Felipe-Lucia, M.R., Guerrero, A.M., Alexander, S.M., Ashander, J., Baggio, J.A., Barnes, M.L., Bodin, Ö., **Bonn, A.**, Fortin, M.-J., Friedman, R.S., Gephart, J.A., Helmstedt, K.J., Keyes, A.A., Kroetz, K., Massol, F., Pocock, M.J.O., Sayles, J., Thompson, R.M., Wood, S.A., Dee, L.E. (2022):
Conceptualizing ecosystem services using social–ecological networks
Trends Ecol. Evol. **37** (3), 211 - 222

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2021.11.012

Target journal: Trends in Ecology and Evolution. *Opinion*

Title: Conceptualizing ecosystem services using social-ecological networks

Authors: María R. Felipe-Lucia, Angela M. Guerrero, Steven M. Alexander, Jaime Ashander, Jacopo A. Baggio, Michele L. Barnes, Örjan Bodin, Aletta Bonn, Marie-Josée Fortin, Rachel S. Friedman, Jessica A. Gephart, Kate J. Helmstedt, Aislyn A. Keyes, Kailin Kroetz, François Massol, Michael J.O. Pocock, Jesse Sayles, Ross M. Thompson, Spencer A. Wood, Laura E. Dee.

Corresponding author: Felipe-Lucia, M.R. (maria.felipe-lucia@idiv.de; maria.felipe.lucia@gmail.com)

Affiliations

María R. Felipe-Lucia, Department Ecosystem Services, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ) and German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig. Puschstrasse 4, 04103 Leipzig, Germany. ORCID 0000-0003-1915-8169 https://www.ufz.de/index.php?en=45282

Angela M. Guerrero, Stockholm Resilience Centre, Kräftriket 2B, 10691 Stockholm, Sweden, and Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Queensland, 4000, Australia. ORCID 0000-0002-1556-9860.

Steven M. Alexander, Environmental Change and Governance Group, University of Waterloo. 200 University Ave W, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1 Canada. ORCID 0000-0001-9285-879X. Twitter: @salexander_11

Jaime Ashander, Resources for the Future 1616 P St NW Washington DC 20036 USA. ORCID 0000-0002-1841-4768. Twitter: @jaimedash

Jacopo A. Baggio, School of Politics, Security and International Affairs, National Center for Integrated Coastal Research. 4297 Andromeda Loop N, Orlando, FL, 32816, USA. ORCID 0000-0002-9616-4143

Michele L. Barnes, ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Townsville, QLD 4810, Australia. ORCID 0000-0002-1151-4037

Örjan Bodin, Stockholm Resilience Centre, Kräftriket 2B, 10691 Stockholm, Sweden. ORCID 0000-0002-8218-1153

Aletta Bonn, Department Ecosystem Services, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ), German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, and Friedrich Schiller University of Jena. Puschstrasse 4, 04103 Leipzig, Germany. ORCID 0000-0002-8345-4600

Marie-Josée Fortin, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Toronto. 25 Willcocks Street, Toronto, ON M5S 3B2 Canada. ORCID 0000-0002-9935-1366.

Rachel S Friedman, Institute for Climate, Energy & Disaster Solutions, The Australian National University College of Science. Building 141, Linnaeus Way, Acton, ACT 2601 Australia. ORCID 0000-0002-9437-9239. Twitter: @YumMusings

Jessica A. Gephart, Department of Environmental Science, American University. 4400 Massachusetts Ave NW, Washington, DC 20016 USA. ORCID 0000-0001-6836-9291. Twitter: @jagephart

Kate J. Helmstedt, School of Mathematical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology. 2 George St, Brisbane City QLD 4000 Australia. ORCID 0000-0003-0201-5348. Lab website: katehelmstedt.com. Twitter: @KateHelmstedt

Aislyn A. Keyes, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder. Ramaley Biology, Boulder, CO 80302 USA. ORCID 0000-0002-1323-1735. Twitter: @AislynAKeyes

Kailin Kroetz, School of Sustainability, Arizona State University & Resources for the Future. PO Box 875502, Tempe, AZ 85287-5502 USA.

Francois Massol, University of Lille, CNRS, Inserm, CHU Lille, Institut Pasteur de Lille, U1019 - UMR 9017, Center for Infection and Immunity of Lille (CIIL), F-59000 Lille, France. ORCID 0000-0002-4098-955X

Michael J.O. Pocock, Centre for Ecology & Hydrology. Wallingford, Oxfordshire, OX10 9QY , UK. ORCID 0000-0003-4375-0445

Jesse S. Sayles, ORISE Postdoctoral Fellow Appointed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development. Center for Environmental Measurement and Modeling. Atlantic Coastal Environmental Sciences Division. 27 Tarzwell Dr, Narragansett, RI 02882, USA. ORCID 0000-0002-1837-8920. http://saylesunchartedwaters.com. Twitter: @SaylesJS

Ross M. Thompson, Centre for Applied Water Science, Institute for Applied Ecology, University of Canberra, ACT 2617 Australia.

Spencer A. Wood, College of the Environment, University of Washington. Box 352100, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195 USA. ORCID 0000-0002-5794-2619

Laura E. Dee, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Colorado, Boulder. Ramaley Biology, Boulder, CO 80302 USA. ORCID 0000-0003-0471-1371. Lab website: lauraedee.com; Twitter: @LauraEllenDee

Abstract

Social-ecological networks (SENs) represent the complex relationships between ecological and social systems, and a useful tool for analyzing and managing ecosystem services. However, mainstreaming the application of SEN in ecosystem service research has been hindered by a lack of clarity about how to match research questions to ecosystem services conceptualizations in SEN (i.e., either as nodes, links, attributes, or emergent properties). Building from different disciplines, we propose a typology for representing ecosystem service in SENs and identify opportunities and challenges of using SENs in ecosystem service research. Our typology provides guidance for this growing field to improve research design and increase the breadth of questions that can be addressed with SEN to understand human-nature interdependencies in a changing world.

Keywords: multilayer networks, multiplex network, complex systems, social-ecological interactions, coupled human and natural systems, nature contributions to people

Ecosystem services as social-ecological networks

Ecosystem services (see Glossary) represent an interface between ecological and social systems, as the benefits people receive from nature [1]. Given the inherent dependencies between social and ecological systems, **social-ecological networks** (hereafter SENs) have recently been proposed as a promising approach for conceptualizing and managing ecosystem services [2–6]. SENs complement and enhance current approaches to ecosystem service research (Box 1), such as those focused on spatial mapping or valuing ecosystem services [7,8], by explicitly considering complex interactions, dependencies, and feedbacks between ecosystem services and their underlying social and ecological components [3,4].

