Hybrid structural arrangements mediate stability and feasibility in mutualistic networks
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The debate about ecosystems persistence, namely how ecological communities sustain a large number of species, holds considerable importance since the middle of the last century. It has been recognized that the persistence of a system requires stability, but also feasibility, defined as the capability to sustain positive abundances for all biotas. So far, the relationship between the emergence of ecological variables and the species interaction networks has been studied by restricting to single structural patterns, such as nestedness or modularity. Focusing on mutualistic communities, the current paper addresses the role of the interaction architecture in the emergence and maintenance of both properties. Specifically, we propose a new approach relying on hybrid architectural configurations, motivated by the intuition that the co-occurrence of multiple variables cannot be properly grasped by considering different network configurations distinctly. We launch in-block nestedness in the field of ecology, compound by disjoint subsets of species (modules) with internal nested character, and prove that it trades off stability and feasibility. Remarkably, we analyze a large amount of empirical communities and find that a relevant fraction of them exhibits a marked in-block nested structure. We elaborate on the implications of these results, arguing that they provide useful insights about the key properties ruling community assembly.

I. INTRODUCTION

Ecological systems are constituted by a high number of species that share a habitat, and interact with each other in varied ways—predation, mutualism, competition, etc. Interactions among species play a crucial role in the dynamics and organization of communities. They shape the ongoing evolutionary process and represent a key component of several properties, for example, the maintenance of diversity, the coexistence and abundance of species, as well as the stability of the whole system. Herein, network theory has contributed important advances in the understanding of how species interactions affect these variables.

Previous studies pointed out that interaction among biotas are not randomly assembled, but manifest clear architectural patterns. For instance, Bascompte et al. analyzed 52 plant-animals mutualistic communities finding that they are organized in nested arrangements, i.e. the specialist species interact only with subsets of those interacting with the more generalists. Similarly, Olesen et al. showed as well that pollination networks can exhibit a modular character, with weakly interlinked groups of species (modules), which exhibit strong internal connectivity. Besides these two common examples of interaction configuration, there exist several other types that remain largely understudied.

The evidence that real ecosystems networks can be strongly structured triggered a long series of research investigating the relationship between these structural arrangements and several dynamical property of the ecosystem. Much effort was devoted to explore the effect of interaction architecture on stability. In particular, in the authors pointed out that nested networks are less likely to be stable, while the several other works discussed the stabilizing effects associated to modularity. Leaving stability aside, Bastolla et al. proved that nestedness promotes diversity. Further, nested arrangements have been shown to positively correlate with ecosystems feasibility, a quantity related to species coexistence, or be a result of optimizing species abundances.

Taking a general overlook at the state-of-the-art, it is easy to realize that, so far, the structure-dynamics interplay has been centered on one-to-one mappings, examining the correspondence of a given dynamical property to a single architectural pattern, or viceversa. This necessarily leads to a description of the resulting behavior where a particular property predominates over the remaining ones. For instance, the analysis in terms of modularity portrays a picture of a community in which stability is promoted over diversity or, similarly, nestedness benefits feasibility. However, this reductionistic view may not fit with the more complex dynamics of natural systems, which seem to evolve by jointly optimizing several ecological variables. Note that several structural arrangements, offering complementary beneficial aspects to an ecosystem, may not be structurally
compatible with each other \cite{20}, pushing this path to a dead-end. Limited to a single dynamical property, multilayer or multiplex networks \cite{21,26} may address some aspects of the problem. Here, we seek a different research direction, exploring hybrid structural arrangements.

The study of how nested and modular network arrangements may entangle has become, during the last years, a central issue empirically \cite{5,27,30} and theoretically \cite{31,34}. Particular attention has been payed to the coexistence of both patterns because, as discussed, they seem arise as a consequence of different evolutive mechanisms. Here, in-block nestedness (IBN) stands out as a potential hybrid network configuration, consisting of blocks whose internal connectivity is arranged in a nested manner. Such compound architecture was first described in \cite{7}, and structurally embodies properties of both modularity and nestedness \cite{31,32}.

