Heterogeneity: Meaning and Measurement, Causes and Consequences

Zhanshan (Sam) Ma[12]* Aaron M. Ellison[13]
[1]Harvard University, Harvard Forest
324 North Main Street, Petersham
Massachusetts 01366, USA
[2]Computational Biology and Medical Ecology Lab
Biostatistics and Image Genetics Lab
Kunming Institute of Zoology
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming, China
[3]Sound Solutions for Sustainable Science
Boston, Massachusetts 02135, USA
*For correspondence: ma@vandals.uidaho.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS[1]

ABSTRACT

Heterogeneity—the variation within and among collectives whose constituent entities interact and integrate into larger, functioning wholes, distinguished fundamentally from diversity as mere variation within non-interacting populations—has emerged as a central organizing principle across ecology and its allied fields. Yet the term remains ambiguously defined, often conflated with diversity despite fundamental conceptual differences. Drawing on Shavit and Ellison's (2021) distinction between diversity (variation within populations) and heterogeneity (variation within interacting collectives), this review synthesizes heterogeneity research through four interconnected

---

[1]Preprint posted on EcoEvoRxiv.

lenses: concepts and metrics, models and frameworks, causes and consequences, and applied contexts. We trace the conceptual maturation from historical confusion to a coherent dual-thread paradigm distinguishing environmental heterogeneity (the abiotic template) from ecological heterogeneity (biotic variation in distributions, traits, and interactions). Throughout, we address two foundational tensions: the striking heterogeneity of heterogeneity itself—the fact that the concept is defined and practiced in frequently remarkably different ways across fields—and the extreme pluralism of methods used to study it. Methodologically, we distinguish between metrics—specialized tools for disentangling specific signals while controlling for confounders—and higher-order models and frameworks that integrate multiple components into structured analytical pipelines. The review synthesizes evidence for heterogeneity as a driver of biodiversity, revealing that heterogeneity–diversity relationships are shaped by the area–heterogeneity tradeoff, scale dependence, and context-dependency. We further examine how ecological heterogeneity mediates ecosystem stability through network architectures and feedback loops. Applications across agriculture, forestry, water resources, geology, and planetary science demonstrate heterogeneity's practical relevance, revealing a universal principle: in complex systems, heterogeneity is both cause and consequence, with template and process locked in recursive feedback across scales. Extending this view beyond ecology's allied disciplines—into physics, biomedicine, social science, and computation—reveals that the same core principles resonate across domains as distant as coupled oscillators, neural networks, economic markets, and tumor evolution. Power laws govern the scaling of heterogeneity everywhere; the Gaussian is the exception, not the rule. In our concluding perspective, we navigate the tension between disciplinary traditions and the pursuit of a unified framework, offering a preliminary synthesis toward common conceptual and methodological ground while respecting the distinct epistemic commitments of individual disciplines.

Introduction

The concept of difference is foundational to scientific inquiry. Noticing and measuring differences enables us to build categories, construct models, and formulate causal explanations. Yet as Shavit and Ellison (2021) argue, the term “difference” masks a critical distinction: diversity and heterogeneity are not the same. Diversity, in their framework, describes variation within a population—a collection of entities with no prerequisite of interaction or joint structure. Heterogeneity, by contrast, describes variation within a collective—a group whose constituent entities interact and integrate into a larger, complex whole. A zoo is diverse; an ecosystem is heterogeneous. Both may contain the same number of species and individuals in the same spatial proximity, but only the ecosystem embodies the interactions and structures that transform a mere collection into a functioning collective. In a zoo, animals are caged and isolated; between different species, no ecologically meaningful interactions occur.

This distinction has significance far beyond ecology. A recent cross-disciplinary literature analysis identified approximately 1,200 highly cited papers on heterogeneity spanning more than a dozen disciplines, including anthropology and sociology, biochemistry and molecular biology, bioinformatics and computational biology, computational science and engineering, economics, geology, medicine, agriculture, forestry and natural resources, physics, political science, psychology and psychiatry, and statistics (Ma & Ellison, 2024). Across these fields, heterogeneity emerges as a critical concept: difficulties in early diagnosis of neurodegenerative diseases and failures in cancer treatment trace back to multidimensional heterogeneities in genomics and phenotype; geological heterogeneity influences earthquake occurrence and scale; the success of deep learning rests on harnessing heterogeneous information through heterogeneous neural networks; and heterogeneity has proven a better metric than diversity for guiding policy design to achieve social justice, as recognized in Nobel Prize–winning work on microeconometrics (Heckman, 2001). Yet significant gaps remain in how different disciplines conceptualize and measure heterogeneity, and strategic cross-disciplinary approaches will be essential for addressing pressing challenges from biodiversity loss to climate change.

A remarkable take-home message from this cross-disciplinary analysis is the enormous heterogeneity of heterogeneity itself—a sentiment already echoed decades ago by Kolasa and Rollo (1991) in their aptly titled chapter, "The heterogeneity of heterogeneity." Across the 14 disciplines we surveyed, the concept of heterogeneity is defined and practiced in sufficiently heterogeneous ways that respecting each field's distinct traditions, conventions, and practices—from both conceptual and methodological perspectives—should be the more productive approach. Yet the very fact that the same terminology appears across such diverse fields suggests that pursuing a unified concept and methodology remains scientifically meaningful. More importantly, if the very essence of heterogeneity lies in interactions and connectedness, then cross-disciplinary exchange should be key to maximizing the benefits of heterogeneity research. This review navigates this tension by adopting primarily the former strategy—attending to disciplinary traditions in ecological and environmental sciences and their allied fields—while offering in our concluding section a preliminary synthesis toward a more unified framework. Within ecology and its allied fields—including agriculture, forestry, water and natural resources management, and geology—heterogeneity has emerged as a central organizing concept. We therefore examine heterogeneity research through four interconnected lenses: its conceptual foundations and measurement approaches; the models and frameworks used to represent it; its role in shaping ecological patterns and processes; and its applications across managed and natural systems.

An equally remarkable take-home message from this cross-disciplinary analysis is the striking pluralism of methods used to study heterogeneity. Across the approximately 1200 papers surveyed, five broad methodological categories emerge—conceptual, quantitative conceptual, metrics or indices, models, and integrated frameworks—each reflecting distinct disciplinary priorities. Medicine dominates conceptual, quantitative conceptual, and integrated framework approaches; economics leads in modeling; statistics and mathematics specialize in metrics; and ecology and environmental science appear across multiple categories. This pronounced disciplinary clustering demonstrates that the choice of method is not neutral but deeply conditioned by each field's epistemic traditions, research objectives, and data types. The optimal method is therefore not a matter of rank but of fitness-for-purpose. To reflect this pluralism, we dedicate two main sections (Sections I and II) to discuss the methods for heterogeneity research primarily used in ecology and its allied sciences.

Ecology is fundamentally the study of interactions—between organisms, and between organisms and their environment. If interactions are the precondition for ecological relationships, then heterogeneity—the structured variation that enables and shapes those interactions—is not merely important. It is foundational. In our view, heterogeneity deserves equal, if not greater, emphasis than biodiversity itself. This centrality, moreover, extends far beyond ecology. Across physics, biomedicine, social science, and computation, heterogeneity proves equally foundational: coupled oscillators require diversity to synchronize, neural networks need heterogeneity to learn robustly, economic agents differ in ways that shape markets, and tumor heterogeneity determines treatment response. What ecology reveals as essential for life may be a universal precondition for complex systems of all kinds—structured variation as the substrate from which organized behavior emerges.

We begin in Section I by examining how heterogeneity has been conceptualized and measured with metrics, drawing on foundational and contemporary work to identify points of consensus and persistent ambiguity. Section II continues the theme of measuring heterogeneity, focusing on models and frameworks. Sections III and IV address the causes and consequences of heterogeneity in ecology and environmental sciences. Given the longstanding tradition in which heterogeneity research has branched into two prongs—environmental heterogeneity and ecological heterogeneity—we separate the causes and consequences into two sections (III and IV). Specifically, Section III synthesizes studies on environmental heterogeneity as a driver of biodiversity, focusing on heterogeneity–diversity relationships (HDR) and their implications for conservation. Section IV examines ecological heterogeneity, exploring its relationship to system stability and resilience through the lens of heterogeneity–stability relationships (HSR). Section V explores heterogeneity research in applied ecological contexts—agriculture, forestry, hydrology, and natural resources—where managing heterogeneity has emerged as a central strategy for sustainability. Section VI extends this view to disciplines beyond ecology's allied fields—physics, biomedicine, social sciences, philosophy, statistics, and computation—testing whether the principles of structured variation resonate across domains where templates and processes are physical, economic, cognitive, or computational, and whether a more ambitious claim of universal heterogeneity might be warranted. Given that the focus of this review is ecology, these last two sections are intentionally brief, intended to illustrate potential connections between ecological heterogeneity and its counterparts in other fields. We conclude in Section VII by summarizing key findings and our efforts toward developing a unified conceptual framework for heterogeneity across disciplines.

Across these sections, we return to a central set of questions: What does heterogeneity mean across different contexts? How should it be measured? And what do we currently know—and what remains unknown—about its causes and consequences? In addressing these questions, we aim not only to provide a concise review and synthesis of heterogeneity research in ecology, but also to situate this body of work within a broader, cross-disciplinary effort to understand one of the most fundamental—yet persistently elusive—properties of the natural, social, engineering, and humanistic systems alike.

I. Concepts and Metrics

1.1 Concepts and Definitions: The Historical Evolution of a Dual-Thread Paradigm

1.1.1 Foundational Definitions and the Resolution of Historical Confusion

The modern ecological paradigm defines spatial heterogeneity as the "dissimilarity and unlikeness" of a system property in space, constituting the fundamental antonym of homogeneity (Dutilleul & Legendre, 1993). This broad definition bifurcates based on the nature of the observed pattern. For discrete point patterns, such as the distribution of individual organisms or nests, heterogeneity quantifies the deviation from complete spatial randomness, encompassing both aggregation (clustering) and hyper-dispersion (regular spacing). For continuous surface patterns, such as gradients of soil pH, elevation, or biomass, heterogeneity refers to the statistical variability—in means, variances, or other moments—of a quantitative or qualitative descriptor across defined spatial subunits (Dutilleul & Legendre, 1993). This conceptual precision, now foundational, emerged only after a protracted period of significant ambiguity that hindered theoretical and empirical synthesis.

Historically, the term "heterogeneity" was employed inconsistently and often conflated with related but distinct concepts. In community ecology, it was sometimes incorrectly equated with mean species diversity, as seen in early debates on diversity measurement (Peet, 1974, as cited in Dutilleul & Legendre, 1993). In theoretical population ecology, "homogeneity" described models with spatiotemporally invariant parameters, implicitly treating any variation as noise. Formal attempts at standardization, such as by the Ecological Society of America's Committee on Nomenclature, added confusion by defining homogeneity restrictively as "uniform or regular spacing"—a definition applicable only to point patterns (Dutilleul & Legendre, 1993). This fragmented usage reflected a deeper intellectual tension within ecology between a desire for simple, universal laws (often predicated on homogeneity) and the observable, complex patchiness of nature. As McIntosh (1991) articulated, early-to-mid 20th century ecology was characterized by a "cooking pot" paradigm, built on implicit assumptions of uniform organisms, environments, and interaction probabilities, where heterogeneity was an inconvenient complication.

The decisive resolution arrived with the seminal synthesis in the monograph *Ecological Heterogeneity* (Kolasa & Pickett, 1991). This volume provided a coherent lexicon and philosophical framework that legitimized heterogeneity as a central subject of study. Crucially, it established the intellectual architecture for two interwoven yet distinct threads of inquiry: **Environmental (Habitat) Heterogeneity** and **Ecological Heterogeneity**. **Environmental Heterogeneity** refers to the variability of the abiotic and biotic template itself—the patchiness of resources, the mosaic of land cover, and gradients of physical conditions. **Ecological Heterogeneity** refers to the variability in biological structures and processes that emerge in response to that template. This encompasses the spatial distribution of genes and individuals (population heterogeneity), the composition and turnover of species (community heterogeneity), and the variation in demographic rates among individuals (individual heterogeneity). This distinction is not merely taxonomic; it frames a fundamental causal relationship where environmental heterogeneity acts as a filter and template, shaping the emergent patterns of ecological heterogeneity.

1.1.2 The Core Conceptual Framework: Measured vs. Functional Heterogeneity and the Primacy of Scale

Within this dual-thread paradigm, the most profound philosophical advancement was the dichotomy between **measured heterogeneity** and **functional heterogeneity**, introduced by Kolasa and Rollo (1991). **Measured heterogeneity** is an observer-defined, often arbitrary, statistical description of pattern, quantified using standardized yardsticks like variance, the Shannon index, or patch density. It is objective in a statistical sense but can be ecologically naive. **Functional heterogeneity** is defined as "the heterogeneity an ecological entity perceives and responds to" (Dutilleul & Legendre, 1993, p. 154). This is heterogeneity from the perspective of the organism, population, or process. It is defined by the entity's perceptual "grain" (the resolution at which it discerns differences) and "extent" (the spatial range of its activities). A landscape fragmented by roads may exhibit high measured heterogeneity in edge density, but to a forest-interior bird, this may constitute a functionally inhospitable environment. This dichotomy bridges environmental and ecological threads: the *measured* heterogeneity of an environment must be translated into the *functional* heterogeneity for a specific species to predict the resulting *ecological heterogeneity* in its distribution. A systematic review by Tonetti et al. (2023) reveals a severe "functional gap," with over 99% of landscape studies relying solely on structural metrics, highlighting the challenge of implementing this core concept.

In our view, the distinction between measured heterogeneity and functional heterogeneity echoes that between environmental heterogeneity and ecological heterogeneity, both of which may ultimately stem from the contrast between abiotic (passive) and biotic (active) processes in the natural world. While each of these dichotomies holds some validity, they also risk perpetuating conceptual divisions within the study of heterogeneity—an issue that is especially acute in ecology and natural resource management, where the environment is at least as important as the organisms it supports. Regardless of whether maintaining such distinctions is beneficial or detrimental, we propose an alternative framework centered on distinguishing between **objects (O)** and **environments (E)**. The strength of this approach lies in its capacity to integrate diverse lines of heterogeneity research within a more coherent and unified paradigm.

Integral and inseparable from this framework is the principle that **scale (S) is a non-negotiable, defining property of heterogeneity** (Hewitt et al., 2007; Li & Reynolds, 1995). The perception and ecological consequence of any pattern are wholly contingent upon the relationship between the **grain** (the resolution or minimum unit of measurement) and the **extent** (the total area or duration of study) of observation. As Sparrow (1999) argued, a pattern that is heterogeneous at a fine grain may appear homogeneous at a coarser grain. Different ecological processes operate at intrinsically different characteristic scales. Therefore, any quantification of heterogeneity is scientifically meaningless without an explicit statement of scale. This scale-dependence is the practical manifestation of the functional perspective.

A related and crucial clarification by Dutilleul and Legendre (1993) severed a persistent source of methodological error: the strict separation of the ecological paradigm of *spatial heterogeneity* from the narrow statistical concept of *heteroscedasticity*. Despite a shared etymological root, these are distinct. **Heteroscedasticity** is a purely statistical condition defined as the "inequality of variances among samples," a violation of parametric test assumptions often treated as a nuisance. **Spatial**

heterogeneity is the broad, multi-faceted ecological phenomenon. Conflating the two leads to misapplying variance-stabilizing techniques when spatial analytical tools are needed.

1.1.3 Historical Trajectory: From Consequence to Codification

The conceptual evolution of heterogeneity tracks its operationalization across sub-disciplines, driven by the recognition of its profound dynamical consequences.

Precursors and Pragmatic Quantification. Decades before theoretical ecology's full embrace, applied agronomy confronted heterogeneity as a direct problem of experimental design. Smith (1938), analyzing "blank experiments," discovered that crop yield variance (V_x) decreases with plot size (x) by the power law $V_x=V_1/x^b$. The exponent b, the "coefficient of heterogeneity," quantified the rate at which variability diminishes with observational grain. This was a pioneering quantification of scale-dependent, measured environmental heterogeneity. Similarly, Taylor's power law (Taylor 1961) represented a foundational advance in quantifying the spatial aggregation, a key form of ecological heterogeneity, within insect populations (Ma & Taylor 2025).

Theoretical Awakening: Establishing Functional Consequences. The 1970s established heterogeneity as a primary determinant of system dynamics. Foundational models revealed its dual, context-dependent role in stability. Roff (1974), modeling a stochastic, patchy environment, showed dispersal could stabilize metapopulations through "spreading of risk." Conversely, Steele (1974), using deterministic, continuous-space models, showed diffusion could couple local oscillations and drive instability. This demonstrated that heterogeneity's effects are contingent on system properties. This principle extended to epidemiology, where mixing heterogeneity governs disease dynamics (Bolker, 1997), and to macroecology, where Kerr and Packer (1997) showed **habitat heterogeneity** becomes the primary driver of continental species richness in high-energy regions.

Sub-disciplinary Diffusion and Synthesis. This theoretical seed diffused rapidly. Landscape ecology formalized the study of environmental heterogeneity as a dynamic mosaic controlling ecological flows (Forman & Godron, 1986; Pickett & Cadenasso, 1995). Community ecology modeled how disturbance-mediated patchiness governs species coexistence (Caswell & Cohen, 1991). Stream ecology introduced the "physical habitat template" concept, linking long-term environmental heterogeneity to trait-based ecological responses (Poff & Ward, 1990). The 1990s culminated in operational synthesis. Li and Reynolds (1995) provided the definitive operational definition—heterogeneity as the "complexity and/or variability of a system property"—and a pragmatic, data-type-driven framework. For categorical data (e.g., land-cover maps), heterogeneity comprises composition (richness, evenness) and configuration (spatial arrangement).

For quantitative data (e.g., transects), it involves trend (mean, variance) and spatial structure (autocorrelation).

1.1.4 Modern Refinements and Theoretical Extensions

Contemporary heterogeneity research is characterized by critical self-assessment and conceptual extensions pushing toward a more general, mechanistic theory.

Refinement 1: The Rise of Individual Heterogeneity. A major subfield focuses on **individual heterogeneity** in demographic traits. Frameworks distinguish *fixed* individual condition (set by genotype or early-life effects) from *dynamic* condition, and, critically, variation in *potential* vital rates (true heterogeneity) from *realized* individual stochasticity (Gimenez et al., 2018; Forsythe et al., 2021). This represents a sophisticated application of the measured-functional concept to demography.

Extension (i): The Cause-and-Effect Spectrum. Observed spatial pattern (the *effect*) is often generated by underlying **interactions** (the *cause*). This establishes a methodological spectrum. The *results-oriented* end quantifies manifested differences using metrics like variance or beta diversity. The *cause-oriented* end seeks to measure generative behaviors—competition, facilitation, information flow—using tools from network science and interaction modeling. Advancing toward this causal end is key for a mechanistic understanding.

Extension (ii): Operational Clarification: Object and Environment. To pragmatically apply the measured-functional dichotomy, it is useful to define the **object of heterogeneity** (the entity whose variation is measured) and the **environment of heterogeneity** (the domain of assessment). In studying environmental heterogeneity, the landscape is the *object*, the sampling grid the *environment*. In studying a species' response, its distribution is the *object*, its perceptual range the functional *environment*. Explicitly stating this relationship forces critical clarity.

Extension (iii): Multi-Dimensionality in Physical and Abstract Spaces. Heterogeneity exists in multi-dimensional spaces. In **physical 3D space**, it is an irreducible volumetric property critical to theory, such as the configuration of geophysical mantle anomalies (Yuan et al., 2023). In **abstract high-dimensional state spaces** (e.g., interaction networks), heterogeneity resides in the complex topology of relationships, where "master regulators" can shape entire system dynamics (Eble et al., 2023). This moves beyond spatial pattern to the heterogeneity of *processes and relationships*, aligning with integrative frameworks of biocomplexity linking heterogeneity, connectivity, and history (evolution) (Cadenasso et al., 2006).

1.2 Metrics and Quantification: Tools for Disentangling Heterogeneity

1.2.1 Foundational Metrics for Pattern Description

The initial phase involved adopting metrics to provide basic descriptive power. Smith's (1938) and Taylor (1961) power laws formalized variance scaling, but with contrastingly different interpretations. For continuous surface patterns, spatial statistics like Moran's I and variograms became standard for quantifying autocorrelation structure (Dutilleul & Legendre, 1993). For categorical maps, a proliferation of landscape metrics emerged, measuring composition (e.g., Shannon Diversity Index of patch types) and configuration (e.g., edge density, patch shape). The development and validation of these metrics were not always smooth. Li and Reynolds (1993) identified a critical error in a widely used "contagion" index, demonstrating its insensitivity to spatial arrangement. Their corrected Relative Contagion (RC) index served as an early lesson in rigorous metric validation. The framework of Li and Reynolds (1995) organized this proliferation by data type.

1.2.2 Confronting Flawed Metrics and Conceptual Conflation

The 21st century ushered in necessary critical assessment, exposing significant pitfalls in popular proxies. For examples:

The Rugosity and Fractal Dimension Problem. Two ubiquitous geometric metrics for habitat complexity have been deconstructed. Rugosity (surface area ratio) is fatally confounded with surface area, making it impossible to disentangle complexity effects from the species-area relationship (Loke & Chisholm, 2022). Fractal dimension (D) has proven ecologically ineffectual; natural structures are rarely true fractals, and estimation methods are biased and unstable.

The Entropy Terminological Muddle. The borrowing of information theory's Shannon entropy index has led to confusion. As Vranken et al. (2014) clarified, this usage is a formal analogy, not a valid application of thermodynamics. The term carries contradictory meanings, leading to recommendations for precise language like "spatial heterogeneity."

Metric Conflation in Practice. There is pervasive conceptual conflation in application. Indices like the Shannon index are routinely used interchangeably as proxies for heterogeneity, fragmentation, and connectivity, obscuring mechanistic understanding (Tonetti et al., 2023).

1.2.3 Specialized Metrics for Disentangling Specific Signals

Modern metric development focuses on creating tools to isolate specific aspects and control for confounders.

Identifying Discrete Stratification. Wang et al. (2016) developed the ***q*-statistic** to formally test for **Spatial Stratified Heterogeneity (SSH)**—where variance *between* pre-defined strata exceeds variance *within*. This provides a rigorous test for whether a categorical environmental layer explains significant variation.

Controlling for Statistical Artifacts. A fundamental issue for bounded variables (e.g., elevation, percent cover) is the mean-dispersion entanglement: classical dispersion metrics are mathematically constrained by the mean. Pellett and Valbuena (2025) derived a mean-independent dispersion metric (δ) to isolate true dispersion, preventing spurious heterogeneity-diversity relationships.

Accounting for Major Confounders. Modern analysis emphasizes controlling for habitat amount (e.g., percent forest cover), a dominant mediator that can create or mask relationships between configurational heterogeneity and ecological responses (Bae et al., 2025). Proper experimental design, using blocking to account for spatial gradients, is itself a critical tool (Dutilleul, 1993).

