

Kent Academic Repository

Full text document (pdf)

Citation for published version

Bearup, Daniel and Petrovskii, S. and Blackshaw, R. and Hastings, A. (2013) Synchronized dynamics of *Tipula paludosa* metapopulation in a southwestern Scotland agroecosystem: Linking pattern to process. *American Naturalist*, 182 (3). pp. 393-409. ISSN 0003-0147.

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1086/671162>

Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/64320/>

Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

researchsupport@kent.ac.uk

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

**Synchronized Dynamics of *Tipula paludosa*
Metapopulation in a South-Western Scotland
Agroecosystem: Linking Pattern to Process**

Daniel Bearup, Sergei Petrovskii¹

Department of Mathematics, University of Leicester,
University Road, Leicester LE1 7RH, U.K.
Emails: djb69@le.ac.uk, sp237@le.ac.uk

Rod Blackshaw

Centre for Agricultural and Rural Sustainability, University of Plymouth,
Drake Circus, Plymouth PL4 8AA, U.K.
Email: r.blackshaw@plymouth.ac.uk

Alan Hastings

Department of Environment Science and Policy, University of California at Davis,
Davis, CA 95616, USA.
Email: amhastings@ucdavis.edu

Keywords: metapopulation, synchronization, dispersal, Moran effect, *T. paludosa*

Publication type: article

Additional elements of the expanded online edition: [Appendix](#)

Figures to print in color: Figs. 1, 2 and 11

¹Corresponding author. Phone/fax: +44 116 252 3916/3915, email: sp237@le.ac.uk

Abstract

Synchronization of population fluctuations at disjoint habitats has been observed in many studies but its mechanisms often remain obscure. Synchronization may appear as a result of either inter-habitat dispersal or because of regionally correlated environmental stochastic factors, the latter being known as the Moran effect. In this paper, we consider the population dynamics of a common agricultural pest insect *T. paludosa* on a fragmented habitat by analyzing data derived from a multi-annual survey of its abundance in 38 agricultural fields in South-West Scotland. We use cross-correlation coefficients and show that there is a considerable synchronization between different populations across the whole area. The correlation strength exhibits an intermittent behavior so that close populations can be virtually uncorrelated but populations separated by distances up to about 150 kilometers can have a cross-correlation coefficient close to one. In order to distinguish between the effects of stochasticity and dispersal, we then calculate a time-lagged cross-correlation coefficient and show that it possesses considerably different properties to the non-lagged one. In particular, the time-lagged correlation coefficient shows a clear directional dependence. The distribution of the time-lagged correlations with respect to the bearing between the populations has a striking similarity to the distribution of wind velocities, which we regard as evidence of long-distance wind-assisted dispersal.

1 Introduction

Understanding of population dynamics in complex environments has been one of the main challenges both for theoretical and empirical ecology over the last few decades (Levin 1976; Kareiva 1990; Lundberg et al. 2000). Environment is known to shape the geometry of ecological interactions through a variety of specific spatial and spatiotemporal mechanisms such as landscape structure (Pickett and Thompson 1978; Kaitala et al. 2001), seasonality and solar cycles (Sinclair and Gosline 1997), and transient weather conditions both on global and regional scale (Baars and Van Dijk 1984; Post and Forchhammer 2002; Raimondo et al. 2004). The latter is usually regarded as environmental stochasticity or noise; e.g. see Vasseur and Yodzis (2004) and references therein.

Landscape heterogeneity often results in a situation **where** populations of the same species occupy disjoint habitats. Depending on the inter-habitat distance, individual mobility and the nature of the environment between the habitats, e.g. how harsh it is, these local populations may or may not interact with each other through dispersal. The classic concept of metapopulation (Hanski and Gilpin 1991) refers to the case **where** the sizes of local populations fluctuate independently, thus assuming that the dispersal coupling **between them** can be neglected. In many cases, however, this is not the case and the population fluctuations in different habitats appear to be, to a certain extent, correlated (so that the metapopulation concept had to be updated accordingly, e.g. see Haydon and Steen 1997; Sutcliffe et al. 1997). This phenomenon is known as **synchronization, and inter-habitat** dispersal has been identified as a synchronizing factor (Liebhold et al. 2004). There is considerable evidence that dispersal coupling by just a tiny fraction of the population may bring population fluctuations into synchrony (Haydon and Steen 1997; Kendall et al. 2000; Ripa 2000).

Remarkably, dispersal coupling is not the only factor resulting in population synchronization. The impact of spatially correlated environmental noise on disconnected populations can synchronize the population fluctuations too, the phenomenon being known as the Moran effect (Moran 1953a,b; Royama 1992; Ranta et al. 1997). Having originally been discovered theoretically (cf. “Moran’s theorem”), it has later been widely observed in different taxa and in various environments (Liebhold et al. 2004). Synchronization of population fluctuations can therefore be driven by the regional environmental stochasticity, by the interaction between local populations through dispersal, or by a mixture of both (Goldwyn and Hastings 2011). Without any impact from the Moran effect, dispersal

0058
0059
0060
0061
0062
0063
0064
0065
0066
0067
0068
0069
0070
0071
0072
0073
0074
0075
0076
0077
0078
0079
0080
0081
0082
0083
0084
0085
0086
0087
0088
0089
0090
0091
0092
0093
0094
0095
0096
0097
0098
0099
0100
0101
0102
0103
0104
0105
0106
0107
0108
0109
0110
0111
0112
0113
0114

0115 is typically too weak a force to produce synchrony (Goldwyn and Hastings 2011), but the
0116 Moran effect alone cannot produce very high levels of synchrony. What is less clear is the
0117 relative importance of these two forces.
0118
0119

0120 Synchronization has many implications across the whole range of ecological sciences.
0121 Good understanding of patterns and mechanisms of synchronization is required in or-
0122 der to efficiently manage issues arising in agro-ecology (Rosenstock et al. 2011), in pest
0123 control (Milne et al. 1965; Blackshaw 1983; Williams and Liebhold 1995) and in nature
0124 conservation programs (Earn et al. 2000). Identifying particular factor(s) resulting in
0125 synchronization is therefore important. Indeed, linking an observed ecological pattern to
0126 a specific process has been a major issue in contemporary ecology (Levin 1992). However,
0127 since both dispersal and the Moran effect can have a similar impact on population dy-
0128 namics, it is often very difficult to distinguish between them unless direct measures of the
0129 effect of dispersal are possible. For example, observed synchronies in the yield of pistachio
0130 trees must be due only to the Moran effect as there is no equivalent to dispersal in this
0131 system and this is confirmed by models (Lyles et al. 2009). But a system where dispersal
0132 can be eliminated as a force causing synchrony is rare, and differentiating the effects of
0133 stochasticity from that of dispersal is sometimes regarded as one of the greatest challenges
0134 to ecologists studying spatiotemporal population dynamics (Liebhold et al. 2004).
0135
0136
0137
0138
0139
0140
0141
0142
0143
0144

0145 Another challenging problem is to identify the corresponding spatial scale of the mecha-
0146 nisms involved. For species with low mobility, the scale of synchronization due to dispersal
0147 is known to be smaller than the scale induced by the regional stochasticity. In particu-
0148 lar, in a field study on butterflies, Sutcliffe et al. (1996) showed that the spatial scale of
0149 dispersal coupling is on the order of 5 kms while population synchrony can be observed
0150 on much larger distances of up to 200 kms. The larger spatial scale of synchronization
0151 is therefore likely to be linked to regional stochasticity, although this may not always be
0152 true if insect dispersal is assisted by the wind. Synchronization of population dynamics
0153 has been observed for many other insect species (Baars and Van Dijk 1984; Hanski and
0154 Woiwod 1993; Sutcliffe et al. 1996; Peltonen et al. 2002), although the specific factors re-
0155 sponsible for synchronization were not always clear. Other striking examples of patterns
0156 of synchrony come from the dynamics of childhood diseases (Rohani et al. 1999). This
0157 study shows the importance of interactions between dispersal and dynamics since two
0158 diseases, measles and pertussis, show very different spatiotemporal patterns even though
0159 the dispersal parameters must be the same.
0160
0161
0162
0163
0164
0165
0166
0167
0168
0169
0170
0171

In this paper, we consider how the spatial pattern observed in population dynamics of an insect species dwelling on a habitat consisting of an array of agricultural fields can be affected by the landscape properties and by the weather conditions. The focus of this study is on *T. paludosa* which is a common pest in the British Islands and can cause significant damage to agriculture (Blackshaw and Coll, 1999). For this reason, its dynamics has been a focus of numerous field studies (Milne et al., 1965; Mayor and Davies, 1976; Blackshaw, 1983) as well as some theoretical work (Blackshaw and Petrovskii, 2007).

