



UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

ARCHIVIO DELLA RICERCA

University of Parma Research Repository

Key species and impact of fishery through food web analysis: A case study from Baja California Sur, Mexico

This is a pre print version of the following article:

Original

Key species and impact of fishery through food web analysis: A case study from Baja California Sur, Mexico / Rocchi, Marta; Scotti, Marco; Micheli, Fiorenza; Bodini, Antonio. - In: JOURNAL OF MARINE SYSTEMS. - ISSN 0924-7963. - 165:(2017), pp. 92-102. [10.1016/j.jmarsys.2016.10.003]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11381/2818508 since: 2021-10-01T11:05:05Z

Publisher:

Elsevier B.V.

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.jmarsys.2016.10.003

Terms of use:

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

12 August 2025

1 **Key species and impact of fishery through food web analysis: a case from Baja California Sur, Mexico**

2
3 Marta Rocchi^{1*}, Marco Scotti², Fiorenza Micheli³, Antonio Bodini¹

4
5 ¹ Department of Life Sciences, University of Parma, Viale Usberti 11/A, 43124 Parma, Italy

6 ² GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel, Düsternbrooker Weg 20, 24105 Kiel, Germany

7 ³ Hopkins Marine Station, Stanford University, Pacific Grove, CA 93950, USA

8
9 * Corresponding author: Marta Rocchi

10 Department of BioSciences, University of Parma, Viale Usberti 11/A, 43124 Parma, Italy

11 email: marta.rocchi@studenti.unipr.it - phone: +39 0521 905106

12
13 **Abstract**

14 Ecosystem Based Management (EBM) aims to support the protection of natural ecosystems and to improve
15 economic activities. It requires considering all of the actors interacting in social-ecological systems (e.g., fish
16 and fishers) in the understanding that their interplay determines the dynamic behavior of the single actors
17 as well as that of the system as a whole. Connections are thus central for EBM and in the ecological domain
18 of the enlarged socio-ecological system interactions between species define such connections. In their
19 trophic form they shape ecosystem food webs. Understanding how connections affect ecosystem and
20 species dynamics is often impaired by a lack of data. We propose food web network analysis as a tool to
21 help to bridge the gap between EBM theory and practice in case of data-poor contexts showing an
22 application to a coastal marine ecosystem in Baja California Sur, Mexico. First, we calculated centrality
23 indices to identify which key (i.e., most central) species must be considered when designing strategies for
24 sustainable resource management. Second, we analyzed the resilience of the system by measuring the
25 changes in food web structure due to the local extinction of vulnerable species (i.e., by mimicking the
26 possible effect of an excessive fishing pressure). The consequences of species removals were quantified in
27 terms of impacts on global structural indices and species' centrality indices. Overall, we found that this
28 ecosystem shows high resilience to species loss. We identified species (e.g., Octopus sp. and the kelp bass,
29 *Paralabrax clathratus*) whose protection could further decrease the risk of potential negative impacts of
30 fishing activities on the Baja California Sur food web. This work introduces an approach that can be applied
31 to other ecosystems to aid the implementation of EBM in data-poor contexts.

32
33 *Keywords:* Ecosystem-Based Management; Food webs; Network analysis; Overfishing; Centrality indices;
34 Small-Scale Fisheries

35 **Introduction**

36 Marine ecosystems are undergoing huge pressures through overexploitation, habitat loss, pollution, species
37 introduction, ocean acidification and warming (Halpern et al. 2008a, Hoegh-Guldberg and Bruno 2010,
38 Burrows et al. 2011, Doney et al. 2012). Fisheries management, once interested primarily on large scale
39 industrial fisheries, is now focusing also on Small-Scale Fisheries (SSFs) and their dependent human
40 communities (Allison et al. 2001, Jacquet et al. 2008, Chuenpagdee 2011, Kolding et al. 2014). SSFs are
41 pervasive and of great importance (Finkbeiner 2015): small- and large-scale fisheries each contribute to
42 approximately half of global fisheries capture, but SSFs employ over 96% of the world's fishers
43 (Chuenpagdee et al. 2006).

44 Given the complexity of the issues and failure of traditional fisheries management efforts (Botsford et al.
45 1997, Hilborn et al. 2007), new management strategies have been called for. These have essentially
46 introduced a shift in focus: from single species or sectors to the whole ecosystem as the unit of
47 management. This view has produced a framework called "Ecosystem-Based Management" (EBM, Long et
48 al. 2015). EBM is increasingly taking ground as demonstrated by the ever greater effort devoted to its
49 applications worldwide (Pew 2003, USCOP 2004, Lester et al. 2010, Link 2010). EBM EBM is a cross-sectoral,
50 holistic approach (Link 2002a, Ruckelshaus et al. 2008, Halpern et al. 2008b, Francis et al. 2011, Link et al.
51 2012) as it is expected to prevent the overexploitation of resources, support ecosystem restoration,
52 maintain ecosystem health, and therefore promote human well-being (Long et al. 2015). One of the fifteen
53 principles that constitute its pillars (Long et al. 2015) highlights that connections are central to understand
54 ecosystem behavior and to design effective management strategies. Connections functionally link different
55 parts of a system and allow impacts to spread from one part to the others. Although the attention focuses
56 on connections that link variables of sub-domains of the socio-ecological system, i.e. how changes in
57 societal priorities or regulative framework may affect the dynamics of species (Long et al. 2015),
58 connections can be central also within the ecological domain of this enlarged ecosystem. Understanding
59 linkages between species, in particular, can improve our knowledge about how the ecological community
60 may respond to environmental or anthropogenic stress and can thus provide valuable indications of
61 possible impacts on ecosystems of management regulation and policies (Carey et al. 2013).

62 In this study we reconstructed the linkage structure of the coastal marine ecosystem of the North Pacific
63 region of Baja California Sur, Mexico, which is presently exploited by local SSFs. We produced a qualitative
64 food web that we then used to simulate species deletions mimicking the disappearance of vulnerable
65 species (Micheli et al. 2014) due to excessive fishing pressure. We studied this food web to unveil: (1) which
66 species are the most central in the community; (2) whether these central species are also the most
67 vulnerable ones considering their productivity and the cumulative effects of multiple fisheries (Micheli et al.
68 2014); (3) how species centrality changes after the removal of one or more species; (4) how the structural
69 features of the community as a whole change when central species disappear and when species are instead

70 removed at random. The interest in structural features of food webs is justified on the grounds of the
71 potential relationship that links food web structure and ecosystem functions (Petchey et al. 1999, 2007). In
72 particular, centrality indices can provide information about the transmission of control (top-down vs.
73 bottom-up) and the flow of energy in ecosystems (Jordán et al. 2006, 2009), and overall structural metrics
74 provide indications about the integrity of the food web upon which ecosystem functions depend (Miehls et
75 al. 2009, Bondavalli and Bodini 2014). Results of this investigation are then discussed as for their
76 implications on food web structure, fishing impacts, and management.

77

78

79 **Methods**

80 *Study Area*

81 We performed our investigation on the coastal marine ecosystem that supports local fishing communities,
82 which are organized in fishing cooperatives (McCay et al. 2014), located along the coast of the Vizcaino
83 Desert Biosphere Reserve in the North Pacific region of Baja California Sur, Mexico (Figure 1). The North
84 Pacific region can be defined as temperate to subtropical, with sea surface temperatures ranging from 12°
85 to 27° C throughout the year. This region is characterized by a mosaic of rocky reef and sandy subtidal
86 ecosystems that encompass the southern edge of the range of giant kelp (*Macrocystis pyrifera*) where a
87 zone of persistent upwelling maintains high biological productivity (Martone 2009).

