

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION **INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS** I.C.T.P., P.O. BOX 586, 34100 TRIESTE, ITALY, CABLE: CENTRATOM TRIESTE



SMR.780 - 77

# FOURTH AUTUMN COURSE ON MATHEMATICAL ECOLOGY

(24 October - 11 November 1994)

"Extinction in a Structured Predator-Prey Model with Size-Dependent Predation"

> Thomas G. Hallam Department of Mathematics College of Liberal Arts University of Tennessee Knozville, TN 37996-1300 U.S.A.

These are preliminary lecture notes, intended only for distribution to participants.

MAIN BUILDING STEADA CONTREA 11 TH 27401 THE MAY 274163 THE A A60392 ADMAND CONTRE HOUSE VIA GENERADO 9 TEL 224241 TELEFAX 224531 TELEX 460449

#### EXTINCTION IN A STRUCTURED PREDATOR-PREY MODEL

#### WITH SIZE-DEPENDENT PREDATION

#### THOMAS G. HALLAM

Department of Mathematics and Graduate Program in Ecology, University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1300, U.S.A.

and

SHANDELLE M. HENSON Department of Mathematics, University of Tennessee Knozville, Tennessee 37996-1300, U.S.A.

#### DEDICATION

In memory of the friendship and science of Stavros Busenberg

#### ABSTRACT

Two age-size structured, individual-based, partial differential equation population models are coupled to form a predator-prey model, which is parametrized for a *Daphnia*-trout (*Daphnia magna-Oncorhynchus mykiss*) community. Lethal effects chemical uptake models for fish and *Daphnia* are coupled to the community, and *Daphnia* population extinction thresholds due to predation are computed as a function of chemical concentration in the water. Predation of fish on *Daphnia* is size dependent, and *Daphnia* population extinction thresholds are also computed as a function of size-dependent predation.

## 1. Introduction

#### 1.1. The Problem

Interactions between species are mechanistically complex because they depend upon numerous environmental, physiological, behavioral, and trophic factors. This article focuses on two possible controlling agents in the predation process, physiological processes and exogenous chemical stressors. Predation, a fundamental structuring process in ecological systems, is often influenced by size of both the predator and its prey. This attribute, along with the ecotoxicological aspects of our study, require an individual-based perspective.

Dynamics of structured population models are difficult to ascertain because of the spectrum of possible behaviors. Our efforts focus on persistence and extinction phenomena obtained from consideration of size-governed feeding and chemical toxicity in an age-size structured predator-prey model. The results are obtained via

L

simulations of the community model.

## 1.2 The Model

The predator-prey model is composed of two age-size structured population models, one for each of the predator and prey populations, and the trophic interactions between them. The population models are partial differential equation models of McKendrick-von Foerster type, and are individual-based in that the growth rate of an individual organism appears in the population equation.

The individual growth rate models are mechanistic representations of individual energy budgets, and rely on parameters estimated from empirical data collected at the individual level. Individual biology is important for risk assessment because environmental influences such as toxic stress affect populations by affecting the population's individual members. Lipophilic chemicals, for example, affect individual organisms according to their fat content<sup>1</sup>.

The predator model is constructed and parametrized for the rainbow trout, Oncorhynchus  $mykiss^2$ , and the prey model is constructed and parametrized for Daphnia magna<sup>3</sup>. The two population models are coupled through the feeding of the fish on the Daphnia and the consequent mortality imposed on the prey population. Predator resource density is computed from prey density, and one component of prey mortality is due to predation. Once the predation interaction has been specified, a given predator feeds according to the uptake term(s) in its individual growth model, and the resulting mortality on the prey population is computed<sup>4</sup>.