In order to address the issues of pattern, process and scale, we have analyzed annual data on the population abundance of *T. paludosa* collected between 1980 and 1994 in a few dozen agricultural fields across South-Western Scotland. Analysis of the time series of population density obtained at different locations across the region shows that the fluctuations in the abundance of *T. paludosa* are not independent. However, the synchronization pattern that we have observed exhibits some rather counter-intuitive properties. There is a considerable degree of synchronization between some of the fields but an absence of synchronization between others. Note that the generic dependence of synchronization on the inter-habitat distance is well known, with the degree of synchronization between different populations usually decreasing with distance (e.g. Sutcliffe et al. 1996; also Lundberg et al. 2000; Liebhold et al. 2004). However contrary to this, synchronization between *T. paludosa* abundances in different fields does not show any clear relation to the inter-field distance. Furthermore, we show that the observed synchronization pattern has a distinct directional aspect. In particular, while the north-west and south-east areas of the region are on average strongly correlated, there is much less correlation between the north-east and south-west areas. By linking this directional asymmetry to weather data, we show that it is likely to result from wind-assisted dispersal. In order to distinguish the effect of dispersal from that of stochasticity, we introduce a delay-based cross-correlation coefficient and show that it exhibits a pattern of directional dependence very similar to that of the wind velocity.

2 Methods

2.1 Species

Tipula paludosa Meig., the marsh crane-fly, are found in cool temperate regions of northern Europe and the USA (Jackson and Campbell 1975). *T. paludosa* is univoltine with peak

0172
0173
0174
0175
0176
0177
0178
0179
0180
0181
0182
0183
0184
0185
0186
0187
0188
0189
0190
0191
0192
0193
0194
0195
0196
0197
0198
0199
0200
0201
0202
0203
0204
0205
0206
0207
0208
0209
0210
0211
0212
0213
0214
0215
0216
0217
0218
0219
0220
0221
0222
0223
0224
0225
0226
0227
0228

0229 adult emergence between mid-August and mid-September in the UK. Mature *T. paludosa*
0230 are flying insects and thus are found in a range of environments. However, dispersal is
0231 thought to be limited as females are poor fliers, emerging gravid and typically laying
0232 eggs within twelve hours of emergence (Blackshaw and Coll 1999). The larval stages of
0233 *T. paludosa*, known as leatherjackets, are soil dwelling and relatively lacking in mobility;
0234 consequently they are restricted to the locality in which they hatch. They feed primarily
0235 on the roots and stems of grasses and cereals, although they are also able to consume
0236 a variety of other crops (Blackshaw and Coll 1999). Leatherjackets are considered an
0237 agricultural pest, although it is relatively rare for them to destroy a sward. A substantial
0238 body of work postulates that leatherjacket populations can be affected by environmental
0239 conditions, specifically by the average rainfall prior to hatching. However, a significant
0240 effect (that may even result in a population crash) is only seen when weather conditions
0241 in September/October are exceptionally dry (Milne et al. 1965). On the other hand,
0242 temperature was shown to have little effect on *T. paludosa* dynamics (Blackshaw and
0243 Moore 2012). Correspondingly, other studies suggest that the environmental factors may
0244 be less significant than the effects of population density, especially in a harsh environment.
0245 In particular, contest competition through combat between leatherjackets is posited as
0246 the mechanism for this population regulation (Blackshaw and Petrovskii 2007; Petrovskii
0247 and Blackshaw 2003).

0262 2.2 Population data

0265 Populations of *T. paludosa* larvae in Scottish farmland were surveyed annually (usually in
0266 January/February) between 1975 and 1994. The results as a whole remain unpublished,
0267 a part of the data was earlier used by Blackshaw and Petrovskii (2007). Population
0268 counts were obtained from soil cores extracted from individual fields (20 cores per field),
0269 which is a common technique for soil zoology (cf. Mayor and Davies 1976). The details
0270 of sampling (such as the time of sampling, the core's volume etc.) were consistent across
0271 the survey and as such all counts obtained are comparable. For each field, the mean
0272 number of insects per core was calculated and we assume that these numbers provide
0273 absolute estimates of the population levels at the time of sampling. A total of 83 fields
0274 were sampled over the course of the survey period. However, most fields were sampled
0275 for less than the full twenty years. In particular, sampling did not begin in the same year
0276 for all fields. Furthermore, not all of the time series are complete for the period studied;

for some years, the count is not available.

The purpose of this study is to **investigate** the synchronisation of local populations, i.e. the populations in individual fields. In order to obtain a detailed view of the spatial aspect, it is desirable to include as many fields as possible. On the other hand, the accuracy of estimates of the degree of synchronisation will be dependent on the length of the time series used. Consequently it is preferable both that time series cover the greatest duration possible and that as many different time series as possible are used.

Given these limitations, it is not possible to use all fields surveyed. A compromise between number of fields and length of time series has to be found. Consequently, we restrict our analysis to a subset of 38 fields for which a complete fifteen year time series between 1980 and 1994 is available. A map of the fields in question can be seen in Fig. 1.

Information about the minimum, maximum and time-average size for each of the local populations (as represented by the mean value across the collected soil cores, see above) is given in Tab. 1. It is readily seen that the populations exhibit considerable variability. More detailed data on the *T. paludosa* population size in five particular fields over the given period, 1980-94, are shown in Fig. 2. A visual inspection of the data reveals a certain degree of correlation between the time series, such as, for instance, a decrease in all five population sizes between 1987-88, a minimum population size in 1985 and 1993 (three out of five fields), an increase in the population size between 1993-94 (four out of five fields), etc. A quantitative insight into this is made below.

2.3 Elimination of population density dependence

Ninety-seven percent of the populations included in the study (i.e. 37 out of 38 fields) display significant population density dependence when subjected to the test outlined by Pollard et al. (1987). The effects of this density dependence on local population dynamics may obscure the effects of synchronisation between these populations. Consequently it is desirable to eliminate these density dependent effects from the local population dynamics.

The following model:

$$\Delta N_t = N_{t+1} - N_t = N_t \left[10^\alpha \left(\frac{\bar{N}}{N_t} \right)^{-\beta} - 1 \right] \quad (1)$$

(where \bar{N} is the average population across the entire study area and α and β are to be

determined), which we write as

$$N_{t+1} = f(N_t) = N_t \cdot 10^\alpha \left(\frac{\bar{N}}{N_t} \right)^{-\beta}, \quad (2)$$

was introduced by [Blackshaw and Petrovskii](#) (2007) to describe these effects.

The parameters α and β can be determined by linear regression of $\log((\Delta N_t/N_t) + 1)$ against $\log(N_t/\bar{N})$ for a given time series. Density dependence is expected to be a species property and as such the same parameters apply for each individual population. Thus we determine these parameters for the time series obtained by computing the average




Figure 1: Map showing the locations of fields, indicated by balloon markers, included in this study. Numbers correspond to those in Tab. 1. The flag markers show the positions of weather stations from which data were obtained. The arrows provide an approximate location of the corner points of the plots used in Sections 3.4-3.5 (Figs. 8 to 11). Barren and rocky areas are shown in various shades of brown, while green shading is an indicator of grass cover. Relative height of terrain is indicated by the three dimensional effect.

Table 1: Minimum, maximum and the time-average of population counts for each field. Field numbering corresponds to that used in Fig. 1.