88

89

[Figure 1 goes here]

90

91 The fishing cooperatives of the central Baja California region belong to FEDECOOP (Federacion Regional de
92 Sociedades Cooperativas de la Industria Pesquera de Baja California), which acts as a co-management
93 agency with the national and regional fisheries agencies to monitor resources and develop management
94 plans. The fishing cooperatives of the North Pacific date back to the late 1930s, as a manifestation of the
95 Mexican cooperative movement that was mainstreamed into national fisheries development policies
96 (Ponce-Diaz et al. 2009, McCay et al. 2014). SSFs represent 99% of registered fishing vessels on the Baja
97 California and Baja California Sur peninsula (INEGI 2008¹). Cooperatives have renewable 20-year
98 concessions for different species, including red spiny lobster (*Panulirus spp.*), abalone (*Haliotis fulgens* and
99 *H. corrugata*), wavy turban snail (*Megastrea undosa*), sea cucumber (*Parastichopus parvimensis*), red sea
100 urchin (*Mesocentrotus franciscanus*), and red algae *Gelidium robustum*. Fishers also catch many species of
101 finfish but, in contrast with benthic invertebrates and algae, do not hold territorial rights for them (i.e.,
102 fishing cooperatives do not have exclusive access to finfish within a geographically defined area; see

¹ <http://www.inegi.org.mx/> [last accessed on February 9, 2016].

103 Afflerbach et al. 2014). Within the food web, species are subjected to different fishing pressure, applied
104 through a variety of fishing methods, and risk (Micheli et al. 2014).

105

106 *Food web construction and trophic structure*

107 We constructed an adjacency matrix that reports presence/absence of trophic interactions (i.e., who eats
108 whom) among species or species groups within the food web. Rows represent prey species and columns
109 represent predator species. Each coefficient a_{ij} is 1 if the row species i is a prey of the column species j and
110 0 elsewhere (Dunne et al. 2002a, Abarca-Arenas et al. 2007, Gaichas and Francis 2008, Navia et al. 2010,
111 2012). We constructed an unweighted food web (i.e., all trophic interactions are set to 1) because no
112 information about link strength (i.e., amount of biomass flowing from prey to predators) was available.
113 Community composition and trophic resolution level were based on active collaboration with experts:
114 starting from species considered in Micheli et al. 2014, we expanded the nodes dataset on the base of a
115 coastal marine food web contest. Data on trophic interactions were obtained from the Kelp forest Database
116 (Beas-Luna et al. 2014), literature and general online descriptor such as FishBase (Froese and Pauly 2015),
117 Encyclopedia of Life², Discover Life³ and Animal Diversity Web⁴ (see Table S1 in Supplementary Material for
118 a detailed description of diet sources for each nodes). When dietary information was unavailable for some
119 species in the study area, data from similar ecosystems were used to complete the food web, thus it is
120 more literature based due to lack of data (e.g., gut content or stable isotopes analyses) that characterized
121 our study area. Every nodes diet was checked by expert marine biologists working in Baja California (Table
122 S1). The adjacency matrix that summarizes all trophic interactions is included in the Supplementary
123 Materials. The resulting food web of the North Pacific region of Baja California Sur is visualized in Figure 2.
124 The food web is composed of 121 nodes ($S = 121$) and 979 trophic interactions ($I = 979$). In the graph, each
125 node stands for a species or a trophospecies (i.e., a group of species with equivalent feeding habits and
126 preyed upon by the same set of predators), while directed edges indicate the presence of trophic
127 interactions. Nodes represent 100 species and 21 trophospecies: three birds, three marine mammals, 75
128 fish, 34 invertebrates, four algae, zooplankton and phytoplankton.

129

130 [Figure 2 goes here]

131

132 We used network analysis to investigate the food web structure of the Baja California Sur marine system.
133 We wanted to identify key (i.e., most central) species through centrality indices and explore the resilience
134 of the system by evaluating the changes in both global structural indices and species' centrality indices due
135 to the local extinction of vulnerable species (as defined by Micheli et al. 2014).

² <http://www.eol.org> [last accessed on February 9, 2016].

³ <http://www.discoverlife.org/> [last accessed on February 9, 2016].

⁴ <http://animaldiversity.org/> [last accessed on February 9, 2016].

136

137 *Global structural indices*

138 There are many structural indices that describe global features of food webs. These global structural indices
139 can be related to various aspects of food web functioning such as energy delivery (Allesina and Bodini
140 2004), stability (Rooney et al. 2006), and robustness (Dunne et al. 2002b). Table 1 summarizes the indices
141 we computed to assess the consequences of species' removals on the whole food web structure. We
142 selected the most commonly used indices for which clear ecological interpretation is associated to changes
143 in their values (see the last column in Table 1).

144

[Table 1 goes here]

146

147 *Trophic levels and centrality indices*

148 To characterize the food web structure we calculated species' trophic level with the cheddar library in the R
149 environment (Hudson et al. 2013). There are different methods for measuring trophic levels of species and
150 trophospecies in food webs (e.g., see Williams and Martinez 2004, Scotti et al. 2006). We used the prey
151 averaged trophic level that returns for each predator 1 plus the mean trophic level of its prey, using the
152 matrix inversion method of Levine (1980).

153 Besides the trophic level, we quantified the structural roles of species by computing centrality indices. Such
154 indices were developed in social network analysis and can be used as an approximation of species'
155 functional importance (e.g., see Jordán and Sheuring 2002, Jordán et al. 2006, Abarca-Arenas et al. 2007,
156 Jordán 2009, Navia et al. 2010). We considered some of the most commonly applied indices : degree
157 centrality, betweenness centrality, and closeness centrality. Table 2 provides a synthetic description of the
158 indices.

159

[Table 2 goes here]

161

162 In summary, species that show a high value for D_i are hubs (i.e., they locally interact with many other
163 species). When BC_i is high the node i plays an important role in mediating indirect effects. High CL_i values
164 identify nodes that, when disturbed (e.g., decline of their population size), more rapidly spread the impact
165 to other food web nodes. Centrality indices were computed with Cytoscape (Shannon et al. 2003) and using
166 the igraph library in the R environment (Csárdi and Nepusz 2006). See the Supplementary Material for the
167 algorithms of centrality indices.