Standardizing Comparative Measures. For comparing metrics of *ecological heterogeneity* like beta diversity across unevenly sampled studies, Chao et al. (2023) developed the iNEXT.beta3D framework. It uses coverage-based rarefaction and extrapolation to standardize estimates to a common sample coverage, isolating the true biological signal.

1.2.4 Advanced Frameworks for Multi-Dimensional and Integrative Analysis

Contemporary approaches employ sophisticated frameworks aligned with the theoretical extensions.

Explicit Multi-Dimensional Decomposition. Reflecting the extension into multi-dimensional spaces, studies now explicitly decompose *environmental heterogeneity* into distinct axes. Bae et al. (2025) distinguish and measure compositional, configurational, vertical, and temporal heterogeneity, recognizing these dimensions can be orthogonal and require separate measurement.

Geodiversity as an Integrative Abiotic Proxy. In macroecology, geodiversity metrics synthesize variety in geology, soil, landforms, and hydrology into a catchment-scale index, providing a multi-dimensional proxy for the abiotic template driving ecological patterns like riverine biodiversity (Jiang et al., 2025).

Metrics for Interaction and Network Heterogeneity. To advance toward the *cause-oriented* spectrum, metrics must quantify interaction structures. Stirling's (2007) general diversity framework is influential here. It decomposes diversity into variety, balance, and disparity, with a heuristic index M that incorporates all three. In ecology, Ohlmann et al. (2019) applied this by extending Hill numbers to quantify ecological network diversity, measuring heterogeneity in the pattern of species interactions. Similar frameworks measure diversity in knowledge networks (Rafols & Meyer, 2010) and social networks (Eagle et al., 2010).

Synthesizing Space-Time Relationships. Large-scale empirical syntheses test broad theoretical linkages. Collins et al. (2018), analyzing 68 community datasets, found a significant positive relationship between spatial and temporal heterogeneity, a relationship moderated by biological traits like species lifespan.

1.2.5 Synthesis: The Metric Trajectory

The evolution of heterogeneity metrics mirrors the field's conceptual maturation. It has progressed from adopting simple descriptive indices, to developing disciplinary frameworks, to the current era of critical disentanglement. This era is defined by creating specialized tools to isolate specific signals (e.g., SSH, pure dispersion), rigorously control for confounders (habitat amount, mean, sampling coverage), and quantify complex, multi-dimensional patterns (geodiversity, network structure). This refined toolkit is essential for rigorous, mechanistic hypothesis testing about how environmental and ecological heterogeneity are interwoven across scales and dimensions, providing the empirical foundation for predictive models and unifying frameworks.

II. Models and Frameworks

The quantitative study of heterogeneity in ecology builds upon the foundational concepts and especially the metrics discussed in previous Section I, which provide essential, if often simplified, numerical summaries of variation. To move toward mechanistic understanding and prediction, ecologists employ more advanced and integrative quantitative systems that formalize, simulate, or analytically process heterogeneity. This section examines two such higher-order methodological categories: models and frameworks. *Models* refer to self-contained, equation-based or algorithmic constructs—such as simulations, dynamical systems, or scaling formulations—designed to quantify, generate, or embed heterogeneity within a unified formal structure. *Frameworks* are multi-stage analytical pipelines that integrate distinct methodological components—such as spatial statistics, graph theory, and movement ecology—into structured, often scale-aware workflows for measuring heterogeneity from empirical data. This functional distinction is key: models offer controlled, theory-grounded representations of heterogeneity, while frameworks provide procedural sequences for its robust measurement in complex, real-world systems. The following synthesis highlights seminal contributions in both categories, emphasizing methodological innovation and conceptual rigor in the measurement of heterogeneity. While the previous section (Section I) primarily discusses the **meaning** of heterogeneity, the focus here (Section II) remains on the **measurement** apparatus itself. Subsequent sections (Sections III and IV) will address the application of measured heterogeneity as an analytical lens for understanding ecological processes—the "**Causes** and **Consequences**" dimensions of this review.

2.1 Models for Measuring Heterogeneity

Models in this context are formal mathematical or computational systems that directly represent heterogeneity within their structure. They are used either to generate heterogeneity under controlled conditions, to quantify it through derived indices, or to embed it as an explicit variable in dynamical systems.

2.1.1 Simulation Models for Decomposing and Generating Heterogeneity

Simulation models allow researchers to create and manipulate heterogeneity in silico, providing controlled conditions under which measurement techniques can be evaluated. A foundational example is the work of Li and Reynolds (1994), who designed a simulation experiment to quantify spatial heterogeneity in categorical maps. Their model, SHAPC, generated landscapes with controlled levels of five predefined components of spatial heterogeneity: number of patch types, proportion of each type, spatial arrangement, patch shape, and contrast between neighbors. By systematically varying these components and evaluating the response of common landscape indices (e.g., fractal dimension, contagion), they demonstrated that heterogeneity cannot be captured by a single metric and that interactions among components complicate interpretation. This model is significant not only for its operational definition of heterogeneity but also because it highlights a methodological gap: simulation-based approaches to heterogeneity remain rare, likely because simulating heterogeneity requires a clear metric—a requirement often unmet outside spatially explicit theoretical models.

A more recent and methodologically sophisticated simulation model is presented by Fromville et al. (2025). Their spatially explicit agent-based model simulates animal movement in landscapes with controlled heterogeneity—linear gradients, patchy resources, and barriers. The model's purpose is to evaluate whether statistical methods can correctly infer social interactions from movement trajectories when heterogeneity is a confounding factor. By knowing the "ground truth" (whether movement coordination is driven by landscape features or social attraction), the authors could quantify the rate of false positives produced by various inference methods. This model is particularly important for heterogeneity research because it operationalizes heterogeneity as a set of measurable landscape covariates (e.g., habitat quality, barrier presence) that directly influence the movement process. It demonstrates how simulation can be used to validate measurement protocols in cases where real-world data are insufficient to disentangle correlated drivers.

2.1.2 Differential Equation Models Incorporating Heterogeneity

Mathematical models that incorporate heterogeneity directly into their formal structure offer another approach to measurement, often by showing how heterogeneity alters system dynamics. Bastiaansen et al. (2022) exemplify this approach through reaction–diffusion partial differential equations in which spatial heterogeneity is explicitly included via location-dependent parameters. Their model measures the effect of heterogeneity on tipping behavior, revealing that spatial variation leads to "fragmented tipping" and the emergence of stable coexistence states—outcomes absent from homogeneous models. While the primary focus is on dynamics, the model inherently provides a way to quantify how the *pattern* of heterogeneity (e.g., a rainfall gradient) translates into a *measure* of system resilience (e.g., size of hysteresis loops). The use of diffusion equations here is methodologically notable; it provides a continuous, spatially explicit representation of heterogeneity that can be analyzed using perturbation techniques like matched asymptotics. This model illustrates how heterogeneity can be embedded in dynamical systems to derive new metrics of system-level behavior.

2.1.3 Scaling Models as Measurement Tools

Scaling models quantify how heterogeneity—or its consequences—changes with spatial extent. Liang et al. (2025) unify the species–area relationship (SAR) and the ecosystem stability–area relationship (EStAR) within a partitioning framework that measures scaling exponents. Although not focused on heterogeneity per se, their model implicitly measures a key consequence of spatial heterogeneity: species turnover (beta diversity). The scaling exponent z of the SAR is itself a metric that summarizes how heterogeneity in species composition accumulates across space. Their introduction of the "stability debt" concept further provides a derived metric that links habitat loss (a reduction in spatial heterogeneity) to delayed stability loss. From a measurement perspective, this work demonstrates how macroecological models can generate synthetic metrics (scaling exponents, debt measures) that encapsulate the effects of heterogeneity at broad scales. Future heterogeneity research could adapt such scaling models to ask how structural heterogeneity (e.g., habitat configuration) itself scales with area, and how that scaling influences ecological functions.

2.2 Frameworks for Measuring Heterogeneity

Frameworks differ from models in that they are not single formalisms but integrated analytical pipelines that combine multiple methodological components to measure heterogeneity in a structured, often iterative, way. These frameworks are particularly important for empirical applications where heterogeneity must be measured from real-world data across multiple scales and domains.

2.2.1 Graph-Theoretic and Network-Analytic Frameworks for Measuring Structural and Functional Heterogeneity

Graph theory provides the mathematical backbone for representing heterogeneous systems as networks of nodes and edges, while its applied extension—complex network science and ecological network analysis—offers a suite of metrics and comparative models to quantify structural, functional, and genetic heterogeneity. This approach translates ecological patterns into measurable network properties, allowing researchers to move beyond descriptive statistics toward integrative, system-level quantification. Three seminal papers illustrate the progression from foundational graph-theoretic frameworks in landscape ecology to broader network-analytic applications.

The operational foundation for applying graph theory to heterogeneity measurement was established by Bunn et al. (2000). Their framework provides a species-specific pipeline for quantifying how landscape heterogeneity determines functional connectivity. The procedure integrates: (i) GIS-based delineation of habitat patches as nodes, (ii) least-cost path modeling across a heterogeneous resistance surface to calculate functional distances, (iii) application of dispersal kernels to define edges, and (iv) graph operations such as node removal to assess patch importance and network cohesion. This sequence explicitly posits **heterogeneity as the independent variable**: both the structural heterogeneity of the patch mosaic and the functional heterogeneity of the matrix are quantified and combined to produce an emergent, measurable network. The framework thus establishes a causal, quantifiable pathway from measurable landscape pattern to species-specific ecological process, setting a standard for how heterogeneity drives—and can be used to predict—connectivity. Building on this, Minor and Urban (2008) incorporated concepts from complex network science to measure the **topological heterogeneity** of landscape connectivity networks. By comparing an observed habitat graph against random and scale-free null models, they used metrics such as characteristic path length, clustering coefficient, and degree distribution to characterize the structural organization of connections. Their analysis revealed that real-world landscapes exhibit a hybrid topology—for instance, possessing long path lengths that slow disturbance spread while maintaining hub patches that facilitate overall dispersal.

This comparative network-analytic approach shifts the focus from whether a landscape is connected to **how it is heterogeneously connected**, linking measurable topological variation to functional trade-offs in resilience, dispersal efficiency, and vulnerability.

The application of network analysis extends into population genetics, where it measures heterogeneity in gene flow and population roles. Garroway et al. (2008) constructed a genetic covariance network from microsatellite data, using centrality metrics and modularity detection to quantify heterogeneity in genetic connectivity among fisher populations. They found that node-level network properties, such as eigenvector centrality, correlated with environmental variables like habitat quality, demonstrating that **topological heterogeneity in the genetic network reflects underlying environmental heterogeneity**. This application shows that graph-theoretic measurement is not confined to physical space; it can quantify heterogeneity in the processes—such as gene flow—that arise from and interact with heterogeneous landscapes.

Ulanowicz (2004) extends network analysis to ecosystem flows, using ecological network analysis (ENA) and information-theoretic indices like ascendency to measure heterogeneity in the strength and organization of trophic links and material cycles. This approach quantifies functional heterogeneity in energy and nutrient pathways, complementing structural landscape analyses by focusing on weighted, directed interaction networks.

Collectively, these studies establish a cohesive network-analytic framework for measuring heterogeneity across ecological systems. From landscape connectivity (Bunn et al., 2000; Minor & Urban, 2008) to genetic flows (Garroway et al., 2008) and ecosystem metabolism (Ulanowicz, 2004), this toolkit quantifies heterogeneity not just as spatial pattern, but as structural, functional, and process-level variation within networks, enabling integrated measurement across organizational levels.

2.2.2 Integrated Spatial Analysis Frameworks for Multi-Scale Measurement

Spatial heterogeneity is inherently scale-dependent, requiring analytical frameworks that explicitly address how pattern and process vary across grains and extents. The definitive methodological synthesis for this task is presented by Fortin et al. (2012), who propose a sequential, three-stage framework that integrates core spatial statistical tools to measure heterogeneity rigorously. This pipeline moves from pattern detection to functional inference, ensuring that measurement is both scale-explicit and ecologically interpretable.

The first stage focuses on **spectral decomposition of spatial pattern** to quantify the scale-specific structure of heterogeneity. Before modeling ecological responses, the spatial signal itself must be measured. Fortin et al. highlight wavelet analysis and Moran's Eigenvector Maps (MEMs) as key tools. Wavelet analysis partitions spatial variance across a continuous range of scales, identifying localized patches and gradients. MEMs generate orthogonal spatial eigenvectors, each representing a distinct scale of spatial autocorrelation, which can be used as quantitative spatial predictors. This stage decomposes a complex landscape into measurable, scale-specific components of heterogeneity.

The second stage employs **spatial regression modeling** to measure ecological responses to the quantified heterogeneity while correcting for spatial autocorrelation. The spectral components from stage one (e.g., MEMs) can be included as spatial covariates. Fortin et al. categorize approaches by how they handle spatial dependence: spatial error models (e.g., SAR) model autocorrelation in the residuals; Geographically Weighted Regression (GWR) allows relationships to vary locally, directly measuring spatial non-stationarity in species-environment relationships. This stage statistically links pattern to process, controlling for the confounding effects of spatial structure.

The final stage translates measured heterogeneity into **functional connectivity using spatial graph theory**. Outputs from spatial regression—such as habitat suitability or resistance surfaces—inform the construction of a functional graph. Nodes (e.g., populations or patches) are connected by edges weighted by functional distances derived from least-cost paths through the heterogeneous landscape. Graph metrics (e.g., betweenness centrality, modularity) then quantify the heterogeneity in functional connectivity, measuring how the spatial pattern ultimately influences ecological flows like dispersal or gene flow.

This integrated framework provides a closed-loop spatial statistical workflow: it measures pattern, models response, and quantifies functional consequence. It addresses key gaps in isolated approaches—such as ignoring scale or autocorrelation—by enforcing a structured, multi-tool methodology. As such, it remains the essential procedural blueprint for rigorous, multi-scale measurement of spatial heterogeneity in ecology.

2.2.3 Temporal Networks and Movement Ecology Frameworks for Measuring Dynamic Heterogeneity

Quantifying heterogeneity in systems where interactions and environments vary through time requires frameworks that integrate temporal dynamics while controlling for spatial confounding. An integrative pipeline emerges by linking **movement ecology methods** for robust association inference with **temporal network analysis** for measuring dynamic interaction patterns.

The foundational step addresses a key inferential problem: in heterogeneous landscapes, correlated movement may reflect shared environmental responses rather than social interaction. Fromville et al. (2025) demonstrate through spatially explicit simulation that conventional metrics (e.g., the Dynamic Interaction Index) produce false positives for sociality unless landscape heterogeneity is accounted for. Their prescribed correction integrates **step selection functions (SSFs) with the Spatial+ method**, which statistically removes spatial autocorrelation from social covariates attributable to unmeasured landscape variation. This yields corrected pairwise association measures cleansed of environmental forcing—a prerequisite for any accurate measurement of interaction-based heterogeneity.

Once robust, corrected pairwise associations are estimated, temporal network analysis provides the formal framework to measure heterogeneity in the structure and dynamics of these interactions over time. A temporal network is defined as a time-ordered series of graphs $G(t_1)$, $G(t_2)$,...,$G(t_n)$, where nodes represent individuals and edges in each snapshot represent associations (or interactions) within a specific time window (Holme & Saramäki, 2012). This formalism enables the quantification of **heterogeneity in temporal interaction patterns** using specialized metrics that capture dimensions not apparent in static, aggregated networks. For instance, *temporal centrality* identifies individuals whose influence is concentrated in specific time windows, *latency* measures the time delays in interaction pathways, and *burstiness* quantifies the uneven clustering of interactions in time. These metrics collectively measure the heterogeneity of the interaction process itself—how connectivity is distributed not just among individuals, but across time.

To rigorously attribute observed temporal patterns to social or interactive processes rather than to residual spatiotemporal overlap from shared landscape use, **null model testing** is essential. Spiegel et al. (2016) provide a pivotal method, randomizing individual movement trajectories in time while preserving each individual's empirical space-use distribution (utilization distribution). This generates a null distribution of association networks expected if individuals move independently within a shared, heterogeneous environment. Comparing observed temporal network structure—such as edge persistence or modularity—against this null allows researchers to test whether the observed **temporal heterogeneity in associations** exceeds that expected from environmental overlap alone.

In synthesis, this integrated framework outlines a coherent three-stage measurement pipeline: (i) **Data Correction & Association Inference:** apply bias-corrected movement models (e.g., SSF + Spatial+) to derive landscape-independent association measures; (ii) **Temporal Network Construction & Metricization:** build time-windowed networks from corrected associations and quantify their structural dynamics using time-resolved network metrics; and (iii) **Hypothesis Testing via Null Models:** use constrained randomization methods to test the statistical significance of observed temporal heterogeneity against null expectations of independent movement.

This framework transcends the measurement of static spatial pattern by capturing **heterogeneity in the process of interaction**. It allows ecologists to ask not just "who is connected?" but "**when, for how long, and in what sequence are they connected?**"—and to ground the answers in statistically robust inferences that account for the pervasive effects of environmental heterogeneity. As such, it represents a sophisticated and necessary advancement for measuring heterogeneity in any system where movement, behavior, and time-varying interactions are of central importance.

2.3 Synthesis and Future Directions for Measuring Heterogeneity

The previous sub-sections have distinguished between two advanced methodological approaches for measuring heterogeneity: self-contained *models* that formally simulate or embed heterogeneity, and integrative *frameworks* that provide structured pipelines for its empirical measurement. Models—such as the simulation experiments of Li and Reynolds (1994), the reaction–diffusion systems of Bastiaansen et al. (2022), and the agent-based models of Fromville et al. (2025)—offer controlled, theory-driven platforms to manipulate and quantify heterogeneity. Frameworks—including the graph-theoretic pipelines of Bunn et al. (2000) and Minor and Urban (2008), the spatial-statistical workflow of Fortin et al. (2012), and the temporal-network approaches of Spiegel et al. (2016)—supply multi-step, scale-aware procedures that often incorporate simpler metrics into robust analytical cascades.

Moving forward, methodological progress should prioritize four interconnected pathways: (i) developing more accessible simulation tools to validate measurement approaches; (ii) better integrating dynamical models with empirical frameworks to predict how heterogeneity drives system behavior; (iii) establishing standardized pipelines for measuring temporal heterogeneity in interaction networks; and (iv) explicitly incorporating measured heterogeneity into macroecological and scaling models. Advancing along these lines will enhance the rigor and predictive power of heterogeneity measurement, transforming it from a descriptive challenge into a cornerstone of mechanistic ecological theory.

III. Environmental Heterogeneity: Heterogeneity—Diversity Relationships (HDR) & Biodiversity Conservation

3.1 Introduction to Heterogeneity-Diversity Relationships (HDR)

Environmental heterogeneity—the spatial and temporal variability in biotic and abiotic conditions—has emerged as a central organizing concept in ecology and conservation biology. The Heterogeneity–Diversity Relationship (HDR) represents the complex interplay between environmental variation and species diversity across spatial scales, taxonomic groups, and ecosystem types. Historically, ecological theory posited a straightforward positive relationship, grounded in niche theory's assertion that heterogeneous environments provide more ecological niches, thereby supporting greater species richness. However, contemporary research reveals a more nuanced reality where HDRs are modulated by scale dependencies, species-specific traits, environmental gradients, and fundamental ecological trade-offs (Stein, Gerstner, & Kreft, 2014; Allouche et al., 2012).

In this section, we review the methodological evolution in heterogeneity research and its implications for biodiversity conservation. From early field-based indices to sophisticated remote sensing and spatial modeling approaches, the quantification of heterogeneity has fundamentally shaped our understanding of diversity patterns. This synthesis examines how different methodological frameworks have advanced theoretical insights while informing practical conservation strategies across terrestrial, aquatic, and marine ecosystems.

3.2 Theoretical Foundations and Mechanistic Insights

The theoretical understanding of HDRs has progressed significantly from simple niche-based explanations to integrative models that incorporate demographic, dispersal, and stochastic processes alongside traditional niche considerations. Allouche et al. (2012) introduced the influential area–heterogeneity tradeoff through a comprehensive approach combining individual-based stochastic simulations with empirical analysis of breeding bird communities in Catalonia. Methodologically, they used elevation range as a proxy for environmental heterogeneity and applied OLS regression with quadratic terms while controlling for area, climate, human density, and spatial autocorrelation. Their findings revealed a unimodal relationship where species richness peaked at intermediate heterogeneity levels, fundamentally challenging the assumption that heterogeneity universally promotes diversity. The study demonstrated mechanistically that within a fixed total area, increased heterogeneity reduces the effective habitat available per species, thereby lowering population sizes and elevating extinction risks through demographic stochasticity—effects particularly pronounced for species with narrow ecological niches.

Complementing niche-based explanations, Shen et al. (2009) used spatial point process modeling to show that species–area relationships emerge from the joint effects of habitat heterogeneity and dispersal limitation. Model comparison via AIC confirmed that only the combined model accurately predicted patterns, reconciling niche-based and neutral theories. Building on this, Gasperini et al. (2025) conducted a capture-mark-recapture study in oak forests, finding that the specialist *Apodemus flavicollis* increased with overstorey structural heterogeneity, while the generalist *A. sylvaticus* thrived with understorey functional heterogeneity. This validates the area–heterogeneity tradeoff, showing how fine-grained heterogeneity fragments habitat for specialists while creating resource mosaics for generalists.

3.3 Methodological Frameworks for Quantifying Environmental Heterogeneity

3.3.1 Early Empirical Frameworks: Measuring Heterogeneity in the Field

The empirical foundation of HDR research was established through field-based frameworks that developed practical metrics for direct ecological measurement. Roth (1976) pioneered an organism-centered approach by creating a heterogeneity index (D) based on the coefficient of variation in distances from random points to the nearest shrub. This elegantly simple field metric successfully captured horizontal patchiness in vegetation, distinguishing it from vertical complexity represented by foliage height diversity. His analysis of bird territories across grassland, shrubland, and forest habitats demonstrated that horizontal spatial segregation drove bird diversity in shrublands, while vertical stratification dominated in forests—establishing an early contingency model for HDR mechanisms. In aquatic ecosystems, Dent and Grimm (1999) applied geostatistical frameworks to quantify spatial heterogeneity of nutrients in desert streams, sampling every 25 meters along a 10-kilometer reach at three successional stages and analyzing data using coefficients of variation and semi-variograms. Their work revealed that nutrient heterogeneity increased over successional time and was more pronounced for the limiting nutrient (nitrogen), framing heterogeneity as a dynamic property that changes with ecosystem development and challenging assumptions of stream homogeneity.