Num	Grid Ref	Min	Max	Average	Num	Grid Ref	Min	Max	Average
1	NY 416779	0	16	4.33	20	NX 693537	0	16	4.07
2	NS 114668	2	41	12.33	21	NY 426783	0	16	6.80
3	NX 716619	0	13	3.67	22	NY 394758	2	21	7.07
4	NX 724573	0	15	3.93	23	NS 369400	0	25	6.00
5	NY 049748	0	22	4.73	24	NS 659469	1	48	9.53
6	NX 071534	2	23	6.93	25	NR 661199	0	16	5.60
7	NX 057556	1	24	6.53	26	NS 324683	0	20	3.93
8	NY 101852	0	11	2.20	27	NS 265446	0	32	11.53
9	NS 639691	0	23	4.13	28	NS 562727	1	17	6.33
10	NS 402392	0	13	3.53	29	NX 743601	0	17	4.60
11	NS 278435	1	20	8.07	30	NX 839734	0	20	4.47
12	NR 698229	0	12	6.33	31	NS 053638	1	41	12.27
13	NX 008680	0	33	5.53	32	NS 111703	1	32	8.20
14	NS 452152	2	15	7.73	33	NS 385235	1	36	7.93
15	NX 093520	0	8	4.07	34	NS 440289	0	20	6.00
16	NX 463378	0	24	9.47	35	NS 671956	0	34	6.73
17	NS 412331	0	27	6.60	36	NN 943236	0	8	2.33
18	NX 377452	0	11	4.53	37	NS 129682	0	23	5.67
19	NS 046674	1	24	8.87	38	NY 203711	0	24	6.47

population across all fields at each time point. The resulting data are plotted in Fig. 3. Note that the resulting values of α and β correspond well to those obtained in previous studies (Blackshaw and Petrovskii 2007).

Now for each time series of populations, X , we can compute the difference between the **observed and predicted** populations for any time point as follows:

$$R_t^X = X_t - f(X_{t-1}), \quad (3)$$

(where $t = 2, 3, \dots, n$) to obtain a time series of residuals, R^X , one time step shorter than the original observed data. These residuals measure the degree to which real populations deviate from the levels predicted by the density dependent mechanism either by chance




Figure 2: Plot of population counts against time for five example fields. Fields were chosen on the basis of geographic position; specifically, four are on the edges of the study area (field no. 36 at the North, no. 21 at the East, no. 16 at the South and no. 25 at the West) and the fifth is in the centre (field no. 14). The mean count across all thirty-eight fields in the study was determined for each year and is also plotted (black line).

or due to underlying processes which are not described by internal population regulation.

A histogram of all such residuals was constructed, see Fig. 4 (left), which strongly suggested that the residuals arise from a log-normal distribution. To confirm this intuition, a Q-Q plot of the residual distribution against the log-normal distribution was constructed, $\mathcal{LN}_R = \exp(\mathcal{N}(1.9, 0.537)) - 7.217$; see Fig. 4 (right). It is clear that the majority of the quantiles plotted lie on the line $y = x$ so the residual distribution is approximately given by the log-normal distribution stated.

Thus we can describe the population dynamics of these populations with the following stochastic difference equation:

$$N_{t+1} = \begin{cases} f(N_t) + \eta_R, & \text{if } f(N_t) + \eta_R > 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where η_R is a random variate drawn from the distribution \mathcal{LN}_R .

0514
0515
0516
0517
0518
0519
0520
0521
0522
0523
0524
0525
0526
0527
0528
0529
0530
0531
0532
0533
0534
0535
0536
0537
0538
0539
0540
0541
0542
0543
0544
0545
0546
0547
0548
0549
0550
0551
0552
0553
0554
0555
0556
0557
0558
0559
0560
0561
0562
0563
0564
0565
0566
0567
0568
0569
0570




Figure 3: Log-log plot of the average per capita population increase against average relative population (crosses). The solid line was obtained by linear regression analysis of these data and has the intercept $\alpha = -0.0335$ and the slope $-\beta = 0.8903$. The R^2 value of this regression is 0.42.




Figure 4: Left: Histogram of residuals as obtained after removing density dependence from the original data; see Eq. (3). Right: Q-Q plot of the residual distribution against the log-normal distribution given by $\exp(\mathcal{N}(1.9, 0.537)) - 7.217$.

2.4 Finding relationships between the local populations

We quantify the degree of synchronization between the populations of two fields (say, X and Y) by calculating the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of their respective residual time series, R^X and R^Y . This value is given by the following expression:

$$r_0(R^X, R^Y) = \frac{\sum_{i=2}^n (R_i^X - \mu_R^X)(R_i^Y - \mu_R^Y)}{\sqrt{(\sum_{i=2}^n (R_i^X - \mu_R^X)^2) (\sum_{i=2}^n (R_i^Y - \mu_R^Y)^2)}} , \quad (5)$$

where R_i^X and R_i^Y are the residual population densities at year i in fields X and Y , respectively, and μ_R^X and μ_R^Y are the sample means of the two time series, i.e.,

$$\mu_R^X = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=2}^n R_i^X , \quad \mu_R^Y = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=2}^n R_i^Y . \quad (6)$$

It is not immediately clear, however, what constitutes a statistically significant correlation coefficient. Since we work with time series of finite length, and the data are affected by stochastic factors, any given value of the correlation coefficient (5) may appear by chance. One must therefore distinguish between the cases when high absolute values of $r_0(R^X, R^Y)$ are superficial and the cases when these values are the result of actual synchronization. In order to do so, the population data were subjected to a careful statistical analysis; full details of the analysis are given in the online Appendix.

2.5 Assessing the effects of time delay

The correlation coefficient (5) is not capable of fully explaining all possible relationships between two field populations. For example, if **the fields** are coupled by dispersal, then the corresponding biological mechanisms may be subject to time delay. The population census during the survey was done in winter, i.e. before the species enters its mobile (flying) stage. Therefore, the effect of dispersal coupling, if any, will only be seen in the next year census.

Obviously, the effects of delay are not taken into account by the standard correlation coefficient r_0 . In order to identify such relationships (for a single generational delay of one year), we introduce a delay-based correlation coefficient which is calculated between two time series, A and B , as follows:

$$r_1(A, B) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (A_i - \mu_{A,1})(B_{i+1} - \mu_{B,1})}{\sqrt{(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (A_i - \mu_{A,1})^2) (\sum_{i=2}^n (B_i - \mu_{B,1})^2)}} , \quad (7)$$

where $\mu_{A,1}$ and $\mu_{B,1}$ are defined as follows:

$$\mu_{A,1} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i, \quad \mu_{B,1} = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=2}^n B_i. \quad (8)$$

We emphasize that, generally speaking, $r_1(A, B) \neq r_1(B, A)$. Therefore, the delay-based correlation coefficient separates the effect that the populations of field A have on field B (described by $r_1(A, B)$) from the effect that the population of field B may have on A (described by $r_1(B, A)$). In other words, it takes into account a possible asymmetry in the inter-field coupling. Such asymmetry can occur, for instance, when insect dispersal is assisted by the wind (Gatehouse 1997; Compton 2002) in case wind has a prevailing direction. This kind of asymmetry reflects what is essentially a traveling wave as has been observed in the dynamics of childhood diseases (Rohani et al. 1999).

It remains then to determine which time series this coefficient should be calculated for. An immediate analogue of the comparison used in the undelayed case would use $r_1(R^X, R^Y)$. This would then compute the degree to which deviations from internal dynamics of one population affect deviations from the internal dynamics of another population. However, here we argue that this is not a meaningful measurement. Instead we are interested in how the absolute population in one location (regardless of whether it is higher or lower than internal dynamics would predict) may affect the population dynamics at another location. The strength of this relationship should be described by the value of $r_1(X, R^Y)^2$. Note that in this case the asymmetry lies not only in the correlation coefficient but in the series which are compared.

3 Results

3.1 The effect of distance on strength of correlation

Several earlier studies have shown that there exists a clear “synchrony versus distance pattern” where the correlation between population abundances tends to decrease as the distance between the populations increases (Sutcliffe et al. 1996; Lundberg et al. 2000; Peltonen et al. 2002). A reasonable initial hypothesis therefore seems to be that populations in fields which are close together are more likely to exhibit synchronization than populations that are spatially more separated. In order to investigate this hypothesis,

²Values computed in this way are referred to as r_1 from now on.