The main aim of our work is to show that hybrid structures are crucial to approach the ecosystem functioning. These structures may offer an interesting balance between different dynamical properties incompatible a priori, as implied from the current state-of-the-art. We will consider the case of IBN, showing that it trades-off stability and feasibility and constitutes an optimal pattern to ensure the persistence of ecosystems. Such result is obtained for an ensemble of synthetic networks of different size and connectance, and holds both in a pure mutualistic context and in presence of intra-species competition. Furthermore, we analyze almost one hundred and fifty mutualistic empirical networks, including anemone-fish, plant-pollinator and seed-dispersal communities, and find that a high fraction of them exhibits an appreciable degree of IBN—often higher than any other structural arrangement. This has important consequences on the understanding of the organization of mutualistic communities, suggesting for many systems the emergence of hybrid interaction patterns in the attempt to preserve both stability and diversity, rather than promoting one over the other.

II. METHODS

A. Generalized Lotka-Volterra dynamics

An ecological community may be modeled as a network in which nodes represent the species, while edges encode the interaction type and strength among them: a link is turned on between nodes $i$ and $j$ if the related species interact. On the basis of this interaction network, species abundances can be described by a set of time-dependent functions $x_i(t)$, and their temporal evolution is commonly studied by recalling the generalized Lotka-Volterra equation

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = x_i \left(r_i - \sum_j M_{ij}x_j\right), \quad i, j \leq S,$$

where $S$ corresponds to the species number. The parameters $r_i$ represent the intrinsic self-growth coefficients, ruling the dynamics of the $i$-species when interspecies interaction is dropped out. The information concerning this interaction is embodied in matrix $M$, properly endowed by weights, which corresponds to the adjacency matrix of the interaction network.

In the present work we focus on bipartite mutualistic networks, in which nodes are divided in two groups $A$ and $P$. Accordingly, the interaction between different sets species is assumed to be mutualistic, while within species corresponding to the same set only competition occurs. This captures the evolution of several bipartite communities of plants and animals, such as plant-pollinators or seed-dispersal, where species belonging to different sets cooperate, while compete with those of the same group to get resources. In this case, the adjacency matrix of the interaction has a particular shape,

$$M = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \Omega_{AA} & -\Gamma_{AP} \\ \hline -\Gamma_{PA} & \Omega_{PP} \end{array}\right),$$

where the block $\Omega_{AA}$ ($\Omega_{PP}$) stands as the competitive interactions among species belonging to the set $A$ ($P$), and the block $\Gamma_{AP}$ describes the mutualistic interaction between species corresponding to different sets. For the sake of simplicity, during the rest of the manuscript we will assume that both the set $A$ and $P$ contains the same number of species $S$.

The main aim of the work is to understand how the joint behavior of stability and feasibility is affected by the architecture of mutualistic interactions. Thus, the off-diagonal block $\Gamma_{AP}$ (exhibiting the same structure of $\Gamma_{PA}$) is the relevant structure for our analysis. This is generated by means of the model introduced in \cite{21} which permits to span nested, modular, and IBN structures in terms of four parameters: the number of communities $B \in [1, \infty)$, the noise regarding the existence of interactions outside the communities $\mu \in [0, 1]$, how nested the interaction within communities is $\rho \in [0, 1]$, and a shape parameter controlling the slightness of the nested structure $\xi \in [1, \infty]$ (see Fig. 2 in \cite{32}). More details regarding the synthetic network generation model are provided in Appendix A.

The diagonal blocks, following the state-of-the-art \cite{16,17}, are treated as unstructured interactions. The weights of both the competitive and mutualistic interaction are treated in the mean field interaction:

$$\Gamma_{ij} = \langle \Gamma_{ij} \rangle + \sigma_{ij}^\gamma \equiv \gamma + \sigma_{ij}^\gamma, \quad \sigma_{ij}^\gamma \ll \gamma,$$

and similar for the other blocks. In particular, we assume $\langle \Omega_{ij}^{AA} \rangle = \langle \Omega_{ij}^{PP} \rangle = \omega$, namely the average value of the intraspecies competition is the same for the two sets. In agreement with the previous literature \cite{16,17} their diagonal is set to one, i.e. $M_{ii} = 1$: these elements correspond to the species auto-interaction, namely they specify the behavior of a species due to internal interaction among different specimens.
B. Stability

Stability is evaluated by looking into the Jacobian matrix of the generalized Lotka-Volterra model, Eq. (1)

\[ J_{ij} \equiv \left( \frac{\partial \dot{x}_i}{\partial x_j} \right)_{x=x^*}, \]  

(4)

where \( x^* \) represents the stationary state of Eq. (1), defined by the condition \( \dot{x}^*_i = 0 \), leading to

\[ x^* = M^{-1}r, \]  

(5)

and describing the species abundances at equilibrium. Replacing Eq. (1) into Eq. (4) and recalling Eq. (5) it turns

\[ J_{ij} = -x^*_i M_{ij}, \]  

(6)

The system is stable if the maximum real part of the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix is negative, otherwise is said to be unstable. Hence, the quantity

\[ \lambda^* = -\text{Max} \{ Re \{ \lambda_J \} \}, \quad \lambda_J \in \text{Sp}(J) \]  

(7)

naturally describes the stability of the system.

