

Prey biomass in patch #2 $B_1^{*(2)}$ is positive if $f(\gamma) = \lambda\gamma^2 - \omega\lambda\gamma + 2 > 0$. f opens upwards: thus, if $\omega < \sqrt{8/\lambda}$, f has no roots and is always positive. Otherwise, $B_1^{(2)}$ is positive if:

$$\gamma > \frac{\lambda\omega + \sqrt{\lambda(\lambda\omega^2 - 8)}}{2\lambda} \xrightarrow{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \omega \quad \text{if } \omega > \sqrt{\frac{8}{\lambda}} \quad \text{or} \quad (27a)$$

$$\gamma < \frac{\lambda\omega - \sqrt{\lambda(\lambda\omega^2 - 8)}}{2\lambda} \xrightarrow{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} 0 \quad \text{if } \omega > \sqrt{\frac{8}{\lambda}} \quad (27b)$$

617 Predators B_2 thrive in each patch for all values of ω and γ (Figure S2-6C). Hence, coexistence is ensured for
618 all values of top-down control λ , asymmetry of resource supply ω and asymmetry of interaction strength
619 γ only if $\gamma = \omega$. In the main text, we always consider $\gamma = \omega$ (Figure S2-6D), but their independent effects
620 are detailed in the following.




Figure S2-6: Distribution of parameters, asymmetry of resource supply ω and asymmetry of interaction strength γ , leading to the coexistence of predator and prey in each patch. Only predators are able to disperse at an infinite rate (well-mixed predator populations). This distribution is assessed for different values of the positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and negative effect of predator on prey ma . **A)** Biomass of prey in patch #1 $B_1^{*(1)}$ and **B)** in patch #2 $B_1^{*(2)}$. **C)** Biomass of predator in patches #1 and #2 ($B_2^{*(1)} = B_2^{*(2)}$ because predator populations are well mixed). **D)** Coexistence of predator and prey in each patch.

621 S2-2-3 Nontransitivity of correlation

622 To explain the correlation between prey populations, we can track the transmission of perturbations in
623 the metacommunity. Increasing the asymmetry of interaction strength γ tends to decorrelate predator and
624 prey dynamics within each patch (Figure S2-7A). When prey are perturbed in patch #1, the dynamics
625 of predator and prey biomass are correlated in patch #1 and anticorrelated in patch #2 due to the
626 bottom-up and top-down transmissions of perturbations, respectively. Although we would expect the
627 two populations of prey to be anti-correlated according to the mechanism described by Quévieux et al.
628 (2021) (see Figure S2-28 in the following), we actually observe a weak correlation of these two populations
629 (Figure S2-7B). In the same way, the intermediate correlation and anti-correlation of predator and prey
630 when prey are perturbed in patch #2 do not explain the strong anti-correlation of prey populations

631 (Figure S2-7C). Therefore, other mechanisms are acting in our system.




Figure S2-7: Correlation between predator and prey with each patch ($\varepsilon a = 1$, $ma = 1$, $d_2 = 10^6$, $\omega = \gamma$). **A)** Correlation in each patch depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ when prey in patch #1 (left panel) or in patch #2 (right panel) are perturbed. Labels and vertical dashed lines represent the correlation values used in panels B and C. **B)** Schematic representation of correlations when $\gamma = 7$. Coloured double arrows and their associated number (see also the colour scale) represent the correlations between populations. Prey are perturbed in patch #1. **C)** Prey are perturbed in patch #2.

632 S2-2-4 Complete effects of εa and ma

633 The stability patterns observed in Figures 2, 3 and 5 in the main text are also observed for a wide
 634 range of ecological and physiological parameters aggregated into the positive effect of prey on predators
 635 εa and the negative effect on predators on prey ma . Therefore, our results are robust and the identified
 636 mechanisms are specific to a particular combination of parameters.

637 The response of the asymptotic resilience to the asymmetry of interaction strength (Figure S2-11A)
 638 is not similar to the results of Rooney et al. (2006). Indeed, we do not observe minimum of resilience
 639 for $\gamma = 1$ for all combinations of εa and ma . The variations in asymptotic resilience depend on the
 640 relative contribution of each population of each species (Figure S2-11B), which is governed by the biomass
 641 distribution of each species among patches (Figure S2-8A) and the ratio of predator to prey metabolic
 642 rate ratio m (Figure S2-1B). As demonstrated by Haegeman et al. (2016) and Arnoldi et al. (2018),
 643 rare species control the long term response to perturbations of the metacommunity (*i.e.*, the asymptotic
 644 resilience), as well as species with a slow pace of life (*i.e.*, a slow metabolism).