Assume  $(\rho, q)$  is the unique solution of the age-size structured model

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} &+ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial a} + \sum_{i=1}^{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial m_{i}} (g_{i}\rho) = -\mu\rho \\ \rho(0, a, \vec{m}) &= \hat{\rho}(a, \vec{m}) \\ \rho(t, 0, \vec{m}_{0}) &= \int_{\Omega} \int_{0}^{\infty} \beta(a, \vec{m}, \vec{m}_{0}) \rho(t, a, \vec{m}) dad\vec{m} \end{aligned}$$
(1)  
$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial q}{\partial t} &+ \frac{\partial q}{\partial a} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\partial}{\partial n_{i}} (h_{i}q) = -vq \\ q(0, a, \vec{n}) &= \hat{q}(a, \vec{n}) \\ q(t, 0, \vec{n}_{0}) &= \int_{\Gamma} \int_{0}^{\infty} B(a, \vec{n}, \vec{n}_{0}) q(t, a, \vec{n}) dad\vec{n} \end{aligned}$$

where  $\vec{m} = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_j)$  and  $\vec{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$  are vectors of j physiological variables for the prey and k physiological variables for the predator.  $\rho(t, a, \vec{m})$  is the age-mass (but not volumetric) density at time t, age a, and mass vector  $\vec{m}$  of

the prey in numbers per unit age per unit mass, and  $q(t, a, \vec{n})$  is the density at time t, age a, and mass vector n of the predators.  $g_i(a, \vec{m})$  and  $h_i(a, \vec{n})$  are the growth rates of the  $i^{th}$  mass variables  $m_i$  and  $n_i$ , respectively, in an individual prey and predator.  $\beta(a, \vec{m}, \vec{m}_0)$  and  $B(a, \vec{n}, \vec{n}_0)$  are the birth rates of the prey and predators, respectively;  $\mu(t, a, \vec{m}, \rho(t, \cdot, \cdot), q(t, \cdot, \cdot))$  and  $v(t, a, \vec{n}, q(t, \cdot, \cdot))$  are the mortality rates for the prey and predators, respectively; and  $\hat{\rho}$  and  $\hat{q}$  are the initial distributions of prey and predators.

Variation among individuals can be introduced by modelling an arbitrary number of ecotypes in the populations. Each ecotype is modelled with a partial differential equation and is distinguished by its distinct individual growth rate.

## 1.3 Relative Foraging Volumes

Because the predator-prey model is solved numerically, it is difficult to simulate the large number of *Daphnia* required to provide resources for a reasonable number of fish; therefore, only a fraction of the *Daphnia* are simulated and the model is approximately scaled. The fish population is associated with a volume parameter  $V_F$  representing predator foraging range. The simulated representative daphnids are associated with another (possibly the same, but probably smaller) volume parameter  $V_D$ . The *Daphnia* population is assumed to be distributed uniformly over volume  $V_F$ , but the simulation only tracks a representative fraction of the whole *Daphnia* population. If  $V_D = V_F$ , then the simulation follows the entire *Daphnia* population. If not, interactions between the predator and prey communities must be modified by the scaling factor  $V_D/V_F$ .

## 1.4 Predator Feeding

An individual fish is assumed to only eat daphnids whose length  $L_D$  falls within a certain prey size window that depends linearly on the length of the fish<sup>5</sup>. In particular, the fish can consume daphnids whose length satisfies the inequality

$$10 \cdot k_{\min} \cdot L_F \le L_D \le 10 \cdot k_{\max} \cdot L_F,\tag{2}$$

where  $k_{min}$  and  $k_{max}$  are parameters. Smaller and larger daphnids either are not pursued by the fish or are transported through the gills. A daphnid of length  $L_D$ therefore can (only) be consumed by a fish whose length satisfies the inequality

$$0.1 \cdot k_{max}^{-1} \cdot L_D \le L_F \le 0.1 \cdot k_{min}^{-1} \cdot L_D.$$
(3)

For both species, length is computed allometrically from structural mass, one of the mass variables computed in both the fish and *Daphnia* models. Let  $\Omega(\vec{n})$  denote the range of masses of *Daphnia* which a fish of mass  $\vec{n}$  can consume, and let  $\Gamma(\vec{m})$  denote the range of masses of fish which can consume a daphnid of mass  $\vec{m}$ .