The Jacobian matrix provides information about the long-time response of the first-order dynamical behavior of the system, after infinitesimal perturbations of the stationary abundances. These in general affect the expression of the Jacobian, as results from Eq. (6), and have to be taken into account in the eigenvalues calculation. Following the approach presented in [35] we assume that the abundances are all positive, i.e. \( x_i^* > 0 \forall i \leq S \). This is equivalent to sample a proper \( r \) vector in the feasibility domain, namely to tune the values of the self-growth rates in order to obtain positive abundances for a given \( M \) matrix.

C. Feasibility

The feasibility regards the conditions on the external parameters yielding a stationary state in which all species abundances are positive, i.e. \( x_i > 0, \forall i \leq 2S \). In the case of the Generalized Lotka-Volterra model, in Eq. (1), is easy to infer that, once \( M \) is fixed, feasibility only depends on the self-growth vector \( r \). The feasibility space is spanned by the values of this quantity associated to positive abundances. This, as pioneered by [36] and then also shown by [16, 37], takes the form of a cone, which borders are given by the column vectors of \( M \).

The degree of feasibility is provided by the openness of the cone, i.e. the related solid angle \( \Omega \), that is completely determined by the \( M \) matrix. Apart of its geometric meaning, \( \Omega \) may be interpreted, once it has been properly normalized, as the probability of sampling randomly a \( r \) vector related to positive abundances. This quantity has been calculated in [38] proving that it takes the following form

\[ \Omega = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{S/2}\sqrt{\det(\Sigma)}} \int_{R^S \geq 0} e^{-\frac{1}{2}x^T\Sigma^{-1}x} dx, \]  

(8)

which is the cumulative function of a multivariate normal distribution with mean value equal to zero and variance matrix \( \Sigma^{-1} = 2M^T M \).

Following the approach presented in [16], the \( \Omega \) function may be calculated in R language by means of the function \texttt{pmvnorm}, which involves the computation of multivariate normal probabilities with arbitrary correlation matrices. This is efficiently performed through quasi-Monte Carlo method, recalling the algorithm presented in [39]. Hereafter, we represent the solid angle on a logarithmic scale \( F \equiv \log_{10}(\Omega) \); this is the quantity we will actually mean by the term feasibility. It turns that
$-\infty < F \leq 0$ because $0 \leq \Omega \leq 1$, since it is a normalized distribution. The higher the value of $F$ the larger the likelihood of finding the system in a feasible state.

III. RESULTS

A. Synthetic networks

The results of the stability and feasibility calculation for nested, in-block, and modular synthetic networks are presented in Fig. 2. It is possible to see that modularity is the more likely structure to be stable, while nestedness constitutes the less one. In this sense, stability defines a hierarchy in which modularity is on the top and nestedness in the bottom. Feasibility also discriminates the three architectures and yields a hierarchy where, at odds of stability, nestedness is on the top and modularity in the bottom. Importantly, in both situations IBN is in the middle, standing out as a trade-off between stability and feasibility. Summarizing, we have

\[
\langle F_N \rangle > \langle F_I \rangle > \langle F_Q \rangle, \quad \langle \lambda^*_N \rangle < \langle \lambda^*_Q \rangle < \langle \lambda^*_I \rangle,
\]

where $\langle F_X \rangle$ indicates the average value of feasibility over an ensemble of synthetic networks with $X$ structure. Similarly for $\langle \lambda^*_X \rangle$.