Figure S2-8: Biomass distribution of each species in each patch depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and negative effect of predator on prey ma . **A**) Biomass distribution. **B**) Biomass scaled by the biomass in the metacommunity without dispersal ($d_2 = 0$).




Figure S2-9: Correlation between populations depending on asymmetry in interaction strength γ when predators disperse and prey are perturbed in patch #1 or #2. Predators have a high scaled dispersal rate ($d_2 = 10^6$), which strongly couples their two populations ($\gamma = \omega$).




Figure S2-10: Biomass CV at different scales depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and negative effect of predator on prey ma ($d_2 = 10^6$ and $\omega = \gamma$). **A**) Biomass CV of the population of each species in each patch. **B**) CV of the total biomass of each species.




Figure S2-11: Linear stability depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and negative effect of predator on prey ma . **A**) Asymptotic resilience (real part of the dominant eigenvalue of the Jacobian matrix) **B**) Contribution of the populations of each species to the dominant eigenvector.




Figure S2-12: Time series of biomasses rescaled by their value at equilibrium after an increase in prey biomass by 20% in patch #1 (left panel) or patch #2 (right panel) for two values of interaction strength asymmetry ($\gamma = 1$ or $\gamma = 10$, $\epsilon a = 1$, $m a = 1$, $d_2 = 10^6$ and $\omega = \gamma$).




Figure S2-13: Time series of biomasses rescaled by their value at equilibrium after an increase in prey biomass by 20% in patch #1 (left panel) or patch #2 (right panel) depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and negative effect of predator on prey $m a$ ($\gamma = 3$, $d_2 = 10^6$ and $\omega = \gamma$).

645 S2-2-5 Effect of asymmetry of resource supply ω

646 According to Figure S2-6, we set $\omega = \gamma$ to ensure the coexistence of prey and predators in each patch for
 647 all combinations of ϵa and $m a$. Varying the asymmetry of resource supply ω does not qualitatively alter
 648 the response of biomass (Figure S2-14), correlation (Figure S2-15A) and biomass CV (Figure S2-15B) to
 649 the variations in the asymmetry of interaction strength γ .




Figure S2-14: Biomass distribution of each species in each patch depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ and biomass production ω ($\epsilon a = 0.1$, $ma = 0.1$ and $d_2 = 10^6$). **A**) Biomass distribution. **B**) Biomass scaled by the biomass in the metacommunity without dispersal ($d_2 = 0$).




Figure S2-15: Stability depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ and biomass production ω ($\epsilon a = 0.1$, $ma = 0.1$ and $d_2 = 10^6$). **A**) Correlation between populations. **B**) Biomass CV of the population of each species in each patch.

650 S2-2-6 Effect of perturbation of predators

651 The perturbation of predators leads to the same response regardless of the perturbed patch because
 652 the very high dispersal of predators perfectly synchronises their population dynamics. The asymmetry
 653 of interaction strength leads to different dynamics in each patch that decreases the correlation of prey
 654 dynamics (Figure S2-16) and stabilises predator dynamics by decreasing their biomass CV (Figure S2-
 655 17A).




Figure S2-16: Correlation between populations depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator εa and negative effect of predator on prey ma . Predators disperse and are perturbed in patch #1 or patch #2 ($d_2 = 10^6$ and $\omega = \gamma$).




Figure S2-17: Biomass CV at different scales depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator εa and negative effect of predator on prey ma . Predators disperse and are perturbed in patch #1 or patch #2 ($d_2 = 10^6$ and $\omega = \gamma$). **A**) CV of the total biomass of each species. **B**) CV of the total biomass of the metacommunity.

656 S2-2-7 Effect of food chain length

657 Here, we consider three trophic levels to extend our results to metacommunities with longer food chain
 658 lengths. In this setup, only top predators (species 3) are able to disperse, and basal species (species 1)
 659 receive stochastic perturbations. γ also has the same value across trophic levels. We observe a similar
 660 response to the case with two trophic levels for the correlations of the dynamics of the biomass of species
 661 2 and 3 (Figure S2-18) as well as for biomass CV (Figure S2-19). However, the response of species 1

662 in completely different. Therefore, the mechanisms described in the main text are only acting for the
 663 dispersing species and the species directly interacting with it.




Figure S2-18: Correlation between populations in a three trophic level food chain depending on the asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and negative effect of predator on prey ma ($d_3 = 10^6$ and $\omega = 1$). Top predators disperse, and the basal species is perturbed in patch #1 or #2.