0628
0629
0630
0631
0632
0633
0634
0635
0636
0637
0638
0639
0640
0641
0642
0643
0644
0645
0646
0647
0648
0649
0650
0651
0652
0653
0654
0655
0656
0657
0658
0659
0660
0661
0662
0663
0664
0665
0666
0667
0668
0669
0670
0671
0672
0673
0674
0675
0676
0677
0678
0679
0680
0681
0682
0683
0684

the correlation coefficients obtained for each pair of fields are plotted against the distance between the fields; see Fig. 5, top-left for r_0 (no time delay), top-right for r_1 (time delay of one year).

A visual inspection, however, does not reveal any clear pattern. We observe that, indeed, some fields are strongly synchronized up to distance of 150-170 kms; this happens both with and without time delay. There are also fields that are significantly anti-




Figure 5: Plots of correlation coefficients for pairs of distinct fields against distance between those fields. The top-left plot shows all the correlation coefficients calculated without a time delay (as given by Eq. 5), the top-right plot uses a time delay of 1 year (Eq. 7). The bottom row show the correlation coefficients that are statistically significant at 5% level, left without time delay, right with a delay of 1 year. The solid lines indicate trends predicted by linear regression analysis.

correlated. On the other hand, for any inter-field distance (including the cases of apparent proximity), there are fields that are not correlated at all. On the whole, the plots for r_0 and r_1 are broadly similar³, although stronger negative correlations are observed for the time delay case. We therefore conclude that, as such, the absolute distance between fields cannot be the only controlling factor in whether the populations of two fields synchronize. Hence, more information about the ‘geometry’ of the environment has to be taken into account.

This qualitative understanding can be made more rigorous using linear regression analysis. The results are plotted as solid lines in Fig. 5. Interestingly, the regression analysis of correlation with respect to distance reveals different behaviour between the two cases. In the no-delay case, the correlation strength shows a tendency to decrease as distance increases. The gradient of the slope is small (approximately -0.0074), but statistically significant with a p -value below 0.01. The correlation coefficient predicted by the best-fitting line is about 0.2 at small distances and it approaches zero for distances on the order of 300 kms. In the time-delay case, the correlation strength is not significantly different from 0 for any distance range.

The existence of the inter-field coupling over the whole area becomes even more evident if the correlation-versus-distance analysis is restricted to statistically significant values only. The results are shown in the bottom row of Fig. 5. In the no-delay case all the significant correlation coefficients appear to be positive and have a relatively large value between 0.5 and 1.0 (Fig. 5, bottom, left). In the time-delay case, all the statistically significant correlation coefficients are large and negative (Fig. 5, bottom, right). Surprisingly, in neither of the two cases does the correlation strength show any decay with distance; on the contrary, the two best-fitting lines have gradients of 0.001 and -0.0029 respectively, but these values are statistically not significantly different from zero.

3.2 The effect of direction on strength and sign of correlation

In the previous section, we showed that the population dynamics of *T. paludosa* in the study area is synchronized over large distances, although the inter-field distance alone provides a rather poor description of the synchronization pattern, especially in the time-delayed case (see Fig. 5, top, right). More details of the synchronization pattern can be obtained if we consider the relative positions of fields whose populations are correlated.

³Note that the time delay case includes twice as many points as the no delay case.

0742
0743
0744
0745
0746
0747
0748
0749
0750
0751
0752
0753
0754
0755
0756
0757
0758
0759
0760
0761
0762
0763
0764
0765
0766
0767
0768
0769
0770
0771
0772
0773
0774
0775
0776
0777
0778
0779
0780
0781
0782
0783
0784
0785
0786
0787
0788
0789
0790
0791
0792
0793
0794
0795
0796
0797
0798

0799
0800
0801
0802
0803
0804
0805
0806
0807
0808
0809
0810
0811
0812
0813
0814
0815
0816
0817
0818
0819
0820
0821
0822
0823
0824
0825
0826
0827
0828
0829
0830
0831
0832
0833
0834
0835
0836
0837
0838
0839
0840
0841
0842
0843
0844
0845
0846
0847
0848
0849
0850
0851
0852
0853
0854
0855




Figure 6: Relative frequency of positive and negative correlations as a function of bearings between fields. Left: positive correlation without time delay between residual populations, Eq. (5). Right: negative correlation with a one year time delay between population and residual population, Eq. (7). The radial distance between the center of the circle and the thick broken line gives the **relative frequency of positive (left) or negative (right) correlations** (as a fraction of unity) within the given bearing range; see details in the text.

This can be described in part by the directions of the lines connecting any pair of fields, i.e. by considering the bearing of one field from another.

A quantitative insight into how relationships between populations vary with respect to bearing can be made by considering the relative frequency of positive and negative correlation values in a given bearing range. That is given a bearing range, 0-10° for example, we divide the number of positive (or equivalently negative) correlation values obtained in that range by the total number of correlation values obtained in that range. The resulting histograms for correlations computed with and without a time delay are shown on a unit circle in Fig. 6. Note that, in order to take into account the different tendency observed in the delayed and non-delayed cases (as seen from Fig. 5, top), for r_0 we present the fraction of positive correlations obtained, while for r_1 we present the fraction of negative correlations obtained.

It is readily seen that, when no time delay is considered, the relative frequency of positive and negative correlations is approximately independent of bearing, and positive relationships (shown by the thick solid line in Fig. 6, left) are clearly more common over

the whole circle. In contrast, when a time delay is introduced, the relative frequency of positive and negative correlations is strongly dependent on the bearing between the fields. Negative correlations (shown by the thick solid line in Fig. 6, right) prevail in the range of bearings between south-east and due north, while in the remainder of the range positive correlations dominate. We therefore conclude that the synchronization pattern has a clear directional aspect.

3.3 Analysis of weather pattern

Weather conditions are known to have a significant impact on the population dynamics of many insect species (Baars and Van Dijk 1984; Williams and Liebhold 1995; Raimondo et al. 2004). In particular, the direction and strength of the wind were proved to be factors strongly affecting dispersal of flying insects (Gatehouse 1997; Compton 2002). Aiming to explain the observed directional asymmetry in the synchronization pattern, we therefore now turn our attention to the weather pattern. Indeed, synchronization between local populations is known to result from either the Moran effect or dispersal coupling **between habitats**. It seems improbable that the regional stochasticity (e.g. short-term stochastic variation in the local temperature and humidity) could possess a directional aspect. In contrast, the existence of a prevailing wind direction, if any, obviously can make the coupling asymmetric.

Measurements of wind velocity were recorded at four weather stations spanning the study area (see Fig. 1), i.e. Dundrennan, Abbotsinch, West Freugh and Tiree. The time series are obtained from a single year, 1987, which we assume to be representative for the whole duration of the survey. The data cover a two month period, August to September. This period corresponds to peak adult emergence of *T. paludosa* and thus is the time in which interactions between dispersed populations are most likely. The data⁴ comprised hourly measurements of the average wind speed and the wind direction.

Some signs of environmental heterogeneity within the study domain can be immediately identified from the distributions of average windspeed; see Fig. 7. The weather stations at West Freugh and Tiree tend to report higher windspeeds than the less exposed stations at Dundrennan and Abbotsinch, presumably because higher windspeeds can be sustained over the relatively flat surfaces of the surrounding seas and wide stretches of water. In contrast, the wind direction appears to be less influenced by local terrain as is shown by

⁴Original data supplied by the Met Office; <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk>

0913
0914
0915
0916
0917
0918
0919
0920
0921
0922
0923
0924
0925
0926
0927
0928
0929
0930
0931
0932
0933
0934
0935
0936
0937
0938
0939
0940
0941
0942
0943
0944
0945
0946
0947
0948
0949
0950
0951
0952
0953
0954
0955
0956
0957
0958
0959
0960
0961
0962
0963
0964
0965
0966
0967
0968
0969




Figure 7: Histograms of average wind speed and wind direction over the study period at four weather stations. Wind direction histograms are in polar form and are laid out in the same order as those of average wind speed.

the comparison between Fig. 7 and Fig. 1. The stations at West Freugh, Abbotsinch and Dundrennan suggest that winds predominantly blow either due south or between south east and north, at Tiree the separation between these two modes is less pronounced. In general, there is very little wind blowing in the south to north-west sector. This is **in strikingly** good agreement with the pattern shown in Fig. 6, right.