Despite this growing interest, we still lack guidance for conceptualizing particular ecosystem services in SEN analyses and identifying contexts in which ecosystem service research could benefit the most from a SEN approach [9,10]. SENs are an extraordinarily flexible tool for studying ecosystem services, yet this flexibility also raises questions about how to apply them. Ecosystem services have been explicitly represented as elements of networks: as an **attribute** of social or ecological **nodes** [4], as **nodes** in a network together with ecological and/or social nodes [3,5,11–13], and as **links** between social and ecological nodes [9,14]. Alternatively, ecosystem services have been conceptualized as an implicit outcome or **emergent property** of the interactions in a network, rather than explicitly depicted in a SEN [15–18]. As a result, it remains unclear how different representations may support specific research questions or contexts, and when they may lead to divergent conclusions. Furthermore, data to build SENs are often rare, siloed in particular disciplines (e.g., social or ecological studies), and can be difficult and costly to gather [19]. As a consequence, clear objectives and methodological understanding are needed to reconcile these diverse conceptualizations and identify the best SEN representation for different research questions and contexts and to guide future data collection efforts.

Here, we synthesize and align research on SEN approaches for ecosystem service research. To do so, we bring together perspectives from an interdisciplinary group of researchers working with social, ecological, social-ecological networks, and ecosystem services. Specifically, we provide a typology for representing ecosystem services using SENs. Our perspective aims to support future studies addressing the remaining challenges to fully realize the potential of SENs in ecosystem service research. Furthermore, our typology provides guidance for this growing body of work, including consideration of the diverse ways in which ecosystem services can be represented in a SEN and the benefits of each. Together, this typology can help improve research designs by aligning specific SEN conceptualizations and research questions.

Representing ecosystem services in social-ecological networks

Building on examples from the literature (see Table 1), we identified four main approaches for representing and analyzing ecosystem services as part of SENs: ecosystem services as links, nodes, node attributes, or as emergent properties of the network (Figure 1; see Supplementary Figure 1 for a terrestrial example). We propose that the choice of representation ought to be guided by the research question and context – rather than suggesting a single "best" representation. Thus, we provide examples of key questions each approach can answer and identify associated applications and data requirements (Table 1).

In all representations, we describe a basic conceptualization of the study system as a network composed of two node categories: social (e.g., diver, farmer) and ecological (e.g., fish, coral). Nodes within each category can be linked to create a layer of social or ecological interactions. Links between social nodes can represent information or resource exchange, while links between ecological nodes can represent trophic interactions or competition. In turn, a SEN can constitute a **multilayer** network with three interaction types: those between social nodes, between ecological nodes, and between social and ecological nodes, where the latter can represent e.g., management of an ecological node [14,20]. Other concepts such as drivers of change or stressors (e.g., deforestation, overfishing) can also be represented as nodes [3,12,21].

Ecosystem services as links (ES-links; Figure 1A)
In the ES-links approach, directed links from ecological nodes to social nodes represent the **ecosystem service flow** [10,14]. Links can be weighted, to indicate the amount of service provided. Links from a species to a beneficiary could represent supply of ecosystem services such as aesthetic value or food, while links from an actor to a species could indicate attachment (e.g., symbolic value) or management (e.g., conservation) affecting the nodes [15,17]. Utilizing the three interaction types of a SEN, it is possible to ask questions about the role of ecological interactions in ecosystem service supply (e.g., *how do fish-coral relationships affect fisheries yields and aesthetic values of coral reefs?*), or how ecosystem services flow through the social system (e.g., who sells fish to whom or who benefits from tourism?) [22].

The ES-links approach focuses on identifying how the different nodes are connected to deliver or manage ecosystem services, which requires detailed information on both the ecological and social layers or subnetworks. As a result, this representation is best suited for analyzing how loss or change in one node can affect supply or management of ecosystem services in other parts of the system (Table 1). Therefore, the ES-links approach can, for example, contribute to forecasting impacts of stressors such as climate change, and how these impacts may propagate through a SEN [13,23]. This approach can also be applied to understand interdependencies in the system due to ecosystem services flowing from sources to their beneficiaries over long distances (i.e., telecoupling) [24,25].

Ecosystem services as nodes (ES-nodes; Figure 1B)

The ES-nodes approach represents ecosystem services as nodes, together with either social, ecological, or both types of nodes. This is a multilayer network approach that is convenient for representing relationships between an ecosystem service and the social and/or ecological system (*see* Dee et al. [3]). Ecological nodes can be included to indicate ecological entities that together deliver an ecosystem service (e.g., trophic networks or landscape features). Ecological interactions may be included if the research question is about impacts of ecosystem service management on biodiversity or ecosystem functions, or *vice versa* [3]. Social nodes can be added to indicate people who manage or benefit from ecosystem services in order to explore direct or indirect trade-offs between beneficiaries. For example, if the social node is a beneficiary of ecosystem services, the link could indicate whether this benefit flows directly from the ecological node or indirectly through other nodes. If the node is an actor involved in the management or governance of the ecosystem, a link between service and actor can represent the kind of management action (e.g., restoration, invasive species control, harvest quotas). In both cases, weights of links can represent the frequency or intensity of the relationship. In addition, it is possible to distinguish between positive (mutually supporting) and negative (antagonistic) relationships between nodes to analyze, for instance, how interactions in the social system, such as collaborations, impact ecosystem services through coordinated management actions [14,20,26,27]. The flexibility of the ES-nodes approach allows SENs to be constructed as Bayesian belief networks, where the states of social, ecological, and management or policy nodes can have a causal impact on ecosystem service nodes (i.e., with links representing causal relationships) [28–30].