This finding agrees with the previous literature, where nestedness was recognized to hinder stability [10, 12]. From the mathematical point of view, this fact may be understood in terms of the Gershgoring theorem, linking the maximum real part of the Jacobian eigenvalues with the matrix average row sum (related to $\xi$ parameter), which is maximized in nested networks because of the presence of generalist species. Along this line, we argue that blocks structure minimizes the row sum, while in-block generalists species permits to reach an intermediate score between nestedness and modularity. This is certainly true for the pure mutualistic systems but, worth highlighting, our results are robust for an average competition strength approximately equal to the 10% of the mutualistic one.

The result presented in Fig. 2 refers to a fixed value of connectance and species number. In Fig. 3 we extend this analysis over a wide range of such parameters. It is possible to point out that, for the given values of competition and mutualism, stability hierarchy holds over the whole selected domain. Surprisingly, the feasibility-architecture relationship is not uniform and tends to reverse as $C$ and $S$ increase. A general representation of the validity region of the feasibility hierarchy is portrayed in Fig. 4. We infer the the trade-off role of IBN is not universal and concerns a finite, albeit significative, portion of the parameters space, mainly related to small values of connectance or species number.

Remarkably, as connectance and species number grow, we approach a situation where modular networks promote feasibility, as well as stability, and stands out as optimal interaction architecture to preserve ecological persistence. We have:

\[
\langle F_N \rangle > \langle F_I \rangle > \langle F_Q \rangle, \quad \langle \lambda^*_N \rangle > \langle \lambda^*_I \rangle > \langle \lambda^*_Q \rangle,
\]

The non-uniform behavior of feasibility also concerns its dependence on connectance. While for small $S,C$ values feasibility increases as a function of this quantity at the odds of stability, they approximately match the same behavior in the opposite limit.

B. Empirical Networks

An important part of the current work is constituted by the comparison between our theoretical findings and the properties of real mutualistic ecosystems. We look into pollinators and seed-dispersal communities of the Web of Life database [40]. This contains 186 networks, ranging over a large domain of size and connectance. In this work, we restrict to parameters space bounded by $S_{max} = 110$ and $C_{max} = 0.3$, where are concentrated 129 communities.

In the previous subsection we showed that the relationship between feasibility and network architecture is not uniform and depends on the size and connectance. Fig. 4 presents a comparison between the empirical communities distribution in the $S$-$C$ space, and the validity regime of the hierarchies in Eq. 9 for synthetic networks. It is possible to see that the majority of real networks, i.e. the 90.7%, falls into the region where IBN trades off stability and feasibility, representing a profitable interaction architecture to preserve ecological persistence.

We are interested in the structural properties of the empirical communities we considered, namely if they are predominantly nested, modular or in-block. A suitable manner to present this information is given by a ternary plot (or simplex), see Fig. 5. Here, each ecological community is located with the three coordinates $f_N$, $f_Q$, and $f_I$, defined as $f_N = N/(N + Q + I)$, and similarly for $f_Q$, $f_I$, with $N$, $Q$, $I$ providing the degree of nestedness, modularity and in-block nestedness (see Sec. B). Note that the, by definition, the quantities $f_N$, $f_Q$, and $f_I$ take values in the $[0, 1]$ range. The simplex may be divided into dominance regions, bounded by the three angle bisectors, associated to the several architectures. Note the part of the ternary are necessarily empty, because of the constraints mentioned in Appendix B and carefully discussed in [32].

Fig. 5 unveils that most of the ecological communities fall into the IBN area. Here, networks result to be relatively small, while those with a notable size tend to be located in the modularity region. Interestingly, as discussed for Fig. 4, small communities fulfill the hierarchies in Eq. 9 and IBN exhibits the trade-off property. Our empirical analysis suggests so that mutualistic ecosystems develop an IBN architecture to maintain an equilibrium between stability and feasibility, in order to ensure persistence.
FIG. 2. Stability and Feasibility values for an ensemble of synthetic networks with in-block, nested, and modular architecture. Networks refer to mutualistic communities with species number \( S = 30 \) and connectance \( C = 0.1 \). Plot on the left describes a pure mutualistic context while that on right includes intraguild competition, with the same parameters values employed in [10]. Each point represents a network: its horizontal coordinate is given by the feasibility \( \mathcal{F} \) introduced in Sec. II C, while the vertical one is provided by the quantity \( \lambda^* \) introduced in Eq. (7). It is possible to recognize three different clusters corresponding to different structures: nested and modularity respectively promote feasibility and stability, while IBN trades-off the two properties. Red daggers are located at the average values of stability and feasibility, introduced in Eq. (9) of the structured networks cluster. Colorbar refers to the \( \xi \) values of the nested (left) and in-block (right) networks.