168

169 *Removal analysis*

170 Removal analysis was conducted to mimic the effects of possible collapse of certain species due to
171 overfishing (Hamre 1994, Dolgov 2002). Species to be removed were selected using the risk-based
172 approach introduced by Micheli et al. (2014). Micheli et al. extended Productivity Susceptibility Analysis
173 (PSA) to assess the cumulative risk posed by multiple fisheries to the species of the North Pacific marine
174 food web. PSA defines species vulnerability (V) as a function of productivity (P) and aggregated
175 susceptibility (AS): $V = \sqrt{P^2 + AS^2}$. Productivity is calculated by using information on species life history
176 such as age and size at maturity, fecundity, reproductive strategy, and trophic level (Hobday et al. 2007).
177 Two or more fisheries may affect a single species and it is assumed that their cumulative potential impact
178 may be larger (e.g., additive or multiplicative) than that generated by the single fishery with the greatest
179 impact (Halpern et al. 2008b). Aggregated susceptibility accounts for possible cumulative effects of multiple
180 overlapping fishing activities and is assessed on the basis of several attributes (e.g., the selectivity of fishing
181 gears and post-capture mortality of discarded bycatch; see Micheli et al. 2014). To investigate how fishing
182 can modify the structure of the food web we considered the vulnerability of species that takes into account
183 the cumulative risk due to multiple fisheries (Micheli et al. 2014). According to the values of these
184 vulnerability scores we classified species as at high, medium and low risk (Table S2 in Supplementary
185 Material). The first group (i.e., high risk) included 28 species: three mammals, 24 fish, and one invertebrate;
186 medium risk species comprised 28 species: one bird, 22 fish, and five invertebrates; the latter group (i.e.,
187 low risk) was composed of 16 species: nine fish, six invertebrates and one algae (Table S2). We explored the
188 impacts of different combinations of high/medium/low risk species removal (i.e., by removing
189 combinations of one, two, three or four nodes at the same time) and considered both the effects on single
190 species and on the entire food web structure. The number of all possible combination (C) was determined
191 by: $(n, r) = \frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!}$, where n is the number of high/medium/low risk species taken r at a time (i.e., one,
192 two, three or four). Removal scenarios were targeted first to the 28 high risk species, which were all
193 removed one at a time. Second, all possible pairs of high risk species were removed. Then we removed all
194 possible combinations of three and four high risk species. We repeated the same procedure by considering
195 the medium and low risk species. In summary, for single species removals we had 28 different scenarios for
196 high and medium risk species, and 16 scenarios for low risk species. Two species removals yielded 378
197 combinations for both high and medium risk species, and 120 scenarios for low risk species. For three
198 species removals, both high and medium risk species generated 3,276 different combinations, whereas 560
199 scenarios were obtained with the subset of low risk species. Combinations of four species were 20,475 for
200 high and medium risk species, and 1,820 for low risk species. We did not consider scenarios in which
201 removals targeted mixed combinations of high, medium and low risk species although we recognize that
202 this is not unrealistic.

203 The influence of single species removals on the whole food web was assessed using global structural indices
204 (Table 1) and visualized through frequency histograms of assortativity coefficient (AC), clustering coefficient
205 (CC), modularity (MD), connectance (C), linkage density (LD), diameter (DM), average path length (APL) and
206 number of nodes with betweenness centrality equal to 0 (BC0). The impact of removals on single species
207 was assessed on the basis of changes in their centrality indices. For degree centrality, to quantify the
208 effects of species' removals ($remD_i$) we considered the ratio between the values with (D_i^{rem}) and without
209 removals (i.e., in the original food web; D_i): $remD_i = D_i^{rem}/D_i$. Hence, a value equal to 1 means no change in
210 degree centrality, while values < 1 identify those species whose total degree centrality decreased after
211 removals. To assess the changes in betweenness and closeness centralities (indices for which we used the
212 normalized versions that bring all values into the range [0, 1]; see Supplementary Material), the values
213 computed for each removal experiment (BC_i^{rem} and CL_i^{rem}) were subtracted from their counterparts
214 computed in the original food web (BC_i and CL_i): $remBC_i = BC_i - BC_i^{rem}$; $remCL_i = CL_i - CL_i^{rem}$. Therefore, a null
215 value means no change, a positive value stands for a decrease and a negative value indicates an increase in
216 the centrality score. The impacts of single species removals on centrality indices of all other species in the
217 food web were visualized by heat maps.

218 To further investigate whether species at risk (according to the definition provided by Micheli et al. 2014)
219 occupy most central structural positions in the food web we compared the consequences of their removal
220 with those produced by random removals (i.e., obtained by taking into account all of the food web species,
221 independently of their V score). We considered single species removals as well as combination of up to four
222 species selected at random. Thus, we had respectively 121, 7,260, 287,980 and 8,495,410 possible removal
223 scenarios to be compared with the ones based on targeted removals (i.e., these latter scenarios follow the
224 V index criteria). The presence of a significant difference between the effect of targeted and random
225 deletions indicates that the species that are most vulnerable to fishing pressure are also important from a
226 structural point of view (i.e., this is for testing whether targeted removals have more consistent negative
227 effects on food web topology compared to random deletions). This would imply that the disappearance of
228 vulnerable species can have consequences on the community structure and possibly function. This analysis
229 evaluates whether the vulnerability ranking proposed by Micheli et al. (2014) also reflects species'
230 structural importance.

231

232 *Statistical analysis*

233 To investigate a possible aggregation bias (i.e., the presence of significant differences in the centrality
234 indices of species vs. trophospecies) in the original food web (i.e., in absence of any removal) we applied
235 the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (KS-test). To compare index values obtained after targeted removals (i.e.,
236 risk-based) with those obtained from random deletions we performed the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test.
237 All statistical analyses were implemented in R.

238

239 **Results**

240 *Topological analysis: global structural indices, trophic levels and centrality indices*

241 The food web is depicted in Figure 2 The connectance is 0.07 and the network is disassortative ($R = -0.34$,
242 Sokhn et al. 2013): high degree nodes (i.e., nodes with many connections) are connected to low degree
243 nodes (i.e., nodes with few connections). All centrality indices differ significantly between species and
244 trophospecies ($D_{in,species} > D_{in,trophospecies}$, $p < 0.001$; $D_{out,species} < D_{out,trophospecies}$, $p \ll 0.001$; $D_{species} < D_{trophospecies}$, p
245 < 0.003 ; $undBC_{species} < undBC_{trophospecies}$, $p \ll 0.001$; $BC_{species} < BC_{trophospecies}$, $p < 0.024$; $CL_{species} < CL_{trophospecies}$, $p <$
246 0.010 , see Table 2 for indices description). This result confirms that the level of aggregation (species vs.
247 trophospecies) bias the analyses: trophospecies might have a significantly high number of trophic
248 interaction and because of this they may take part in a higher number of pathways with consequences on
249 betweenness and closeness values. Thus, we restricted the analysis to species (100 nodes). The values for
250 the indices are given in the Table S2 of Supplementary Material. Twelve species occupy the most central
251 positions in the trophic network, based on degree, betweenness, and closeness centralities (Table 3).

252

[Table 3 goes here]

254

255 *Removal analysis*

256 In general, the food webs generated by the removal experiments (i.e., the food webs constructed using
257 different scenarios of either targeted or random species deletion; see Figure 3) did not show significantly
258 different values of global structural indices when compared with the values computed in the original food
259 web (i.e., see the red line in Figure 3). This holds true for the global structuring indices AC, CC, MD, C, BC0,
260 APL and DM values. Link density shows a progressive increase in the difference between the value in the
261 original web and the ones obtained through species removals (Figure 3). We found similar patterns on
262 global structural indices for random and selective removals (i.e., when one to four species are removed)
263 across risk levels (i.e., medium and low risk species deletions; see Figures S1-S5 in Supplementary Material).

264

[Figure 3 goes here]

266

267 There is no significant difference between selected removals and random removals in case of CC (Mann-
268 Whitney-Wilcoxon test; Table 4). Significant differences emerged, instead, for AC, MD and APL, under
269 removal scenarios from two to four species removed. Indices MD and APL were significantly higher when
270 the food web was exposed to targeted removals (Table 4). Different values for C and LD occurred when
271 three and four species were removed (Table 4). Different values for BC0 emerged only when four species
272 were removed (Table 4).