The focus of the ES-nodes approach is on the existence or persistence of an ecosystem service rather than on the rate or amount of delivery that flows to people. Thus, it can be applied when there is no primary data on the magnitude or per-species contribution to ecosystem services, but an indicator of ecosystem service supply. This is particularly useful given that per-species data are often lacking and difficult to obtain for most ecosystems and services [13]. The ES-nodes approach can help assess how ecosystem services and network structure respond to drivers of change, such as species losses [13], climate change, or invasive species [3,12], and changes in governance structures [14,31] (see examples in Table 1). Representing ES as nodes instead of links can also facilitate an understanding of the relationships between multiple ecosystem services, and between services and other social or ecological nodes [19]. Trade-offs between the management of multiple ecosystem services and their potential users are then easier to detect [32,33]. An ES-nodes approach can describe multiple species providing a single service to different beneficiaries (e.g., multiple species pollinating crops) [34], or a service depending on multiple ecosystem functions or species (e.g., provisioning services associated with biodiversity and ecosystem functions at low land-use intensity levels) [3,11]. Another application of the ES-nodes approach is to assess how a service is affected by multiple stressors or threats [13]. For example, Rocha et al. [21] used a tripartite network to represent how stressors (e.g., deforestation and overfishing) lead to regime shifts in ecological systems that ultimately affect different ecosystem services. Keyes et al. [13] simulated direct and indirect consequences of species losses (e.g., from climate change) for multiple ecosystem services in coastal systems. Finally, the ES-nodes approach can contribute to studies on equity in the distribution of ecosystem services, including issues of procedural and distributive justice. For example, this can be analyzed using a multilayer network to identify which actors are more dependent on a predefined set of ecosystem services [35,36], and those with the greatest ability to manage or control services at different spatial scales [37], which is fundamental to multiscale power dynamics.

Ecosystem services as attributes of social or ecological nodes (ES-attributes; Figure 1C)
The ES-attributes approach represents ecosystem services as attributes of nodes, indicating whether and how the node is related to the ecosystem service [4]. Other social and ecological information about the node (e.g., type of social actors, species richness, etc.), can also be added as a node attribute. The ecological nodes shown in Figure 1C, for example, have three attributes: abundance (from common to rare), economic value (from low to high), and the ecosystem service attached to it (the provisioning service – food; or the cultural service – aesthetic value of an aquarium fish). Attributes of social nodes can also include ecosystem services to represent perceived values or management actions associated with them (not shown). For example, the attribute could represent the perceived ecosystem services received from the fish or natural resource an individual is connected to, or the ecosystem services impacted by the management actions of a manager or governance actor [37,38].

The ES-attributes approach is helpful when the social or ecological nodes or their links are central to the research question, such as interactions between users or managers, or interactions between species (Table 1). This type permits a single-layer representation when the research question is focused on one category of node (i.e., social or ecological), as the ecosystem service is captured by the node attributes. The ES-attributes approach may be useful when providers of ecosystem services are identifiable entities (e.g., harvestable fish stocks or seed varieties) [4], or when services are estimated from higher spatial scales, such as land cover maps (with e.g., habitat patches [39] or municipal boundaries [40] represented as a nodes). When nodes represent existing management units, such as a farmers' union or a forest patch, this approach may be particularly useful for decision-making by integrating with current management strategies. However, it would not be appropriate when existing management units are not properly designed to enhance ecosystem services [39] and could also oversimplify the system by assuming that ecosystem services can be estimated from land use/land cover maps, without testing those assumptions.

Ecosystem services as an emergent property of the network (ES-emergent; Figure 1D)
In the ES-emergent approach, ecosystem services are not explicitly depicted in the network because they result from overall interactions in the network as an emergent property of the system [41,42]. An example is farmers' cooperatives organized around water temples to maximize rice production in Bali [42] (see Supplementary Figure 1). In this example, each cooperative (node) is connected to other cooperatives by irrigation canals (link) through their paddy fields (node), in which they grow different rice varieties (node attribute). Biological pest control emerges as an ecosystem service from the interactions between farmers that coordinate water management and rice varieties. In this case, both the provisioning service (rice yield) and the regulating services (water supply and biological pest control) are quantifiable but not represented in the network; instead, authors consider these

services as emergent properties of the network. Similarly, in Figure 1, the cultural service of recreation results from the interplay of all actors that maintain adequate fish and coral populations, water quality, and a safe swimming environment [43]. Other cases where ecosystem services can be conceived of as emergent properties of habitat networks include those with dependence on particular species (e.g., a sufficiently connected habitat underlies seed dispersal by ring-tailed lemurs (*Lemur catta*) [48]).

The main focus of the ES-emergent approach is to represent relevant management units to the ecosystem service of interest (e.g., species, habitats, society, industry) and their connections, rather than identify or quantify links between specific actors and services (Table 1). For example, power dynamics between actors related to ecosystem services are often visualized as links, without explicit representation of ecosystem services [15,41,44]. The ES-emergent approach also applies to relational values that people have with nature and others [45,46], and which are tightly connected to experiences of cultural ecosystem services [47]. As another example, co-produced ecosystem services result from the combination of both natural processes and different types of anthropogenic contributions [48,49]. In this case, human actions can directly influence the individual ecological or social nodes, indirectly affecting the emergent ecosystem service. Coordinated management of different ecological nodes can lead to sustained supply of multiple ecosystem services at the landscape scale through persistence of wildlife populations that provide services [20,25].



Figure 1. **Typology of approaches for conceptualizing ecosystem services in social-ecological networks of social actors (grey), ecological entities (blue), and ecosystem services (ES, green).** **A. ES as links**: ES are directed links from sources to beneficiaries, where nodes are entities of the social-ecological system. **B. ES as nodes:** ES are nodes together with the social and ecological entities they are related to by links. **C. ES as node attribute:** ES are one attribute of each fish species, where nodes are both social and ecological entities. **D. ES as emergent property:** ES are represented as a circle surrounding the network, as they emerge as a property resulting from the interplay between different entities of the social-ecological system, which are represented as nodes. In all types, interactions between nodes could be positive (e.g., collaboration, influence, dependence, facilitation),

antagonistic (e.g., competence, predation), formal (e.g., contractual, kinship) or informal (e.g., friendship) relationships. See also Online Supplemental Information Figure S1.

Table 1. Key research questions for ecosystem services (ES) and their corresponding conceptualization in social-ecological networks. We provide examples of key questions each approach in our typology can answer and identify applications and data requirements of each.