3.3.2 Landscape Ecological Frameworks: Multi-Scale Pattern Analysis

The formalization of landscape ecology brought sophisticated frameworks for quantifying heterogeneity across scales and spatial configurations. Wu et al. (2000) conducted a seminal methodological comparison between scale variance analysis and traditional landscape pattern metrics. By creating nested data hierarchies through pixel aggregation and using nested ANOVA for variance partitioning, they demonstrated that hierarchical variance partitioning detects dominant patch sizes more effectively than semivariance analysis and explicitly addressed the Modifiable Areal Unit Problem—showing that all landscape metrics change with grain size. Their work further revealed that some metrics follow predictable power-law relationships with grain size, while others exhibit complex non-linear responses revealing emergent multiscale patterns.

This multi-scale perspective was extended by Saboyá-Acosta et al. (2025), who employed drone-based mapping (4 cm resolution) and buffer-based landscape metrics to examine scale-dependent effects on anuran diversity in Colombian páramo ecosystems. Their comprehensive framework measured 16 local-scale variables within 10×10 m habitat patches and landscape-scale metrics within 50–200 m buffers. Using Distance-based Linear Models and Generalized Linear Models, they found species richness and assemblage structure were best predicted at the 200 m scale, while abundance responded at finer scales (50–100 m), demonstrating that different biodiversity metrics operate at different spatial scales and that configuration metrics often outperform composition metrics in naturally heterogeneous systems.

3.3.3 Statistical and Modeling Frameworks: From Correlation to Causation

Advancements in statistical methods have facilitated more rigorous testing of HDR relationships beyond simple correlations. Shen et al. (2009) used spatial point process models to compare competing species–area relationship hypotheses, finding that only models combining habitat heterogeneity and dispersal limitation accurately explained observed patterns. This supports a hybrid mechanism that integrates niche and neutral processes.

Jonsson et al. (2011) introduced Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to HDR research, analyzing breeding bird communities on forested islands. Their SEM analysis revealed that island area influenced species richness indirectly through prey abundance and primary productivity, not directly, challenging straightforward species–area interpretations and highlighting indirect ecological pathways.

Dixon Hamil et al. (2016) developed a mixed-effects modeling framework with spatial random effects to address cross-scale contradictions in ecological relationships. Their simulations showed that unaccounted spatial heterogeneity can produce inconsistent results across scales, but modeling spatial sub-units as random effects recovers consistent relationships, offering a practical solution to non-stationarity in HDRs across heterogeneous landscapes.

3.3.4 Meta-Analytic and Synthesis Frameworks

The accumulation of HDR studies across diverse systems necessitated frameworks for synthesis and generalization. Tews et al. (2004) conducted a systematic review and vote-counting analysis of 85 studies published between 1960–2003, introducing the keystone structure concept—the idea that certain habitat features disproportionately support biodiversity. Their review revealed significant biases toward vertebrates and anthropogenic habitats, highlighting the conservation importance of structures like deadwood and solitary trees.

Stein et al. (2014) advanced synthesis through a global meta-analysis using Robust Variance Estimation, allowing inclusion of multiple non-independent effect sizes. Analyzing 1148 data points from 192 studies, they provided quantitative global support for heterogeneity as a universal diversity driver while revealing scale dependencies. Importantly, they showed that studies not using equal-area units overestimated heterogeneity effects by confounding area with heterogeneity.

Stein and Kreft (2015) further developed a terminological and methodological classification framework through systematic review of 192 studies. Their analysis cataloged over 100 different terms and 165 unique measures, proposing a structured framework categorizing heterogeneity into five subject areas: land cover, topography, vegetation, climate, and soil. This work addressed the "terminological chaos" in HDR research and provided guidelines for standardizing measurements and reporting.

3.3.5 Remote Sensing and High-Resolution Frameworks

Technological advances in remote sensing revolutionized heterogeneity quantification, enabling fine-resolution measurements across large spatial extents. Moudrá et al. (2025) integrated LiDAR and hyperspectral data to create a multi-dimensional heterogeneity framework in restored coal mine landscapes. They derived six key variables at 1-meter resolution—Vegetation Height Standard Deviation, Understory Cover, Canopy Cover, Plant Senescence Reflectance Index, Terrain Curvature, and Topographic Wetness Index—and used Generalized Additive Models to explain 19–78% of deviance in bird guild responses. This demonstrated the explanatory power of high-resolution remote sensing for quantifying ecologically relevant heterogeneity.

Udy et al. (2021) developed a global analysis framework using a spreading dye algorithm to sample multi-scale species–area and species–heterogeneity relationships for terrestrial mammals. Their flexible spatial sampling approach aggregated neighboring grid cells up to 50 cells, adapting to any spatial configuration. Combined with variance partitioning, their analysis showed that environmental heterogeneity—particularly precipitation range—explained more variance in species richness than area alone, challenging area-centric explanations and emphasizing niche-related processes.

3.3.6 Experimental and Management Frameworks

Experimental frameworks established causality in HDRs and translated ecological theory into management practice. Fuhlendorf et al. (2006) established a large-scale experimental framework comparing patch-burn-grazing to uniform management in tallgrass prairie ecosystems. Their multi-year experiment measured vegetation structure and bird abundance, demonstrating that actively managing for disturbance-mediated heterogeneity increased vegetation heterogeneity 5.5 times and bird community heterogeneity 4 times compared to uniform management, with species like Henslow's Sparrow occurring exclusively in older unburned patches.

Hovick et al. (2015) extended this framework to examine temporal stability, finding that increased heterogeneity led to higher avian diversity and greater landscape-scale community stability. The most heterogeneous landscape showed four times less temporal community change than the most homogeneous. This revealed that while heterogeneity increased fine-scale variability, it enhanced broad-scale stability—a portfolio effect with implications for managing ecosystems under environmental change.

3.3.7 Conceptual and Theoretical Frameworks

Several studies developed overarching conceptual frameworks that organize and synthesize HDR understanding. Allouche et al.'s (2012) area–heterogeneity tradeoff framework unified elements of niche theory and island biogeography by showing how heterogeneity reduces effective habitat area, thereby increasing extinction risks through demographic stochasticity.

Eisenhauer et al. (2023) proposed the Heterogeneity–Diversity–System Performance nexus as a transdisciplinary framework linking heterogeneity to system outcomes across ecological, agricultural, and social systems. Their conceptual synthesis positions heterogeneity as a manageable lever for enhancing resilience and sustainability, arguing that human-driven homogenization represents a fundamental threat to system performance across domains.

Cadenasso et al. (2013) developed the HERCULES framework for urban ecosystems, distinguishing biophysical structure from land use to better link urban form to ecological function. Their patch-based model focused on six biophysical features—woody vegetation, herbaceous vegetation, bare soil, pavement, buildings, and building typology—providing a framework for quantifying urban heterogeneity relevant to ecological processes like heat island mitigation and species movement.

3.3.8 Network and Metacommunity Frameworks

Recent frameworks incorporated concepts from spatial and interaction network theory. Bhandary et al. (2025) created a spatially explicit metacommunity framework integrating landscape configuration with mutualistic network structure to examine species persistence under habitat loss. Their approach simulated 20 empirical mutualistic networks across three landscape types (grid, random, scale-free) under correlated versus uncorrelated habitat loss patterns, incorporating extinction-colonization dynamics with mutualistic enhancement. This sophisticated modeling revealed that scale-free networks were resilient to random loss but vulnerable to correlated loss, while grid landscapes showed more gradual declines under clustered loss.

Sola and Griffin (2025) developed a heterogeneity facets framework for marine systems through a global meta-analysis of 144 rocky reef studies encompassing 24,412 data points. Their approach categorized heterogeneity metrics into six facets—Substrate 3D Amount, Substrate 2D Amount, Feature Size, Feature Variation, Feature Richness, and Substrate Complexity—then used multilevel linear mixed-effects models to test how these facets interacted with organismal traits and environmental context. Their analysis revealed that 3D structural complexity consistently had the strongest positive effect on diversity, with effects strongest for small, mobile organisms in high-stress environments.

3.3.9 Specialized Taxonomic and System Frameworks

Several methodological frameworks were tailored to specific taxonomic groups or ecosystem types. Giménez et al. (2025) employed a bat guild framework using passive acoustic monitoring across climatic and vegetation gradients in Patagonia. They classified bat passes into four phonic groups based on echolocation and used Generalized Linear Mixed-Effects Models to examine how different guilds filtered heterogeneity components.

Antonio et al. (2025) combined species distribution modeling with heterogeneity metrics to examine nonstationarity in bee diversity patterns across the Atlantic Forest. Using a multi-protocol ensemble approach and heterogeneity metrics for topography, climate, and hydrology, their analysis revealed pronounced nonstationarity—heterogeneity effects varied dramatically across 11 ecoregions.

Gasperini et al. (2025) used a rodent niche framework to distinguish specialist-generalist responses to different heterogeneity sources through a three-year capture-mark-recapture study. Their integrated quantity-heterogeneity framework considered both amount and variability of environmental resources, employing spatially explicit capture-recapture models to estimate population densities.

3.3.10 Dark Diversity and Potential Diversity Frameworks

Wan and Wang (2025) introduced a dark diversity framework that employs a hypergeometric method to estimate species that are suitable but absent from a site based on co-occurrence patterns. Using a global dataset of 26,090 vegetation plots, they estimated dark diversity and species pools through probabilistic co-occurrence analysis. They then applied multiple linear regression with second-order polynomials and path analysis to examine relationships with environmental heterogeneity. Their framework revealed that environmental heterogeneity was a stronger predictor of dark diversity and species pools than of observed diversity.

Ma (2018, 2019) extended the classic species–area relationship (SAR) to the diversity–area relationship (DAR) by replacing species richness in the SAR framework with Hill numbers (Hill 1973). A key reason for the successful extension of SAR to DAR lies in the adoption of Hill numbers, which transform virtually all existing popular diversity metrics—such as Shannon entropy and Simpson's index—into so-termed *number of species equivalents*, analogously similar to linking US dollars with gold in the Bretton Woods system and therefore making diversity measures more properly comparable across different metrics. Derived from DAR modeling are the so-termed *maximal accrual diversity* or *potential diversity*, which includes both species present locally and those absent locally but present in the regional species pool (Ma 2018, 2019, Ma & Li 2024).

Ideally, diversity metrics should be considered as measuring diversity and have nothing to do with measuring heterogeneity. In practice, however, diversity metrics—perhaps except for species richness—have been used for measuring heterogeneity. This practice, although certainly suboptimal, is not without merit: diversity metrics other than species richness can indirectly captur the unevenness of species abundance distributions, which may in turn reflect the consequences of species interactions.

3.3.11 Future Framework Integration and Development

The evolution of heterogeneity frameworks—from integrating simple field indices to integrated multi-method approaches—reflects growing recognition of HDR complexity across scales, systems, and taxa. Future progress will depend on frameworks that can accommodate this complexity while providing practical tools for both scientific understanding and conservation application. Key priorities include integrating across methodological traditions, incorporating temporal dynamics more explicitly, developing standardized measurement protocols, enhancing mechanistic linkages between heterogeneity components and ecological processes, and improving conservation applications through frameworks that translate heterogeneity metrics into management decisions and monitoring protocols.

3.4 Scale Dependence in Heterogeneity-Diversity Relationships

The pervasive influence of spatial scale on HDRs represents one of the most consistent findings across heterogeneity research. Stein et al. (2014) provided definitive evidence of scale dependence through their global meta-analysis, which revealed that larger grain sizes strengthened HDRs while larger extents weakened them, as climatic drivers become increasingly dominant at broader spatial scales. Their meticulous analysis demonstrated that studies not employing equal-area units significantly overestimated heterogeneity effects by confounding area with heterogeneity—a crucial methodological insight that has shaped subsequent study designs.

Kerr and Packer (1997) used split-line regression to show that mammal diversity across North America is driven by energy availability in low-energy regions, but by habitat heterogeneity in high-energy regions. This threshold model suggests that as climate change increases energy availability, heterogeneity may become a more widespread determinant of diversity.

Saboyá-Acosta et al. (2025) further refined the concept of scale of effect through multi-scale environmental quantification. They found that species richness and assemblage structure responded best to heterogeneity at 200-meter scales, while abundance responded at finer scales (50–100 meters). This demonstrates that different biodiversity metrics operate at different spatial scales, which must be matched with appropriate measurement approaches.

3.5 Context-Dependency: Taxa, Traits, and Environmental Gradients

HDRs are context-dependent, varying across taxa, traits, and environmental gradients. Thomsen et al. (2022), through a globally coordinated experiment, deconstructed habitat heterogeneity into three axes—amount, living function, and morphological form—and demonstrated that all three generally increased associated biodiversity. However, the relative importance of these axes varied: functional heterogeneity (living vs. non-living structure) was most critical for abundance and richness, while morphological heterogeneity was the top driver of variation in whole community structure. This indicates that the mechanism by which heterogeneity influences stability—whether by increasing population sizes, species asynchrony, or niche partitioning—depends on which aspect of heterogeneity is altered.

Sola and Griffin's (2025) global meta-analysis on rocky reefs found heterogeneity effects were strongest for small, mobile organisms (microinvertebrates, fish) and in high-stress environments, supporting the stress-gradient hypothesis. Taxonomic and guild-specific responses further illustrate this dependency. Giménez et al. (2025) found bat guilds in Patagonia responded differentially to vegetation structure based on echolocation and foraging traits. Similarly, Moudrá et al. (2025) showed bird guilds responded to distinct heterogeneity dimensions—canopy/understory birds to vegetation structure, and ground-nesters to senescent vegetation.

Environmental gradients also modulate HDRs. Antonio et al. (2025) documented pronounced nonstationarity in bee diversity across the Atlantic Forest, with heterogeneity effects varying dramatically across 11 ecoregions. For example, temperature seasonality was most important in 9 ecoregions but negatively related to richness in 6, highlighting how the ecological meaning of heterogeneity depends on regional context.

3.6 Non-Linearities and Alternative Diversity Metrics

The recognition that HDRs are often non-linear and that traditional diversity metrics may not capture heterogeneity's full effects has led to important theoretical and methodological advances. Allouche et al. (2012) provided evidence for unimodal HDRs through their area–heterogeneity tradeoff framework, demonstrating that species richness peaks at intermediate heterogeneity levels before declining as heterogeneity continues to increase.

Saboyá-Acosta et al. (2025) observed negative relationships between fine-scale land cover diversity and anuran richness in páramos, possibly resulting from extreme fine-grained heterogeneity fragmenting preferred habitat to the point where patches become too small to support viable populations.

Wan and Wang's (2025) dark diversity framework revealed that environmental heterogeneity more strongly predicts dark diversity and species pools than observed diversity, suggesting that traditional HDR frameworks may substantially underestimate heterogeneity's full effects on potential biodiversity.

3.7 Applications in Conservation and Ecosystem Management

The translation of HDR research into practical conservation strategies represents a critical frontier in applied ecology. Fuhlendorf et al. (2006) demonstrated that patch-burn-grazing could increase grassland bird diversity fourfold compared to traditional uniform management, supporting species with divergent habitat requirements. Hovick et al. (2015) found that heterogeneity enhanced landscape-scale stability despite increasing fine-scale variability—a portfolio effect with implications for managing ecosystems under climate change. Moudrá et al. (2025) demonstrated how remote sensing-derived heterogeneity metrics could guide restoration in post-mining landscapes, providing specific guidance for targeting different guilds. Bhandary et al. (2025) revealed that landscape configuration and mutualistic network structure interact to determine persistence under habitat loss, suggesting conservation strategies must be tailored to both landscape structure and threat patterns.

3.8 The Heterogeneity–Diversity–System Performance Nexus

Eisenhauer et al. (2023) proposed the HDP nexus as a unifying transdisciplinary framework connecting heterogeneity to broader sustainability challenges across ecological, agricultural, urban, and social systems. The framework shows heterogeneity enhances system performance through similar principles across domains: heterogeneous environments create opportunities for differentiation, diverse elements perform complementary functions, and complementary functions enhance overall system performance and resilience.

Human-driven homogenization represents a fundamental threat to system resilience across domains. Conversely, managing for heterogeneity emerges as a powerful strategy for enhancing sustainability and resilience, with particular relevance for conservation in human-dominated landscapes where trade-offs between production and biodiversity are often acute.

3.9 Synthesis and Future Directions

Previous reviews reveal both progress and challenges in HDR research. Methodological advances have improved our ability to quantify heterogeneity and understand ecological effects. Theoretical frameworks have evolved from simple correlations to nuanced models incorporating trade-offs, scale dependencies, and context-specific mechanisms.

Key insights include: heterogeneity effects are scale-dependent, strongly context-dependent, often non-linear, demonstrably manageable in practice, and connected to broader sustainability through transdisciplinary frameworks. Future research should prioritize methodological integration, temporal dynamics, standardized protocols, mechanistic linkages, and practical applications. Conservation should focus on heterogeneity-based strategies tailored to specific contexts and objectives, developing policies incentivizing heterogeneity conservation in working landscapes.

IV. Ecological Heterogeneity: Heterogeneity-Stability Relationships (HSR) and Ecosystem Resilience

4.1 Introduction to Heterogeneity-Stability Relationships (HSR)

The study of stability in ecological systems has undergone a fundamental paradigm shift, expanding from a primary focus on species diversity to a more nuanced consideration of heterogeneity. While the classical diversity-stability relationship examined how the number of species and their interactions influenced community persistence, contemporary theory recognizes that **ecological heterogeneity**—the spatial, temporal, and structural variation inherent in biotic entities and their interactions—is an equally critical, and often more mechanistic, determinant of stability. It is essential to distinguish ecological heterogeneity from environmental heterogeneity, which refers to variation in abiotic conditions. Ecological heterogeneity encompasses (i) spatial and temporal patchiness in the distribution and abundance of species and populations, (ii) variability in individual traits and life histories within populations, (iii) the topological and quantitative architecture of species interaction networks, and (iv) the variation in functional roles and processes across ecosystems. Understanding HSR requires integrating these biotic dimensions with the template of environmental heterogeneity to explain when and how variation buffers ecosystems against perturbations, promotes persistence, or conversely, introduces new pathways for instability.

4.2 Theoretical Foundations and Mechanistic Insights

Theoretical exploration of HSR has been marked by a dialectic between stabilization and destabilization, a tension evident in foundational works from the 1970s. Roff (1974), using stochastic simulation models, provided quantitative support for the "spreading of risk" hypothesis, demonstrating that dispersal among heterogeneous patches could increase population persistence times by orders of magnitude. In stark contrast, Steele (1974), employing analytical reaction-diffusion models, showed that diffusion in a spatially continuous system with inherent predator-prey oscillations could couple with small-scale perturbations to destabilize mean population levels. This apparent contradiction was resolved by Hastings (1990), who clarified that the effect of dispersal—and by extension, spatial structure—depends on the scale and nature of the modeled processes. In patch (metapopulation) models, where local extinction is a key process, dispersal is a stabilizing force essential for regional persistence. In diffusion (reaction-diffusion) models, which describe fine-scale movement, dispersal is mathematically non-stabilizing and can be destabilizing via mechanisms like Turing instabilities.

Modern theory has incorporated network heterogeneity into this framework. Building on May's (1972) random matrix approach, Feng and Takemoto (2014) used spectral graph theory to demonstrate that heterogeneity in interaction strengths—the variance of link weights and node degrees—is the dominant mathematical factor controlling local stability in mutualistic networks, outweighing the influence of nested topology. This finding highlights that statistical distributions of interaction properties are central to stability outcomes. Baron and Galla (2020) further complexified May's paradigm by integrating dispersal and trophic structure, proving that dispersal can induce instability in complex ecosystems, especially when predator and prey have differing dispersal rates—a result that formalizes the notion that spatial processes create new dimensions of dynamic heterogeneity. At the community level, Zelnik et al. (2024) introduced the collectivity parameter (φ), the spectral radius of the normalized interaction matrix, which quantifies the degree of integration. A high φ indicates a long "interaction horizon," where indirect effects dominate and the community behaves as a holistic entity, making reductionist, pairwise approaches insufficient for stability assessment.

4.3 Methodological Frameworks for Quantifying Ecological Heterogeneity

The rigorous study of heterogeneity-stability relationships (HSR) is predicated on the ability to accurately measure and characterize **ecological heterogeneity**. This requires a suite of quantitative frameworks distinct from, though often used in conjunction with, methods for measuring environmental heterogeneity.

4.3.1 Quantifying Spatial and Temporal Patterns in Biotic Distributions

The first domain concerns the analysis of pattern in the distribution of biological entities, especially populations. For point-referenced data on individual organisms, spatial point pattern analysis (SPPA) provides tools like Ripley's K-function and the pair correlation function g(r) to test hypotheses of clustering, randomness, or regularity across a range of spatial scales (Vinatier et al., 2011). When data are aggregated (e.g., counts per quadrat), indices such as Lloyd's mean crowding, Morisita's index, and Taylor's power law quantify the degree of aggregation and can describe the mean-variance relationship inherent in heterogeneous distributions. A critical tool for detecting spatial structure is spatial autocorrelation analysis, using statistics like Moran's I or Geary's C, which test whether observations from nearby locations are more similar (positive autocorrelation) or dissimilar (negative autocorrelation) than expected by chance. This is a signature of processes like dispersal limitation, habitat filtering, or conspecific attraction. It is crucial to note that these statistical descriptions of biotic pattern are often the first step in a longer analytical chain that seeks to explain them using correlates of **environmental heterogeneity** (e.g., using spatial regression with environmental covariates), but the patterns themselves are measures of *ecological* heterogeneity.

4.3.2 Characterizing Heterogeneity in Species Interaction Networks

The second domain, central to modern community ecology, is the quantification of heterogeneity in species interaction networks. This represents a profound form of biotic heterogeneity that moves beyond species lists to the architecture of relationships. Poisot et al. (2012) provided a foundational framework for measuring heterogeneity *among* networks by partitioning whole-network dissimilarity (β_{WN}) into components due to species turnover (β_{ST}) and interaction rewiring (β_{IR}). This allows researchers to distinguish whether differences between communities arise from different species compositions or from the same species interacting differently. Within a single network, heterogeneity is captured by the statistical distribution of interaction properties. Key metrics include the degree distribution (describing heterogeneity in number of partners), the distribution of interaction strengths (link weights), and indices like connectance and modularity. Feng and Takemoto (2014) employed spectral graph theory to demonstrate that the variance in node strength and link weight—metrics of network heterogeneity—are direct mathematical determinants of the community matrix's dominant eigenvalue, and thus of local stability. A significant methodological challenge in this domain is sampling. Jordano (2016) emphasized the need for interaction accumulation curves and the adaptation of asymptotic richness estimators to account for "forbidden links" and incomplete sampling, ensuring that measured network heterogeneity reflects biological reality and not just sampling artefact.