273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307

[Table 4 goes here]

One example of the impact of removals on single species by computing centrality indices is given in Figure 4 (all the other cases are reported in the Supplementary Material). *Octopus sp.* seems to be the species that, if removed (either individually or in combination with other species), determines the greatest impact (based on centrality index D; see also Figures S6-S8 in Supplementary Material). The most impacted species are all fish species: *Alopias pelagicus*, *Cynoscion parvipinnis* and *Kathetostoma avarruncus*. Two invertebrate species are also affected when some combinations of two to four species are removed: the scallop *Hinnites multirugosus* and the sea cucumber *Parastichopus parvimensis*. Considering index BC, *Paralabrax clathratus*, *Octopus sp.*, *Paralichthys californicus* and *Sphyræna argentea* (three fish and one invertebrate) are the most impacted species in all the removal scenarios (i.e., their value decreases; Figures S6-S8 in Supplementary Material). When *Octopus sp.* is the target of removal, both as single species and in combination with others, more than 50% of the remaining species shows a decrease in closeness (Figures 4 and S6-S8 in Supplementary Material). The removal of *Paralichthys californicus* and *Stereolepis gigas* also induces a decrease in this index. Phytoplankton, zooplankton, the kelp *Eisenia arborea* and other algae increase their closeness for all combinations of species except for the deletion of *Octopus sp.* (i.e., both as single species or in combination with others), for which their values decrease.

[Figure 4 goes here]

Discussion

We identified 12 species as the most central (i.e., topologically important) in the food web of Baja California (Table 3). Five of these 12 species are the most central for at least three indices and could be thought of as key players in the community. They are: the kelp bass *Paralabrax clathratus*, the California halibut *Paralichthys californicus*, *Octopus sp.*, the California sheephead *Semicossyphus pulcher* and the spiny lobster *Panulirus interruptus*. All of them are evaluated as at risk for the cumulative effects of multiple fisheries according to Micheli's vulnerability index (Micheli et al. 2014). Of these five species, three are high risk species, one medium, and one low (see Table 3 and Figure 2).

Our results show that removing up to four target species (i.e., at risk; see Micheli et al. 2014), does not alter the structural attributes of the food web. Thus the network results as structurally resilient: its structure tends to maintain its integrity in the face of several simulated extinction events. The only structural index that shows a significant difference between the value of the original web and that obtained after removals is link density. This indicates that as the number of removed species increases the average number of

308 feeding links per species decreases. This effect may have consequences on ecological function and food
309 web resilience to additional species loss because it reduces the diet breadth of species and the number of
310 pathways through which materials and energy move through the web, and the functional redundancy of
311 the assemblage (e.g. Micheli and Halpern 2005). The sensitivity of link density to changes in food web
312 structure has been already reported in the literature, with a previous study showing how link density is
313 more sensitive to data aggregation than connectance (Dunne et al. 2006). Thus, the result of a significant
314 change of link density with species removals is not surprising. In contrast, all other indices were unaffected
315 by removals.

316 Comparing selected (i.e., targeted to high risk species) to random removals we found that the community
317 structure is differently affected depending on the indices considered and the number of species removed
318 (Table 4). The significant differences between target (i.e., risk based) and random removals are even more
319 important because the analysis was conducted in a conservative context (i.e., even risk species are used for
320 random removal scenarios). Modularity (MD) was significantly higher when removals targeted to high risk
321 species were compared to random extinctions. Thus, removing species at high risk can create a more
322 fragmented food web. This is due to the central position that some of the high risk species occupy in the
323 network of trophic interactions. Their loss seems not be immediately critical for the community but it may
324 render the whole network more fragile and thus possibly more vulnerable to further extinction events.
325 Connectance (C) increases significantly when high risk species are removed. According to Bondavalli and
326 Bodini (2014), as this parameter augments the number of redundant links becomes higher in comparison
327 with that of functional links. Allesina et al. (2009) showed that functional connections affect food web
328 robustness, whereas redundant links are neutral in its respect. Targeted removals thus, by significantly
329 increasing connectance (and the fraction of redundant links) in comparison with random removals, would
330 make the food web less robust than its original counterpart as the number of independent pathways (i.e.,
331 those composed by functional connections and that are fundamental for energy delivery) likely decreases
332 (but see Dunne et al. 2002). In summary, the presence of some significant difference (e.g., MD, C in Table 4)
333 between the effect of targeted and random deletions it is a confirmation that species undergoing strong
334 fishing pressure are also important from a structural point of view.

335 The analysis of species centrality expands in a functional perspective the concept of structural
336 connectedness (Jordán et al. 2006, Jordán 2009). *Octopus sp.* ranked highest for all the centrality indices.
337 Closeness centrality indicates how close a species is to the others; according to this, it can be inferred that
338 *Octopus sp.* plays an important role in the spread of both direct and indirect effects being responsible for
339 their diffusion in the ecosystem via shortest paths. Since it has been ascertained that in food webs the bulk
340 of energy travels along pathways that tend to be short (Bellingeri and Bodini 2015), *Octopus sp.* may enter
341 several main routes for energy delivery from primary producers to top species. This hypothesis needs to be
342 tested with empirical measurements and experiments, as the ecological role of *Octopus sp.* in these food

343 webs is unknown. Empirical and theoretical studies quantifying the main pathways for energy delivery and
344 the strength of these links would elucidate the role *Octopus sp.* and other species with high values of
345 closeness centrality play in energy delivery, and whether these species may act as bottlenecks for energy
346 distribution to otherspecies in the food web (Allesina and Bodini 2004). The high value of closeness for this
347 species, being calculated as undirected index, suggests that *Octopus sp.* might be involved in spreading of
348 top-down control, e.g., it may be part of trophic cascade leading from its predators to its prey. Control by
349 higher level consumers upon lower levels can be possible through several paths in a food web. However,
350 fastest spreading is assured by the shortest paths that can become the dominant routes through which
351 control is exerted by top consumers. The highest value of closeness, combined with the highest value of
352 betweenness centrality, suggests that *Octopus sp.* might enter in several of these dominant routes through
353 which cascading trophic interactions may manifest (Hodgson 2005). Network position in itself, however,
354 does not guarantee a prominent role in top-down regulations. This hypothesis, as highlighted above,
355 remains to be tested.