Type of approach	**Key research questions appropriate for this representation**	**Applications in ES research**	**Data requirements**
ES as **links** representing flows (Figure 1A)	● What is the role of ecological interactions in ES supply? ● How do ES flow through the social system? ● How do changes in one node affect the flow of ecosystem services? ● How does managing social or ecological nodes affect the flow of ES?	● Identify interdependencies between systems affected by ES flows, including telecoupling [24,50–52]. ● Forecast impacts of stressors such as global change [3,53]. ● Predict potential threat propagation (e.g., drought, fires, disease, invasions) [16].	● Detailed information on either ecological or social networks. ● Dependent on the level of detail: trade-off between exhaustive (amount) versus precise (quality) information.
ES as **nodes** representing natural capital stocks (Figure 1B)	● How do drivers (e.g. invasive species or species losses*)* impact ES? ● How does directly or indirectly managing ES impact the rest of the system, including other ES? ● How does the structure of the governance network (i.e., the involvement of different types of actors) drive effective ES management? ● Who are the beneficiaries of ES?	● Relationships within multiple ES or between ES and other social or ecological nodes [19]. ● Studies on supply, demand, and governance of ES [31]. ● Trade-offs between multiple ES [32,33]. ● Equity and justice in access to ES or distribution of ES [35–37]. ● Use of Bayesian Belief Networks [28–30,54]. ● Incorporating ES in social-ecological	● Information on social and/or ecological networks (ES can represent the ecological or social underlying network, summarizing complex ecological or social interactions).

		fit analyses [55]. ● When primary data for ES are not available [3,12,31]. ● When multiple species provide a single ES to different beneficiaries [13]. ● When ES depends on multiple ecosystem functions or species [11].	
ES as **node attribute** (Figure 1C)	● What are the values attached to a particular species or landscape area? ● How do management actions taken by an actor affecting some species or landscape area impact ES supply?	● Existence of multiple layers of information or multiple values associated to a node (e.g., economic or cultural value, management actions). ● Defined ES providers or ES attached to a species (i.e., the species that delivers ES is a node), such as a harvestable fish population or individual [4]. ● ES estimated from higher spatial scales (e.g., a forest patch is a node) [40]. ● Integration of decision-making with existing management units [20].	● Abundant information for each of the nodes in the network. ● Additional covariates of interest (social and ecological data that is relevant to the research question can be captured as a node attribute).
ES as **emergent property** of the network (Figure 1D)	● What social and ecological elements are related to a particular ES? ● What are the ES outcomes of coordinated landscape management?	● Uncover the ES outcomes of network structure. ● Conceptualize relational values as SEN [45]. ● Analyze ES co-production as SEN [56,57].	● Identification of the many actors and connections. ● No requirement on quantification of ES or links from ES to particular actors. ● Generally not appropriate for large

		• Identify power dynamics between actors related to ES [15,44]. • When ES cannot be managed directly or management of ecological nodes is decentralized.	networks.

Remaining challenges and opportunities in the use of SENs for ecosystem service research

In this section, we identify key challenges and opportunities in the application of SENs that can help ecosystem services research to advance knowledge and fully leverage SEN approaches. In addition, we highlight the need for coordinated approaches to data collection in interdisciplinary research for generalizing insights in Box 2.

Mechanistic trade-offs in space and time. SEN can help identify potential trade-offs in ecosystem services through direct and indirect paths connecting services with antagonistic interactions. For example, take two competitor species that provide two different ecosystem services. Favoring the abundance of one to increase the ecosystem services provided by it can reduce the abundance, and correspondingly the ecosystem services stemming from the other species (Figure 1A). Transformations of Lotka-Volterra equations can be used to obtain competition coefficients from trophic interactions [58], while Genetic Algorithms can be used in multilayer networks to minimize trade-offs between ecosystem services associated to management practices [59].

Second-order effects. SEN can also detect time-lag responses of the ecological systems and/or the governance process. Predicting impacts on ecosystem services requires an understanding of how shocks propagate through SENs, such as identifying direct and indirect effects [3]. These can be represented using multilayer networks and hypergraphs, and analyzed using a variety of methods (see below) including Bayesian Belief Network approaches [29,30]. In addition, identifying the functional form of relationships between nodes related to ecosystem services [60] and simplifying networks into functional groups [61] has considerable promise to identify second-order effects and potential time-lags for managing ecosystem services [62].

Incorporating feedback and dynamics. Ecosystem service management rarely accounts for multiple interactions and feedback loops. SEN analysis is an interdisciplinary tool that could contribute to advancing this knowledge frontier, for example, by using network models that analyze structural change over time [63,64]. As time-series data become increasingly available, dynamic SEN models can be built on a common network structure to understand the determinants of network dynamics [64,65] . For example, dynamic stochastic block models can be used to understand evolution of node groups through time [63,66]. Stochastic actor-oriented models can be used to test competing explanations for network change and to calculate the relative effect of different factors influencing changes in the network [67].

Communal interactions. Networks typically only represent pairwise relationships between nodes, which might not be sufficient when ecosystem services stem from a common pool or are obtained through communal actions and cannot be reduced to a series of pairwise interactions. For instance, animals use group behavior to protect individuals against predators. Similarly, “work parties” for agricultural tasks result in services obtained at group level among the Duupa in sub-Sahelian Cameroon [68]. Recently, such communal interactions have been represented as simplicial complexes or hypergraphs [69–71]. Future research should investigate how to meaningfully approximate communal interactions in SEN, and which pieces of information would otherwise be overlooked. For example, while individual ecosystem service benefits can be represented using our

ES-links type (Figure 1A), community level benefits could be better captured using the ES-nodes (Figure 1B) or ES-emergent types (Figure 1D).

Weighted networks. Links between nodes can be weighted according to their strength (e.g., governance effectiveness or feeding rate), while nodes can be sized reflecting their state (e.g., population size, magnitude of service supplied). Such weighted networks can be used to compare ecosystem service outcomes from alternative management or governance scenarios. Modelling approaches able to integrate different types of weighted links in a multilayer network would contribute to advance these analyses but remain rare [72,73].

Methods to analyze multilayer networks. New methods from network theory have been developed for the analysis of multilayer networks [74,75], including methods to assess global properties (e.g., centralization [15], clustering [76]) and node-level properties (e.g., degree [74], hub score [11]). For example, multiplex network centrality has been used to assess the contribution of multiple ecosystem services to landscape resilience [39]. Further, these methods have been applied in a fully articulated SEN (*sensu* Sayles et al. [2]) showing that centralization in the multilayer network negatively correlates with collaboration productivity in watershed restoration [15]. Analyzing ecosystem services with multilayer networks can lead to results countering intuition developed from single layer networks. For example, clustering in multilayer networks has been related to a reduction in SES robustness to disturbance [77], while the opposite is often hinted at by single layer network analysis [78]. To further test hypothesized relationships between structure and outcomes in SEN, and to understand the implications of structure for ecosystem service flows, methods for structural statistics of multilayer networks need to be improved through interdisciplinary efforts and iterating modelling with case studies and experimentation [2,19,74].