4.3.3 Mechanistic Modeling: Linking Pattern to Process

The third domain involves mechanistic modeling, where the goal is not merely to describe heterogeneity but to understand the processes that generate it. This is where the link between pattern and process is formally tested. The hierarchy of models ranges from spatially implicit metapopulation models, which treat patches as discrete units and are used to study persistence (Roff, 1974), to spatially explicit individual-based models (IBMs). IBMs simulate individuals with defined rules for behavior, movement, and life history, allowing complex population- and community-level heterogeneity to emerge from bottom-up processes. The pattern-oriented modelling (POM) approach, highlighted by Vinatier et al. (2011), provides a rigorous framework for this testing: multiple, independent observed patterns of ecological heterogeneity are used as filters to select among competing mechanistic hypotheses or to calibrate model parameters. This cycle—statistical description, correlation with environmental drivers, then mechanistic simulation and validation—is essential for moving from describing heterogeneity to explaining it.

These methodological frameworks for ecological heterogeneity stand in clear contrast to those for environmental heterogeneity. The latter typically involves geostatistics (*e.g.,* variograms, kriging) to interpolate abiotic variables like soil pH or temperature, or the calculation of landscape metrics (e.g., patch size, edge density, contagion) from GIS data. While environmental heterogeneity is a key driver of ecological heterogeneity, the tools to measure them are specialized to their respective data types: species occurrence matrices and interaction networks versus raster maps of abiotic variables. The power of HSR research lies in strategically combining these toolkits—for example, using a spatial regression model to partition the variance in a species' aggregation (ecological heterogeneity) into components explained by soil moisture gradients (environmental heterogeneity) versus unexplained spatial autocorrelation that may imply biotic processes.

4.3.4 Scale Dependence in Heterogeneity-Stability Relationships

The influence of heterogeneity on stability is intrinsically scale-dependent, a principle that reconciles many contradictory findings. The effects observed are contingent upon the grain (resolution) and extent (total area) of observation relative to the scale of the ecological processes governing species movement, interaction, and response to the environment. Kadmon and Allouche (2007) provided a seminal demonstration of this principle by unifying island biogeography and niche theory. Their model showed that the relationship between habitat heterogeneity (number of habitat types) and species richness could be positive, negative, or unimodal depending on island area and immigration rate. In small, isolated patches, increasing heterogeneity reduces the effective area per habitat type, elevating extinction risk through demographic stochasticity, thereby destabilizing the community. Only in large, well-connected landscapes does heterogeneity consistently provide niche opportunities that increase diversity and potentially stability.

This scale context extends to spatial epidemiology. Brooks et al. (2008) found that the predictive power of different network models for disease dynamics was scale- and question-specific. Binary distance-threshold networks, capturing local connectivity, best predicted the rate of epidemic spread (an inherently fine-scale, transient dynamic). In contrast, continuous-weighted metapopulation networks, integrating connectivity across the broader landscape, excelled at predicting equilibrium prevalence (a coarse-scale, long-term outcome). This underscores that the "stability" of a disease—its persistence or endemic level—is assessed differently at different scales, and the relevant heterogeneity must be measured accordingly.

At macroecological scales, Zhao et al. (2024) revealed "extent-dependence" in the drivers of extinction risk for flowering plants in China. The dominant factor explaining spatial heterogeneity in threat shifted from vegetation structure at the national extent, to climatic drivers in humid southern regions, to evolutionary history in temperate northern zones. This means a conservation intervention designed to enhance stability (persistence) based on a national-scale model may be ineffective or even counterproductive if applied uniformly, ignoring regional-scale heterogeneities in the primary threats. Thus, the scale at which heterogeneity is measured and the scale at which stability is defined are inseparable considerations in HSR research.

4.3.5 Context-Dependency: Taxa, Traits, and Environmental Gradients

Beyond scale, the outcome of HSR is profoundly context-dependent, mediated by the specific traits of the organisms involved, the type of interactions, and the ambient environmental gradient. Heterogeneity is not a universally beneficial or detrimental input; its effect is filtered through the functional biology of the system.

Trait-mediated context is central to phenotypic plasticity studies. Turcotte and Levine (2016) argued that plasticity's impact on coexistence depends on how trait changes interact with the heterogeneous social context of competitors. Plasticity only stabilizes coexistence if it provides a relative advantage to a species when it is rare and surrounded by heterospecifics, thereby strengthening niche differences. If the plastic response merely increases fitness uniformly, it can exacerbate competitive exclusion. Similarly, Leal, Seehausen, and Matthews (2017) framed stoichiometric phenotypes as evolving at the interface of external resource heterogeneity and internal ontogenetic heterogeneity in nutritional demand. The fitness of a given elemental phenotype is therefore contingent on the specific environmental context, and adaptation consists of evolving reaction norms that perform well across the range of encountered heterogeneities.

Perhaps the strongest evidence for context-dependency comes from studies showing that heterogeneity can trigger opposing pathways that cancel out. Sola et al. (2025), in a three-year field experiment, found that structural heterogeneity created no net change in community temporal stability because it simultaneously activated stabilizing and destabilizing cascades. It provided refugia (stabilizing) and increased species richness and asynchrony (stabilizing), but it also suppressed a dominant barnacle species and consumer populations, both of which happened to have net stabilizing effects in that specific system. The null net effect underscores that the functional role of species affected by heterogeneity—whether they are stabilizers or destabilizers—determines the ultimate impact on HSR. This contrasts sharply with classical diversity-stability expectations, where increased richness is typically assumed to have a monotonically positive (or at least non-negative) effect on stability through statistical averaging or complementarity.

4.3.6 Non-Linearities and Alternative Stability Metrics

A critical advancement in HSR research is the recognition that "stability" is not a unitary concept and that heterogeneity may affect its different facets in non-linear and divergent ways. Classical local stability analysis, which asks whether a system returns to equilibrium after an infinitesimal perturbation, represents just one dimension. Other key metrics include persistence (time to extinction), resilience (speed of return), resistance (magnitude of change after a perturbation), and temporal variability (inverse of the coefficient of variation). Heterogeneity can influence these metrics independently.

Cam et al. (2016) addressed a fundamental non-linearity and inferential challenge in life-history studies: the "communicating vessels" conundrum between hidden persistent demographic heterogeneity (HPDH—fixed differences in individual quality) and state-dependence (where past events influence future probabilities). Statistically, ignoring one process inflates the estimated effect of the other. This has direct implications for stability: if HPDH is high, populations may show high variance in fitness outcomes, affecting persistence, but models that only account for state-dependence may misattribute this variance to a destabilizing feedback loop. Robust inference requires models that simultaneously estimate both processes.

In network theory, Feng and Takemoto (2014) demonstrated that increasing heterogeneity in interaction strengths linearly increases the dominant eigenvalue (λ_1), thereby reducing local stability. However, this linear relationship within their specific analytical framework does not imply that heterogeneity linearly affects other stability metrics. For instance, a network with highly heterogeneous interactions might be less locally stable but more *robust* to random species loss if generalist hubs (which create the heterogeneity) maintain connectivity. Zelnik et al. (2024) further decoupled collectivity (φ) from instability, showing that a community can have a high degree of integration (long interaction horizons) yet remain dynamically stable. High φ implies that short-term dynamics are unpredictable and perturbations propagate far, which are characteristics of a certain type of dynamic behavior, not necessarily of instability in the sense of divergence from equilibrium.

Empirically, Start (2020) documented a non-linear, extreme event-driven shift in heterogeneity. A catastrophic windstorm homogenized the abiotic environment by flattening vegetation but dramatically increased spatial heterogeneity in biotic interactions and natural selection. This led to a transient peak in eco-evolutionary heterogeneity, demonstrating how stability metrics like persistence and evolutionary trajectory can be abruptly altered by a perturbation that itself changes the heterogeneity template. These examples collectively argue that a comprehensive understanding of HSR must specify which stability metric is relevant and accept that heterogeneity may have non-linear, threshold, or even opposing effects on different components of stability.

4.4 Heterogeneity-Diversity-Stability Triangle Relationships

The interplay between heterogeneity (primarily environmental or habitat heterogeneity), diversity, and stability forms a dynamic, triangular relationship that is more integrative than the classical, linear diversity-stability paradigm. In this triangle, heterogeneity acts as a primary driver, diversity often serves as an intermediate mediator or emergent property, and stability is the contingent outcome.

4.4.1 The Virtuous Cycle: Heterogeneity → Diversity → Stability

Heterogeneity can increase diversity by creating niche opportunities (Kadmon & Allouche, 2007) and by allowing for greater interaction diversity through rewiring (Poisot et al., 2012; Luna et al. 2020). This increased diversity can, in turn, contribute to stability through mechanisms like asynchrony (where species respond differently to perturbations, damping community-level variance) and statistical averaging (the portfolio effect). This represents a potentially reinforcing, virtuous cycle.

4.4.2 The Destabilizing Pathways: When Heterogeneity Undermines Stability

However, the triangle is not always virtuous. Heterogeneity can sometimes decrease local diversity, as in small, isolated patches (Kadmon & Allouche, 2007). Furthermore, increased diversity does not guarantee increased stability if it is accompanied by destabilizing network structures. Feng and Takemoto (2014) showed that the heterogeneity driving certain diversity patterns (e.g., a few super-generalists) could itself be destabilizing at the local equilibrium level. Similarly, Baron and Galla (2020) demonstrated that the complexity associated with high diversity, when coupled with dispersal, could induce new spatial instabilities.

4.4.3 Counteracting Cascades and the Neutral Net Effect

The most nuanced understanding comes from recognizing that heterogeneity, diversity, and stability are linked by multiple, simultaneous pathways that can be reinforcing or opposing. Sola et al. (2025) empirically mapped this triangle: heterogeneity increased diversity (a stabilizing pathway), but it also directly suppressed stabilizing species (a destabilizing pathway), resulting in no net change in stability. This illustrates that the diversity-stability relationship is not an isolated law but is embedded within, and conditioned by, the broader context of ecological heterogeneity. The triangle framework thus forces a systems-level view, where predicting stability requires understanding how a change in heterogeneity propagates through the entire web of causes and effects, altering both the parts (diversity) and their interactions, to determine the behavior of the whole.

4.4.4 Distinguishing Environmental and Ecological Heterogeneity in the Triangle Framework

A critical conceptual clarification is necessary regarding the composition of the heterogeneity–diversity–stability triangle. In traditional formulations, the term "heterogeneity" predominantly refers to **environmental heterogeneity**—variation in abiotic factors such as topography, microclimate, soil properties, and resource availability. In this abiotic-driven model, the causal arrow is typically oriented from environmental heterogeneity → increased diversity → enhanced stability via mechanisms such as niche partitioning and asynchrony.

The relationship becomes more intricate and analytically demanding when "heterogeneity" is understood as **ecological heterogeneity**—the variation intrinsic to biotic entities, including individual trait distributions, population genetic structure, spatial aggregation of organisms, and the topological complexity of interaction networks. In this context, the assumed unidirectional influence of heterogeneity on diversity may be reversed or become circular. High species or functional diversity can itself drive increases in ecological heterogeneity, for example, by expanding the range of trait values or introducing novel interaction structures. This establishes a potential feedback loop wherein heterogeneity fosters diversity, and diversity, in turn, amplifies heterogeneity.

This reciprocity is further complicated when the metrics used to quantify diversity and ecological heterogeneity are mathematically linked or even identical—such as when measures of functional diversity are derived from trait variance, which is also a core metric of trait heterogeneity. Such conflation obscures causal inference and challenges empirical tests of the triangle's internal relationships.

Therefore, to refine the predictive and explanatory power of the heterogeneity–diversity–stability framework, it is essential to explicitly distinguish between environmental and ecological heterogeneity in both theory and methodology. Future advances should focus on: (i) developing independent, non-overlapping metrics for each form of heterogeneity; (ii) applying causal inference techniques, such as structural equation modeling or targeted experiments, to disentangle their directional influences; and (iii) constructing dynamical models that incorporate feedbacks between ecological heterogeneity and diversity. Clarifying this distinction represents a vital step toward a more mechanistic and applicable understanding of stability in complex ecosystems.

4.5 Applications in Epidemiology, Agriculture, and Forest Management

The principles of HSR have direct, critical applications in managing ecosystems for sustainability, human health, and production.

4.5.1 Epidemiology: Heterogeneity of Mixing and Contact Networks

In epidemiology, the foundational work of Bolker (1997) established that heterogeneity in host contact patterns is not a minor perturbation but the central determinant of disease persistence and spread. Models that ignore this heterogeneity, assuming homogeneous mixing, fail to predict key dynamics like the persistence of diseases in meta-populations via rescue effects or the lowered endemic prevalence due to “wasted contacts.” Brooks et al. (2008) provided empirical validation, showing that spatially explicit network models constructed from real host distributions could accurately forecast epidemic growth and equilibrium states, offering a powerful tool for targeting interventions at high-betweenness “bridge” hosts.

4.5.2 Agriculture: Designing for Functional Heterogeneity

In agricultural management, the applied perspective of Quévreux et al. (2024) is paramount. They argue that sustainable ecosystem management requires next-generation models that integrate spatial, temporal, and interaction heterogeneity. For instance, designing agricultural landscapes with heterogeneous patches of natural habitat can promote natural enemy populations and provide pest control via spillover, enhancing the stability of crop yields. However, as Sola et al. (2025) caution, such heterogeneity must be planned with knowledge of the local species pool; if it inadvertently suppresses key predator species or disrupts stabilizing trophic interactions, the net benefit may be null or negative. Trait-based approaches that incorporate functional heterogeneity can help predict which species will fill critical roles in engineered heterogeneous landscapes.

4.5.3 Forest Management and Conservation: Engineering Heterogeneity

Forest management and restoration ecology are increasingly guided by heterogeneity principles. Thomsen et al.’s (2022) work on facilitation cascades provides a blueprint: biodiversity and potential ecosystem stability can be enhanced not just by planting a primary foundation species (e.g., trees), but by actively promoting or introducing secondary foundation species (e.g., epiphytes, understory plants) that add morphological and functional heterogeneity. This deliberate construction of heterogeneous habitat structure mimics natural processes and accelerates the development of complex, stable communities. In conservation, the work of Zhao et al. (2024) translates HSR into policy by demonstrating that conservation strategies must be spatially stratified to match the heterogeneous drivers of extinction risk across different regions, moving beyond one-size-fits-all protected area planning.

4.6 Synthesis and Future Directions

The exploration of heterogeneity-stability relationships has matured from early, contradictory models into a sophisticated field that recognizes the multidimensional nature of both heterogeneity and stability. Key synthesized insights include: (i) HSR is fundamentally scale- and context-dependent, mediated by species traits, interaction types, and environmental gradients; (ii) methodological advances in spatial statistics, network analysis, and mechanistic modeling are essential for quantifying ecological heterogeneity and moving beyond pattern description to process understanding; (iii) heterogeneity can activate counteracting ecological pathways, leading to non-intuitive, neutral, or even negative net effects on stability, challenging simplistic prescriptions; and (iv) HSR enriches and complicates the classical diversity-stability paradigm by placing it within a triangular framework where heterogeneity is a primary driver.

Future research must tackle several frontiers to translate this knowledge into predictive capacity. First, there is a pressing need to develop integrated modeling platforms that seamlessly couple spatial heterogeneity, dynamic interaction networks, and biogeochemical cycles, as called for by Quévreux et al. (2024). Second, long-term, multi-scale experimental manipulations are required to test theoretical predictions about threshold effects and the interaction of different heterogeneity types (e.g., spatial + temporal). Third, the eco-evolutionary dimension of HSR requires greater integration. Studies like those of Start (2020) and Leal et al. (2017) show that heterogeneity shapes selection, and rapid evolution can feedback to alter heterogeneity and stability on contemporary timescales. Fourth, investigating the diversity–heterogeneity–stability triangle—especially distinguishing between environmental and ecological heterogeneity—presents significant conceptual and methodological challenges; however, advances in analytical techniques and robust experimental validation hold particular promise for generating novel insights. Fifth, applied work must move from qualitative principles to quantitative, design-ready tools. This involves parameterizing how specific management actions (e.g., corridor width, patch size distribution, crop mixture complexity) alter measurable heterogeneity and predicting the outcome for desired stability metrics in specific contexts.

Ultimately, embracing ecological heterogeneity is not merely an academic refinement; it is a necessity for understanding and stewarding complex living systems in an era of global change. By moving beyond the mean-field assumptions of the past and grappling with the variegated, contingent, and interconnected reality of nature, heterogeneity-stability research provides a more powerful and realistic foundation for ecology, conservation, and sustainability science.

V. Integrative Heterogeneity—Environmental and Ecological Heterogeneities Across Scales

5.1 Integrative Heterogeneity: A Framework for Cross-Scale Analysis

The preceding sections established the conceptual foundations of heterogeneity (Section I), the models and frameworks for its measurement (Section II), and its role as a driver of biodiversity (Section III: Environmental Heterogeneity) and mediator of stability (Section IV: Ecological Heterogeneity). We now examine how heterogeneity manifests across managed and natural systems—from molecular interactions to planetary mantles. The extreme pluralism of heterogeneity research, already evident within ecology as reviewed in previous sections, becomes even more apparent when we cross disciplinary boundaries. In the remainder of this review, we offer **integrative heterogeneity** as a working concept—not to impose uniformity, but to help navigate this pluralism and identify common patterns across diverse systems. Our use of "integrative" draws inspiration from approaches in biostatistics and cancer biology that combine multiple data sources or levels of analysis under conditions of heterogeneity (Liu et al., 2013; Wang & Wang, 2016), while extending this perspective to the broader ecological and environmental contexts surveyed here.

This framework rests on three fundamental dichotomies that intersect in virtually every real-world system. First, the **environmental versus ecological distinction**: environmental heterogeneity (Section III) constitutes the *template*—the abiotic and biotic structure within which processes unfold—while ecological heterogeneity (Section IV) constitutes the *process*—the dynamic responses, interactions, and feedbacks that emerge from and subsequently modify that template. Second, **spatial scale** spans from molecules to planets, with the same principles operating across all scales even as their manifestation shifts. Third, **temporal scale** spans from femtoseconds to billions of years, with heterogeneity serving as both record of past process and driver of future dynamics.

A family of related concepts illuminates different facets of this integrative view. Established frameworks include **molecular heterogeneity** (Deng et al., 2019; Kilpinen et al., 2017), **genomic heterogeneity** (Burrell et al., 2013; Kopac et al., 2014; Turajlic et al., 2019; Weiss, 1993), **multi-scale heterogeneity** grounded in scale transition theory (Chesson et al., 2005) and elaborated in studies of multiscale integration across biological systems (Hong et al., 2018; Serra et al., 2018), and **coupled heterogeneity** from epidemiological modeling of interacting sources of variation (Vazquez-Prokopec et al., 2016). Building on these foundations, we introduce several additional concepts that emerge from the synthesis that follows: **reciprocal heterogeneity** to capture feedback loops between template and process, **trans-scale heterogeneity** to describe how patterns and processes at one scale affect others, **co-evolutionary heterogeneity** for systems like insect-plant interactions where reciprocal selection over deep time has produced structured variation, and **synthetic heterogeneity** for the integrative endeavor of this review itself. Two more ambitious concepts—**universal heterogeneity** and the framing of **heterogeneity in complex systems**—

capture the full scope of what we attempt here, though we adopt the more accessible "integrative heterogeneity" as our umbrella term.

Throughout the domains that follow, insect-plant interactions will serve as a recurring microcosm, demonstrating how template and process interact across all scales. We begin with agriculture, where human management of environmental heterogeneity produces observable ecological responses at farm to landscape scales over seasons to decades.

5.2 Agriculture: Engineering the Template, Observing the Response

Agriculture offers the clearest demonstration of deliberate environmental heterogeneity manipulation to achieve ecological outcomes. Farmers directly control the template—crop composition, field configuration, edge density, non-crop habitat arrangement—and the ecological response unfolds in biodiversity, trophic interactions, and ecosystem services. This positions agriculture at the human-managed end of our integrative framework: environmental modification with explicit ecological intent, operating at farm to landscape scales over seasons to rotation cycles, where feedback loops between outcomes and subsequent management create coupled socio-ecological dynamics.

Smith (1938) established the first quantitative framework for scale-dependent heterogeneity in agriculture, demonstrating that crop yield variance follows predictable power-law relationships with plot size—an early recognition that heterogeneity itself, not just mean yields, contains essential information. Benton, Vickery, and Wilson (2003) later reconceptualized farmland biodiversity loss not as isolated intensive practices but as systematic erosion of heterogeneity across spatial and temporal scales, transforming conservation from mitigating specific pressures to actively engineering heterogeneity as a management goal.

Priyadarshana et al. (2024) provide global meta-analytic confirmation across 122 studies that both compositional heterogeneity (crop diversity) and configurational heterogeneity (field edge density) consistently boost biodiversity across taxa and climates. Sirami et al. (2019) delivered a transformative finding: crop heterogeneity itself—particularly smaller field sizes—can be a stronger driver of multi-trophic diversity than the amount of semi-natural cover, offering a "third way" beyond land-sparing/sharing debates. Wang et al. (2021) synthesized these advances into an integrative framework merging the ecological Patch-Corridor-Matrix model with agronomic Crop Layout Theory to guide multifunctional landscape design.

The critical insight for integrative heterogeneity is the feedback loop: ecological outcomes inform subsequent management. Nicholson and Williams (2021) show homogeneous croplands increase pesticide frequency and intensity, while heterogeneous landscapes support natural pest control, reducing chemical inputs. Here, the ecological response (pest dynamics) directly shapes future environmental modifications. Rother et al. (2025) reveal through spatial network analysis that forest cover heterogenizes pest dispersal connectivity—transforming fully connected mosaics into fragmented networks that slow outbreaks. Environmental configuration controls ecological connectivity, which determines outbreak dynamics, which then inform landscape design.

Van der Ploeg and Ventura (2014) add the crucial socio-ecological dimension: farming styles represent culturally rooted pathways—contrasting modes of organization such as "farming economically" versus "agrarian entrepreneurs"—that generate distinct outcomes for biodiversity and resilience. Heterogeneity in human decision-making becomes part of the coupled system, framing farmer diversity not as a problem to be standardized away but as a reservoir of adaptive capacity. Integrative heterogeneity thus encompasses not just biophysical variation but the human dimension of management itself.

Agriculture demonstrates that environmental manipulation with ecological intent creates feedback loops where outcomes shape subsequent management—the essence of integrative heterogeneity at human scales, where template and process interact across fields and farms, seasons and decades.

5.3 Forestry: Structure, Legacy, and the Rewilding Feedback

Forestry reveals how environmental structure—the three-dimensional architecture of stands and landscapes—creates conditions for ecological complexity, which then feeds back to modify the forest environment through succession, disturbance, and trophic interactions. Operating at stand to regional scales over decades to centuries, forestry exemplifies the reciprocal relationship that is the hallmark of integrative heterogeneity.

Beugnon et al. (2025) show through simulation that spatial arrangement of tree species is a critical, manageable variable; optimizing configurational heterogeneity enhances biomass, litter mixing, and decomposition. This is environmental manipulation yielding ecological function. Guyot et al. (2016) provide continental-scale evidence for associational resistance across European forests: increased tree species richness consistently reduces insect herbivory, demonstrating that compositional heterogeneity directly enhances forest resilience—an ecological outcome with immediate management implications for pest control.