356 Considering the simulated impact of fishing, *Octopus sp.* is the species that, if removed, determines the
357 greatest change on other species' centrality. We found that more than 50% of the remaining species after
358 the removal of *Octopus sp.* showed a decrease in their closeness centrality values. This result suggests that
359 decline or loss of *Octopus sp.* might cause a substantial reorganization of the energy flow in the food web.
360 This is because the reduced closeness for a high proportion of species imposes that pathways for energy
361 delivery would elongate, with loss of efficiency. However, this hypothesis arises from a static view of the
362 food web. In real, dynamic food webs, species would actively respond to species loss through mechanisms
363 such as diet switching (Barnum et al. 2015). Nevertheless, a reorganization of the energy flow within the
364 ecosystem might still occur, with potential impacts on the amount of energy that reaches the top species
365 and, possibly the fisheries. Gaichas et al. (2008) have proposed that protecting highly connected species in
366 the network (also called hub species) is crucial to prevent potential structural impacts of fishing activities
367 on the whole ecosystem. The central role that *Octopus sp.* might play, as it is suggested by the centrality
368 indices, supports the correctness of the present regulative framework, which limits the catch to this species
369 to fishing cooperatives that hold exclusive fishing permits. This regulative framework (i.e., exclusive access
370 to cooperatives) applies also to *Panulirus interruptus*, another species that plays a relevant role in the
371 economy of fishery cooperatives and that is also central in the food web, based on this analysis (Figure 2).
372 These conclusions that emphasize the role of Octopus must be taken with circumspection, however, and
373 further scrutiny on the role this species plays in Baja California is needed. Results obtained in this study
374 strongly depend on the assumptions we made about the position that Octopus occupies within the food
375 web and that is defined since the adjacency matrix is compiled. Nevertheless it has been pointed out
376 (Doubleday et al. 2016) that these predators are voracious and adaptable and they impact many prey
377 species, including commercially valuable fish and invertebrates. Also several marine predators rely on this

378 species for food. This confirms that the positional importance of Octopus as a hub with many incoming and
379 outgoing connections seem a reasonable assumption.

380 *In silico* removals conducted in this study provide suggestions about how exploitation of vulnerable species
381 through multiple fisheries could expose the marine community to cascading effects that can lead to
382 modification of structural integrity of the Baja California coastal food web. In general, it seems that the
383 North Pacific Baja California food web shows an intrinsic (i.e., high potential) resilience to species loss. This
384 study highlights the potential of the whole system approach in fishery related questions. For example, the
385 potential ecological importance of individual species emerges not only in a single fishery perspective, but
386 also from the view point of the whole community structure: a species collapse may have community-wide
387 effects beyond the immediate consequences for its fishery. A central species local extinction might impose
388 a restructuring of the energetic backbone of the ecosystem (Bellingeri and Bodini 2016) through which
389 energy travels from primary producers to top consumers. This ultimately may affect the entire fishing
390 sector as fish production is supported by the energetic contribution from lower levels.

391 This study shows the potential of a food-web approach for examining possible ecosystem-wide effects of
392 fishing in data-poor contexts, and produces hypotheses to be tested in further research. However, this
393 approach presents some limitations. First, structural food web analyses are based on a static view of
394 network that precludes grasping dynamical aspects. For example, the top-down regulative mechanisms are
395 certainly linked to the centrality of the species. Most central species are likely to enter the formation of the
396 shortest pathways and are intermediate to many pathways through which control is spread; nonetheless, a
397 static food web does not inform about how this positional importance affects population dynamics.
398 Second, quantitative information about link strength is lacking: this information would be essential to relate
399 the positional importance of the species within the energetic budget of the entire community and the
400 pathways for energy delivery that support fisheries (Scotti et al. 2007, Bellingeri and Bodini 2016). In
401 particular food web are sensitive to lack of link-strength: considering unweighted and weighted version it is
402 proven that weighting could affects ranking (i.e., the node ordering) of topological indices: local indices (D_i)
403 are affected by weighting very seriously, instead BC and CL (that consider indirect effects) are less disturbed
404 (Scotti et al. 2007). Despite these limitations, the network approach can be a starting promising way to
405 bridge the gap between EBM theory (i.e., based on the development and improvement of key principles;
406 see Long et al. 2015) and practice (i.e., how can we deal with the complexity associated to whole systems,
407 in particular in the case of data-poor systems?) and strive to manage in a more conscious way most
408 ecosystems as possible. By this study, in particular, we have shown that many of the species at high risk
409 from multiple fisheries are also the most central in the network. Their reduction or loss may reduce food
410 web robustness, possibly making the community more prone to secondary extinctions. Another
411 consequence that we hypothesize is that patterns of energy transfer may be altered with consequences

412 toward the top of the food chains where, in general, commercially and ecologically important species are
413 found.

414

415

416 **Acknowledgments**

417 We thank Rodrigo Beas-Luna, and the Baja NFS-CNH team for feedback and advice. This work was partly
418 supported by NSF grant DEB-1212124.

419 **References**

- 420 Abarca-Arenas, L.G., Franco-López, J., Peterson, M.S., Brown-Peterson, N.J., Valero-Pacheco, E. (2007).
421 Sociometric analysis of the role of penaeids in the continental shelf food web off Veracruz, Mexico
422 based on by-catch. *Fisheries Research*, 87, 46-57.
- 423 Afflerbach, J.C., Lester, S.E., Dougherty, D.T., Poon, S.E. (2014). A global survey of “TURF-reserves”,
424 Territorial Use Rights for Fisheries coupled with marine reserves. *Global Ecology and Conservation*,
425 2, 97-106.
- 426 Allesina, S., Bodini, A. (2004). Who dominates whom in the ecosystem? Energy flow bottlenecks and
427 cascading extinctions. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 230, 351-358.
- 428 Allesina, S., Bodini, A., Pascual, M. (2009). Functional links and robustness in food webs. *Philosophical*
429 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 364, 1701-1709.
- 430 Allison, E.H., Ellis, F. (2001). The livelihoods approach and management of small-scale fisheries. *Marine*
431 *Policy*, 25, 377-388.
- 432 Arkema, K.K., Reed, D.C., Schroeter, S.C. (2009). Direct and indirect effects of giant kelp determine benthic
433 community structure and dynamics. *Ecology*, 90, 3126-3137.
- 434 Barnum, T.R., Drake, J.M., Colón-Gaud, C., Rugenski, A.T., Frauendorf, T.C., Connelly, S., Kilham, S.S., Whiles,
435 M.R., Lips, K.R., Pringle, C.M. (2015). Evidence for the persistence of food web structure after
436 amphibian extirpation in a Neotropical stream. *Ecology*, 96, 2106-2116.
- 437 Beas-Luna, R., Novak, M., Carr, M.H., Tinker, M.T., Black, A., Caselle, J.E., Hoban, M., Malone, D., Iles, A.
438 (2014). An online database for informing ecological network models: <http://kelpforest.ucsc.edu>.
439 *PLOS ONE*, 9, e109356.
- 440 Bellingeri, M., Bodini, A. (2016). Food web’s backbones and energy delivery in ecosystems. *Oikos*, 125, 586-
441 594.
- 442 Bondavalli, C., Bodini, A. (2014). How interaction strength affects the role of functional and redundant
443 connections in food webs. *Ecological Complexity*, 20, 97-106.
- 444 Botsford, L. W., Castilla, J. C., & Peterson, C. H. (1997). The management of fisheries and marine
445 ecosystems. *Science*, 277(5325), 509-515.
- 446 Bueno, N., Basurto, X. (2009). Resilience and collapse of artisanal fisheries: a system dynamics analysis of a
447 shellfish fishery in the Gulf of California, Mexico. *Sustainability Science*, 4, 139-149.
- 448 Burrows, M.T., Schoeman, D.S., Buckley, L.B., Moore, P., Poloczanska, E.S., Brander, K.M., Hoban, M.,
449 Malone, D., Holding, J. (2011). The pace of shifting climate in marine and terrestrial ecosystems.
450 *Science*, 334, 652-655.
- 451 Carey, M.P., Levin, P.S., Townsend, H., Minello, T.J., Sutton, G.R., Francis, T.B., Harvey, C.J., Toft, J.E.,
452 Arkema, K.K., Burke, J.L., Kim, C.K., Guerry, A., Plummer, M., Spiridonov, G., Ruckelshaus, M. (2013).