Concluding Remarks

SENs bridge social and ecological systems to represent the complex relationships that exist within and between them, enabling combined analyses of both synergistic and antagonistic relationships such as collaboration and conflict. While previous studies have investigated how SENs can be used in environmental management, here we specifically focus on ecosystem services (also applicable to Nature Contributions to People [1]) in SENs. We show four ways in which ecosystem services can be integrated in SENs depending on the research focus. Importantly, neither the focal type of service (e.g., regulating versus provisioning services) nor the spatiotemporal scale of interest are a determinant for a particular conceptualization of ecosystem services in SEN. Instead, choosing a representation fundamentally depends on the research question addressed [18] and is constrained by the availability of data (Table 1). Because ecosystem services can be represented as part of a SEN in multiple ways, alternative SEN approaches allow us to capture different aspects of ecosystem services according to the question at hand (Table 1). For example, to focus on ecosystem service flows or interactions we recommend representing services as links, while to focus on the entities composing the system a node attribute representation fits better. If the system is very complex, representing ecosystem services as nodes is a good way to simplify the number of nodes, while all elements of the system could be explicitly represented in the network of less complex systems, and ecosystem services can be taken as the overall result of their interactions (emergent property) without being explicitly depicted.

We present a typology of ecosystem service representations in SENs to advance ecosystem services research and tackle complex social-ecological system management challenges. By disentangling which representation best fits different research contexts and delineating the data needed to answer some key ecosystem service questions, along with examples, we provide guidance for complex systems thinking via network analyses for ecosystem service research (Table 1). These conceptualizations of ecosystem services in SEN enable new joint research avenues for many disciplines, including social sciences, geography, and ecology (see Outstanding Questions), and support exploration of new aspects of ecosystem services and interactions within systems not evident through other approaches [79]. Acknowledging the multiple representations of ecosystem services in SEN can reveal additional applications of ecosystem services research to address complex human-nature interdependencies and help develop informed management and policy options in a changing world.

******

Box 1. How can SENs complement other approaches to ecosystem service research?

Ecosystem services research can benefit from integration with SEN applications. For example, in tandem with economic valuation methods [80,81] SENs could be used to investigate changes in people's preferences and values when they are aware of social-ecological connections [2]. Incorporating SEN into spatial ecosystem service mapping can provide information about: the direct or indirect role of stakeholders in influencing ecosystem services through conservation and management practices [82], information flows [83], cross-scale interactions among social actors [37] and ecosystem services [39], and long-distance connections through telecoupling [24,50–52]. When ecosystem services transcend local scales (e.g., climate regulation), SENs can assess whether collaborations across multiple spatial scales [84] match the scale of the ecological processes underpinning ecosystem services [19,20,85].

Building on Dee et al. [3], we argue that important information can be missed in ecosystem service studies that analyze only **social or ecological networks** rather than an integrated SEN [19,86,87], such as the role of social relationships in shaping management actions that affect the ecological network [88,89] or the complex ecological interactions underlying ecosystem service supply [5]. SENs can complement other integrated modeling frameworks (e.g., [90,91]) that acknowledge linkages *between*, and complexities *within*, both social and ecological layers. Accounting for these interdependencies is fundamental to advancing ecosystem services research, as ecosystem services directly represent the connection between social and ecological systems [3].

For instance, a question that remains open in ecosystem service science [92] is: *How do multiple ecosystem services interact, and what are the consequences of those interactions for their management?* An existing approach has been to map areas supplying multiple ecosystem services [93,94]. In turn, an ecological network approach could predict how management affects species providing ecosystem services by using simulations [13], while a social network analysis approach would identify policy actors associated with a particular ecosystem services to assess management coordination [95]. Yet, with a SEN, a researcher could identify *both* the underlying ecological processes that connect ecosystem services mechanistically – using the ES-links approach – and how they connect to beneficiaries – using the ES-nodes approach.

*****

Box 2. A Call for Coordinated Research and Data Collection for Generalizing Insights.

A standardized approach to measuring ecosystem services, together with key metrics for comparing studies using SEN, is needed to address sustainability challenges (Table 1). Developing and applying protocols for social-ecological system analyses [96] will allow to infer SEN patterns from case studies. This effort can enable us to synthesise knowledge from local, place-based research [97] and to develop SEN theory [2,53,84] and predictions about changes in ecosystem service supply. Additionally, uniform data collection could enable the parametrization of system models by extending parameters from similar case studies rather than collecting new data [98]. When extensive data is not available, researchers can use simpler SEN representations with ecosystem services as a surrogate of complex social-ecological interactions (i.e., ES-nodes approach, see Table 1).

To overcome outstanding challenges and to enable generalization and comparability across cases we suggest four steps for future studies:

1) *Choose appropriate and consistent indicators.*
Ecosystem service indicators should match the relevant social and ecological nodes connected to diverse types of services and their interactions. This refers particularly to cultural and regulating services, that are often ignored in SEN representations.

2) *Select comparable levels of complexity and use coordinated protocols*.
Our examples show how the research question can guide the level of detail and type of SEN representation. Sharing and following similar data collection and compilation protocols can facilitate comparisons and syntheses.

3) *Expand data continuity and scope.*
Expanding spatial coverage and continuous time-series data will foster the development of dynamic SEN models that incorporate ecosystem services dynamics, e.g. for analyses of time-lagged or spill-over effects of management on ecosystem service demand and use [99,100].

4) *Leverage existing data.*
Large scale initiatives, such as LTSER (Long-Term Social-Ecological Research) platforms and national-level projects (e.g., www.nsercresnet.ca) could support SEN data needs. Leveraging existing databases, e.g. for trade (https://comtrade.un.org/; https://trase.earth/) or social-ecological regime shifts (https://regimeshifts.org/) offer great potential for SEN analyses.