The fish respond to the volumetric density of the prey, and are assumed to divide the resource among themselves by an intraspecific competitive mechanism, with larger fish receiving larger shares. A fish of mass  $\vec{n}_F$  responds to the following resource density of *Daphnia* of mass  $\vec{m}$ :

.....

$$x_{\vec{n}_{F},\vec{m}} = \frac{\int_{0}^{\infty} (\sum \vec{m}) \rho(t, a, \vec{m}) da}{V_{D}} \cdot \frac{\sum \vec{n}_{F}}{\int_{\Gamma(\vec{m})} \int_{0}^{\infty} (\sum \vec{n}) q(t, a, \vec{n}) d\vec{n} da}$$
(4)

grams per unit volume per unit mass, where  $\sum \vec{m}$  is the total mass of the organism having mass vector  $\vec{m}$ . A fish of mass  $\vec{n}_F$  thus responds to a total resource density of

$$x_{\vec{n}_F} = \frac{\sum \vec{n}_F}{V_D} \int_{\Omega(\vec{n}_F)} \frac{\int_0^\infty (\sum \vec{m}) \, \rho(t, a, \vec{m}) \, da}{\int_{\Gamma(\vec{m})} \int_0^\infty (\sum \vec{n}) \, q(t, a, \vec{n}) \, d\vec{n} \, da} \, d\vec{m}$$
(5)

grams per unit volume.

# 2. Results: Extinction Thresholds

## 2.1. Definition

In order to analyze some of the effects of size-dependent predation, we now assume 1) the *Daphnia* population has a constantly abundant resource density, and 2) all mortality is due to predation, starvation, or old age.

Fig. 1. Extinction threshold  $\ln V_F^{-1}$  as a function of  $\ln V_D^{-1}$  for 100-day runs.

,

Because of these hypotheses, extinction can occur in only two ways. The first extinction scenario is also found in aggregated models: the fish eat all the available daphnids, the *Daphnia* population goes to extinction, and then the fish starve. The second extinction scenario is completely due to size structure in the model, specifically size-dependent predation: the fish do not find sufficient *Daphnia* of the appropriate size to eat, and thus starve while the *Daphnia* population survives<sup>4</sup>. This paper concerns the first extinction scenario, which corresponds to the extinction of the *Daphnia* and necessarily leads to the extinction of the fish.

Let  $\hat{\rho}$  and  $\hat{q}$  be nominal initial population distributions of prey and predator, respectively, in units of numbers per unit age per unit mass. While keeping these distributions the same, we vary the initial population densities by varying the volumes  $V_D$  and  $V_F$ , and calculate the extinction threshold. Given an initial Daphnia population density distribution  $\hat{\rho}/V_D$ , the extinction threshold is the infimum of the  $V_F^{-1}$  such that an initial fish density distribution of  $\hat{q}/V_F$  drives the Daphnia population to extinction within a prescribed number of days.

Fig. 2. Extinction threshold log  $V_F^{-1}$  as a function of chemical concentration  $C_W$  in the water and log  $V_D^{-1}$  for 100-day runs. The planes  $C_W = 1.62 \times 10^{-5}$  and  $C_W = 1.78 \times 10^{-5}$  form vertical asymptotes for the surface; and for  $C_W \neq 1.78 \times 10^{-5}$ ,  $V_F^{-1} = 0$  (see Figure 3 for a cross section).

Figure 1 shows the extinction threshold as a function of  $V_D^{-1}$  for 100-day runs with nominal initial population distributions. The initial Daphnia distribution con-

5

tains 26 ecotypes of relatively fast growers and reproducers, and 1 ecotype of slow growers which reproduce only once before dying of old age at 50 days. The lower part of the curve, which has small slope, corresponds to the extinction of the slowgrowing ecotype, and the upper part, which has a larger slope, corresponds to extinction of the faster-growing ecotypes.

 $V_D$  and  $V_F$  must be interpreted as volumes, and not just scaling factors on the initial distributions, because they appear as parameters in their own right in the resource partitioning for fish, where fish numbers respond to Daphnia density.

## 2.2 Extinction threshold as a function of toxicant

We now allow toxicant-induced mortality in both the predator and prey populations by engaging the lethal effects models for fish and  $Daphnia^{1,2}$ .

Figure 2 shows the 100-day extinction threshold for the predator-prey model (with the nominal initial population distributions) as a function of  $C_W$  (concentration of chemical in the water) and  $V_D^{-1}$ . At 2600 days, both populations were given a 3 day exposure to a chemical with octanol-water coefficient 10<sup>4</sup>.  $k_{max}$  and  $k_{min}$  had values of 0.2 and 0.007, respectively.