453 Characterizing coastal foodwebs with qualitative links to bridge the gap between the theory and
454 the practice of ecosystem-based management. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 71, 713-724.

455 Chuenpagdee, R. (2011). A Matter of Scale: Prospects in Small-Scale Fisheries. In: Chuenpagdee, R. (ed.),
456 World Small-Scale Fisheries: Contemporary Visions. Eburon Academic Publishers, Delft, pp. 21-36.

457 Chuenpagdee, R., Liguori, L., Palomares, M.L., Pauly, D. (2006). Bottom-up, Global Estimates of Small-Scale
458 Marine Fisheries Catches. Fisheries Centre Research Reports 14, University of British Columbia,
459 Vancouver, 105 pp.

460 Csárdi, G., Nepusz, T. (2006). The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal*,
461 *Complex Systems*, 1695, 1-9.

462 Cury, P., Bakun, A., Crawford, R.J., Jarre, A., Quiñones, R.A., Shannon, L.J., Verheye, H.M. (2000). Small
463 pelagics in upwelling systems: patterns of interaction and structural changes in “wasp-waist”
464 ecosystems. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 57, 603-618.

465 Dolgov, A.V. (2002). The role of capelin (*Mallotus villosus*) in the foodweb of the Barents Sea. *ICES Journal*
466 *of Marine Science*, 59, 1034-1045.

467 Doney, S.C., Ruckelshaus, M., Duffy, J.E., Barry, J.P., Chan, F., English, C.A., Galindo, H.M., Grebmeier, J.M.,
468 Hollowed, A.B., Knowlton, N., Polovina, J. (2012). Climate change impacts on marine ecosystems.
469 *Marine Science*, 4, 11-37.

470 Doubleday, Z.A., Prowse, T.A.A., Arkhipkin, A., Pierce, G.J., Semmens, J., Steer, M., Leporati, S.C., Lourenço,
471 S., Quetglas, A., Sauer, W., and Gillanders B.M. 2016. Global proliferation of cephalopods. *Current*
472 *Biology*, 26: 406-407.

473 Dunne, J.A., Williams, R.J., Martinez, N.D. (2002a). Food-web structure and network theory: the role of
474 connectance and size. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 99, 12917-12922.

475 Dunne, J.A., Williams, R.J., Martinez, N.D. (2002b). Network structure and biodiversity loss in food webs:
476 robustness increases with connectance. *Ecology Letters*, 5, 558-567.

477 Dunne J.A. (2006). The Network Structure of Food Webs. In: Pascual M., Dunne J.A. (eds.), *Ecological*
478 *Networks: Linking Structure to Dynamics in Food Webs*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 27-
479 86.

480 Ecosystem Principles Advisory Panel. (1999). *Ecosystem-based Fishery Management: A Report to Congress*
481 *by the Ecosystem Principles Advisory Panel, as Mandated by the Sustainable Fisheries Act*
482 *Amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act 1996*. US
483 *Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine*
484 *Fisheries Service, Washington, D.C.*

485 Finkbeiner, E.M. (2015). The role of diversification in dynamic small-scale fisheries: lessons from Baja
486 California Sur, Mexico. *Global Environmental Change*, 32, 139-152.

487 Francis, T.B., Levin, P.S., Harvey, C.J. (2011). The perils and promise of futures analysis in marine ecosystem-
488 based management. *Marine Policy*, 35, 675-681.

489 Froese, R., Pauly, D. (eds.) 2015. FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication. www.fishbase.org,
490 version (10/2015).

491 Gaichas, S.K. Francis, R.C. (2008). Network models for ecosystem-based fishery analysis: a review of
492 concepts and application to the Gulf of Alaska marine food web. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and*
493 *Aquatic Sciences*, 65, 1965-1982.

494 Halpern, B.S., Walbridge, S., Selkoe, K.A., Kappel, C.V., Micheli, F., D'Agrosa, C., Bruno, J.F., Casey, K.S.,
495 Ebert, C., Fox, H.E., Fujita, R. (2008a). A global map of human impact on marine ecosystems.
496 *Science*, 319, 948-952.

497 Halpern, B.S., McLeod, K.L., Rosenberg, A.A., Crowder, L.B. (2008b). Managing for cumulative impacts in
498 ecosystem-based management through ocean zoning. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 51, 203-211.

499 Hamre, J. (1994). Biodiversity and exploitation of the main fish stocks in the Norwegian-Barents Sea
500 ecosystem. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 3, 473-492.

501 Hilborn, R. (2007). Defining success in fisheries and conflicts in objectives. *Marine Policy*, 31(2), 153-158.

502 Hobday, A.J., Smith, A., Webb, H., Daley, R., Wayte, S., Bulman, C., Dowdney, J., Williams, A., Sporcic, M.,
503 Dambacher, J., Fuller, M., Walker, T. (2007). Ecological Risk Assessment for the Effects of Fishing:
504 Methodology. Report R04/1072 for the Australian Fisheries Management Authority, Canberra,
505 Australia.

506 Hodgson, Y.S. (2005). A trophic cascade synthesis: review of top-down mechanisms regulating lake
507 ecosystems. *Bios*, 76, 137-144.

508 Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Bruno, J.F. (2010). The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems.
509 *Science*, 328, 1523-1528.

510 Hudson, L.N., Emerson, R., Jenkins, G.B., Layer, K., Ledger, M.E., Pichler, D.E., Thompson, M.S., O'Gorman,
511 E.J., Woodward, G., Reuman, D.C. (2013). Cheddar: analysis and visualisation of ecological
512 communities in R. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 4, 99-104.

513 Hughes, T.P., Bellwood, D.R., Folke, C., Steneck, R.S., Wilson, J. (2005). New paradigms for supporting the
514 resilience of marine ecosystems. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 20, 380-386.

515 Jacquet, J., Pauly, D. (2008). Funding priorities: big barriers to small-scale fisheries. *Conservation Biology*,
516 22, 832-835.

517 Jordán, F., Scheuring, I. (2002). Searching for keystones in ecological networks. *Oikos*, 99, 607-612.

518 Jordán, F., Liu, W.C., Davis, A.J. (2006). Topological keystone species: measures of positional importance in
519 food webs. *Oikos*, 112, 535-546.

520 Jordán, F., Benedek, Z., Podani, J. (2007). Quantifying positional importance in food webs: a comparison of
521 centrality indices. *Ecological Modelling*, 205, 270-275.

522 Jordán, F. (2009). Keystone species and food webs. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*
523 *Biological Sciences*, 364, 1733-1741.

524 Kolding, J., Béné, C., Bavinck, M. (2014). Small-Scale Fisheries. In: Garcia, S.M., Rice, J., Charles, A. (eds.),
525 *Governance of Marine Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation: Interaction and Coevolution*, pp.
526 317-331.

527 Lester, S.E., McLeod, K.L., Tallis, H., Ruckelshaus, M., Halpern, B.S., Levin, P.S., Chavez, F.P., Pomery, C.,
528 McCay, B.J., Costello, C., Gaines, S.D., Mace, A.J., Barth, J.A., Fluharty, D.L., Parrish, J.K. (2010).
529 Science in support of ecosystem-based management for the US West Coast and beyond. *Biological*
530 *Conservation*, 143, 576-587.

531 Levine, S. (1980). Several measures of trophic structure applicable to complex food webs. *Journal of*
532 *Theoretical Biology*, 83, 195-207.