3.4 Spatial cross-correlations with no time delay

In Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we quantified the cross-correlations between fields by pooling all correlations together. In particular, the existence of correlations between the local populations (with no time-delay) across the region “on average” was shown by finding the best-fitting line to the whole array of pairwise correlation coefficients versus distance;




Figure 8: The height of the bar at a given field indicates the number of populations with residuals significantly correlated to that field’s residual population (ranging from between 0 and 10); further details are given in the text. The labels on the axes shows relative position in tens of kilometers. The inset (top-left corner) shows a weather station that is situated outside of the domain.

0970
0971
0972
0973
0974
0975
0976
0977
0978
0979
0980
0981
0982
0983
0984
0985
0986
0987
0988
0989
0990
0991
0992
0993
0994
0995
0996
0997
0998
0999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026

1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083




Figure 9: Top: The arrow at a given field indicates the average direction to fields with residual populations that are significantly correlated to the resident residual population. Bottom: The dotted lines connect fields with significantly correlated residual populations. Further details are given in the text. Scales indicate relative position in tens of kilometers. The inset (top-left corner) shows a weather station that is situated outside of the domain.

see Fig. 5, left. The existence of a directional aspect (to the time-delayed relationships) was revealed by plotting a histogram of (weighted) correlation coefficients on a circle, i.e. as a function of the bearing (Fig. 6). However, these cumulative properties obscure the role of individual fields. Meanwhile, revealing the contribution of individual fields may be important for better understanding the process behind the observed pattern. The contribution from different pairs of fields to the “synchronization vs distance” pattern, as given by Fig. 5, varies significantly regardless of the distance between them, and hence one might wish to understand why. Besides, the terrain in the study region is highly heterogeneous. It includes hills, valleys, plains, urban areas, as well as some considerable stretches of water (e.g. Firth of Clyde). **Different local populations are therefore exposed to quite diverse environments that vary both in terrain and in weather conditions.**

In order to analyse the impact of precise positional relationships between fields, we now consider all fields individually. In this section, we consider the correlations calculated without time delay (see Eq. 5). The results are summarized in Fig. 8. For each given field X , we count the number of the fields where the residual population dynamics of *T. paludosa* is significantly correlated (at the 5% significance level) to the residual population dynamics in X . Note that, in this case, all the significant correlation coefficients had positive sign; see Fig. 5 (bottom, left). The result is shown by the length of a bar based at the location of each field. The shortest bar (with the length 0.5 unit on the map scale) means that one other population is significantly correlated to this population. The largest number of fields significantly correlated to a given one is found to be 10 (with the length of the corresponding bar thus being set to 5 in map units). For the three fields that do not have a significant correlation to any other field in the array, the bar has length 0, and so their position is shown by a dot.

It is readily seen that the map shows a clear divide between parts of the region above and below the dashed line (which has been included for ease of comparison). In the North-East region, above the dashed line, most of the populations are correlated with a large number of other populations (4.27 on average). In contrast, in the South-West region, below the dashed line, populations are correlated to significantly fewer populations (1.75 on average).

The information shown in Fig. 8 is, however, incomplete until the position of the mutually correlated fields is known. Consider a hypothetical case that field X is significantly correlated to fields A , B and C ; one then might wish to know where fields A , B and

1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140

1141 C are situated with respect to X . Figure 8 is therefore complemented with Fig. 9. In
 1142 the top plot in Fig. 9, the arrows (now normalized to a unit length) indicate the average
 1143 direction to all fields (say, A , B and C) whose populations are significantly correlated to
 1144 that in the given one (say, X). If a given field is correlated to just one other field, then the
 1145 corresponding arrows point towards each other. In the lower plot in Fig. 9, any significant
 1146 relationship between two populations is indicated by a dotted line. Whereas the upper
 1147 plot can be considered a summary of the relationships between a field and the remaining
 1148 populations, the lower plot provides an overview of the networks of relationships formed
 1149 between these populations. Since the weather conditions are expected to be important,
 1150 in order to give a visual idea about the impact of the wind velocity, the position of each
 1151 weather station is indicated by the intersection of two dashed lines. The solid lines orig-
 1152 inating from this intersection replicate the histograms of wind direction given in Fig. 7.
 1153 Interestingly, apart from a few exceptions, the strongly correlated fields in the North East
 1154 region appears to be mostly correlated between themselves forming a dense network which
 1155 largely excludes fields in the South West. The fields in the South-West region form a sim-
 1156 ilar, if more sparse, network, with limited interconnections with the North-East network.
 1157 This provides further evidence of the existence of a division between the North-East and
 1158 South-West regions.

1171 The results shown in Fig. 9 confirm that geographical proximity does not appear to
 1172 be a factor controlling what fields are correlated. It is readily seen that there are many
 1173 situations when a field is not correlated to its immediate neighbour(s) but is significantly
 1174 correlated to fields much further away.

1180 3.5 Spatial cross-correlations with a time delay

1182 In the previous sections, we have shown that the standard correlation coefficient (5) is
 1183 not able to describe all possible relationships between two fields; e.g. see Figs. 5 and 6. A
 1184 dispersal mechanism is likely only to be detected when a time delay is introduced between
 1185 two populations. An analysis of the relationships between influencing populations and
 1186 influenced residual populations with a generational delay (of a single year in this case)
 1187 can be performed in a similar way to that presented in the last section. Again we limit
 1188 our attention to those relationships which are significant at the 5% level. The plots below,
 1189 see Figs. 10 and 11, are therefore analogous in concept to Figs. 8 and 9.

1196 As we previously observed, the time delay introduced in (7) breaks the symmetry

implicit in the standard correlation coefficient (5). Consequently it is possible to consider two classes of relationships between a given population and the other populations. The first class is the set of residual populations which, when delayed by one year, are correlated to a given population, i.e. the set of populations influenced by a given population. The second class is the set of populations which are correlated to a given residual population when it is delayed by one year, i.e. the set of populations influencing a given population.

In Fig. 10, the number of populations influenced by and influencing a given field population is shown by, respectively, the length of a bar above and below the field position (indicated by a plus sign). The scale of these bars is as described in the previous section. Note that, in contrast to the relationships presented in the previous section, all of the statistically significant time lagged relationships now have negative coefficients; see Fig. 5 (bottom, right).




Figure 10: The length of the bar descending (rising) from a given field position indicates the number of fields with populations significantly influencing (influenced by) that field. Further details are given in the text. Scales indicate relative position in tens of kilometers. The inset (top-left corner) shows a weather station that is situated outside of the domain.




Figure 11: Top: The red arrow at a given field indicates the average direction to all fields whose residual populations are significantly influenced by that field. The blue arrow corresponds to the average direction to all fields whose populations have a significant influence on that field's population. Bottom: The dotted lines connect fields between which significant relationships exist. The red section of each line emanates from the influencing field, the blue section terminates at the influenced field. Further details are given in the text. Scales indicate relative position in tens of kilometers. The inset (top-left corner) shows a weather station that is situated outside of the domain.




Figure 12: Distribution of bearings from significantly influencing to influenced populations represented as a histogram. The solid black line indicates the density of significant bearings in the range shown. The solid gray line shows the overall distribution of bearings within the study area.

As in the previous section we add reference lines to divide the study area into three regions, referred to as South-West, Central, and North-East. The average number of fields influenced by a population in any given region is (approximately) constant across the three regions, with values of 1.38, 1.94, and 1.54 in the South-West, Central and North-East regions respectively. In contrast the average number of populations influencing a given population varies significantly across these regions taking values of 0.125, 1.12 and 3.38 in the South-West, Central and North-East regions respectively. Thus populations in the South-West are more likely to influence other populations than to be influenced themselves while populations in the North-East show the opposite trend. Populations in the Central region influence other populations and are influenced themselves at roughly equal levels.