Figure S2-19: Biomass CV in a three trophic level food chain at different scales depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and negative effect of predator on prey ma ($d_3 = 10^6$ and $\omega = 1$). **A**) Biomass CV of the population of each species in each patch. **B**) CV of the total biomass of each species.

664 S2-3 Dispersal of prey and perturbation of predators

665 In this section, we consider a setup mirroring the metacommunity model described in the main text.
 666 Here, only prey are able to disperse at a very high rate ($d_1 = 10^6$), and predators receive stochastic
 667 perturbations. We also set $\gamma = \omega$ to be consistent with the results in the main text. In the following,
 668 we find the same responses to the asymmetry of interaction strength γ , which demonstrates that the
 669 mechanisms described in the main text are not conditioned by the trophic position of the dispersing
 670 species.

671 S2-3-1 Conditions of coexistence

672 When only prey are able to disperse, all populations of each species have positive biomasses for all
 673 values of ω , γ , εa and ma (Figure S2-20).




Figure S2-20: Distribution of parameters, asymmetry of resource supply ω and asymmetry of interaction strength γ , leading to the coexistence of predator and prey in each patch. Only prey are able to disperse at an infinite rate (well mixed prey populations). This distribution is assessed for different values of the positive effect of prey on predator εa and the negative effect of predator on prey ma . The product of εa and ma is the strength of top-down control λ ($\lambda = \varepsilon a^2 m$, see Barbier and Loreau (2019)). **A**) Biomass of prey in patches #1 and #2 ($B_1^{*(1)} = B_1^{*(2)}$) because prey populations are well mixed). **B**) Biomass of predator in patch #1 ($B_2^{*(1)}$) **C**) in patch #2 $B_2^{*(2)}$.




Figure S2-21: Biomass distribution of each species in each patch depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator εa and negative effect of predator on prey ma . **A)** Biomass distribution. **B)** Biomass scaled by the biomass in the metacommunity without dispersal ($d_1 = 0$). Prey and predator curves perfectly overlap




Figure S2-22: Correlation of population when prey disperse and predators are perturbed in patch #1 or in patch #2 depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator εa and negative effect of predator on prey ma .




Figure S2-23: Biomass CV at different scales depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ , positive effect of prey on predator ϵa and negative effect of predator on prey ma ($d_1 = 10^6$ and $\omega = \gamma$). **A**) Biomass CV of the population of each species in each patch. **B**) CV of the total biomass of each species.




Figure S2-24: Time series after pulse perturbation of predators in patch #1 or in patch #2. Biomasses are scaled by their value at equilibrium, and dispersal is high ($\gamma = 3$ and $d = 10^6$).




Figure S2-25: Ratio of the mean variance of species biomass to the mean variance of environmental perturbations (see equation (23)) in each patch depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ . Each prey population receives spatially correlated environmental perturbation (colour gradient scale) scaling with equilibrium biomass B_i^* ($z = 1$).




Figure S2-26: Stability at different scales depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ when predators disperse and prey are perturbed in patch #1 or #2 with environmental perturbations ($\varepsilon a = 1$, $ma = 1$, $\omega = \gamma$). **A)** Spatial correlation between the populations of each species. **B)** Biomass CV at the population scale. **C)** Biomass CV at the metapopulation scale (CV of the total biomass of each species). **D)** Biomass CV at the metacommunity scale (CV of the total biomass of the metacommunity).




Figure S2-27: Stability at different scales depending on asymmetry of interaction strength γ when predators disperse and prey are perturbed by a spatially correlated environmental perturbations (colour gradient scale) ($\varepsilon a = 1$, $ma = 1$, $\omega = \gamma$). **A**) Spatial correlation between the populations of each species. **B**) Biomass CV at the population scale. **C**) Biomass CV at the metapopulation scale (CV of the total biomass of each species). **D**) Biomass CV at the metacommunity scale (CV of the total biomass of the metacommunity).

676 Here, we consider the same metacommunity as in the main text (see Figure 1 in the main text), but
 677 prey receive spatially correlated environmental perturbations. Environmental perturbations correspond
 678 to the synchronous response of all individuals of the same population to an environmental factor (*e.g.*,
 679 drought), and they scale with equilibrium biomass B_i^* (see the supporting information of Quévieux et al.
 680 (2021) for the demonstration). In our metacommunity, we also consider that environmental perturbations
 681 are spatially correlated since it is reasonable to assume that different populations of the same species will
 682 respond in a similar way to environmental perturbations.