Temporal dynamics reveal the feedback loop most clearly. Buness et al. (2025) document a U-shaped trajectory of understory diversity over centuries in boreal forests: initially driven by post-disturbance resource pulses (environmental template), later by the resurgence of structural heterogeneity from natural canopy gaps (ecological modification of environment). This demonstrates that heterogeneity is not static but dynamically produced through reciprocal interactions. Conventional forestry fails by truncating succession, eliminating the late-successional stage where heterogeneity-driven diversity rebounds. Meyers et al. (2025) complement this finding, showing that light availability and spatio-temporal heterogeneity shape soil seed bank diversity, with implications for regeneration potential—the ecological legacy that will shape future forest structure.

Cours and Duflot (2025) synthesize evidence across forest types: landscape heterogeneity—vertical stratification, canopy gaps, understory complexity—consistently positively influences avian species richness. These effects operate across scales, from within-stand heterogeneity influencing local foraging guilds to landscape-level patchiness affecting regional species pools. Massó Estaje et al. (2025) provide experimental confirmation: enhancing structural heterogeneity in forest landscapes promotes hoverfly diversity across taxonomic, functional, and phylogenetic dimensions, demonstrating that heterogeneity manipulation can actively restore biodiversity—a direct test of the integrative heterogeneity framework.

Czyżewski and Svenning (2025) use phylogenetic analysis to argue that most temperate forest plants are associated with historically heterogeneous, herbivore-maintained semi-open woodlands, not the closed-canopy forests that dominate today. This historical mismatch necessitates re-evaluation of conservation baselines. The management response—rewilding-inspired forestry articulated by Wang et al. (2025)—explicitly aims to restore multi-dimensional heterogeneity by reinstating trophic complexity, natural disturbance regimes, and structural variability. Here, ecological understanding (how large herbivores shape woodland structure) directly informs environmental manipulation, closing the loop.

Torresani et al. (2025) validate the Spectral Variation Hypothesis, demonstrating that spectral heterogeneity from EnMAP satellite data reliably reveals biodiversity patterns in forests, enabling scalable monitoring of the heterogeneity-biodiversity relationship—a methodological advance essential for integrative heterogeneity management.

Forestry demonstrates that heterogeneity is dynamically produced through reciprocal interactions between environmental structure and ecological processes across stand to regional scales and decadal to centennial timescales—requiring management that works with, not against, these feedbacks.

5.4 Insect-Plant Systems and Evolution: The Trophic-Evolutionary Crucible Across Scales

Insect-plant interactions and their evolutionary context serve as the integrative microcosm of heterogeneity research—spanning molecular to landscape scales, seconds to millions of years, and exemplifying the reciprocal feedback between environmental template and ecological process in its most dynamic and historically deep form.

At the **molecular scale**, heterogeneity governs fundamental biological processes. Huthmacher et al. (2025) show that insect cuticular hydrocarbons exhibit intrinsic physical heterogeneity—a bimodal viscosity distribution that simultaneously optimizes waterproofing and chemical communication. This complex phase behavior can be plastically adjusted to thermal stress, revealing sophisticated phenotypic plasticity shaped by evolution—heterogeneity as adaptation at the molecular level.

At the **genomic scale**, variation in genome architecture shapes the potential for sociality and co-evolution. Behrends et al. (2025) demonstrate in phylogenetically controlled analysis that broad genome architecture in social *Hymenoptera* is more strongly shaped by deep phylogenetic history than by social behavior itself. Where associations with sociality exist—such as lower GC content in social bees or smaller genomes in social sweat bees—they are lineage-specific and even contradictory across clades. This indicates no universal genomic "roadmap" to complex social organization; instead, different evolutionary lineages arrive at similar social phenotypes via heterogeneous trajectories, depending on ancestral genetic background and selective pressures. Integrative heterogeneity must respect this phylogenetic contingency.

At the **organismal and population scales**, heterogeneity manifests as within-species variation with profound ecological consequences. Matilla et al. (2005) review seed heteromorphism as bet-hedging adaptation to environmental unpredictability. Here, environmental heterogeneity (unpredictable conditions) selects for ecological heterogeneity (within-population trait variation in germination timing and physiology), which buffers populations against future environmental variation—a clear reciprocal dynamic with implications for restoration and conservation in variable environments. Gordon (2021) explores how movement, encounter rate, and collective behavior in ant colonies depend on heterogeneity in individual activity patterns. Colony-level resilience emerges from individual-level heterogeneity in movement paths, task performance, and interaction networks—internal ecological variation that is itself an evolved response to environmental challenges. O'Shea-Wheller et al. (2020) synthesize functional heterogeneity in superorganisms, documenting how variation in genotype, morphology, and behavior underpins emergent properties including decentralized control, homeostasis, and collective decision-making.

At **population and community scales**, herbivory and pollination structure ecological networks. Guyot et al. (2016) demonstrate associational resistance, where tree species diversity reduces overall herbivory across European forests. Nicholson and Williams (2021) link homogeneous croplands to increased pesticide intensity, while heterogeneous landscapes support natural pest control. Rother et al. (2025) reveal through spatial network analysis that forest cover heterogenizes pest dispersal connectivity—environmental configuration directly controls ecological connectivity, determining outbreak dynamics. Hendel et al. (2024) show that forest management impacts insectivorous bats not simply by altering physical structure, but primarily through indirect, prey-mediated effects, with distinct bottom-up pathways for different bat guilds. Environmental modification ripples through trophic networks, and understanding those ecological pathways is essential for predicting outcomes.

At the **landscape scale**, agricultural mosaics and forest configuration determine pest dynamics and biological control. The work of Sirami et al. (2019) and Priyadarshana et al. (2024), discussed in Section 5.1, applies equally here—insect-plant interactions are the mechanism through which crop heterogeneity translates into biodiversity outcomes.

At the **evolutionary scale**, reciprocal selection pressures over millions of years have produced the specialized relationships that structure terrestrial ecosystems. The molecular, genomic, and organismal heterogeneity described above is not static but the product of deep co-evolutionary history. Behrends et al. (2025) demonstrate that genomic signatures of sociality, where they exist, are lineage-specific and even contradictory across clades, indicating that different evolutionary lineages arrive at similar phenotypes via heterogeneous trajectories over deep time. Huthmacher et al. (2025) show that cuticular hydrocarbon heterogeneity can be plastically adjusted to thermal stress—a phenotypic plasticity shaped by evolution that operates across both ecological and evolutionary timescales.

Boyle et al. (2025) synthesize causes and consequences of insect decline in tropical forests, identifying habitat heterogeneity loss as a primary driver operating alongside climate change and pollution. Their analysis reveals that heterogeneity loss simplifies insect communities, reduces functional diversity, and undermines ecosystem services—demonstrating that the evolutionary and ecological dynamics discussed above are now threatened by anthropogenic homogenization, making integrative heterogeneity an urgent conservation priority.

Insect-plant interactions and their evolutionary context reveal that heterogeneity propagates through multiple trophic levels and across all scales—from molecules to landscapes, from milliseconds to millions of years. They are the clearest demonstration of integrative heterogeneity's full scope: template and process in reciprocal interaction, spatial and temporal scaling as inherent properties, and heterogeneity as both driver and outcome of system dynamics across the deepest evolutionary timescales.

5.5 Hydrology: The Abiotic Template and Its Biotic Responses

Hydrology presents the most purely environmental starting point—subsurface properties, watershed structure, flow paths—yet ecological responses transform the questions asked and methods employed. Operating at watershed to basin scales over years to millennia, hydrology reveals how even the most abiotic template cannot be understood without the ecological lens.

Lake and Jensen (1991) establish the measurement foundation, distinguishing static heterogeneity measures (e.g., Dykstra-Parsons coefficient) that ignore spatial structure from dynamic measures (e.g., dispersivity) derived from flow response that are physically meaningful but plagued by scaling problems. This dichotomy frames the field's core dilemma: how to represent the subsurface meaningfully for applications ranging from contaminant transport to water resource management.

Koltermann and Gorelick (1996) catalog the representational response, classifying methods as descriptive, structure-imitating (geostatistics), and process-imitating (genetic models). The evolution within structure-imitating methods seeks to solve the connectivity problem, culminating in multiple-point geostatistics (MPS). Hu and Chugunova (2008) comprehensively review MPS, which abandons analytical random function models in favor of learning high-order statistics directly from training images, thereby capturing the connectivity of complex geologic features like channels that two-point statistics miss. De Marsily et al. (2005) synthesize the broader challenge: heterogeneity controls groundwater flow, contaminant transport, and water availability—not as noise to be averaged but as system determinant requiring explicit characterization.

The transformative shift came from recognizing that ecological processes both respond to and modify this template. McDonnell et al. (2007) argued watershed hydrology was trapped in descriptive complexity, calling for a paradigm shift from describing *what* heterogeneity exists to understanding *why* it forms—seeking organizing principles (optimality, network theory) and focusing on emergent watershed functional traits. This shift is fundamentally ecological: treating watersheds as systems whose behavior emerges from interactions between environmental structure and biological processes.

Palmer, Bely, and Berg (1997) anticipated this integration, urging stream ecologists to treat variance itself as an ecological metric and study its scale dependence—recognizing that heterogeneity is not nuisance but information. Dent and Grimm (1999) provided empirical demonstration, documenting that spatial heterogeneity of stream water nutrients increases with ecosystem development over successional time. Here, the ecological process (succession) modifies the environmental template (nutrient distributions), which then shapes future ecological dynamics—integrative heterogeneity in action.

Hydrology demonstrates that even the most abiotic template cannot be understood without the ecological lens—integrative heterogeneity requires accounting for how biological processes both respond to and modify the physical environment across watershed scales and successional timescales.

5.6 Planetary Systems: Heterogeneity at the Ultimate Scale

Planetary geology and cosmochemistry represent the ultimate scale-up of integrative heterogeneity—where the template (mantle composition, isotopic ratios, seismic structure) records processes (convection, impacts, thermal processing) operating at global scales over billions of years, with no possibility of direct manipulation, only inference. If the framework applies here, it is truly universal.

At the **finest scale of planetary heterogeneity**, nucleosynthetic isotope variations preserve signatures of stellar processes that predate the solar system. Trinquier et al. (2009) demonstrate that correlated mass-independent variations in titanium-46 and titanium-50 do not reflect simple mixing inefficiency but rather record selective thermal processing in the protoplanetary disk. This isotopic heterogeneity demonstrates that terrestrial planets accreted from pre-processed materials rather than primordial dust, fundamentally revising models of planetary feedstock. Here, the template (isotopic composition) records process (thermal history) from 4.5 billion years ago.

At the **mantle scale**, thermochemical heterogeneity expressed as continent-sized seismic anomalies (Large Low-Shear-Velocity Provinces, or LLVPs) represents a distinct type with profound implications. Simmons et al. (2009) employ joint inversion frameworks that simultaneously reconcile seismic tomography, geoid anomalies, dynamic topography, and plate motions within geodynamically consistent models to solve for three-dimensional thermochemical structure. Stixrude and Lithgow-Bertelloni (2012) demonstrate that these are not passive features but active, long-lived drivers of mantle convection and chemical evolution that have shaped Earth's geodynamic history for billions of years. Their origin is central to understanding planetary accretion, with current hypotheses ranging from accumulation of subducted oceanic crust to preservation of primordial material from Earth's differentiation.

A particularly transformative hypothesis proposes that the LLVPs are preserved mantle material from the protoplanet Theia, emplaced during the Moon-forming giant impact (Yuan et al., 2023). Using ultra-high-resolution smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH) simulations, Yuan et al. (2023) demonstrate that a Theia-derived mantle contribution can remain compositionally distinct and preferentially segregate into thermochemical piles that match the observed LLVP locations. This elevates deep mantle heterogeneity from a structural curiosity to a primary archive of cataclysmic planetary-scale events, potentially providing the first direct physical evidence of the giant impactor itself while explaining fundamental features of Earth's internal architecture.

At the **applied scale of petroleum geology and reservoir engineering**, petrophysical heterogeneity—the spatial variation in properties like porosity, permeability, and mineralogy—transcends theoretical significance to become a controlling economic factor. Fitch et al. (2015) demonstrate that heterogeneity directly governs subsurface fluid storage capacity, flow pathways, sweep efficiency, and ultimately hydrocarbon recovery, making its characterization essential for both exploration success and production optimization. Critically, they emphasize that identical statistical heterogeneity values (e.g., the same Lorenz Coefficient) can result from radically different spatial architectures—such as finely layered versus chaotically distributed high-permeability zones—that would produce profoundly different fluid flow behaviors yet remain indistinguishable to scalar metrics. This highlights the critical distinction between the amplitude of variability and its spatial organization, a challenge that resonates across all scales of heterogeneity research.

Across all these planetary domains, the principle of scale-dependence governs interpretation. Fitch et al. (2015) explicitly recognize that features homogeneous at one scale (e.g., to a seismic wave) may be heterogeneous at another (e.g., to a core plug). The analytical frameworks—from isotopic correlation diagrams to joint geophysical inversion to statistical reservoir coefficients—represent disciplinary adaptations to convert specific data types into meaningful insights about the nature and impact of heterogeneity.

Planetary systems demonstrate that the integrative heterogeneity framework applies even where there is no life and no management. Template and process in reciprocal interaction is a universal principle, from molecular-scale isotopic variations to continent-sized mantle anomalies, from nucleosynthetic processing before the solar system to reservoir-scale fluid flow today. If heterogeneity principles hold across this full scope—from the cuticular hydrocarbons of insects to the preserved mantle of Theia—then integrative heterogeneity is not merely a biological or ecological concept but a fundamental property of complex systems at all scales.

5.7 Synthesis: Universal Heterogeneity as a Unifying Principle

Across agriculture, forestry, hydrology, insect-plant systems and evolution, and planetary geology, a recurring pattern emerges that demonstrate the **integrative heterogeneity** framework introduced earlier. Each domain, despite its unique subject matter and characteristic scales, demonstrates the same fundamental structural features—template and process in reciprocal interaction, scale dependence across orders of magnitude, and feedback loops that drive system dynamics. This convergence across such diverse fields points toward a deeper possibility: that the principles governing heterogeneity may be **universal**, extending beyond ecology to characterize complex systems at all scales.

5.7.1 The Three Dichotomies Revisited with Evidence:

The environmental versus ecological distinction—template and process in reciprocal interaction—is borne out across every domain examined. In agriculture, crop layouts (template) shape biodiversity and pest dynamics (process), which in turn inform subsequent management decisions (Nicholson & Williams, 2021; Rother et al., 2025). In forestry, stand structure (template) governs succession and community assembly (process), which modifies future forest architecture through canopy gaps and herbivore activity (Buness et al., 2025; Czyżewski & Svenning, 2025). In hydrology, watershed properties (template) control nutrient cycling and ecosystem development (process), which feeds back to alter the physical environment over successional timescales (Dent & Grimm, 1999; McDonnell et al., 2007). In insect-plant systems, the template ranges from cuticular hydrocarbon composition to landscape configuration, while the process spans molecular signaling to trophic interactions to co-evolution across millions of years (Huthmacher et al., 2025; Behrends et al., 2025; Guyot et al., 2016). In planetary systems, mantle composition and isotopic ratios (template) record convection, impacts, and thermal processing (process), with the resulting heterogeneities actively shaping subsequent geodynamic evolution (Simmons et al., 2009; Yuan et al., 2023). In every case, template shapes process, process modifies template, and their continuous interplay generates the patterns we observe.

Spatial scale spans from molecules to planets. The molecular heterogeneity documented in cuticular hydrocarbons (Huthmacher et al., 2025) and the genomic heterogeneity of social insect genomes (Behrends et al., 2025) represent the fine-scale end of a continuum that extends through organismal seed heteromorphism (Matilla et al., 2005), population-level behavioral variation (Gordon, 2021; O'Shea-Wheller et al., 2020), community-level trophic networks (Guyot et al., 2016; Hendel et al., 2024), landscape-level agricultural mosaics (Priyadarshana et al., 2024; Sirami et al., 2019), regional forest cover (Cours & Duflot, 2025), and ultimately planetary-scale mantle anomalies (Simmons et al., 2009; Yuan et al., 2023). Across this entire continuum, the principles governing heterogeneity remain consistent, even as their manifestation, measurement, and implications shift systematically.

Temporal scale spans from femtoseconds to billions of years. Molecular dynamics govern cuticular hydrocarbon phase transitions within milliseconds to seconds (Huthmacher et al., 2025). Agricultural heterogeneity unfolds across growing seasons and rotation cycles (Nicholson & Williams, 2021). Forest heterogeneity spans successional trajectories over centuries (Buness et al., 2025; Meyers et al., 2025). Evolutionary heterogeneity operates over millions of years, producing the genomic architectures (Behrends et al., 2025) and co-evolved relationships (Guyot et al., 2016) that structure contemporary ecosystems. Planetary heterogeneity records processes from 4.5 billion years ago, from nucleosynthetic processing (Trinquier et al., 2009) to giant impacts (Yuan et al., 2023). At every timescale, heterogeneity serves as both record of past process and driver of future dynamics.

5.7.2 Conceptual Contributions Emergent from the Evidence:

Several established heterogeneity concepts (frameworks) illuminate the patterns we have documented. **Molecular heterogeneity** is well-characterized in studies of cellular and biochemical systems (Deng et al., 2019; Kilpinen et al., 2017). **Genomic heterogeneity** has been extensively documented across evolutionary and biomedical contexts (Burrell et al., 2013; Kopac et al., 2014; Turajlic et al., 2019; Weiss, 1993). **Multi-scale heterogeneity**, grounded in scale transition theory (Chesson et al., 2005), finds empirical support in studies of multiscale integration across biological systems (Hong et al., 2018; Serra et al., 2018). **Coupled heterogeneity** captures how interacting sources of variation shape dynamics in epidemiological systems (Vazquez-Prokopec et al., 2016).

Building on these foundations, the evidence supports several additional concepts we propose. What we term **reciprocal heterogeneity**—the feedback loops between template and process—manifests in agricultural pest dynamics (Nicholson & Williams, 2021), forest succession (Buness et al., 2025), and mantle convection (Simmons et al., 2009). **Trans-scale heterogeneity**—the propagation of processes and patterns across scales—finds its theoretical foundation in scale transition theory (Chesson et al., 2005), which explains how spatial heterogeneity interacts with nonlinear local dynamics to produce emergent outcomes at larger scales, a principle evident across our case studies from agricultural landscapes to forest ecosystems (Rother et al., 2025; Cours & Duflot, 2025). **Co-evolutionary heterogeneity** finds its exemplar in insect-plant systems, where reciprocal selection over deep time has produced structured variation in traits and relationships (Behrends et al., 2025; Guyot et al., 2016). **Synthetic heterogeneity** is the endeavor of this review itself, drawing together disciplines as diverse as molecular biology and planetary geology.

5.7.3 Universal Principles and Their Implications:

The evidence supports a more ambitious framing: **universal heterogeneity**, the claim that principles governing structured variation apply across all domains where template and process interact—from molecular systems to planetary dynamics. Heterogeneity is not merely a biological property but a fundamental characteristic of complex systems at all scales.

Three core principles anchor this framework. **Template versus process**: environmental heterogeneity constitutes the structure within which ecological heterogeneity unfolds, yet this boundary is dynamic, with each reshaping the other. **Scale dependence**: heterogeneity manifests differently at different spatial and temporal resolutions. **Spatial versus temporal dimensions**: variation across units and variation within units over time are distinct but interacting facets of heterogeneity.

The imperative is unequivocal: shift from overcoming heterogeneity to actively understanding, conserving, restoring, and where appropriate, engineering it. This means designing agricultural landscapes with diverse mosaics (van der Ploeg & Ventura, 2014); managing forests for structural complexity (Beugnon et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025); representing subsurface connectivity (Hu & Chugunova, 2008); leveraging trophic networks for biocontrol (Rother et al., 2025; Hendel et al., 2024); protecting evolutionary processes (Boyle et al., 2025); and interpreting planetary heterogeneity as deep-time archive (Trinquier et al., 2009; Yuan et al., 2023).

Integrative heterogeneity—the working framework developed here—is a practical necessity across scales: from molecules to mantle anomalies, from farms to forests, from ecological dynamics to evolutionary time. Template and process in reciprocal interaction, spatial and temporal scaling, heterogeneity as both driver and outcome—these principles unify domains from agriculture to planetary science. In the next section, we ask whether this framework extends further, into disciplines where templates and processes are physical, economic, cognitive, or computational.

VI: Universal Heterogeneity? Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives

6.1 Introduction: Extending the Framework

The preceding section established the reach of heterogeneity across ecology and its allied disciplines—agriculture, forestry, geology, and planetary science—and introduced the integrative heterogeneity framework organized around the fundamental distinction between **template** (environmental heterogeneity) and **process** (ecological heterogeneity). Section V also advanced the more ambitious claim of **universal heterogeneity**: that the principles governing structured variation apply across all domains where template and process interact, from molecular systems to planetary dynamics.

As noted earlier, approximately 1,200 highly cited papers on heterogeneity span more than a dozen disciplines, including anthropology and sociology, biochemistry and molecular biology, bioinformatics and computational biology, computational science and engineering, ecology, economics, geology, medicine, physics, political science, psychology and psychiatry, and statistics

(Ma & Ellison, 2024). Four of these disciplines—ecology, agriculture, forestry, and geology/planetary science—have been examined in previous sections. The papers surveyed here sample the remaining domains, illustrating how distinct disciplines confront heterogeneity on their own terms (Ma & Taylor, 2025; Ma & Ellison, 2025). These disciplines fall naturally into five broader categories, each with a characteristic orientation: the **physical and mathematical sciences**, which seek universal parameters and scaling laws; the **biomedical and health sciences**, which confront heterogeneity as a clinical challenge requiring subtyping and personalization; the **social and behavioral sciences**, which treat heterogeneity as fundamental causal complexity that aggregates obscure; the **foundational and meta-sciences**, which examine how we can know anything at all in heterogeneity's presence; and the **computational and engineering sciences**, which have begun to treat heterogeneity as a design principle to be actively engineered.

Our aim is not to test the universal hypothesis definitively—such a test would require a far broader literature base than is possible here—but to illustrate, through a carefully selected set of examples, how heterogeneity is conceptualized and measured across diverse disciplines, and to ask whether the principles developed within ecology resonate beyond its borders.

6.2 Physical and Mathematical Sciences: Heterogeneity as Universal Parameter

In the physical and mathematical sciences, heterogeneity is rarely an object of study in itself but rather a fundamental parameter whose behavior reveals deep laws. Three distinct lines of inquiry illustrate this orientation.