******

Glossary	
Ecological network	Network depicting ecological entities, such as species, functional groups, or patches, and the processes that connect them (e.g., species interactions, connectivity through dispersal).
Ecosystem service	Material or immaterial benefits people receive from nature. They are often classified as provisioning (e.g., food, water), cultural (e.g., learning, inspiration, aesthetic value), and regulating (e.g., carbon sequestration, water purification). The Nature Contributions to People [1] concept can also be employed.
Ecosystem service flow	Rate at which people use ecosystem services derived from a stock (for provisioning and cultural services), or regulating services derived from species interactions (e.g., predation).
Emergent property	Overall outcome, or property of the network, which results from the interactions between network components.
Link	Connection between two nodes (e.g., dispersal between patches or resource exchange between actors). Synonyms: *arc, edge, interaction, tie*.
Multilayer networks and associated concepts	A family of networks that model multiple layers of information. **Multilevel networks** include multiple types of nodes (called multipartite), as in Figure 1. **Multilayer (or multi-relational)** networks allow for multiple kinds of links between nodes. Certain multilevel approaches (called **multiplex networks**) incorporate multiple link types (e.g., trophic and mutualistic interactions [72]) between nodes of the same kind. Here, we loosely use the term "multilayer" to refer to all these networks. Related concepts include **multi-networks** and **networks of networks**.
Network approach	A system of connected entities (nodes) and their pattern of interactions conceptualized and/or analyzed to understand how relations between entities of interest affect specific outcomes and/or are the results of specific underlying processes.
Node	An identifiable component of a network (e.g., user, beneficiary, species). Synonyms: *actor, alter, ego, entity, vertex.*
Node attribute	A characteristic of a node (e.g., market price of a fish, see Figure 1).
Social network	Network depicting interactions (e.g., knowledge exchange, trust, collaboration, resource sharing) between social actors (e.g., individuals, communities, organizations).
Social-Ecological Network (SEN)	A network that considers connections *within* and *between* the social and ecological layers (i.e., a fully articulated [2] or Type III [9] networks), in contrast to ecological networks or social networks which only account for interactions *within* one of these layers. For simplicity, we also consider as SENs those networks that only include

	the interactions *between* social and ecological nodes (i.e., partially articulated [2] or Type II [9] networks).

Acknowledgments

We are thankful to Editor A.E. A. Stephens and two anonymous reviewers for insightful comments on an earlier version of the article. We acknowledge funding from the National Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center (SESYNC) to L.E. Dee, A.M. Guerrero, R. Friedman for funding a workshop that developed this research, under funding received from the National Science Foundation (NSF) DBI-1639145. We thank other participants of the workshop for fruitful discussions, as well as G. Rada and S. Bernhardt from iDiv Media and Communications for creating the figures. J. Ashander and J. Gephart also acknowledge SESYNC for support. A. Bonn and M. R. Felipe-Lucia gratefully acknowledge the support of iDiv funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG–FZT 118, 202548816) and members of the ESS lab for insightful comments. M.L. Barnes acknowledges support from the Australian Research Council (grant no. DE190101583 and CE140100020). Ö. Bodin acknowledge support from the research council FORMAS through grant 2020-01551. L.E. Dee acknowledges support from NSF OCE-2049360. M.-J. Fortin acknowledges support from NSERC Discovery Grant and Canada Research Chair in Spatial Ecology. K.J. Helmstedt acknowledges support from the Australian Research Council Fellowship DE200101791. J.S. Sayles was supported by an appointment to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Research Participation Program administered by the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (ORISE) through an interagency agreement between the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the EPA. ORISE is managed by ORAU under DOE contract number DE-SC0014664. S.A. Wood was supported by a Data Science Environments project award from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation (Award 2013-10-29) and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (Award 3835) to the University of Washington eScience Institute. All opinions expressed in this paper are the author's and do not necessarily reflect the policies and views of US EPA, DOE, or ORAU/ORISE.

REFERENCES

1 Díaz, S. *et al.* (2015) The IPBES Conceptual Framework — connecting nature and people. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 14, 1–16

2 Sayles, J.S. *et al.* (2019) Social-ecological network analysis for sustainability sciences: a systematic review and innovative research agenda for the future. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 14, 093003

3 Dee, L.E. *et al.* (2017) Operationalizing Network Theory for Ecosystem Service Assessments. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 32, 118–130

4 Bohan *et al.* (2016) Networking Our Way to Better Ecosystem Service Provision. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 31, 105–115

5 Dee, L.E. *et al.* (2017) Do Social–Ecological Syndromes Predict Outcomes for Ecosystem Services? – a Reply to Bodin et al. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 32, 549–552

6 Bodin, Ö. *et al.* (2017) Social-Ecological Network Approaches in Interdisciplinary Research: A Response to Bohan et al. and Dee et al. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 32, 547–549

7 Seppelt, R. *et al.* (2011) A quantitative review of ecosystem service studies: approaches, shortcomings and the road ahead. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 48, 630–636

8 Martínez-Harms, M.J. and Balvanera, P. (2012) Methods for mapping ecosystem service supply: a review. *Int. J. Biodivers. Sci. Ecosyst. Serv. Amp Manag.* 8, 17–25

9 Kluger, L.C. *et al.* (2020) Studying human–nature relationships through a network lens: A systematic review. *People Nat.* 2, 1100–1116

10 Saunders, M.E. *et al.* Ecosystem services networks: an accessible framework for decision-making. 14-Feb-(2019), EcoEvoRxiv

11 Felipe-Lucia, M.R. *et al.* (2020) Land-use intensity alters networks between biodiversity, ecosystem functions, and services. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 117, 28140–28149

12 Jacob, U. *et al.* (2020) Marine conservation: towards a multi-layered network approach. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 375, 20190459

13 Keyes, A.A. *et al.* (2021) An ecological network approach to predict ecosystem service vulnerability to species losses. *Nat. Commun.* 12, 1586

14 Metzger, J.P. *et al.* (2021) Connecting governance interventions to ecosystem services provision: A social-ecological network approach. *People Nat.* 3, 266–280

15 Sayles, J.S. and Baggio, J.A. (2017) Social–ecological network analysis of scale mismatches in estuary watershed restoration. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 114, E1776–E1785

16 Barnes, M.L. *et al.* (2020) Social determinants of adaptive and transformative responses to climate change. *Nat. Clim. Change* 10, 823–828

17 Bodin, Ö. *et al.* (2016) Theorizing benefits and constraints in collaborative environmental governance: a transdisciplinary social-ecological network approach for empirical investigations. *Ecol. Soc.* 21(1):40

18 Bodin, Ö. and Tengö, M. (2012) Disentangling intangible social–ecological systems. *Glob. Environ. Change* 22, 430–439

19 Bodin, Ö. *et al.* (2019) Improving network approaches to the study of complex social–ecological interdependencies. *Nat. Sustain.* 2, 551–559

20 Guerrero, A. *et al.* (2015) Achieving social-ecological fit through bottom-up collaborative governance: an empirical investigation. *Ecol. Soc.* 20(4):41

21 Rocha, J. *et al.* (2015) Marine regime shifts: drivers and impacts on ecosystems services. *Phil Trans R Soc B* 370, 20130273

22 González-Mon, B. *et al.* (2019) Small-scale fish buyers' trade networks reveal diverse actor types and differential adaptive capacities. *Ecol. Econ.* 164, 106338