683 The effect of a perturbation on a population within a community can be assessed by the ratio of
 684 the mean variance of species biomass j to the variance of the perturbation i by equation (23). As
 685 demonstrated by Arnoldi et al. (2019), environmental perturbations affect abundant populations the
 686 most, which is the prey population in the fast patch in our case (Figures S2-3 and S2-25). Therefore, we
 687 can approximate the effect of environmental perturbations by the effect of the perturbation of prey in
 688 the fast patch. Perturbing a single population with demographic or environmental perturbations leads

689 to exactly the same qualitative results (Figure S2-26 and Figure 2 and Figure 3 in the main text), and
 690 only the CV values change because of the different biomass scaling.

691 Increasing the correlation of perturbations increases the correlation of the dynamics of prey populations
 692 (Figure S2-27A) because of the Moran effect (Moran, 1953). The increase in synchrony explains the
 693 increase in the biomass CV observed at each scale for all species (Figure S2-27B-D), except for prey in
 694 the slow patch (Figure S2-27B). The Moran effect is particularly strong at low asymmetry ($\gamma < 4$), but
 695 once asymmetry is high enough, two mechanisms disrupt the Moran effect. First, when asymmetry is high,
 696 the dynamics in each patch become so different that correlated perturbations are not able to generate
 697 similar responses. Second, because of the discrepancy in the distribution of prey biomass among the two
 698 patches, environmental perturbations mostly affected prey in the fast patch (Figure S2-25). Therefore,
 699 with increasing asymmetry of interaction strength γ , the response of the metacommunity to correlated
 700 environmental perturbations converges towards the response of a metacommunity in which only prey in
 701 the fast patch are perturbed.

702 S2-5 Reminder of the symmetric case




Figure S2-28: Summary of the main results from Quévieux et al. (2021), who considered a two patch predator-prey metacommunity with passive dispersal. In the setup presented in **A**), prey are perturbed in patch #1 and only predators are able to disperse. Thus, perturbations have a bottom-up transmission in patch #1 (*i.e.* transmission from lower to upper trophic levels). This leads to the temporal correlation of the biomass dynamics of predators and prey in patch #1 showed in **B**)(1) because if a perturbation increases the biomass of prey, it also increases the biomass of predators due to the vertical transfer of biomass. The passive dispersal of predators transmits the perturbations and spatially correlate their populations as shown in **B**)(2). Then, perturbations have a top-down transmission in patch #2 (*i.e.* transmission from upper to lower trophic levels). This leads to the temporal anticorrelation (negative coefficient of correlation) of the biomass dynamics of predators and prey in patch #2 showed in **B**)(3) because if a perturbation increases the biomass of predators, it decreases the biomass of prey due to the negative effect of predators on prey. Eventually, prey populations are spatially anticorrelated, as shown in **B**)(4). Hence, by knowing which species is perturbed, which species disperses and how perturbations propagate within a food chain, Quévieux et al. (2021) were able to explain the spatial synchrony of the various populations of a metacommunity, summarised by the correlation matrix in **C**).

703 References

- 704 Arnoldi, J.-F., Bideault, A., Loreau, M., & Haegeman, B. (2018). How ecosystems recover from pulse perturbations: A
705 theory of short- to long-term responses. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *436*, 79–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2017.10.003>
- 706
- 707 Arnoldi, J.-F., Loreau, M., & Haegeman, B. (2019). The inherent multidimensionality of temporal variability: How common
708 and rare species shape stability patterns (J. Chase, Ed.). *Ecology Letters*, *22*(10), 1557–1567. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13345>
- 709
- 710 Barbier, M., & Loreau, M. (2019). Pyramids and cascades: A synthesis of food chain functioning and stability. *Ecology*
711 *Letters*, *22*(2), 405–419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13196>
- 712 Haegeman, B., Arnoldi, J.-F., Wang, S., de Mazancourt, C., Montoya, J. M., & Loreau, M. (2016). Resilience, invariability,
713 and ecological stability across levels of organization. *bioRxiv*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/085852>
- 714 Moran, P. (1953). The statistical analysis of the Canadian Lynx cycle. *Australian Journal of Zoology*, *1*(3), 291. <https://doi.org/10.1071/ZO9530291>
- 715
- 716 Quévreur, P., Barbier, M., & Loreau, M. (2021). Synchrony and perturbation transmission in trophic metacommunities.
717 *The American Naturalist*, 714131. <https://doi.org/10.1086/714131>
- 718 Rooney, N., McCann, K. S., Gellner, G., & Moore, J. C. (2006). Structural asymmetry and the stability of diverse food
719 webs. *Nature*, *442*(7100), 265–269. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04887>