Similarly to the previous section, we complement these data with plots showing the directions between fields and the populations that they influence or are influenced by, Fig. 11. In the top plot of this figure red arrows indicate the average direction to residual populations which a given population significantly influences. Blue arrows indicate the average direction to populations which significantly influence a given residual population.

1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368

1369 In the lower plot all significant relationships are represented by a two colour line connecting
1370 the fields between which the relationship exists. The red section of this line connects to
1371 the influencing field while the blue section of the line connects to the influenced field.
1372
1373

1374 Including the positional information in our analysis of this pattern again produces
1375 further understanding. The strong correlations within regional groupings observed in the
1376 undelayed case are, for the most part, absent. Instead South-West populations appear
1377 to influence Central populations which in turn influence North-East populations in an
1378 apparent cascade; see, for example, the relationships between fields along the southern
1379 edge of the study area. Similar interactions can be seen between the populations of the
1380 northern corner and those to their south-east although it is less pronounced.
1381
1382

1383 The distribution of bearings from significantly influencing to influenced is presented as
1384 a histogram in Fig. 12 (black line). It is clear that this distribution deviates noticeably
1385 from the underlying distribution of bearings between fields in the study area (shown by the
1386 grey line); therefore, the observed directional asymmetry cannot be reduced to the effect
1387 of the system geometry. The most significant deviations from this underlying distribution
1388 lie between south east and north. Since all of these relationships have negative correlation
1389 coefficients this is in good agreement with the trend observed in Fig. 6. Furthermore, it
1390 corresponds well to the pattern shown in Fig. 11.
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399

1400 4 Discussion and Conclusions

1401 In this paper, we have considered the population dynamics of an insect pest, *T. paludosa*,
1402 on a habitat consisting of 38 agricultural fields in South-Western Scotland. The annual
1403 data on population abundance collected in a survey accomplished during 1980-94 were
1404 analysed. Our goal is threefold. Firstly, we want to reveal whether there is a correlation
1405 between the fluctuations in local populations, the phenomenon known as synchronization
1406 (Lundberg et al. 2000; Liebhold et al. 2004). Secondly, we want to reveal the corresponding
1407 spatial pattern, i.e. how the degree of synchronization between fields changes in space, in
1408 particular, with inter-field distance. And thirdly, we want to understand the process(es)
1409 resulting in the observed synchronization pattern, i.e. to relate the observed properties of
1410 the *T. paludosa* metapopulation to a specific mechanism or factor.
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420

1421 The first goal is relatively simple to reach. We have calculated all cross-correlation
1422 coefficients as given by r_0 , see Eq. (5), and found that only a small fraction of fields is
1423
1424
1425

uncorrelated or weakly correlated (say, $|r_0| < 0.1$). A majority of population pairs are positively correlated, in many cases r_0 being as large as 0.5 or even higher (see Fig. 5, top, left). There is also a considerable number of pairs that are negatively correlated with typical values of r_0 between -0.1 and -0.3 .

With regard to the spatial pattern, no matter whether synchronization is due to dispersal or the Moran effect, it is reasonable to suppose that the cross-correlation coefficient should decrease with the distance (e.g. Liebhold et al. 2004). We have shown, however, that this expectation is rather over-simplified. While the best-fitting line obtained by using the linear regression analysis indeed has a negative slope (see Fig. 5), a closer look at the correlation strength versus distance immediately reveals that this ‘prediction’ about the decay in synchronization is rather superficial. Instead, synchronization exhibits an intermittent behaviour: For any range of the inter-field distances, from very small (a few kms) to very large (up to 200 kms), there are fields that can be strongly positively correlated, negatively correlated or virtually uncorrelated. In case the analysis is restricted to the statistically significant correlations only (Fig. 5, bottom, left), the decrease in the correlation strength with distance is not seen at all, at least up to the scale of 200 kms.

Beside the usual cross-correlation coefficient r_0 , we also calculated a delay-based cross-correlation coefficient r_1 as given by Eq. (7). Such a delay (assumed to be one year, i.e. one generation for *T. paludosa*) can arise if synchronization is induced by dispersal. Recall that the population data were collected in mid-winter, i.e. when the species is in its larval stage. Dispersal is however associated with the flying stage that normally happens in late August/early September. Therefore, the effect of dispersal will not be seen in the census until the next year. The effect of delay is likely to be felt more strongly if dispersal is asymmetric, i.e. field X delegates a fraction of its population to field Y but not vice versa. In contrast, synchronization due to the impact of stochasticity is unlikely to be subject to delay.

Interestingly, r_1 exhibits properties significantly different from r_0 ; see Fig. 5, right. The values of r_1 are predominantly negative, especially if the analysis is restricted to statistically significant values (Fig. 5, bottom, right) There is no decay with distance at all as the best-fitting line has a slope very close to zero. Contrary to r_0 , the time-delayed coefficient r_1 show a clear directional aspect (Fig. 6, right) so that the relationship between fields appear to be stronger in the East-North-East and South-East directions than on other bearings (see Fig. 12). This is in good agreement with meteorological data on wind

1483 direction, thus we suggest that dispersal is wind-assisted. Note that we are not able to
1484 provide a more quantitative proof of the impact of the wind on population synchronization,
1485 e.g. by calculating a correlation coefficient between the bearing of the pairwise correlations
1486 and the wind velocity. Such calculation would require high-resolution data on the wind
1487 direction across the whole study area; unfortunately, such data do not exist.
1488
1489

1491 Note that from the whole range of environmental factors we only consider wind ex-
1492 plicitly; regarding other factors as environmental stochasticity. Another relevant factor
1493 can be precipitation. However, rainfall only has a significant impact on the population
1494 abundance when autumn is exceptionally dry (Milne et al. 1965; see also Blackshaw and
1495 Petrovskii 2007) and there is no evidence of any abnormal precipitation level in South-
1496 Western Scotland during the period of study.
1497

1501 In this work, we have investigated the synchronization pattern obtained for a time
1502 lag of one year. This choice seems to be suggested by *T. paludosa* life traits. However,
1503 we have also considered longer time delays of two and three years. The corresponding
1504 cross-correlation coefficients r_2 and r_3 show the properties generally similar to those of
1505 r_1 ; in particular, the networks of inter-field connections (not shown here for the sake of
1506 brevity) have shapes which are only slightly different from that shown in Fig. 11, with a
1507 few links having disappeared and a few new links having emerged. A general tendency
1508 seen with an increase in time lag is a gradual decrease in the average correlation strength.
1509 The essential features of the time-lagged correlations are therefore encompassed by the
1510 coefficient r_1 .
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517

1518 The differences between r_0 and r_1 can be used to distinguish between the contribution
1519 from dispersal and the Moran effect, which is the third goal of our study. We associate
1520 the no-delay coefficient r_0 with the effect of environmental stochasticity and the delay-
1521 based coefficient r_1 with dispersal. Since synchronization is seen both with and without
1522 time-delay, we conclude that both mechanisms are involved.
1523
1524
1525
1526

1527 A counter-intuitive finding is that both mechanisms operate on approximately the same
1528 spatial scale of about 200 kms, as given by the size of the study area. With regard to
1529 dispersal coupling, it seems to be a surprising result as *T. paludosa* females are known to
1530 be poor flyers with typical dispersal distances thought to be below one hundred meters.
1531 For species with poor dispersal abilities, synchronization due to dispersal is thought to
1532 occur on a spatial scale much smaller than that of synchronization due to the Moran effect
1533 (Sutcliffe et al. 1996; Peltonen et al. 2002). However, this obviously does not account for
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539

the potential impact of wind, which would not only provide a directional effect but also uncouple any dispersal-distance relationship at smaller scales. What can be true for forest insects, may not necessarily be true for insects dwelling on bare plains and hills of South-Western Scotland. With a wind speed of several meters per second (which is typical for the study area, see Fig. 7), the air flow is strongly turbulent. Turbulence creates ascending currents that can keep individual insects in the air⁵ for many hours (taking also into account the complicated body shape and the relatively large wing-span of the crane fly), i.e. the time that is quite sufficient for them to reach another breeding ground situated a long distance away from their natal field. We note that, although direct evidence of wind-assisted dispersal for *T. paludosa* is not available, “sailing with the wind” is a typical dispersal strategy for many other insect species, with distances covered being dozens and even hundreds of kilometers (Gatehouse 1997; Compton 2002). We also note that the number of successfully travelling females does not necessarily need to be large. There is growing evidence that dispersal coupling by even a small fraction of the population may bring population fluctuations into synchrony (Haydon and Steen 1997; Kendall et al. 2000; Ripa 2000).