23 Holstein, T. *et al.* (2021) Optimization of coupling and global collapse in diffusively coupled socio-ecological resource exploitation networks. *New J. Phys.* 23, 033027

24 Koellner, T. *et al.* (2019) Guidance for assessing interregional ecosystem service flows. *Ecol. Indic.* 105, 92–106

25 Dolan, R. *et al.* (2021) The flows of nature to people, and of people to nature: Applying movement concepts to ecosystem services. *Land* 10, 576

26 Kuslits, B. *et al.* (2021) Ecosystem services becoming political: How ecological processes shape local resource-management networks. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* 9,

27 Bodin, Ö. *et al.* (2020) Reconciling conflict and cooperation in environmental governance: A social network perspective. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 45, 471–495

28 Schmitt, L.H.M. and Brugere, C. (2013) Capturing ecosystem services, stakeholders' preferences and trade-offs in coastal aquaculture decisions: A Bayesian Belief Network application. *Plos One* 8, e75956

29 Dang, K.B. *et al.* (2019) A Bayesian Belief Network - Based approach to link ecosystem functions with rice provisioning ecosystem services. *Ecol. Indic.* 100, 30–44

30 Landuyt, D. *et al.* (2013) A review of Bayesian Belief Networks in ecosystem service modelling. *Environ. Model. Softw.* 46, 1–11

31 Alonso Roldán, V. *et al.* (2015) Linking marine and terrestrial ecosystem services through governance social networks analysis in Central Patagonia (Argentina). *Ecosyst. Serv.* 16, 390–402

32 Hines, J. *et al.* (2015) Chapter Four - Towards an Integration of Biodiversity–Ecosystem Functioning and Food Web Theory to Evaluate Relationships between Multiple Ecosystem Services. In *Advances in Ecological Research* 53, Supplement C vols. (Woodward, G. and Bohan, D. A., eds), pp. 161–199, Academic Press

33 Carcamo, P.F. *et al.* (2014) Using stakeholders' perspective of ecosystem services and biodiversity features to plan a marine protected area. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 40, 116–131

34 Bennett, J.M. *et al.* (2020) Land use and pollinator dependency drives global patterns of pollen limitation in the Anthropocene. *Nat. Commun.* 11, 3999

35 Felipe-Lucia, M.R. *et al.* (2015) Ecosystem Services Flows: Why Stakeholders' Power Relationships Matter. *PLoS One* 10, e0132232

36 Berbes-Blazquez, M. *et al.* (2016) Towards an ecosystem services approach that addresses social power relations. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 19, 134–143

37 Martín-López, B. *et al.* (2019) A novel telecoupling framework to assess social relations across spatial scales for ecosystem services research. *J. Environ. Manage.* 241, 251–263

38 Cumming, G.S. *et al.* (2010) Network analysis in conservation biogeography: challenges and opportunities. *Divers. Distrib.* 16, 414–425

39 Field, R.D. and Parrott, L. (2017) Multi-ecosystem services networks: A new perspective for assessing landscape connectivity and resilience. *Ecol. Complex.* 32, 31–41

40 Rathwell, K. and Peterson, G. (2012) Connecting Social Networks with Ecosystem Services for Watershed Governance: a Social-Ecological Network Perspective Highlights the Critical Role of Bridging Organizations. *Ecol. Soc.* 17(2): 24

41 Ernstson, H. (2013) The social production of ecosystem services: A framework for studying environmental justice and ecological complexity in urbanized landscapes. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* 109, 7–17

42 Lansing, J. and Kremer, J. (1993) Emergent Properties of Balinese Water Temple Networks: Coadaptation on a Rugged Fitness Landscape. *Am. Anthropol.* 95, 97–114

43 Arkema, K.K. *et al.* (2015) Embedding ecosystem services in coastal planning leads to better outcomes for people and nature. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 112, 7390–7395

44 Vallet, A. *et al.* (2020) Power asymmetries in social networks of ecosystem services governance. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 114, 329–340

45 Hartel, T. *et al.* (2020) Understanding human-nature connections through value networks: the case of ancient wood-pastures of Central Romania. *Sustain. Sci.* DOI: 10.1007/s11625-020-00811-z

46 Arias-Arévalo, P. *et al.* (2017) Exploring intrinsic, instrumental, and relational values for sustainable management of social-ecological systems. *Ecol. Soc.* 22(4):43

47 Chan, K.M.A. *et al.* (2012) Where are Cultural and Social in Ecosystem Services? A Framework for Constructive Engagement. *BioScience* 62, 744–756

48 Palomo, I. *et al.* (2016) Chapter Six - Disentangling the Pathways and Effects of Ecosystem Service Co-Production. In *Advances in Ecological Research* 54 (Bohan, D. A. and Woodward, G., eds), pp. 245–283, Academic Press

49 Lavorel, S. *et al.* (2020) Co-producing ecosystem services for adapting to climate change. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 375, 20190119

50 Sonderegger, G. *et al.* (2020) Telecoupling visualizations through a network lens: a systematic review. *Ecol. Soc.* 25(4):47

51 Hull, V. and Liu, J. (2018) Telecoupling: A new frontier for global sustainability. *Ecol. Soc.* 23(4):41

52 Seaquist, J.W. and Johansson, E.L. (2019) Toolbox: Operationalising Telecoupling with Network Analysis. In *Telecoupling: Exploring Land-Use Change in a Globalised World* (Friis, C. and Nielsen, J. Ø., eds), pp. 199–211, Springer International Publishing

53 Janssen, M. *et al.* (2006) Toward a Network Perspective of the Study of Resilience in Social-Ecological Systems. *Ecol. Soc.* 11(1): 15

54 Barton, D.N. *et al.* (2016) Assessing ecosystem services from multifunctional trees in pastures using Bayesian belief networks. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 18, 165–174

55 Bergsten, A. *et al.* (2019) Identifying governance gaps among interlinked sustainability challenges. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 91, 27–38

56 Vialatte, A. *et al.* (2019) A conceptual framework for the governance of multiple ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes. *Landsc. Ecol.* 34, 1653–1673

57 Fischer, A. and Eastwood, A. (2016) Coproduction of ecosystem services as human–nature interactions—An analytical framework. *Land Use Policy* 52, 41–50

58 Bastolla, U. *et al.* (2005) Biodiversity in model ecosystems, I: coexistence conditions for competing species. *J. Theor. Biol.* 235, 521–530

59 Windsor, F.M. *et al.* (2021) Identifying plant mixes for multiple ecosystem service provision in agricultural systems using ecological networks. *J. Appl. Ecol.* DOI: 10.1111/1365-2664.14007