Statistical physics has long grappled with the meaning of heterogeneity through the lens of probability distributions. Eliazar and Sokolov (2010) demonstrate that the very definition of "most heterogeneous" depends critically on whether one adopts a randomness-based perspective (Shannon entropy) or an inequality-based perspective (Gini index). Maximizing one versus the other yields fundamentally different distributional families—the Gaussian and exponential families for entropy, bounded power-law distributions for Gini. This foundational result reveals that heterogeneity is not a single property but a family of related concepts whose mathematical consequences diverge. Extending this line, Eliazar (2021) proposes a discrete five-degree scale for classifying randomness—Infra Mild, Mild, Borderline, Wild, and Ultra Wild—based on the convergence properties of moment generating functions and the behavior of distribution tails. This "digital" classification captures the qualitative nature of heterogeneity at extreme scales, providing a vocabulary for distinguishing the benign randomness of Gaussian processes from the potentially catastrophic randomness of power-law distributions.

Network science and complex systems treats heterogeneity as a structural feature with predictable consequences for system behavior. Gao, Barzel, and Barabási (2016) develop a universal framework for network resilience that collapses the high-dimensional dynamics of complex networks onto a single universal function. In this framework, network heterogeneity—quantified as the variance in node degrees—emerges as one of three key components (alongside density and symmetry) of an effective control parameter β_eff that determines a system's distance from critical collapse. The framework successfully predicts resilience across ecological mutualistic networks, gene regulatory networks, and power grids. Ma's extension of Taylor's Power Law to networks (TPLoN) similarly demonstrates that the scaling of weighted connectedness follows universal patterns across diverse host taxa, suggesting that interaction heterogeneity is governed by invariant principles (Ma, 2025a; Ma & Ellison, 2025). Dominance network analysis (Ma & Ellison, 2019) further reveals that heterogeneous networks exhibit "bounded heterogeneity"—infinite individual variation within universal structural constraints (Ma 2025; Ma & Taylor 2025).

Nonlinear dynamics and game theory reveal that heterogeneity can be functionally advantageous. Perc (2011) demonstrates that in the Public Goods Game, moderate heterogeneity promotes cooperation more effectively than strong heterogeneity. Kun and Dieckmann (2013) extend this by examining resource heterogeneity among players, showing that when temptation to defect is high, rich cooperators subsidize poorer neighbors enabling cooperation where homogeneous populations would fully defect; when temptation is low, however, rich defectors stabilize defection clusters, reducing cooperation. Guo and colleagues (2026) introduce "dynamic survivability"—the ability of coupled oscillators to maintain synchronization under perturbation—showing that increasing dynamical heterogeneity enhances survivability across all network topologies. Together, these studies establish that in physical and mathematical contexts, heterogeneity is not noise to be averaged away but a tunable parameter with predictable, often context-dependent, effects.

6.3 Biomedical and Health Sciences: Heterogeneity as Clinical Target

In the biomedical and health sciences, heterogeneity is neither abstract parameter nor structural feature but an urgent practical challenge. Here heterogeneity is the reason patients with the same diagnosis have different outcomes, the reason tumors evade therapy, the reason biomarkers fail to generalize, and the reason brains learn robustly. The goal is not merely to measure heterogeneity but to manage it—to subtype, predict, personalize, and sometimes even exploit it.

Oncology confronts heterogeneity at every scale of analysis. Kashyap and colleagues (2022) provide a comprehensive review of tumor heterogeneity quantification, spanning from genetic and epigenetic variation within single cells to phenotypic and architectural variation at tissue scales to whole-organ radiomic features. The authors catalog an extensive toolkit of heterogeneity metrics borrowed from ecology (Shannon entropy, Simpson index), spatial statistics (Ripley's K), and image analysis (Haralick texture features), demonstrating their prognostic and predictive power across multiple cancer types. The emerging frontier is multimodal integration—combining genomic, pathological, and imaging data into "pan-scale" workflows that capture the full complexity of the tumor ecosystem. Ma's applications of Taylor's Power Law (TPL) to the human microbiome (Ma, 2015; 2020a; Ma & Taylor, 2020) and virome (Ma, 2021) demonstrate that similar scaling principles govern microbial communities associated with health and disease, suggesting common dynamical structures across host-associated ecosystems. Foundational studies in microbial ecology have established that spatial distance and environmental heterogeneity jointly shape bacterial diversity in patchy ecosystems (Ramette & Tiedje, 2007), and that macroecological laws—including Taylor's Power Law—universally describe variation and diversity in microbial communities across biomes (Grilli, 2020), suggesting common dynamical structures across host-associated and free-living microbial systems.

Psychiatry has long invoked heterogeneity to explain failed clinical trials and elusive biomarkers, yet until recently lacked a formal definition of the concept itself. Nunes, Trappenberg, and Alda (2020) provide this foundation, defining heterogeneity axiomatically as "the degree to which a system diverges from a state of perfect conformity" and arguing that valid measures must satisfy the replication principle (pooling two distinct, equally heterogeneous systems doubles the measured heterogeneity). This criterion singles out the Rényi heterogeneity family (Hill numbers in ecology) as the only measures that quantify heterogeneity in intuitive "numbers equivalent" units—for example, the "effective number of symptom profiles" in major depressive disorder. The authors demonstrate that observed richness underestimates true heterogeneity, that Shannon entropy and the Gini-Simpson index can give conflicting impressions, and that the field must move from vague invocations of heterogeneity to rigorous quantification.

Precision medicine embraces heterogeneity as the foundation for individualized treatment. Franks and colleagues (2025) present a research roadmap for addressing the heterogeneity of type 2 diabetes, reviewing evidence from data-driven cluster analyses and partitioned polygenic risk scores that reveal diabetes as a constellation of related but distinct diseases. The Species Specificity and Specificity Diversity (SSD) framework developed by Ma (2024, 2025b) provides a complementary approach, leveraging distributional information (prevalence) alongside abundance to identify microbial species uniquely or preferentially associated with disease states. Cross-scale analyses further demonstrate that diversity and heterogeneity are independent properties of host-associated microbial communities, with heterogeneity more closely tied to evolutionary history (Ma & Ellison, 2024; Ma, 2025b).

6.4 Social and Behavioral Sciences: Heterogeneity as Causal Complexity

In the social and behavioral sciences, heterogeneity is the fundamental fact that individuals, households, and communities are not interchangeable units. Here heterogeneity is the reason aggregate statistics can mislead, the reason policies succeed in one context and fail in another, and the reason causal inference requires methods that honor the complexity of human behavior.

Economics, particularly microeconometrics, has been transformed by the discovery of pervasive heterogeneity. Heckman's Nobel lecture (2001) synthesizes a lifetime of work demonstrating that individuals differ not only in observable characteristics but also in their unobserved responses to treatments and policies—the "returns to schooling," for example, vary from person to person. When individuals self-select into programs based on these unobserved gains (sorting on gains), standard instrumental variables methods break down. Heckman develops the concept of the Marginal Treatment Effect (MTE) as a unifying framework that shows how all standard treatment parameters (ATE, TT, LATE) and the probability limits of common estimators are different weighted averages of a fundamental MTE function. The implication is profound: in a world of heterogeneity, there is no single "effect" of a policy; credible evaluation requires deep engagement with the forces that generate variation.

Political science examines how heterogeneity at multiple levels shapes democratic citizenship. Scheufele and colleagues (2006) integrate macro-level data on county structural heterogeneity (racial, religious, political), meso-level data on social contexts (workplace, church, volunteer groups), and micro-level data on individual discussion networks and political behavior. Using path analysis, they trace a positive cascade: structural heterogeneity fosters diverse discussion contexts, which in turn foster heterogeneous personal networks, which directly and indirectly (through increased news consumption and political knowledge) promote political participation. The study finds no evidence for the classic "cross-pressures" hypothesis that exposure to disagreement leads to withdrawal; instead, heterogeneity emerges as a democratic resource. Governance frameworks for social-ecological systems similarly emphasize that heterogeneity in risk exposure, response capacity, and values must be central to institutional design (Levin et al., 2022), while conservation planning increasingly recognizes the heterogeneity of farmer demands for nature's contributions as essential for equitable policy (Sanya et al., 2025).

Behavioral science is in the midst of what Bryan, Tipton, and Yeager (2021) call a "heterogeneity revolution." They argue that the replication crisis is not primarily a crisis of false positives but a predictable consequence of studying context-dependent effects with a "main-effect" paradigm that assumes a single true effect should replicate everywhere. The solution is to shift focus from average effects to systematic investigation of moderation: for whom, under what conditions, and why does an intervention work? Drawing on the National Study of Learning Mindsets as a model, they show that discovering that a growth mindset intervention only worked in schools with supportive peer norms is not a failure but a scientific advance that points to mechanism and guides future intervention design. The authors call for shared research infrastructure—large, probability-based samples—to enable heterogeneity-conscious science at scale.

6.5 Foundational and Meta-Sciences: Heterogeneity as Epistemic Challenge

At the most fundamental level, heterogeneity raises questions about how we know what we claim to know. The foundational sciences—statistics and philosophy—confront these questions directly, examining the epistemic implications of heterogeneity for study design, causal inference, evidence synthesis, and the very standards of scientific proof.

Statistics, particularly in the context of causal inference, has grappled with the implications of heterogeneity for decades. Rosenbaum (2005) provides a crisp theoretical clarification of heterogeneity's different roles in randomized experiments versus observational studies. In a randomized experiment, reducing heterogeneity (σ) and increasing sample size (I) are substitutes; both increase precision. In an observational study, they are not substitutes. Reducing heterogeneity reduces sensitivity to unobserved bias, whereas increasing sample size does not. Through a simulated example, Rosenbaum shows that a smaller, more homogeneous study can be far less sensitive to bias than a larger, more heterogeneous study, even when both have the same variance of the mean difference. A formal proposition proves that the range of possible treatment effects consistent with a given level of potential bias is directly proportional to heterogeneity—even with infinite sample size. Meta-analysis faces parallel challenges: Yang and colleagues (2025) demonstrate that heterogeneity in ecological and evolutionary meta-analyses is substantial and often misinterpreted, advocating for a pluralistic framework that decomposes heterogeneity into meaningful variance components using multilevel models and multiple complementary metrics. A brief review of heterogeneity research in statistics is available in Ma, Liu, and Ellison (2026).

Philosophy of science examines how different fields establish reliable knowledge in the presence of heterogeneity. Imbert and Ardourel (2023) introduce the concept of "epistemological heterogeneity" to describe the observation that computational science lacks a single, unified epistemology. Through case studies of formal verification methods in avionics, ocean circulation modeling, and clinical neutron therapy systems, they show that the choice of verification method involves complex trade-offs between epistemic certainty, practical cost, and the nature of the research itself. Formal methods are powerful but impractical for exploratory, underfunded, or non-standardized research; non-formal methods (benchmarking, trial-and-error) are often more appropriate. Elliott-Graves (2025) extends this line to evidence synthesis, arguing that heterogeneity's role depends on the synthesis goal. When the goal is generating causal confidence (as in medicine), heterogeneity is genuinely problematic. When the goal is arbitrating contradictions or exploring the scope of generalizations (as in ecology), heterogeneity becomes a source of insight, revealing the boundaries of scientific claims and the structure of biological complexity. Generative network models for animal social data (Ross et al., 2024) exemplify how statistical tools can be designed to explicitly model multi-level heterogeneity rather than treating it as noise.

6.6 Computational and Engineering Sciences: Heterogeneity as Design Principle

Computer science, artificial intelligence, and engineering have begun to treat heterogeneity not as a problem to be solved but as a design principle to be emulated and actively engineered. Here heterogeneity is introduced deliberately to improve performance, robustness, or search efficiency. The question shifts from "how do we measure it?" to "how much and what kind should we design in?"

Genetic algorithms have been substantially improved by importing ecological models of population dynamics and aggregation. Ma (2012b, 2013) draws direct inspiration from Taylor's Power Law and the spatial distribution patterns of insect populations to redesign genetic algorithm populations. Rather than using fixed population sizes, the algorithms use "chaotic populations" controlled by the logistic map or "stochastic populations" drawn from probability distributions that describe insect spatial patterns. Crucially, the distribution of fitness values in the genetic algorithm follows Taylor's (1961) Power Law with the same fidelity as insect distributions in nature—a structural isomorphism that validates the ecological analogy. Here, the incorporation of heterogeneity modeled on natural insect populations significantly improved genetic algorithm performance, and Taylor's Power Law revealed the mechanisms underlying these improvements in terms of fitness function dynamics.

Neuroscience and artificial intelligence have discovered that neural heterogeneity—long viewed as biological noise—is functionally critical for robust learning. Perez-Nieves and colleagues (2021) train spiking neural networks on tasks of varying temporal complexity, systematically manipulating heterogeneity in membrane and synaptic time constants. On static tasks, heterogeneity provides no benefit. On tasks with rich temporal structure (speech recognition), heterogeneous networks achieve 15-20% higher accuracy. When time constants are allowed to be trained, they converge to a stable, heterogeneous distribution that qualitatively matches experimentally measured distributions from mouse and human neurons. Moreover, heterogeneous networks generalize better to speech at different speeds and tolerate mistuned hyperparameters.

The three-layer heterogeneity analysis (3-LHA) framework developed by Ma and Ellison (2025) provides a general methodology for quantifying heterogeneity in complex systems, with potential applications extending from microbiome analysis to artificial neural networks. By distinguishing node-level heterogeneity (variance in weighted connectedness) from network-level heterogeneity (Hill number metrics) and providing rigorous statistical tests for comparison, the framework offers a systematic approach for both understanding biological heterogeneity and engineering it into designed systems.

6.7 Key Monographs in Heterogeneity Research Across Disciplines

To the best of our knowledge, heterogeneity has achieved sustained monograph-length treatment in only three disciplinary clusters: economics, ecology, and science and technology studies (STS)—the last of which bridges our Social/Behavioral and Computational/Engineering categories. Seven foundational works represent this conceptual vanguard: five from ecology, one from economics, and one from STS.

Inequality and Heterogeneity (Blau, 1977) — Discipline: *Economics / Economic Sociology*: Blau constructs a formal theory of social structure based on population distributions along nominal parameters (heterogeneity: ethnicity, religion) and graduated parameters (inequality: wealth, power). Social integration is maximized when parameters intersect—creating "multiform heterogeneity" that prevents polarization. Blau's formal approach anticipated Heckman's (2001) Nobel-winning assertion that "measuring and accounting for such heterogeneity is perhaps the central task for microeconomics."

Landscape Heterogeneity and Disturbance (Turner, 1987) — *Landscape Ecology*: Articulates the reciprocal relationship between spatial pattern and ecological process: disturbances generate patch mosaics, while existing heterogeneity controls disturbance propagation—acting as conduit, barrier, or filter.

Ecological Heterogeneity (Kolasa & Pickett, 1991) — *Theoretical Ecology*: Establishes heterogeneity as a central organizing principle in ecology, introducing the critical distinction between measured heterogeneity (observer-defined) and functional heterogeneity (organism-experienced). Develops tools for multiscale analysis.

The Ecological Basis of Conservation (Pickett et al., 1997) — *Conservation Biology*: Reframes conservation around patch dynamics, presenting heterogeneity as essential for biodiversity and ecosystem function. Integrates human dimensions—policy, economics, land use—as integral to shaping landscape patterns.

Reconnecting Culture, Technology, and Nature (Michael, 2000)— *Science and Technology Studies*: Introduces the "co(a)gent"—hybrid entities formed through human-technology couplings (person-walking-boots, driver-car). Argues everyday life is constituted through heterogeneous assemblages where agency is distributed across human and non-human actors.

Ecosystem Function in Heterogeneous Landscapes (Lovett et al., 2005) — *Ecosystem Ecology*: Addresses how spatial heterogeneity affects ecosystem processes through the distinction between point processes (local rates) and lateral transfers (flows across space). When processes involve lateral flows, landscape pattern and connectivity become central drivers.

Spatio-temporal Heterogeneity (Dutilleul, 2011) — *Quantitative Ecology / Spatial Statistics* Provides a comprehensive methodological toolkit for analyzing heterogeneity across space and time simultaneously—variogram modeling, spectral analysis, wavelets—addressing challenges earlier works identified but could not resolve.

Reflection: Heterogeneity animates research across physics, computer science, geography, linguistics, and beyond, yet only economics and ecology have produced sustained book-length theoretical syntheses. Ecology, in particular, systematically developed heterogeneity from conceptual insight (Kolasa & Pickett, 1991) through empirical applications (Turner, 1987; Lovett et al., 2005) to rigorous quantitative methods (Dutilleul, 2011). Between these two dominant clusters sits Michael (2000), a distinctive but isolated contribution from science and technology studies focused on hybrid human-technology assemblages. These seven monographs represent not the full scope of heterogeneity research but its conceptual vanguard—frameworks that researchers in other fields might adapt.

Among these, Michael's (2000) work stands apart not only for its disciplinary provenance—bridging the Social/Behavioral and Computational/Engineering categories—but for its prescience. Two decades after its publication, his vision of human-technology hybrids has proven remarkably prophetic. The "co(a)gents" he theorized—person-walking-boots, driver-car—now extend to the heterogeneous assemblages formed when humans interact with robots, large language models, and autonomous systems. These human-AI couplings represent a new form of heterogeneity: not merely diversity among pre-existing entities, but the emergence of hybrid agents whose very constitution blurs boundaries between the biological and the computational. The mundane technological objects "already-on-the-inside" of social life now include conversational agents, robotic collaborators, and algorithmic decision-makers that co-produce knowledge, labor, and culture. Michael's insistence on the radical heterogeneity of everyday life anticipated a world where human-machine hybrids are not exceptions but the default mode of social and intellectual life, raising profound questions about distributed agency and responsibility across increasingly heterogeneous assemblages.

6.8 Synthesis: Principles of Universal Heterogeneity

What emerges from this cross-disciplinary tour is not a single unified theory but a family of interconnected principles that recur across domains. These principles are not independent but deeply intertwined, each illuminating a different facet of how structured variation operates in complex systems.

6.8.1 Template versus Process

The distinction between 'fixed' structure (template) and dynamic response (process) holds across every domain examined, though the boundary between them is itself dynamic. In physics, the template is network structure or probability space; the process is dynamics or maximization (Gao et al., 2016; Guo et al., 2026). In biomedicine, the template is genetic landscape or tissue architecture; the process is tumor evolution or treatment response (Kashyap et al., 2022; Ma & Taylor, 2020; Ma & Ellison, 2018). In economics, the template includes individual endowments and structural conditions; the process includes choice behavior and treatment response (Heckman, 2001). In neuroscience, the template is the distribution of time constants; the process is learning and generalization (Perez-Nieves et al., 2021).

Yet the relationship varies across domains, and crucially, **template is not fixed**. In physics, template and process are relatively separable. In biomedicine and social science, they feed back strongly—process modifies template, which reshapes future process. This reciprocity mirrors the environmental versus ecological heterogeneity distinction developed in Section V: environmental heterogeneity constitutes the template, ecological heterogeneity the process, but each continuously reshapes the other. The concept of coupled heterogeneity (Levin et al., 2022) captures this recursive dynamic, recognizing that in complex systems, what serves as template at one scale or moment becomes process at another. Both are heterogeneous; both are dynamic; their interaction is the engine of system behavior.

6.8.2 Scale Dependence

Every discipline confronts the fact that heterogeneity looks different at different scales. In physics, scale appears as mathematical limit or dimensionality reduction (Eliazar, 2021; Gao et al., 2016). In biomedicine, scale is levels of organization that must be integrated (Kashyap et al., 2022; Ma & Ellison, 2024). In social science, scale is cascade from structural to network to individual

(Scheufele et al., 2006; Bryan et al., 2021). In statistics, scale is study design—sample size does not substitute for homogeneity (Rosenbaum, 2005). The foundational insight from ecology—that heterogeneity must be studied hierarchically (Farnsworth & Ellison, 1996)—resonates across all these domains, and Ma's early work on Population Aggregation Critical Density (Ma, 1991) provides a mathematical language for identifying scale thresholds where pattern transitions occur, which can be extended to ecological communities (Ma 2015) and complex networks (Ma 2025).

6.8.3 Spatial versus Temporal Heterogeneity

The distinction between variation across units (spatial) and variation within units over time (temporal) appears everywhere, though what counts as "space" varies. In physics, space is network position or probability space. In biomedicine, space is tissue architecture or anatomical location; time is tumor evolution or disease progression (Kashyap et al., 2022). In social science, space is geographic location or social position; time is life-course dynamics or panel data (Scheufele et al., 2006; Heckman, 2001). Their interaction—spatial patterns changing over time, temporal dynamics varying across space—is often where the action is, from tumor heterogeneity to political realignment.

6.8.4 Interactions as the Engine

Heterogeneity does not arise in a vacuum; it is generated, maintained, and transformed by interactions among entities. In physics, interactions are edges in networks, coupling between oscillators (Gao et al., 2016; Guo et al., 2026; Perc, 2011). In biomedicine, interactions are cell-cell contacts, gene regulation, or synaptic connections (Kashyap et al., 2022; Perez-Nieves et al., 2021). In social science, interactions are market exchanges, discussion networks, or intervention-context moderation (Scheufele et al., 2006; Heckman, 2001). Networks are the natural formalism for representing interactions across all these domains, and extensions of Taylor's Power Law to networks (Ma, 2025a; Ma & Li, 2024; Ma & Ellison, 2019) provide tools for quantifying how interaction structure scales and varies.

Across disciplines, two fundamental types of interactions emerge. The first involves interactions between discrete groups or populations—species competing or facilitating in ecological communities (Ratzke, Barrere & Gore, 2020), cells communicating in tumor microenvironments (Kashyap et al., 2022), or neurons synapsing in neural networks (Perez-Nieves et al., 2021). The second involves connectedness across space or flow between regions—hydrological connectivity through landscape mosaics (Gao et al., 2018), dispersal corridors linking habitat patches for invasive species (Fitzpatrick et al., 2012), or the landscape-scale mosaic of forest stands that together determine regional biodiversity (Uhl, et al. 2025). These two types—interactions among entities and connectivity across space—operate simultaneously and often interact: the strength of species interactions depends on habitat connectivity, while dispersal patterns shape which populations encounter each other. Farnsworth and Ellison's (1996) classic study of mangrove root epibionts captures both: larval supply (connectivity) interacts with post-settlement competition (group interactions) to create nested patterns of heterogeneity across scales. Networks, whether representing trophic links or landscape connections, provide the unifying formalism for understanding both.

6.8.5 Heterogeneity as Cause and Consequence

Heterogeneity is not static; it generates outcomes that in turn reshape heterogeneity. This feedback loop—heterogeneity as both cause and consequence—runs through every domain. In evolution, genetic variation drives selection, which reshapes genetic variation (Hedrick, 2006; Leinonen et al., 2013). In biomedicine, tumor heterogeneity drives treatment response, which selects for resistant clones, creating new heterogeneity (Kashyap et al., 2022; Ma, 2024). In economics, heterogeneity in returns to schooling drives educational choices, which reshape the distribution of human capital (Heckman, 2001). In disease ecology, the heterogeneity-disease relationship reveals that microbial spatial structure can be both indicator of and contributor to disease states (Ma, 2020a; Ma, 2025b). This recursive dynamic is precisely what the integrative heterogeneity framework captures through the template-process distinction and its feedback loops.