FIG. 3. Stability and Feasibility dependence on the connectance for nested, in-block and modular networks, at different values of the species number. Each point refers to a set of matrices of fixed connectance, and is located at the resulting average value of feasibility (up) or stability (down). Shadow areas provides an information about the variance. All the plots refer to the \( \gamma = 0.13 \) and \( \omega = 0.01 \).

IV. DISCUSSION

Stability and feasibility have been mapped, in the past, onto single preferential architectural patterns. However, the interest in studying abundant, diverse and stable ecological communities calls for a new vision of species interaction patterns, able to reproduce the balance of several properties, rather than the predominance of a single one. With this objective, we leave the traditional approach focused on a single architectural pattern, and look into
compound structures. We consider in-block nested configuration, where nestedness and modularity interfere at a network’s mesoscale, and show that it provides an optimal middle-term between stability and feasibility. Moreover, the analysis of real mutualistic networks proves that a large fraction of them actually exhibits in-block nested assembly.

This result has important consequences on the general understanding of the mechanisms ruling the organization of mutualistic communities. So far, the question has been addressed as finding the key property shaping ecosystems assembly. For instance, in [16] authors conclude that communities promote feasibility over stability, but not both at the same time. This follows from an approach to the study of interaction involving only one possible structure (nestedness). The introduction of an intertwined perspective for interaction architecture permits to revisit and deepen this finding. Particularly, the emergence of in-block nestedness in real communities, associated to a trade-off between stability and feasibility, implies that the fundamental criterium underlying the assembly process is the equilibrium between those properties, rather than the predominance of one of them.

The mediating role of in-block nestedness depends in general on the connectance and species number. As these quantities become larger, we detect an unexpected effect consisting in a reversing of the feasibility hierarchy. In this regime both stability and feasibility result to be promoted by modularity, which stands out as the optimal pattern for ecosystems assemblage. The transition from an in-block to modular optimal pattern may be interpreted as a witness of the non-universal behavior of ecosystems, which cannot be treated regardless of its structural properties, such as size. Particularly, this result paves the way to future studies aimed to look for the optimal size-connectance relationship for the assembly process.

Along the same line, one could look into the extension of our analysis beyond the dynamics in Eq. (1), characterized by an interaction term depending linearly on the $M$ matrix. This dynamics is largely employed in the literature, but many authors also use its non-linear extension, commonly termed Holling type II. The physical difference between the two frames lies in the interaction (or handling) time: it is neglected in the linear case, but not so in the other. Therefore, the magnitude of such a timescale introduces a bound on the validity of the theory we presented. This is certainly available when such a time can be approximated to zero. For finite non-zero values, one may proceed perturbatively provided they are small. Still, it is possible to show that as handling time tends the infinity, the resulting equation may be cast in a linear form. Nevertheless, the effect of intermediate values of the handling time represents an open question.
Appendix A: Synthetic Network Generation

We start the analysis of the trade-offs between stability and feasibility for a big ensemble of synthetic networks with the three patterns of interest, with varying network size and connectance. The number of rows and columns nodes was chosen within the range [30, 250], with $A = P$, and the connectance was mapped onto the range [0.04, 0.4] such that the resulting networks were comparable with empirical ecological networks.

We generated three different sets of synthetic networks, each one with purely nested, modular, and in-block nested patterns, respectively. For this purpose, we have employed a network generation model, introduced in [31], to generate modular and in-block nested synthetic networks, having a fixed block size ($N_{BA} = N_{BP} = 15$ nodes) and an increasing number of blocks, i.e., increasing network size. In the case of the nested matrices, we employed the network generation model by keeping fixed the number of blocks ($B = 1$) and increasing its size $N_{BA} = N_{BP}$.

Besides the number of communities $B$, and the number of rows and columns nodes, the model relies on three additional parameters: noise regarding the existence of interactions outside species communities $\mu \in [0, 1]$, noise regarding interactions outside a perfectly nested structure $p \in [0, 1]$ and a shape parameter that controls the slinness of the nested structure $\xi \in [1, \infty]$. These parameters were varied accordingly for each set of matrices, e.g., for the generation of purely modular networks, we fixed $p = 1$ and smoothly modified the rest of the parameters to obtain networks covering a wide range of modularity values. The same scheme was applied for the generation of purely nested, in-block nested networks, respectively.