We also mention that there are some other mechanisms that may, in principle, synchronize the population fluctuations. Firstly, synchronization can emerge through interaction with another species that is itself synchronized (Liebhold et al. 2004). However, we are not aware of any species that exerts a consistent, regulatory effect on *T. paludosa* populations and so we consider this possibility the least likely explanation. Secondly, since *T. paludosa* is a pest, its abundance is controlled by pesticides. Should the application of pesticides be synchronized across the region, it could possibly synchronize the dynamics of the pest. However, the existing agricultural legislation in the UK does not impose on farmers any obligatory response to pest infestation. In fact, not only are pest controlling measures purely voluntary, but so too is participation in monitoring programs. The probability of a synchronized pesticides application is therefore rather unlikely.

Further evidence of the coupling by the wind-assisted dispersal may also be obtained by developing a more detailed theoretical framework operating across the whole range of spatial scales involved. Indeed, a comprehensive model of the dynamics of an individual population must take all the local populations into account. Correspondingly, it should

⁵*T. paludosa* have been caught in suction traps at 14 meters above ground in samples collected as part of the Rothamsted Insect Survey (Blackshaw, unpublished data).

1597 take into account environmental processes acting on a regional scale along with those going
1598 on locally. In particular, such a model should make use of the patterns in directionality
1599 observed (e.g. see Fig. 12) in order to estimate the probability that a given population
1600 will be influenced by any other population in the study area. A functional relationship
1601 describing the effect of one population on another could then be derived in a similar way
1602 to that used to obtain Eq. (1) but weighted with the probabilities of given interactions
1603 with respect to distance and bearing. In conjunction with Eq. (1), this would provide
1604 a more complete description of a given population's dynamics region-wide. However,
1605 parametrization and verification of such a model can hardly be possible until the impact
1606 of wind and terrain are incorporated explicitly into these functional relationships. This
1607 is a complex task which clearly lies beyond the scope of this paper; in particular, more
1608 detailed weather data currently do not exist.

1609 Given the evidence presented, the dynamics of apparently isolated populations of
1610 *T. paludosa* cannot be completely described by internal mechanisms (e.g. by density de-
1611 pendence). Instead, these dynamics are noticeably influenced by the dynamics of popu-
1612 lations of this species at other locations. Results of our analysis indicate that the wind
1613 is likely to be a factor responsible for the inter-habitat coupling on the spatial scale up
1614 to 200 kms. This is rather counter-intuitive as *T. paludosa* are usually regarded as poor
1615 flyers. **A study to look for genetic similarities between different populations across the
1616 whole area could confirm the existence of inter-habitat coupling by direct transport. We
1617 are considering undertaking such an investigation in the future.**

1618 Although in this paper we have focused on the dynamics of a particular species, we
1619 believe that our approach and findings may be useful in a much broader context. Syn-
1620 chronization of population fluctuations often **occurs due to a combination of the effects**
1621 **of environmental stochasticity and dispersal.** Discriminating between these two mecha-
1622 nisms is a considerable challenge, especially where they act on the same spatial scale. By
1623 studying the coupling between local populations with a time lag of one generation, we
1624 demonstrate a general method for separating them. Indeed, it is hard to see how spatially-
1625 correlated stochastic fluctuations in weather conditions (as required by the Moran theo-
1626 rem) can possibly deliver a time-lagged coupling. The general message is therefore that
1627 within-generation synchrony can be attributed to the environment whilst that with a shift
1628 between generations, i.e. time-lagged, is due to dispersal.

References

- Baars, M.A., and Van Dijk, T.S. (1984) Population dynamics of two carabid beetles at a Dutch heathland. I. Subpopulation fluctuations in relation to weather and dispersal. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 53, 375-88.
- Bartlett, M.S. (1963) The spectral analysis of point processes. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B* 25(2), 264-296. Discussion on Professor Bartlett's paper, p. 294.
- Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y. (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B* 57(1), 289-300.
- Blackshaw, R.P. (1983) The annual leatherjacket survey in Northern Ireland, 1965-1982, and some factors affecting populations. *Plant Path.* 32, 345-349.
- Blackshaw, R.P. and Coll, C. (1999) Economically important leatherjackets of grassland and cereals: biology, impact and control. *Int. Pest. Man. Contr.* 4, 143-160.
- Blackshaw, R.P., and Petrovskii, S.V. (2007) Limitation and regulation of ecological populations: a meta-analysis of *Tipula paludosa* field data. *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom.* 2(4), 46-62.
- Blackshaw, R.P., and Moore, J.P. (2012) Within-generation dynamics of leatherjackets (*Tipula paludosa* Meig.) *J. Appl. Entomol.* 136, 605-613.
- Compton, S.G. (2002) Sailing with the wind: dispersal by small flying insects. In *Dispersal ecology* (J.M. Bullock, R.E. Kenward, R.S. Hails, eds.), pp. 113-133. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Earn, D.J.D., Levin, S.A., and Rohani, P. (2000) Coherence and conservation. *Science* 290, 1360-1364.
- Gatehouse, A.G. (1997) Behavior and ecological genetics of wind-borne migration by insects. *Annu. Rev. Entomol.* 42, 475-502
- Goldwyn, E.E. and Hastings, A. (2011) The roles of the Moran effect and dispersal in synchronizing oscillating populations. *J. Theor. Biol.* 289, 237-246.
- Gotelli, N.J., and Ellison, A.M. (2004) *A Primer of Ecological Statistics*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland.

- 1711 Hanski, I., and Woiwod, I.P. (1993) Spatial synchrony in the dynamics of moth and
1712 aphid populations. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 62, 656-668.
1713
1714
- 1715 Haydon D, Steen H. 1997. The effects of large and small-scale random events on the
1716 synchrony of metapopulation dynamics: a theoretical analysis. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond.*
1717 *B* 264, 1375-1381.
1718
1719
- 1720 Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scand. J.*
1721 *Statist.* 6 (2), 60-65.
1722
1723
- 1724 Hope, A. C. A. (1968). A simplified Monte Carlo significance test procedure. *J. R.*
1725 *Statist. Soc. B* 30 (3), 582-598.
1726
1727
- 1728 Jackson, D. M. and R. L. Campbell (1975). Biology of the European cranefly, *Tipula*
1729 *paludosa* Meigaen, in western Washington (Tipulidae: Diptera). Technical Report
1730 81, Washington State University.
1731
1732
- 1733 Kaitala V, Ranta E, and Lundberg P. (2001) Self-organized dynamics in spatially struc-
1734 tured populations. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 268, 1655-1660.
1735
1736
- 1737 Kareiva, P. (1990) Population dynamics in spatially complex environments: theory and
1738 data. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 330, 175-190.
1739
1740
- 1741 Kendall, B.E., Bjornstad, O.N., Bascompte, J., Keitt, T.H., and Fagan, W.F. (2000)
1742 Dispersal, environmental correlation, and spatial synchrony in population dynamics.
1743 *Am. Nat.* 155, 628-36.
1744
1745
- 1746 Levin, S. (1976) Population dynamics models in heterogeneous environments. *Ann. Rev.*
1747 *Ecol. Syst.* 7, 287-310.
1748
1749
- 1750 Liebhold, A., Koenig, W.D., and Bjornstad, O.N. (2004) Spatial synchrony in population
1751 dynamics. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 35, 467-490.
1752
1753
- 1754 Lundberg, P., Ranta, E., Ripa, J., and Kaitala, V. (2000) Population variability in space
1755 and time. *TREE* 15, 460-464.
1756
1757
- 1758 Lyles, D., Rosenstock, T.S., Hastings, A. and Brown, P.H. (2009) The Role of Large
1759 Environmental Noise in Masting: General Model and Example from Pistachio Trees.
1760 *J. Theor. Biol.* 259, 701-713.
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767