Figure 3 shows a typical cross section of Figure 2 with initial Daphnia density held constant at  $V_D^{-1} = 10^{-4}$ . When  $1.62 \times 10^{-5} \le C_W \le 1.78 \times 10^{-5}$ , all the young

fish die from the toxicant and the remaining fish are too large to eat any of the juvenile daphnids. Thus, each daphnid is allowed to reproduce at least once, and hence the *Daphnia* population grows no matter how high the fish density. When  $C_W > 1.78 \times 10^{-5}$ , the toxicant kills all the *Daphnia*.

## 2.3 Extinction threshold as a function of size-dependent predation

Figure 4 shows the extinction threshold for constant  $V_D^{-1}$  as a function of  $k_{max}$ when  $k_{min}$  is set at 0. At low values of  $k_{max}$ , none of the daphnids are small enough to fall in the prey windows of any of the fish, and so no density of fish is large enough to control the *Daphnia* population. At intermediate values of  $k_{max}$ , all juvenile daphnids and some adult daphnids are consumed by the fish, and so the extinction threshold is finite. At large values of  $k_{max}$ , all sizes of *Daphnia* are consumed by all fish, and so the extinction threshold becomes constant with increasing  $k_{max}$ .

#### Fig. 4. Extinction threshold as a function of $k_{max}$ when $k_{min} = 0$ .

Figure 5 shows the extinction threshold for constant  $V_D^{-1}$  as a function of  $k_{min}$  when  $k_{max}$  is set at  $\infty$ . At low values of  $k_{min}$ , all sizes of Daphnia are consumed by all fish, so the threshold corresponds to the threshold at high  $k_{max}$  in Figure 4. At intermediate values of  $k_{min}$ , adult and some juvenile daphnids are consumed. When  $k_{min}$  is sufficiently high, no juvenile daphnids are consumed. At this point, no finite fish density can control the Daphnia population since each daphnid is allowed to

7.

reproduce at least once.

2

## 3. Summary

When mortality is restricted to predation, starvation, and old age, causes of extinction in the structured community model are restricted to over-exploitation of prey and starvation. When the prey are assumed to have a constantly abundant resource, extinctions can only result from extinction of prey due to predation, or extinction of predators due to lack of sufficient prey of appropriate consumption size. The extinction thresholds obtained are of the former type, and are functions of the size-dependent predation mechanism.

If lethal effects of chemicals are introduced, the densities and size distributions of the populations are perturbed, causing changes in the extinction thresholds. In this case, extinction can also result from a lethal chemical dose to one of the populations.

Fig. 5. Extinction threshold as a function of  $k_{min}$  when  $k_{max} = \infty$ .

#### 4. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank William R. McKinney and Ray R. Lassiter for their contributions to the model and code development and Joanna S. Jaworska for her

. . . .

assistance in the initial analysis of the predator-prey model. This work was supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under Cooperative Agreement XE819569.

## 5. References

- 1. T. G. Hallam, R. R. Lassiter, J. Li, and W. McKinney, Env. Tox. Chem. 9 (1990) 597-621.
- 2. T. G. Hallam, R. R. Lassiter, and S. M. Henson, Modelling fish population dynamics: a physiologically based perspective, to appear (1994).
- 3. T. G. Hallam, R. R. Lassiter, J. Li, and L. A. Suarez, *Ecology* 71 (1990) 938-954.
- 4. T. G. Hallam, R. R. Lassiter, J. Jaworska, and W. McKinney, in *Recent Trends in Differential Equations*, ed. R. P. Agarwal (WSSAA 1, Singapore, 1992).
- 5. J. S. Jaworska, T. G. Hallam, S. M. Henson, W. R. McKinney, and R. R. Lassiter, in *Environmental Toxicology and Risk Assessment Third Volume*, eds. J. S. Hughes, et al. (ASTM STP, Philadelphia, 1994).



.



÷

Fig. 2

141



٠

:

Fig. 3

142

12.



743

;

13.

,



744

.

÷

14

.