Last but not least, given though $\xi$ affects the overall network connectance (total number of existing species interactions), in some cases, we randomly removed or added links to the networks until the desired connectance values were met. The other parameters $p$ and $\mu$ did not alter the density of the network. At the end of the process, we generated around $2 \times 10^5$ networks for each one of the three patterns of interest.

Appendix B: Nested, Modularity and In-Block nestedness measures

The present appendix is devoted to specify the measures we employ to quantify the emergence of structural pattern in mutualistic networks, for instance to build the simplex in Fig. 5.

Nestedness

The notion of nestedness was coined over a decade ago in biology to characterize the spatial distribution of biotas in isolated, fragmented habitats [1]. A perfect nested configuration (see Fig. 1 left) is observed when specialists (nodes with low connectivity) interact with proper subsets of those species interacting with generalists (nodes with high connectivity). To quantify this pattern we recall the global nestedness fitness $\mathcal{N}$ introduced by Solé-Ribalta et al. in [31], which is defined as

$$\mathcal{N} = \frac{2}{N_A + N_P} \sum_{i,j} O_{ij} \left( \frac{O_{ij} - \langle O_{ij} \rangle}{k_j(N_A - 1)} \Theta(k_i - k_j) \right)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{N_A + N_P} \sum_{l,m} O_{lm} \left( \frac{O_{lm} - \langle O_{lm} \rangle}{k_m(N_P - 1)} \Theta(k_l - k_m) \right),$$

where $O_{ij}$ (or $O_{lm}$) measures the degree of links overlap between rows node $i$ and $j$ (or columns $l$ and $m$) node pairs; the quantity $k_i$ corresponds to the degree of the $i$ node; $\Theta(\cdot)$ is a Heaviside step function that guarantees that we only compute the overlap between pair of nodes when $k_i \geq k_j$. Finally, $\langle O_{ij} \rangle = \frac{k_i k_j}{N_A}$. This measure is in the tradition of other overlap measures, such as NODF [11, 12].

Modularity

A modular networks configuration (Fig. 1 center) implies the existence of well-connected subgroups, which may be identified given the right heuristics to do so. Here, we search a (sub)optimal modular partition of the nodes through a community detection analysis [43, 44]. For this goal, we apply the extremal optimisation algorithm [45] (along with a Kernighan-Lin refinement procedure [46]) to maximise Barber’s modularity $Q$ [43],

$$Q = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{N_A} \sum_{j=N_A+1}^{N_A+N_P} (\tilde{a}_{ij} - \tilde{p}_{ij}) \delta(\alpha_i, \alpha_j),$$

where $L$ is the number of interactions (links) in the network, $\tilde{a}_{ij}$ denotes the existence of a link between nodes $i$ and $j$, $\tilde{p}_{ij} = k_i k_j / L$ is the probability that a link exists by chance, and $\delta(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)$ is the Kronecker delta function, which takes the value 1 if nodes $i$ and $j$ are in the same community, and 0 otherwise.

In-Block Nestedness

In-block nestedness configuration refers to a mesoscale hybrid pattern, in which the network presents a modular structure but the interactions within each module are nested (Fig. 1 right). In order to compute the amount of in-block nestedness characterizing a given network we recall the objective function introduced in [31], which employ the same optimization algorithms used to maximize...
modularity. The in-block nestedness objective function may be written as

\[ I = \frac{2}{N_A + N_P} \sum_{i,j} \left[ \frac{O_{i,j} - \langle O_{i,j} \rangle_j}{k_j(C_i - 1)} \Theta(k_i - k_j)\delta(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \right] + \frac{2}{N_A + N_P} \sum_{l,m} \left[ \frac{O_{l,m} - \langle O_{l,m} \rangle_m}{k_m(C_l - 1)} \Theta(k_l - k_m)\delta(\alpha_l, \alpha_m) \right], \]

(B3)

where \( C_i \) represents the size of the \( i \) block. Note that, by definition, \( I \) reduces to \( N \) when the number of blocks is 1. This explains why the right half of the ternary plot (Fig. 5) is necessarily empty: \( I \geq N \) implies that \( f_I \geq f_N \). On the other hand, an in-block nested structure exhibits necessarily some level of modularity, but not the other way around. This explains why the lower-left area of the simplex is empty as well (see [20] for details).