- Mayor, J.G., and Davies, M.H. (1976) A survey of leatherjacket populations in south-west England, 1963-1974. *Plant Path.* 25, 121-128.
- Milne, A., Laughlin, R. and Coggins, R.E. (1965) The 1955 and 1959 population crashes of the leatherjacket, *Tipula paludosa* Meigen, in Northumberland. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 34, 529-534.
- Moran, P.A.P. (1953a) The statistical analysis of the Canadian lynx cycle. I. Structure and prediction. *Aust. J. Zool.* 1, 163-173.
- Moran, P.A.P. (1953b) The statistical analysis of the Canadian lynx cycle II. Synchronization and meteorology. *Austr. J. Zool.* 1, 291-298.
- Peltonen, M., Liebhold, A., Bjrnstad, O.N., and Williams, D.W. (2002) Variation in spatial synchrony among forest insect species: roles of regional stochasticity and dispersal. *Ecology* 83, 3120-3129.
- Perneger, T.V. (1998) What's wrong with Bonferroni adjustments. *Brit. Med. J.* 316, 1236-1238.
- Petrovskii, S.V., and Blackshaw, R. (2003). Behaviourally structured populations persist longer under harsh environmental conditions. *Ecol. Lett.* 6, 455-462.
- Pickett, S., and Thompson, J. (1978) Patch dynamics and the design of nature reserves. *Biol. Cons.* 13, 27-37.
- Pollard, E., Lakhani, K.H. and Rothery, P. (1987) The detection of density dependence from a series of annual censuses. *Ecology* 68, 2046-2055.
- Post, E., and Forchhammer, M.C. (2002) Synchronization of animal population dynamics by large scale climate. *Nature* 420, 168-171.
- Raimondo, S., Liebhold, A.M., Strazanac, J.S., and Butler, L. (2004) Population synchrony within and among Lepidoptera species in relation to weather, phylogeny, and larval phenology. *Environ. Entomol.* 29, 96-105.
- Ranta, E., Kaitala, V., Lindstrom, K., Helle, E. (1997) Moran effect and synchrony in population dynamics. *Oikos* 78, 136-142.

1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824

1825 Ripa, J. (2000) Analysing the Moran effect and dispersal: their significance and interac-
1826 tion in synchronous population dynamics. *Oikos* 89, 175-187.
1827
1828
1829 Rohani, P., Earn, D., and Grenfell, B. (1999) Opposite patterns of synchrony in sympatric
1830 disease metapopulations. *Science* 286, 968-971.
1831
1832
1833 Rosenstock, T.S., Hastings, A., Koenig, W.D., Lyles, D.J., and Brown, P.H. (2011)
1834 Testing Moran's theorem in an agroecosystem. *Oikos* 120, 1434-1440.
1835
1836
1837 Royama, T. (1992) *Analytical Population Dynamics*, Chapman & Hall.
1838
1839
1840 Sinclair, A.R.E., and Gosline, J.M. (1997) Solar activity and mammal cycles in the
1841 Northern hemisphere. *Am. Nat.* 149, 776-784.
1842
1843
1844 Sutcliffe, O.L., Thomas, C.D., and Moss, D. (1996) Spatial synchrony and asynchrony
1845 in butterfly population dynamics. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 65, 85-95.
1846
1847
1848 Sutcliffe, O.L., Thomas, C.D., Yates, T.J., Greatorex-Davies, J.N. (1997) Correlated ex-
1849 tinctions, colonizations and population fluctuations in a highly connected ringlet
1850 butterfly metapopulation. *Oecologia* 109, 235-241.
1851
1852
1853
1854 Vasseur, D.A., and Yodzis, P. (2004) The color of environmental noise. *Ecology* 85,
1855 1146-1152.
1856
1857
1858
1859 Williams, D.W., and Liebhold, A.M. (1995) Influence of weather on the synchrony of
1860 gypsy moth (*Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae*) outbreaks in New England. *Environ.*
1861 *Entomol.* 24, 987-995.
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881

Appendix: Statistical analysis of the population data

As described in the main text, in order to quantify the degree of synchronization between the populations of two fields (say, X and Y), we calculate the correlation coefficient of their respective residual time series, R^X and R^Y :

$$r_0(R^X, R^Y) = \frac{\sum_{i=2}^n (R_i^X - \mu_R^X)(R_i^Y - \mu_R^Y)}{\sqrt{(\sum_{i=2}^n (R_i^X - \mu_R^X)^2)(\sum_{i=2}^n (R_i^Y - \mu_R^Y)^2)}},$$

where R_i^X and R_i^Y are the residual population densities at year i in fields X and Y , respectively, and μ_R^X and μ_R^Y are the sample means of the two time series.

It is not immediately clear, however, what constitutes a statistically significant correlation coefficient. Since we work with time series of finite length, and the data are affected by stochastic factors, any given value of the correlation coefficient (5) may appear by chance. One must therefore distinguish between the cases when high absolute values of $r_0(R^X, R^Y)$ are superficial and the cases when these values are the result of actual synchronization. In order to do so, the following approach can be used. Suppose that the two time series used to calculate the correlation coefficient, r_0 , are unsynchronised. Then, if one of these series is replaced with random residuals drawn from \mathcal{LN}_R and the correlation coefficient is recalculated, the resulting distribution of correlation coefficients should be centred on r_0 . Furthermore it is possible to estimate the probability of a higher absolute value of the correlation coefficient being obtained from a purely random time series. This approach constitutes a (two-tailed) Monte Carlo test as was originally described by Professor Barnard in (Bartlett 1963) and later refined by Hope (1968).

In particular, we start from the assumption (or null hypothesis) that two populations are not synchronised, that is that any correlation between them occurs by chance. The probability of obtaining the observed correlation coefficient given this assumption, called the p -value, is calculated as described below. If this probability falls below a certain significance level, denoted α , then our initial assumption is rejected and instead the populations are considered synchronised. Hence, for a single test, the significance level is the probability of incorrectly rejecting the null hypothesis, i.e. a false positive or Type I error; e.g. see Gotelli and Ellison (2004).

Monte Carlo test. Random variates from the distribution \mathcal{LN}_R were used to construct time series of residuals, R^* . A correlation coefficient, \bar{r}_0 , for each (R^X, R^*) pair was calculated and compared with r_0 , the value obtained for (R^X, R^Y) . The number of pairs

for which $\bar{r}_0 > r_0$ was then divided by the total number of trials to determine the estimated p -value of r_0 . An initial run of 500 permutations were used to obtain a crude p -value, p_c . If $p_c > 0.2$ then the pair were considered not significantly correlated without further calculation. If $p_c < 0.2$ a further run of 50000 permutations were used to obtain a refined p -value, p_r .

Note that the number of random permutations used in the refinement run are high relative to those proposed in (Bartlett 1963) and (Hope 1968). It was determined heuristically that this number was required to ensure consistent results at the lowest significance level used $\alpha = 0.05$. The initial crude assessment allows computational run time to be reduced if the majority of time series assessed are not strongly correlated.

Multiple comparisons and significance level. In assessing the synchronization of each distinct pair of populations included in the study a large number of statistical tests must be carried out. It is intuitively clear that undertaking more tests increases the number of false positives obtained. In order to maintain the desired significance level over the entire family of inferences undertaken it is necessary to account for this in some way without excessively compromising the power of the test (Perneger 1998). This is achieved by defining an acceptable false positive rate (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995).

Note first that we have a finite set of N distinct events, $\{A_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, representing each instance where the null hypothesis might be falsely rejected. The union of these events corresponds to obtaining at least one false positive. A limit on the probability of this union is given by Boole's inequality:

$$P(\cup_i A_i) \leq \sum_i P(A_i), \tag{9}$$

in terms of the probability of each individual false positive.

Thus to control the false positive rate we first place the correlation values obtained in ascending order according to their p -value. A given null hypothesis is then rejected only if the sum of its p -value with those of all tests ranked below it is less than the desired family significance level. Once the cumulative p -value exceeds this level all remaining null hypotheses are accepted, that is all remaining populations are considered to be unsynchronised. Thus the probability of at least one false positive is restricted by Boole's inequality to less than the family significance level.