60 Manning, P. *et al.* (2019) Chapter Ten - Transferring biodiversity-ecosystem function research to the management of ‘real-world’ ecosystems. In *Advances in Ecological Research* 61 (Eisenhauer, N. et al., eds), pp. 323–356, Academic Press

61 Zanin, M. (2021) Simplifying functional network representation and interpretation through causality clustering. *Sci. Rep.* 11, 15378

62 Mayfield, M.M. and Stouffer, D.B. (2017) Higher-order interactions capture unexplained complexity in diverse communities. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 1, 1–7

63 Matias, C. and Miele, V. (2017) Statistical clustering of temporal networks through a dynamic stochastic block model. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* 79, 1119–1141

64 Fortin, M.-J. *et al.* (2021) Network ecology in dynamic landscapes. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 288, 20201889

65 Cinner, J.E. *et al.* (2019) Sixteen years of social and ecological dynamics reveal challenges and opportunities for adaptive management in sustaining the commons. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 116, 26474–26483

66 Chiquet, J. *et al.* (2021) *sbm: Stochastic Blockmodels*,

67 Snijders, T.A.B. (2017) Stochastic Actor-Oriented Models for Network Dynamics. *Annu. Rev. Stat. Its Appl.* 4, 343–363

68 Garine, E. (2001) An ethnographic account to the many roles of millet beer in the culture of the Duupa agriculturalists (Poli Mountains, Northern Cameroon). In *Drinking : An Anthropological Approach* (Garine, E. and Garine, V., eds), pp. 191–204, Berghan Press

69 Battiston, F. *et al.* (2020) Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics. *Phys. Rep.* 874, 1–92
70 Golubski, A.J. *et al.* (2016) Ecological Networks over the Edge: Hypergraph Trait-Mediated Indirect Interaction (TMII) Structure. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 31, 344–354
71 Iacopini, I. *et al.* (2019) Simplicial models of social contagion. *Nat. Commun.* 10, 1–9
72 Pilosof, S. *et al.* (2017) The multilayer nature of ecological networks. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 1, 0101
73 Hutchinson, M.C. *et al.* (2019) Seeing the forest for the trees: Putting multilayer networks to work for community ecology. *Funct. Ecol.* 33, 206–217
74 Kivela, M. *et al.* (2014) Multilayer networks. *J. Complex Netw.* 2, 203–271
75 De Domenico, M. *et al.* (2013) Mathematical Formulation of Multilayer Networks. *Phys. Rev. X* 3, 041022
76 Cozzo, E. *et al.* (2015) Structure of triadic relations in multiplex networks. *New J. Phys.* 17, 073029
77 Baggio, J.A. and Hillis, V. (2018) Managing ecological disturbances: Learning and the structure of social-ecological networks. *Environ. Model. Softw.* 109, 32–40
78 Delmas, E. *et al.* (2019) Analysing ecological networks of species interactions. *Biol. Rev.* 94, 16–36
79 Pocock, M.J.O. *et al.* (2016) Chapter Two - The Visualisation of Ecological Networks, and Their Use as a Tool for Engagement, Advocacy and Management. In *Advances in Ecological Research* 54 (Woodward, G. and Bohan, D. A., eds), pp. 41–85, Academic Press
80 Pascual, U. *et al.* (2012) The economics of valuing ecosystem services and biodiversity. *Econ. Ecosyst. Biodivers. Ecol. Econ. Found.* DOI: 10.4324/9781849775489
81 Costanza, R. *et al.* (2014) Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. *Glob. Environ. Change* 26, 152–158
82 Mbaru, E.K. and Barnes, M.L. (2017) Key players in conservation diffusion: Using social network analysis to identify critical injection points. *Biol. Conserv.* 210, 222–232
83 Lange, E. de *et al.* (2019) Improving Environmental Interventions by Understanding Information Flows. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 34, 1034–1047
84 Bodin, Ö. (2017) Collaborative environmental governance: Achieving collective action in social-ecological systems. *Science* 357, 6352,
85 Guerrero, A.M. *et al.* (2015) Achieving Cross-Scale Collaboration for Large Scale Conservation Initiatives. *Conserv. Lett.* 8, 107–117
86 Barnes, M.L. *et al.* (2019) Social-ecological alignment and ecological conditions in coral reefs. *Nat. Commun.* 10, 2039
87 Guerrero, A.M. and Wilson, K.A. (2017) Using a social-ecological framework to inform the implementation of conservation plans. *Conserv. Biol.* 31, 290–301
88 Rhodes, J.R. *et al.* (2020) Fundamental insights on when social network data are most critical for conservation planning. *Conserv. Biol.* 34, 1463–1472
89 Stier, A.C. *et al.* (2017) Integrating Expert Perceptions into Food Web Conservation and Management. *Conserv. Lett.* 10, 67–76
90 Pickett, S.T.A. *et al.* (2005) Biocomplexity in Coupled Natural–Human Systems: A Multidimensional Framework. *Ecosystems* 8, 225–232

91 Liu, J. *et al.* (2007) Complexity of Coupled Human and Natural Systems. *Science* 317, 1513–1516

92 Bennett, E.M. (2017) Research Frontiers in Ecosystem Service Science. *Ecosystems* 20, 31–37

93 Clec'h, S.L. *et al.* (2016) Mapping multiple ecosystem services indicators: Toward an objective-oriented approach. *Ecol. Indic.* 69, 508–521

94 Simons, N.K. *et al.* (2021) National Forest Inventories capture the multifunctionality of managed forests in Germany. *For. Ecosyst.* 8, 5

95 Lubell, M. *et al.* (2014) Network structure and institutional complexity in an ecology of water management games. *Ecol. Soc.* 19(4): 23

96 Biggs, R. *et al.*, eds. (2021) *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods for Social-Ecological Systems*, Routledge.

97 Balvanera, P. *et al.* (2017) Interconnected place-based social–ecological research can inform global sustainability. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* 29, 1–7

98 Firkowski, C.R. *et al.* (2021) Monitoring social–ecological networks for biodiversity and ecosystem services in human-dominated landscapes. *FACETS* 6, 1670–1692

99 Rieb, J.T. *et al.* (2017) When, Where, and How Nature Matters for Ecosystem Services: Challenges for the Next Generation of Ecosystem Service Models. *BioScience* 67, 820–833

100 Snäll, T. *et al.* (2021) High rates of short-term dynamics of forest ecosystem services. *Nat. Sustain.* DOI: 10.1038/s41893-021-00764-w