533 Link, J.S. (2002a). What does ecosystem-based fisheries management mean? *Fisheries*, 27, 18-21.

534 Link, J.S. (2002b). Does food web theory work for marine ecosystems? *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 230,
535 1-9.

536 Link, J.S. (2010). *Ecosystem-based Fisheries Management: Confronting Tradeoffs*. Cambridge University
537 Press, New York. 224 pp.

538 Link, J.S., Ihde, T F., Harvey, C.J., Gaichas, S.K., Field, J.C., Brodziak, J.K.T., Townsend, H.M., Peterman, R.M.
539 (2012). Dealing with uncertainty in ecosystem models: the paradox of use for living marine
540 resource management. *Progress in Oceanography*, 102, 102-114.

541 Long, R.D., Charles, A., Stephenson, R.L. (2015). Key principles of marine ecosystem-based management.
542 *Marine Policy*, 57, 53-60.

543 Martinez, N.D. (1992). Constant connectance in community food webs. *American Naturalist*, 139, 1208-
544 1218.

545 Martone, R.L.G. (2009). *Geographic Variation in Species Demography and Community Structure in*
546 *Temperate Rocky Reefs*. ProQuest (PhD Thesis), 115 pp.

547 McCay, B.J., Micheli, F., Ponce-Díaz, G., Murray, G., Shester, G., Ramirez-Sanchez, S., Weisman, W. (2014).
548 Cooperatives, concessions, and co-management on the Pacific coast of Mexico. *Marine Policy*, 44,
549 49-59.

550 Micheli, F., & Halpern, B. S. (2005). Low functional redundancy in coastal marine assemblages. *Ecology*
551 *Letters*, 8(4), 391-400.

552 Micheli, F., De Leo, G., Butner, C., Martone, R.L.G., Shester, G. (2014). A risk-based framework for assessing
553 the cumulative impact of multiple fisheries. *Biological Conservation*, 176, 224-235.

554 Miehs, A.L.J., Mason, D.M., Frank, K.A., Krause, A.E., Peacor, S.D., Taylor, W.W. (2009). Invasive species
555 impacts on ecosystem structure and function: a comparison of the Bay of Quinte, Canada, and
556 Oneida Lake, USA, before and after zebra mussel invasion. *Ecological Modelling*, 220, 3182-3193.

557 Navia, A.F., Cortés, E., Mejía-Falla, P.A. (2010). Topological analysis of the ecological importance of
558 elasmobranch fishes: a food web study on the Gulf of Tortugas, Colombia. *Ecological Modelling*,
559 221, 2918-2926.

560 Navia, A.F., Cortés, E., Jordán, F., Mejía-Falla, P.A., Cruz-Escalona, V.H. (2012). Changes to marine trophic
561 networks caused by fishing. In: Mahamane, A. (ed.), *Diversity of Ecosystems*. Intech Open Access
562 Publisher, Rijeka, pp. 417-452.

563 Neutel, A.M., Heesterbeek, J.A., van de Koppel, J., Hoenderboom, G., Vos, A., Kaldewey, C., Berendse, F., de
564 Ruiter, P.C. (2007). Reconciling complexity with stability in naturally assembling food webs. *Nature*,
565 449, 599-602.

566 Newman, M.E. (2002). Assortative mixing in networks. *Physical Review Letters*, 89, 208701.

567 Petchey, O.L., McPhearson, P.T., Casey, T.M., Morin, P.J. (1999). Environmental warming alters food-web
568 structure and ecosystem function. *Nature*, 402, 69-72.

569 Petchey, O.L., Beckerman, A.P., Riede, J.O., Warren, P.H. (2008). Size, foraging, and food web structure.
570 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 105, 4191-4196.

571 Pew Oceans Commission (Pew). (2003). *America's Living Oceans: Charting a Course for Sea Change. A*
572 *Report to the Nation: Recommendations for a New Ocean Policy*. Pew Oceans Commission,
573 Arlington, VA.

574 Ponce-Díaz, G., Arregín-Sánchez, F., Díaz-de León, A., Torres, P.A. (2009). Promotion and Management of
575 Marine Fisheries in Mexico. In: Winter, G. (ed.), *Towards Sustainable Fisheries Law - A Comparative*
576 *Analysis*. IUCN Environmental Policy and Law Paper No. 74, Gland, Switzerland, pp. 233-252.

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

579 Ruckelshaus, M., Klinger, T., Knowlton, N., DeMaster, D.P. (2008). Marine ecosystem-based management in
580 practice: scientific and governance challenges. *BioScience*, 58, 53-63.

581 Scotti, M., Allesina, S., Bondavalli, C., Bodini, A., Abarca-Arenas, L.G. (2006). Effective trophic positions in
582 ecological acyclic networks. *Ecological Modelling*, 198, 495-505.

583 Scotti, M., Podani, J., Jordán, F. (2007). Weighting, scale dependence and indirect effects in ecological
584 networks: a comparative study. *Ecological Complexity*, 4, 148-159.

585 Shannon, P., Markiel, A., Ozier, O., Baliga, N.S., Wang, J.T., Ramage, D., Amin, N., Schwikowski, B., Ideker, T.
586 (2003). Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated models of biomolecular interaction
587 networks. *Genome Research*, 13, 2498-2504.

588 Sokhn, N., Baltensperger, R., Bersier, L.F., Nitsche, U.U., Hennebert, J. (2013). Structural network properties
589 of niche-overlap graphs. In: 2013 International Conference on Signal-Image Technology & Internet-
590 Based Systems (SITIS), pp. 478-482.

591 Tylianakis, J.M., Laliberté, E., Nielsen, A., Bascompte, J. (2010). Conservation of species interaction
592 networks. *Biological Conservation*, 143, 2270-2279.

593 Ulanowicz, R.E. (2001). Information theory in ecology. *Computers & Chemistry*, 25, 393-399.

594 United States. Commission on Ocean Policy, USCOP (2004). *An Ocean Blueprint for the 21st Century: Final*
595 *Report (Vol. 5)*. US Commission on Ocean Policy.

596 Williams, R.J., Martinez, N.D. (2004). Limits to trophic levels and omnivory in complex food webs: theory
597 and data. *American Naturalist*, 163, 458-468.