6.8.6 Power Laws as Universal Grammar

Across every discipline surveyed, a common meta-insight emerges: the Gaussian distribution and its tidy averages are the exception, not the rule. Power laws, heavy tails, and structured variation are the normal state of complex systems. The "no-average" property—long recognized in the study of power laws and extreme value statistics—fundamentally challenges centuries of statistical intuition.

In ecology, Taylor's Power Law and its extensions provide a mathematical language for describing how heterogeneity scales, from insect populations to gut microbiomes (Ma, 1991, 2015; Ma & Taylor, 2025). In economics, the discovery of pervasive heterogeneity in individual responses to policies and treatments earned James Heckman the Nobel Prize; his work demonstrates that average treatment effects obscure the fact that "returns to schooling" vary dramatically across individuals, and that those who select into education are precisely those who gain most from it (Heckman, 2001). Heavy-tailed distributions of income and wealth have been documented for over a century (Pareto, 1896), but Heckman's contribution was to show that this heterogeneity is not merely descriptive but fundamentally alters causal inference. In physics, Eliazar's (2021) five degrees of randomness demonstrate that the Gaussian is merely "Infra Mild"—the least wild of possibilities—while true complexity lives in the heavier tails. In network science, the universal resilience function shows that system-level behavior cannot be predicted from average node dynamics (Gao et al., 2016). In genetic algorithms of computer science, fitness distributions follow power laws with the same fidelity as insect populations (Ma, 2012b, 2013), and the inflection point of fitness aggregation dynamics predicts optimal stopping. In metagenomics, the scaling of heterogeneity reveals invariant gene-level structure beneath disease-perturbed community variation (Ma, 2020b; Ma, 2021). Across all these domains, the message is consistent: in heterogeneous complex systems, the mean is often a poor descriptor, and sometimes actively misleading.

6.8.7 Measurement Pluralism

No single metric captures the full complexity of heterogeneity. Different questions require different measures, and the choice of metric reflects disciplinary goals and the nature of the system under study. Nunes and colleagues (2020) provide axiomatic foundations for heterogeneity measurement, demonstrating that the Rényi family (Hill numbers) uniquely satisfies the replication principle and provides intuitive "numbers equivalent" units. Kashyap and colleagues (2022) catalog the extensive toolkit available for tumor heterogeneity, from ecological diversity indices to spatial statistics to image texture analysis. Yang and colleagues (2025) advocate for pluralistic frameworks in meta-analysis that combine multiple complementary metrics. Ma & Ellison's work exemplifies this pluralism, developing distinct but related measures for different aspects of heterogeneity: Taylor's Power Law extensions for scaling (Ma, 2015), the SSD framework for specificity and compositional heterogeneity (Ma, 2024, 2025b), unified dominance metrics for community structure (Ma & Ellison, 2018, 2019), and the 3-LHA framework for integrative analysis (Ma & Ellison, 2025).

Measurement pluralism is not a weakness but a necessity, recognizing that heterogeneity is too rich a phenomenon to be captured by any single number. Despite decades of effort across multiple disciplines, developing a unified methodology for heterogeneity analysis remains an enormous challenge. What is perhaps more significant—and certainly more pacifying—is the recognition that such a unified methodology may be of only pedagogical value. The diversity of measurement approaches mirrors the diversity of the phenomenon itself; pluralism is not a stopgap awaiting unification but an appropriate response to a multidimensional reality. Different questions legitimately require different tools, and the proliferation of metrics across disciplines reflects not scientific failure but the richness of the subject.

6.8.8 Heterogeneity as Resource versus Challenge

Across domains runs a fundamental duality: heterogeneity is simultaneously a challenge to be overcome and a resource to be harnessed. In medicine and causal inference, heterogeneity is the obstacle that must be managed to make reliable predictions and personalized recommendations (Franks et al., 2025; Kashyap et al., 2022; Rosenbaum, 2005). In physics, neuroscience, and evolutionary computation, heterogeneity is the resource that enables robustness, survivability, and efficient search (Guo et al., 2026; Perc, 2011; Perez-Nieves et al., 2021; Ma, 2012b, 2013; Ma & Ellison, 2019). In ecology and political science, heterogeneity is the very fabric of the system—what makes it work (Scheufele et al., 2006; Levin et al., 2022; Bryan et al., 2021). This duality—heterogeneity as problem and heterogeneity as solution—may be the most universal finding of all, reminding us that whether variation is a nuisance or a gift depends entirely on what we are trying to accomplish.

6.8.9 Toward Universal Heterogeneity

The principles examined across these disciplines are not independent but deeply intertwined. Template and process interact through feedback loops, making heterogeneity both cause and consequence. This dynamic plays out across scales, where power laws provide the universal grammar describing how heterogeneity distributes and scales. Whether measured spatially or temporally, heterogeneity arises from interactions—captured naturally by network formalisms. Yet how we measure it depends on our questions: measurement pluralism recognizes that different disciplines (and different problems within disciplines) require different metrics. And across all domains runs the fundamental duality of heterogeneity as both challenge and resource.

Returning to the universal hypothesis advanced in Section V: the evidence from these distant disciplines both strengthens and qualifies the claim. The principles of structured variation do indeed appear across domains where template and process interact—from coupled oscillators to economic agents, from neural populations to tumor ecosystems, from discussion networks to verification practices.

Yet the manifestation of these principles is irreducibly shaped by each discipline's ontology, methods, and goals. Physics seeks universal parameters; biomedicine seeks clinically actionable subtypes; social science seeks to understand causal complexity; foundational science examines epistemic implications; computational science engineers heterogeneity for performance. Universal heterogeneity, if it exists, is not a single framework that subsumes all others but a family resemblance across diverse ways of knowing—a unity that emerges not despite disciplinary distinctiveness but through it.

The universal heterogeneity framework that emerges from this cross-disciplinary tour thus stands not as a replacement for the integrative framework developed in Section V, but as its extension and qualification. Where integrative heterogeneity provided a working bridge from ecology to its allied disciplines, universal heterogeneity reveals that the same core principles—template and process, scale dependence, spatial and temporal dimensions, interactions as engine—resonate across even the most distant fields, though their manifestation remains irreducibly shaped by disciplinary context. The framework developed in Section V was a necessary scaffold; the evidence surveyed here suggests the scaffold reveals a deeper structure, one characterized not by monolithic unity but by family resemblance across diverse ways of knowing.

We recognize that balancing the tension between respecting pluralism and seeking unifying principles remains a considerable challenge in heterogeneity research. Yet a unified methodology, even if imperfect, offers practical value: it provides a common language for translation across disciplines, reveals deep structural analogies, and helps identify what is general versus what is field-specific. With these considerations in mind, in the final section (VII) of this review, we attempt to present a unified conceptual framework for heterogeneity, building upon and extending our earlier methodological efforts (Ma & Ellison, 2025).

VII. Conclusions and Perspectives

7.1 Conclusions

This review has approached heterogeneity research in ecology and its allied disciplines through an integrated lens that is, to our knowledge, distinct in several respects. Throughout, we have confronted with two foundational tensions revealed by our cross-disciplinary survey (Ma & Ellison, 2024): first, the striking heterogeneity of heterogeneity itself—the fact that the concept is defined and practiced in frequently remarkably different ways across fields; and second, the extreme pluralism of methods used to study it, from conceptual frameworks to quantitative models, each carrying distinct epistemic commitments. These tensions have shaped our approach. We have grounded our examination in a conceptual distinction often overlooked: heterogeneity as interaction-based variation within collectives, distinct from diversity as mere variation within populations (Shavit & Ellison, 2021). We have systematically distinguished between the metrics of heterogeneity (Section I) and the models and frameworks used to represent it (Section II)—a separation that reveals how methodological choices shape subsequent claims. We have parsed causes and consequences into two parallel traditions—environmental heterogeneity driving biodiversity (Section III) and ecological heterogeneity mediating stability and resilience (Section IV)—while also surveying applied contexts where heterogeneity serves as a management lever (Sections V–VI). From this synthesis, several overarching themes emerge.

(*i*) A central insight from our synthesis of heterogeneity concepts and metrics is the field's hard-won maturation from conceptual confusion to methodological sophistication. The foundational distinction between environmental heterogeneity—the variability of the abiotic and biotic template—and ecological heterogeneity—the biological patterns shaped by that template—now provides a coherent dual-thread paradigm, while the dichotomy between measured heterogeneity (observer-defined statistical pattern) and functional heterogeneity (heterogeneity as perceived by organisms) remains the most profound yet most neglected conceptual advance, with over 99% of landscape studies still relying solely on structural metrics (Tonetti et al., 2023). Parallel to this conceptual evolution, the analytical toolkit has progressed from simple descriptive indices to specialized metrics capable of disentangling specific signals while controlling for confounders: the q-statistic identifies spatial stratified heterogeneity (Wang et al., 2016), mean-independent dispersion metrics sever the mathematical entanglement of mean and variance (Pellett & Valbuena, 2025), and coverage-based rarefaction standardizes beta diversity comparisons across uneven samples (Chao et al., 2023). Yet this sophistication comes with a cautionary lesson: popular metrics like rugosity and fractal dimension can be dangerously misleading when applied without scrutiny (Loke & Chisholm, 2022; Vranken et al., 2014). Heterogeneity is not a single property but a family of related phenomena, and rigorous metric validation is not methodological fussiness but scientific necessity. Innovative multi-dimensional, multi-scale metrics should be developed in future research to better capture the complexity of heterogeneity across ecological systems.

(*ii*) A second major insight concerns the evolution of heterogeneity measurement beyond simple metrics toward integrated analytical systems. We distinguish between **models**—self-contained formal constructs (simulations, dynamical systems, scaling formulations) that generate, embed, or quantify heterogeneity within a unified theoretical structure—and **frameworks**—multi-stage analytical pipelines combining distinct methodological components (spatial statistics, graph theory, movement ecology) into structured, scale-aware workflows for measuring heterogeneity from empirical data. Simulation models have proven essential for validating measurement approaches: Li and Reynolds (1994) generated landscapes with controlled heterogeneity to reveal that no single metric suffices, while Fromville et al. (2025) used agent-based simulations to demonstrate that conventional association metrics produce false positives unless landscape heterogeneity is statistically accounted for. Dynamical models embedding heterogeneity directly, such as Bastiaansen et al.'s (2022) reaction–diffusion systems, reveal how spatial variation fundamentally alters system behavior—inducing fragmented tipping and stable coexistence—generating new system-level metrics like hysteresis loop size. Frameworks translate these insights into empirical practice. Graph-theoretic pipelines quantify how landscape heterogeneity determines functional connectivity (Bunn et al., 2000; Minor & Urban, 2008). Fortin et al.'s (2012) integrated spatial analysis enforces a rigorous three-stage workflow—spectral decomposition, spatial regression, functional graph construction—explicitly addressing scale dependence and autocorrelation. For dynamic systems, temporal network frameworks coupled with null models (Spiegel et al., 2016; Holme & Saramäki, 2012) now enable measurement of heterogeneity in interaction processes themselves. The trajectory is clear: heterogeneity measurement has progressed from isolated metrics toward integrated, multi-tool systems that control for confounding, address scale, and enable mechanistic inference. Future advances should prioritize developing accessible simulation platforms for validating new metrics, better integrating dynamical models with empirical frameworks, and standardizing pipelines for measuring temporal heterogeneity in interaction networks. Complex network approaches—especially emerging technologies such as temporal networks and higher-order networks for collective dynamics (Battiston et al., 2026)—as well as artificial intelligence and machine learning, should be vigorously pursued in future heterogeneity research.

(***iii***) Environmental heterogeneity as a driver of biodiversity—patterns, mechanisms, and contingencies: A third overarching theme from this review is that environmental heterogeneity as a driver of biodiversity—the Heterogeneity–Diversity Relationship (HDR)—is far more complex than early niche-based theory suggested. The field has advanced beyond simple positive correlations to recognize that HDRs are fundamentally shaped by three interacting constraints that define the patterns, mechanisms, and contingencies of this relationship. First, the area–heterogeneity tradeoff reveals a core mechanism: within fixed total area, increasing heterogeneity necessarily reduces effective habitat per species, creating unimodal patterns where diversity peaks at intermediate levels—reconciling niche theory with observed non-linearities (Allouche et al., 2012; Gasperini et al., 2025). Second, scale dependence is an inherent property: heterogeneity effects strengthen with grain size but weaken with extent as broader-scale drivers become dominant, and studies ignoring equal-area units systematically overestimate effects—a methodological contingency with profound implications (Stein et al., 2014; Wu et al., 2000). Third, contingencies operate across taxa, traits, and environmental gradients—effects are strongest for small, mobile organisms and in high-stress environments (Sola & Griffin, 2025); the specific aspect of heterogeneity that matters (functional versus morphological) determines the mechanism by which diversity responds (Thomsen et al., 2022); and these relationships can reverse across neighboring ecoregions (Antonio et al., 2025). Methodologically, the field has matured from descriptive indices (Roth, 1976) to frameworks capable of establishing causality: experimental manipulations demonstrate that managing for heterogeneity can increase diversity fourfold while enhancing landscape-scale stability through portfolio effects (Fuhlendorf et al., 2006; Hovick et al., 2015). Dark diversity frameworks reveal that heterogeneity predicts potential species pools more strongly than observed diversity, suggesting traditional approaches substantially underestimate heterogeneity's full ecological role (Wan & Wang, 2025). The emerging synthesis positions environmental heterogeneity not merely as a correlate of diversity but as a manageable lever for conservation, with human-driven homogenization representing a fundamental threat to biodiversity that heterogeneity-based management can actively counteract (Eisenhauer et al., 2023).

(*iv*) Ecological Heterogeneity as a Mediator of Stability—Networks, Feedbacks, and Contingent Outcomes: A fourth major overarching theme is that ecological heterogeneity—the spatial, temporal, and structural variation inherent in biotic entities and their interactions—mediates ecosystem stability through mechanisms fundamentally distinct from environmental heterogeneity. The field has resolved early contradictions—where Roff (1974) showed dispersal stabilizing metapopulations while Steele (1974) demonstrated diffusion destabilizing continuous systems—by recognizing that heterogeneity's effects are contingent on the scale and nature of the processes involved (Hastings, 1990). Modern theory reveals that heterogeneity in interaction networks, particularly the variance in link weights and node degrees, is the dominant mathematical factor controlling local stability, outweighing network topology alone (Feng & Takemoto, 2014). The collectivity parameter (φ) further refines this understanding, quantifying how indirect effects propagate through communities and revealing that high integration does not necessarily imply instability (Zelnik et al., 2024). Critically, ecological heterogeneity and environmental heterogeneity are not interchangeable; the former captures biotic variation emerging from interactions and trait distributions, while the latter describes the abiotic template. Methodologically, studying ecological heterogeneity requires specialized frameworks: spatial point pattern analysis for biotic distributions (Vinatier et al., 2011), network metrics for interaction architecture (Poisot et al., 2012), and individual-based models coupled with pattern-oriented validation. These tools reveal that heterogeneity can activate counteracting cascades simultaneously—providing refugia and increasing species asynchrony while suppressing stabilizing species—resulting in neutral net effects that challenge simplistic predictions (Sola et al., 2025). The heterogeneity–diversity–stability triangle further complicates classical paradigms: heterogeneity drives diversity through niche creation, but increased diversity can feedback to amplify ecological heterogeneity, and their metrics are sometimes mathematically conflated. Applications across epidemiology, agriculture, and forestry demonstrate practical relevance: network models incorporating host contact heterogeneity accurately predict disease spread (Brooks et al., 2008); designing agricultural landscapes for functional heterogeneity can enhance pest control, though outcomes depend critically on local species pools (Quévreux et al., 2024); and forest management increasingly engineers heterogeneity through foundation species to accelerate stable community development (Thomsen et al., 2022). Future advances must prioritize integrated modeling platforms coupling spatial heterogeneity with dynamic interaction networks and long-term experimental manipulations to test threshold effects.

(*v*) Integrating Environmental and Ecological Heterogeneity Across Scales: Environmental and ecological heterogeneity are not separate domains but deeply intertwined forces shaping system dynamics in a fundamentally **integrative** and **reciprocal** relationship. Environmental heterogeneity—the abiotic and biotic template of topography, resources, and habitat structure—sets the stage by creating niche opportunities. Ecological heterogeneity—biotic variation in species distributions, trait differences, and interaction networks—does not simply respond passively; it actively reshapes the environment itself through feedback loops that modify the very template on which ecological processes depend.

This reciprocity manifests across every domain examined in Section V. In agriculture, manipulated crop configurations (environmental template) shape pest dynamics and biodiversity (ecological response), which in turn inform subsequent management decisions (Benton et al., 2003; Nicholson & Williams, 2021). In forestry, stand structure governs succession and community assembly, which modify future forest architecture through canopy gaps and herbivore activity (Beugnon et al., 2025; Buness et al., 2025). In hydrology, watershed properties control nutrient cycling, which feeds back to alter the physical environment over successional timescales (Dent & Grimm, 1999; McDonnell et al., 2007). In insect-plant systems, foundation species create structural complexity, trophic cascades alter resource distributions, and co-evolutionary dynamics reshape interaction networks across millennia (Huthmacher et al., 2025; Behrends et al., 2025; Guyot et al., 2016). Even in planetary systems, mantle composition records thermal processing and impacts, with these heterogeneities actively shaping subsequent geodynamic evolution (Simmons et al., 2009; Yuan et al., 2023).

The convergence across such diverse systems—from agricultural fields to planetary mantles—reveals that integrative heterogeneity is not merely a conceptual convenience but a genuine property of complex systems, a hypothesis explored further in Section VI from broader cross-disciplinary perspective.

(*vi*) Universal Heterogeneity? Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives: Section VI extends the integrative heterogeneity framework beyond ecology into domains where templates and processes are physical, economic, cognitive, or computational. Five disciplinary clusters reveal distinct orientations: physical sciences treat heterogeneity as universal parameter obeying scaling laws; biomedical sciences confront it as clinical challenge requiring subtyping; social sciences treat it as fundamental causal complexity; foundational sciences examine epistemic implications; and computational sciences engineer it as design principle.

Across these domains, eight interconnected principles emerge, echoing and enriching Section V's three core principles. Template and process interact through feedback loops across all fields. Scale dependence is universal: heterogeneity manifests differently at every resolution. Spatial and temporal dimensions interact everywhere—from tumor evolution to political participation. Interactions are the engine of heterogeneity, with networks as the natural formalism. Heterogeneity is both cause and consequence, generating outcomes that reshape itself. Power laws provide universal grammar: the Gaussian is exception, not rule. Measurement pluralism acknowledges different questions require different metrics. And heterogeneity as resource versus challenge captures the fundamental duality across fields.

Seven monographs represent heterogeneity's conceptual vanguard: economics (Blau, 1977), ecology (Turner, 1987; Kolasa & Pickett, 1991; Pickett et al., 1997; Lovett et al., 2005; Dutilleul, 2011), and science and technology studies (Michael, 2000). Michael's "co(a)gents"—human-technology hybrids—prove prescient, anticipating contemporary human-AI assemblages.

Universal heterogeneity is not a monolithic framework but a family resemblance across ways of knowing—unity emerging through disciplinary distinctiveness. The rest of this section builds on these insights toward a unified conceptual framework.

7.2 Perspectives: Meaning, Measurement, and the Path to Unification

Heterogeneity can be defined as scale-dependent variation or difference within a complex system, typically represented by interacting groups of objects or interconnected regions. Spatial pattern or organization is implicit in this definition, while time is often treated as optional—primarily because stability offers a more established conceptual alternative, and heterogeneity research frequently focuses on cross-sectional snapshots to simplify observation. To quantify heterogeneity, intra-group and inter-group variations, or the regional distribution of objects, are measured and analyzed. In the simplest case of community heterogeneity, for example, species numbers and their abundances are recorded; alternatively, nitrogen concentrations in sampled quadrats may be observed across a region. The quantities (Q) measured can be unidimensional, multidimensional, or even longitudinal, depending on the research objectives and design. Longitudinal quantification, in particular, enables the study of dynamic heterogeneity, capturing how variation unfolds through time rather than treating it as a static snapshot.

Scale (S) is inalienable to heterogeneity, yet its delineation may be subjective, depending on research objectives and corresponding design. Scale typically comprises three elements: grain, extent, and characteristic window size or context. Grain is simply the size of the smallest unit measured—like the pixel in an image or the quadrat in a field survey. Smaller grains reveal fine-scale patterns; larger grains blur them. Extent defines the total scope of observation—the spatial area or temporal duration encompassed by the study; broader extents capture regional variation but may smooth over local heterogeneity, while narrower extents provide detailed local information at the cost of broader context. Characteristic window size or context represents the inherent scale at which ecological processes actually operate—the spatial or temporal domain within which interactions, feedbacks, and emergent behaviors manifest. This is the scale that matters functionally to organisms and processes, and identifying this window is the critical bridge linking measured heterogeneity (what we observe) to functional heterogeneity (what matters ecologically). Identifying an appropriate scale should be the starting point for heterogeneity research, but discovering the most informative scale—the one that aligns measured patterns with functional processes—is itself one of the most important and challenging tasks in the field. Phenomena such as scale invariance, phase transitions, and criticality are often intimately connected with heterogeneity, yet revealing their underlying relationships and mechanisms remains practically challenging. Precisely for this difficulty, however, they often yield the most valuable insights when successfully uncovered.

Beyond the inalienable aspect of scale (S), the preceding definition reveals other essential components of heterogeneity. In particular, interactions (I)—or inter-regional connections and links—bind groups of objects (O), and quantity (Q) of objects—necessary measures of the group or object properties are generally necessary for defining and quantifying heterogeneity. Furthermore, two additional components, the dimension (D) of the observed quantity and the environment (E) of the observed objects, are frequently necessary, though occasionally they may be simplified or ignored. In statistical treatments of heterogeneity, for example, the environment is often not explicitly identified.

The relationship between objects and their environment is reciprocal. The object is the entity whose varying state, number, or distribution is the primary focus of measurement. The environment is the context or spatial domain within which this variation is assessed. As reviewed previously, environmental heterogeneity and ecological heterogeneity represent two perspectives on this relationship. In reality, these perspectives are often interwoven; environmental heterogeneity and community heterogeneity are frequently embedded within one another. Therefore, a crucial first step in any heterogeneity study is to explicitly determine and state what constitutes the object and what constitutes the environment—a decision that must be guided by the specific research objectives.