598

Indices	Explanation	Interpretation
Assortativity coefficient (AC)	It is a correlation between the degree (i.e., the number of connections) of two neighboring nodes (Newman 2002, Sokhn et al. 2013).	AC < 0, the network is disassortative (i.e., high degree nodes are connected to low degree nodes). AC > 0, the network is assortative (i.e., high degree nodes are connected to high degree nodes). AC = 0, the connections between nodes do not depend by their degree.
Clustering coefficient (CC)	It is measured as the ratio between the number of edges involving the neighbors of a node <i>i</i> , and the maximum number of edges that could exist. The clustering coefficient of the food web is the average of the clustering coefficients of all nodes. If the food web is fully connected, the clustering coefficient is then equal to 1.	An increase in the values of this index indicates that species tend to compete with other species in more clustered groups (Sokhn et al. 2013).
Modularity (MD)	It is a qualitative measure for food web clustering. MD ranges from 0 to 1: if MD approaches 1, this indicates strong modular structure; if the number of intra-modular edges is no more than what could be expected from random networks, then MD = 0 (Sokhn et al. 2013).	When this index increases the food web becomes more fragmented and therefore more vulnerable.
Betweenness centrality equal to 0 (BC0)	Betweenness centrality of a node <i>i</i> is the fraction of shortest paths in a graph that passes through <i>i</i> . The global index derived from this centrality quantifies the number of nodes with betweenness centrality equal to zero.	If the number of species with a betweenness centrality equal to 0 increases, then more species compete with only one particular group of species and hence belong to a unique subgraph; instead, if there is a decrease this indicates that less species compete (Sokhn et al. 2013).
Connectance (C)	It is computed as the ratio between existing and all possible trophic interactions (i.e., $C = I/S^2$, Martinez 1992).	Lower connectance value can reveal a decrease in food web robustness (Dunne et al. 2002b).
Linkage density (LD)	It is the average number of feeding links per species.	Lower link density values can reveal a decrease in food web robustness (Dunne et al. 2002b).
Average path length (APL)	It is the average distance between any two nodes in the undirected network.	A decrease in this index can be an indicator of faster spread of disturbance in the whole food web.
Diameter (DM)	It is the shortest undirected path (number of trophic interactions) between the two most distant nodes in the network.	This can be an indicator of how fast disturbance can spread in the whole food web.

601

602 **Table 1** – Global structural indices. A brief description for each index is provided (Explanation) together
603 with the meaning as a function of their values (Interpretation).

604

Indices	Explanation	Interpretation
Degree centralities ($D_{in,i}$, $D_{out,i}$, D_i)	The degree of node i (D_i) is obtained summing together the total number of all of its prey (in-degree, $D_{in,i}$) and of its predators (out-degree, $D_{out,i}$).	They measure the local importance of species. Species that show a high value for D_i are hubs (i.e., they locally interact with many other species).
Betweenness centrality (BC_i)	It counts how many times a target node i lies on the shortest paths connecting every other pair of species j and k in the food web. It considers shortest paths with a strict bottom-up perspective (i.e., tracing biomass flow from primary producers to consumers).	It measures how central a given node is in terms of being included in many shortest paths in the network, thus describing how crucial (i.e., high index values) a species is in mediating the diffusion of indirect effects throughout the whole food web in a bottom-up perspective.
Undirected betweenness centrality ($undBC_i$)	It counts how many times a target node i lies on the shortest paths connecting every other pair of species j and k in the food web. It accounts for the spread of both bottom-up and top-down effects (i.e., without being constrained by the direction of biomass flow).	It measures how central a given node is in terms of being included in many shortest paths in the network, thus describing how crucial (i.e., high index values) a species is in mediating the diffusion of indirect effects throughout the whole food web in a top-down and bottom-up perspective.
Undirected closeness centrality (CL_i)	It measures the length of the shortest paths from a given species i to all other species that can be reached in the food web.	It measures how close a node is to the others and quantifies how rapidly an effect that generates from species i can spread in the food web both from top-down and bottom-up perspective (i.e., it is not constrained by biomass flow direction in the food web and does not implement a strict bottom-up perspective).

605

606 **Table 2** – Centrality indices. A brief description for each index is provided (Explanation) together with the
607 meaning as a function of their values (Interpretation).

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

ID code	Species	Category	D _{in}	D _{out}	D	BC	undBC	CL
6	<i>Paralabrax clathratus</i>	Fish	37(1st)		47(2nd)	0.089(2nd)	0.036(2nd)	0.603(2nd)
4	<i>Paralichthys californicus</i>	Fish	30(2nd)		40(3rd)	0.071(3rd)	0.021(4th)	0.577(3rd)
27	<i>Octopus sp.</i>	Invertebrate		37(1st)	58(1st)	0.111(1st)	0.089(1st)	0.635(1st)
24	<i>Semicossyphus pulcher</i>	Fish	24(4th)		32(5th)		0.027(3rd)	0.569(4th)
47	<i>Panulirus interruptus</i>	Invertebrate			36(4th)		0.020(5th)	0.569(5th)
21	<i>Stereolepis gigas</i>	Fish	28(3rd)			0.030(4th)		
16	<i>Zalophus californianus</i>	Mammal	24(5th)					
84	<i>Pugettia producta</i>	Invertebrate		25(3rd)				
41	<i>Clupeids</i>	Fish		30(2nd)				
105	<i>Eisenia arborea</i>	Algae		21(4th)				
49	<i>Cancer anthonyi</i>	Invertebrate		19(5th)				
19	<i>Sphyræna argentea</i>	Fish				0.016(5th)		

626

627 **Table 3** – The 12 most central species in the Baja California coastal food web. For each index, we consider
628 the species that occupy the top five positions. For each species and index, we show centrality values and
629 ranking position (1st to 5th).

630

Species removed	AC	CC	MD	BC0	C	LD	APL	DM
1	0.980	0.774	0.787	0.656	0.394	0.394	0.712	NA
2	0.010	0.500	<0.001	0.903	0.715	0.715	< 0.005	NA
	ASH < R		ASH > R				ASH > R	
3	<< 0.001	0.472	<< 0.001	0.145	< 0.004	< 0.004	<< 0.001	NA
	ASH < R		ASH > R		ASH > R	ASH > R	ASH > R	
4	<< 0.001	0.641	<< 0.001	<< 0.001	<< 0.001	<< 0.001	<< 0.001	0.180
	ASH < R		ASH > R					

631

632 **Table 4** – Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test for the comparison of global structural indices computed after
633 either targeted (i.e., high risk) or random removals. The scenarios comprise single removals and multiple
634 removals of all possible combinations up to four species (see the different rows of the table). ASH key labels
635 targeted removals of species at risk; R key identifies random extinctions. Numbers indicate the p-values of
636 the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon test. ASH > R indicates that the index is significantly higher for targeted
637 removals than for random removals, while ASH < R stands for significantly lower values in case of targeted
638 removals if compared to random deletions.

639

640 **Figure captions**

641

642 **Figure 1** – Map of the study area located along the coast of the Vizcaino Desert Biosphere Reserve in the
643 North Pacific region of Baja California Sur, Mexico (reproduced from Micheli et al. 2014, with permission).

644

645 **Figure 2** – Food web diagram representing trophic interactions in the area located along the coast of the
646 Vizcaino Desert Biosphere Reserve in the North Pacific region of Baja California Sur, Mexico. Each node
647 represents either a species or a trophospecies. The edges connecting the nodes stand for trophic
648 interactions (each arrowhead edge leaves the prey and enters the predator). Species' vertical position
649 reflects the trophic level. The color of the nodes indicates different levels of vulnerability (V), the border
650 line specifies taxonomic groups and the shape displays fishing permits. The food web diagram was
651 visualized with Cytoscape (Shannon et al. 2003).

652

653 **Figure 3** – Frequency histograms for global structural indices following removals of four species (20,475
654 combinations): high risk species removal (A) and random removals (B). In each chart the red line shows the
655 value of the index for the food web with no removals.

656

657 **Figure 4** – Changes in closeness centrality due to the targeted removal of species at high risk. On the x axis
658 there are the combination of species removed, they are indicated by white boxes. Species for which
659 consequences are visualized are listed on the right side of the heat map. The order is changing on the basis
660 of clustering method (i.e., complete linkage method with Euclidean distance measure that finds similar
661 clusters). In the upper left corner the color scale used for visualization and the corresponding numerical
662 range for the index. According to this scale, green boxes indicate lowest closeness values after removals.