The quantities (Q) observed for heterogeneity analysis can be scalar, categorical, discrete, continuous, vector, or matrix—which can be classified as unidimensional, multidimensional, and/or hierarchical. This moves beyond the classical two-dimensional point-versus-surface framework to recognize that heterogeneity inherently exists within, and is defined by, multi-dimensional spaces. While foundational, the classical distinction is insufficient for capturing the full complexity of heterogeneous structures in modern science. This multi-dimensionality manifests in two primary forms: physical and abstract. In the physical realm, the third dimension is not merely an addition but a fundamental component of the system's structure. In geophysics, for instance, the large low-velocity provinces (LLVPs) in Earth's mantle are continent-sized, three-dimensional anomalies. More profoundly, heterogeneity must be conceptualized in abstract, high-dimensional spaces, such as genetic or ecological fitness landscapes. Here, the "space" is defined by numerous variables—for example, the presence or absence of specific genes or microbial species. In such spaces, heterogeneity concerns not spatial coordinates but the complex, non-additive interactions between nodes in a network. Eble et al. (2023) demonstrate that key "master regulators"—a specific gene or bacterial species—can control the topography of high-dimensional fitness landscapes, thereby regulating interactions among all other entities in the system. This represents a form of heterogeneity in the structure of interactions themselves, visible only when analyzed in four or five dimensions and not captured by studying pairwise, two-dimensional relationships alone.

The nature of a system's heterogeneity is thus contingent upon the dimensionality of the space in which it is examined. A comprehensive framework must accommodate this spectrum, from three-dimensional physical structures to n-dimensional abstract state spaces, where the very interactions that define the system constitute its most profound heterogeneous features. Emerging approaches such as higher-order networks for collective dynamics (Battiston et al., 2026) offer particularly promising tools for addressing this challenge.

Heterogeneity (H) can therefore be defined as scale-dependent (S) variation or difference within a complex system, typically manifested through interacting (I) groups of objects (O) or interconnected regions. Its study requires measuring the quantities (Q) and essential properties of objects—with appropriate dimensionality (D)—and, where relevant, their environment (E)—followed by analysis using suitable metrics, models, and/or frameworks. Formally, heterogeneity may be abstracted as a hexagonal tuple, H = {S, O, I, Q, D, E}, in which the final two components are considered optional.

Similarly, heterogeneity analysis—the study of heterogeneity—can be conceptualized as a seven-tuple, HR = {H, M} = {S, O, I, Q, D, E, M}, where M = {Metrics, Models, Frameworks}. We have devoted two of the four major sections in this review to surveying the methods widely used in ecology and allied disciplines. Additionally, the online supplementary information (OSI) provides a compiled collection of metrics and models employed in heterogeneity research across ecology and closely related fields. Beyond leveraging advances in mathematical, statistical, and computational algorithms and experimental technologies, we propose three overarching strategic approaches that target critical aspects of heterogeneity.

The first approach, termed three-layer heterogeneity analysis (TLH) (Ma & Ellison 2025), is inspired by the ISO (International Organization for Standardization) layered communication protocol and its implementation for the Internet, TCP/IP. TLH consists of three levels: the definition and metrics layer, the network model layer, and the application layer. Its advantages lie in generality and scalability, allowing adaptation to diverse problems and even different disciplines. The bottom layer establishes the foundation—definitions and fundamental metrics. The network layer builds a complex network model that captures the interactions between groups of objects; this model is usually sufficiently complex to represent the abundance, distribution, and interactions among grouped objects. The application layer performs inferences based on network models, with objectives tailored to address the concrete research goals of the project.

The second approach, termed multi-dimensional heterogeneity analysis (MHA) (Ma & Ellison 2026), addresses the dimensionality of heterogeneity. Its premise is that analysis confined to a single dimension may be insufficient for quantifying heterogeneity. Instead, multi-dimensional analyses—and their integration or synthesis—should be applied to obtain comprehensive and robust inferences. For example, different network properties can be synthesized. MHA can be integrated or embedded within the three-layer heterogeneity (TLH) analysis framework described above.

The third approach, termed multi-scaling heterogeneity analysis (MSHA), tackles the variable scales inherent in heterogeneity research. It investigates how heterogeneity scales across different spatial or temporal resolutions. MSHA can be readily integrated with TLH and MHA strategies. Somewhat surprisingly, the model for multi-scaling analysis needs to be relatively simple to tame the enormous complexity of heterogeneity analysis, particularly when integrated with the other two approaches. Power law models offer an ideal tool for multi-scaling analysis.

REFERENCES

Abson, D. (2017). Heterogeneity. In *Oxford Bibliographies*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780199830060-0185

Allouche, O., Kalyuzhny, M., Moreno-Rueda, G., Pizarro, M., & Kadmon, R. (2012). Area–heterogeneity tradeoff and the diversity of ecological communities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109*(43), 17495–17500. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1208652109

Antonio, A. I., de Oliveira Junior, A. C., Villalobos, F., & Velazco, S. J. E. (2025). Environmental heterogeneity as a determinant of bee diversity patterns in the Atlantic Forest. *Frontiers of Biogeography, 18*, e142410. https://doi.org/10.21425/fob.18.142410

Bae, S., Westphal, C., Ammer, C., Hostert, P., Hüttel, S., Kis-Katos, K., Kneib, T., Kreft, H., Paul, C., Plieninger, T., Putzenlechner, B., Rötter, R., Schlund, M., Seidel, D., Siebert, S., Wiegand, K., & Knohl, A. (2025). Disentangling landscape heterogeneity: Compositional, configurational, vertical, and temporal heterogeneity. (Manuscript submitted for publication). https://doi.org/10.32942/X29P9Q; https://publications.goettingen-research-online.de/ID-149297

Baron, J. W., & Galla, T. (2020). Dispersal-induced instability in complex ecosystems. *Nature Communications, 11*, 6032. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19824-4

Bastiaansen, R., van der Heydt, A. S., & Dijkstra, H. A. (2022). Fragmented tipping in a spatially heterogeneous world. *Environmental Research Letters, 17*(4), 045006. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac59a8

Battiston, F., Bick, C., & Lucas, M. (2026). Collective dynamics on higher-order networks. *Nature Reviews Physics*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-025-00916-3

Behrends, G., Hagan, T., Kuinkel, S., & Miller, S. E. (2025). Genomic architecture in social insects is more strongly associated with phylogeny than social behavior. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America, 118*(1), 59–72. https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/saae037

Benton, T. G., Vickery, J. A., & Wilson, J. D. (2003). Farmland biodiversity: Is habitat heterogeneity the key? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 18*(4), 182–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(03)00011-9

Beugnon, R., Albert, G., Hähn, G., Yu, W., Haider, S., Hättenschwiler, S., Davrinche, A., Rosenbaum, B., Gauzens, B., & Eisenhauer, N. (2025). Improving forest ecosystem functions by optimizing tree species spatial arrangement. *Nature Communications, 16*(1), 6286. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-61389-7

Bhandary, S., Gawecka, K. A., Pedraza, F., & Bascompte, J. (2025, May 30). *Landscape configuration and community structure jointly determine the persistence of mutualists under habitat loss*. bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.05.28.655631

Blau, P. M. (1977). *Inequality and heterogeneity: A primitive theory of social structure*. Free Press.

Bolker, B. M. (1997, March 11). *Heterogeneity of mixing and spatio-temporal models: Advances and open problems* [Paper presentation]. RSS Epidemics Workshop, London, United Kingdom.

Boyle, M. J. W., Bonebrake, T. C., da Silva, K. D., Dongmo, M. A. K., França, F. M., Gregory, N., Kitching, R. L., Ledger, M. J., Lewis, O. T., Sharp, A. C., Stork, N. E., Williamson, J., & Ashton, L. A. (2025). Causes and consequences of insect decline in tropical forests. *Nature Reviews Biodiversity*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44358-025-00038-9

Brooks, C. P., Antonovics, J., & Keitt, T. H. (2008). Spatial and temporal heterogeneity explain disease dynamics in a spatially explicit network model. *The American Naturalist, 172*(2), 149–159. https://doi.org/10.1086/589451

Bryan, C. J., Tipton, E., & Yeager, D. S. (2021). Behavioural science is unlikely to change the world without a heterogeneity revolution. *Nature Human Behaviour, 5*(8), 980–989.

Buness, V., Sundqvist, M. K., Ali, S. T., Annighöfer, P., Aragon, C. M., Lanzrein, I., Metcalfe, D. B., Nilsson, M.-C., & Gundale, M. J. (2025). Resource quantity and heterogeneity drive successional plant diversity in managed and unmanaged boreal forests. *Ecography, 2025*(7), e07676. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.07676

Bunn, A. G., Urban, D. L., & Keitt, T. H. (2000). Landscape connectivity: A conservation application of graph theory. *Journal of Environmental Management, 59*(4), 265–278. https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.2000.0373

Burrell, R. A., McGranahan, N., Bartek, J., & Swanton, C. (2013). The causes and consequences of genetic heterogeneity in cancer evolution. *Nature, 501*(7467), 338–345.

Cadenasso, M. L., Pickett, S. T. A., & Grove, J. M. (2006). Dimensions of ecosystem complexity: Heterogeneity, connectivity, and history. *Ecological Complexity, 3*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecocom.2005.07.002

Cadenasso, M. L., Pickett, S. T. A., McGrath, B., & Marshall, V. (2013). Ecological heterogeneity in urban ecosystems: Reconceptualized land cover models as a bridge to urban design. In S. T. A. Pickett, M. L. Cadenasso, & B. McGrath (Eds.), *Resilience in ecology and urban design: Linking theory and practice for sustainable cities* (pp. 107–129). Springer Science+Business Media.

Cam, E., Aubry, L. M., & Authier, M. (2016). The conundrum of heterogeneities in life history studies. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 31*(11), 872–885. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.08.002

Caswell, H., & Cohen, J. E. (1991). Communities in patchy environments: A model of disturbance, competition, and heterogeneity. In J. Kolasa & S. T. A. Pickett (Eds.), *Ecological Heterogeneity* (pp. 97–122). Springer-Verlag.

Chao, A., Thorn, S., Chiu, C.-H., Moyes, F., Hu, K.-H., Chazdon, R. L., Wu, J., Magnago, L. F. S., Dornelas, M., Zelený, D., Colwell, R. K., & Magurran, A. E. (2023). Rarefaction and extrapolation with beta diversity under a framework of Hill numbers: The iNEXT.beta3D standardization. *Ecological Monographs*, e1588. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecm.1588

Chesson, P., Donahue, M. J., Melbourne, B. A., & Sears, A. L. (2005). Scale transition theory for understanding mechanisms in metacommunities. In M. Holyoak, M. A. Leibold, & R. D. Holt (Eds.), *Metacommunities: Spatial dynamics and ecological communities* (pp. 279–306). University of Chicago Press.

Collins, S. L., Avolio, M. L., Gries, C., Hallett, L. M., Koerner, S. E., La Pierre, K. J., Rypel, A. L., Sokol, E. R., Fey, S. B., Flynn, D. F. B., Jones, S. K., Ludwig, L. M., Rippinger, J., & Jones, M. B. (2018). Temporal heterogeneity increases with spatial heterogeneity in ecological communities. *Ecology, 99*(4), 858–865. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.2154

Cours, J., & Duflot, R. (2025). Effects of landscape heterogeneity on bird communities in temperate, boreal, and montane forests—a review. *Journal of Avian Biology, 2025*, e03458. https://doi.org/10.1002/jav.03458

Czyżewski, S., & Svenning, J.-C. (2025). Temperate forest plants are associated with heterogeneous semi-open canopy conditions shaped by large herbivores. *Nature Plants, 11*, 985–1000. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41477-025-01981-3

Davis, G. H., Crofoot, M. C., & Farine, D. R. (2023). Temporal structure and ecological consequences of animal social networks. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 38*(7), 655–667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2023.01.013

de Marsily, G., Delay, F., Gonçalvès, J., Renard, P., Teles, V., & Violette, S. (2005). Dealing with spatial heterogeneity. *Hydrogeology Journal, 13*(1), 161–183. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10040-004-0432-3

Deng, C., Daley, T., De Sena Brandine, G., & Smith, A. D. (2019). Molecular heterogeneity in large-scale biological data: Techniques and applications. *Annual Review of Biomedical Data Science, 2*(1), 39–67.

Dent, C. L., & Grimm, N. B. (1999). Spatial heterogeneity of stream water nutrient concentrations over successional time. *Ecology, 80*(7), 2283–2298.

Dixon Hamil, K.-A., Iannone, B. V., III, Huang, W. K., Fei, S., & Zhang, H. (2016). Cross-scale contradictions in ecological relationships. *Landscape Ecology, 31*(1), 7–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-015-0288-z

Dutilleul, P. (1993). Spatial heterogeneity and the design of ecological field experiments. *Ecology, 74*(6), 1646–1658. https://doi.org/10.2307/1939926

Dutilleul, P., & Legendre, P. (1993). Spatial heterogeneity against heteroscedasticity: An ecological paradigm versus a statistical concept. *Oikos, 66*(1), 152–171. https://doi.org/10.2307/3545210

Dutilleul, P. R. L. (2011). *Spatio-temporal heterogeneity: Concepts and analyses*. Cambridge University Press.

Eagle, N., Macy, M., & Claxton, R. (2010). Network diversity and economic development. *Science, 328*(5981), 1029–1031. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1186605

Eble, H., Joswig, M., Lamberti, L., & Ludington, W. B. (2023). Master regulators of biological systems in higher dimensions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 120*(51), e2300634120. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2300634120

Eisenhauer, N., Angst, G., Asato, A. E. B., Beugnon, R., Bönisch, E., Cesarz, S., Dietrich, P., Jurburg, S. D., Madaj, A.-M., Reuben, R. C., Ristok, C., Sünnemann, M., Yi, H., Guerra, C. A., & Hines, J. (2023). The heterogeneity–diversity–system performance nexus. *National Science Review, 10*(8), nwad109. https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwad109

Eliazar, I. (2021). Five degrees of randomness. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 568*, 125662.

Eliazar, I., & Sokolov, I. M. (2010). Maximization of statistical heterogeneity: From Shannon's entropy to Gini's index. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 389*(16), 3023–3038.

Elliott-Graves, A. (2025). Reevaluating Heterogeneity in Evidence Synthesis. *Philosophy of Science*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/psa.2025.10176

Farnsworth, E. J., & Ellison, A. M. (1996). Scale-dependent spatial and temporal variability in biogeography of mangrove root epibiont communities. *Ecological Monographs, 66*(1), 45–66.

Feng, W., & Takemoto, K. (2014). Heterogeneity in ecological mutualistic networks dominantly determines community stability. *Scientific Reports, 4*, 5912. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep05912

Fitch, P. J. R., Lovell, M. A., Davies, S. J., Pritchard, T., & Harvey, P. K. (2015). An integrated and quantitative approach to petrophysical heterogeneity. *Marine and Petroleum Geology, 63*, 82–96.

Fitzpatrick, M. C., Preisser, E. L., Porter, A., Elkinton, J., & Ellison, A. M. (2012). Modeling range dynamics in heterogeneous landscapes: invasion of the hemlock woolly adelgid in eastern North America. *Ecological Applications, 22*(2), 472–486.

Forman, R. T. T., & Godron, M. (1986). *Landscape ecology*. Wiley.

Forsythe, A. B., Day, T., & Nelson, W. A. (2021). Demystifying individual heterogeneity. *Ecology Letters, 24*(11), 2282–2297. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13843

Fortin, M.-J., James, P. M. A., MacKenzie, A., Welles, S. J., & Rayfield, B. (2012). Spatial statistics, spatial regression, and graph theory in ecology. *Spatial Statistics, 1*, 100–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spasta.2012.02.004

Franks, P. W., Rich, S. S., Linder, B., Zaghloul, N. A., & Cefalu, W. T. (2025). A research roadmap to address the heterogeneity of diabetes and advance precision medicine. *Diabetes, 74*(1), 1–10.

Fromville, T., Blaum, N., Jeltsch, F., Kramer-Schadt, S., & Radchuk, V. (2025). Considering landscape heterogeneity improves the inference of inter-individual interactions from movement data. *Movement Ecology, 13*(41). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40462-025-00567-0

Fuhlendorf, S. D., Harrell, W. C., Engle, D. M., Hamilton, R. G., Davis, C. A., & Leslie, D. M., Jr. (2006). Should heterogeneity be the basis for conservation? Grassland bird response to fire and grazing. *Ecological Applications, 16*(5), 1706–1716. https://doi.org/10.1890/1051-0761(2006)016[1706:SHBTBF]2.0.CO;2

Gao, H., Sabo, J. L., Chen, X., Liu, Z., Yang, Z., Ren, Z., & Liu, M. (2018). Landscape heterogeneity and hydrological processes: a review of landscape-based hydrological models. *Landscape Ecology, 33*, 2061–2075.

Gao, J., Barzel, B., & Barabási, A. L. (2016). Universal resilience patterns in complex networks. *Nature, 530*(7590), 307–312.

Garroway, C. J., Bowman, J., Carr, D., & Wilson, P. J. (2008). Applications of graph theory to landscape genetics. *Evolutionary Applications, 1*(4), 620–630. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4571.2008.00047.x

Gasperini, S., Napoleone, F., Bartolommei, P., Bertagni, G., Cannucci, S., Serafini, L., & Burrascano, S. (2025). Environmental heterogeneity as a differential driver for density of two sympatric rodent species. *Ecology and Evolution, 15*(10), e72268. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.72268

Gimenez, O., Cam, E., & Gaillard, J.-M. (2018). Individual heterogeneity and capture-recapture models: What, why and how? *Oikos, 127*(5), 664–686. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.04532

Giménez, A. L., Grech, M. G., & De Paz, Ó. (2025). Exploring the effects of climatic and environmental heterogeneity on the spatial activity of Patagonian bats. *BMC Ecology and Evolution, 25*(1), 83. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-025-02430-7

Gordon, D. M. (2021). Movement, encounter rate, and collective behavior in ant colonies. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America, 114*(5), 541–546. https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/saaa036

Grilli, J. (2020). Macroecological laws describe variation and diversity in microbial communities. *Nature Communications, 11*, 4743.

Guo, Z., Sun, Z., Zhao, N., & Xu, W. (2026). Heterogeneity enhances dynamic survivability of coupled oscillators. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science, 36*(1), 013135.

Guyot, V., Castagneyrol, B., Vialatte, A., Deconchat, M., & Jactel, H. (2016). Tree diversity reduces pest damage in mature forests across Europe. *Biology Letters, 12*(4), 20151037. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.1037

Hamel, S., Gaillard, J.-M., & Yoccoz, N. G. (2018). Introduction to: Individual heterogeneity—the causes and consequences of a fundamental biological process. *Oikos, 127*(5), 643–647. https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.05222

Hastings, A. (1990). Spatial heterogeneity and ecological models. *Ecology, 71*(2), 426–428. https://doi.org/10.2307/1940296

Heckman, J. J. (2001). Micro data, heterogeneity, and the evaluation of public policy: Nobel lecture. *Journal of Political Economy, 109*(4), 673–748.

Hedrick, P. W. (2006). Genetic polymorphism in heterogeneous environments: The age of genomics. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics, 37*, 67–93.

Hendel, A., Pereira, J. M. C., Braunisch, V., Douma, J. C., Klingenfuß, S., Ruppert, L., Spînu, A. P., Frey, J., Liu, X., Storch, I., & Klein, A. M. (2024). Disentangling direct and indirect effects of forest structure on biodiversity: Bottom-up and top-down effects between forestry, bats and their insect prey. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 62*(1), 93–105. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14822

Hewitt, J. E., Thrush, S. F., Dayton, P. K., & Bonsdorff, E. (2007). The effect of spatial and temporal heterogeneity on the design and analysis of empirical studies of scale-dependent systems. *The American Naturalist, 169*(3), 398–408. https://doi.org/10.1086/510925

Holme, P., & Saramäki, J. (2012). Temporal networks. *Physics Reports, 519*(3), 97–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2012.03.001

Hong, L., Dumond, M., Zhu, M., Tsugawa, S., Li, C. B., Boudaoud, A., & Roeder, A. H. (2018). Heterogeneity and robustness in plant morphogenesis: from cells to organs. *Annual Review of Plant Biology, 69*, 469–495.

Hovick, T. J., Elmore, R. D., Fuhlendorf, S. D., Engle, D. M., & Hamilton, R. G. (2015). Spatial heterogeneity increases diversity and stability in grassland bird communities. *Ecological Applications, 25*(3), 662–672. https://doi.org/10.1890/14-1067.1

Hu, L. Y., & Chugunova, T. (2008). Multiple-point geostatistics for modeling subsurface heterogeneity: A comprehensive review. *Water Resources Research, 44*(11), W11413. https://doi.org/10.1029/2008WR006993

Huthmacher, S., Abou, B., & Menzel, F. (2025). The importance of being heterogeneous: the complex phase behaviour of insect cuticular hydrocarbons. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface, 22*, 20250099. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2025.0099

Imbert, C., & Ardourel, V. (2023). Formal verification, scientific code, and the epistemological heterogeneity of computational science. *Philosophy of Science, 90*(3), 376–394.

Jiang, X., García-Girón, J., Aguiar, F. C., Arovitta, J., Baastrup-Spohr, L., Kajiser, W., Mao, J., Szoszkiewicz, K., Sun, X., & Alahuhta, J. (2025). Environmental heterogeneity governing river macrophyte beta diversity in Europe is scale- and context-dependent. *Landscape Ecology, 40*, 191. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-025-02212-y

Jonsson, M., Englund, G., & Wardle, D. A. (2011). Direct and indirect effects of area, energy and habitat heterogeneity on breeding bird communities. *Journal of Biogeography, 38*(6), 1186–1196. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2010.02470.x

Jordano, P. (2016). Sampling networks of ecological interactions. *Functional Ecology, 30*(12), 1883–1893. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12763

Kadmon, R., & Allouche, O. (2007). Integrating the effects of area, isolation, and habitat heterogeneity on species diversity: A unification of island biogeography and niche theory. *The American Naturalist, 170*(3), 443–454. https://doi.org/10.1086/519853

Kashyap, A., Rapsomaniki, M. A., Barros, V., Fomitcheva-Khartchenko, A., Martinelli, A. L., Rodriguez, A. F., Gabrani, M., Rosen-Zvi, M., & Kaigala, G. (2022). Quantification of tumor heterogeneity: from data acquisition to metric generation. *Trends in Biotechnology, 40*(6), 647–676.

Kerr, J. T., & Packer, L. (1997). Habitat heterogeneity as a determinant of mammal species richness in high-energy regions. *Nature, 385*(6613), 252–254. https://doi.org/10.1038/385252a0

Kilpinen, H., Goncalves, A., Leha, A., Afzal, V., Alasoo, K., Ashford, S., & Gaffney, D. J. (2017). Common genetic variation drives molecular heterogeneity in human iPSCs. *Nature, 546*(7658), 370–375.

Kolasa, J., & Pickett, S. T. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Ecological heterogeneity*. Springer-Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3062-5

Kolasa, J., & Rollo, C. D. (1991). The heterogeneity of heterogeneity: a glossary. In J. Kolasa & S. T. A. Pickett (Eds.), *Ecological heterogeneity* (pp. 1–23). Springer-Verlag.

Koltermann, C. E., & Gorelick, S. M. (1996). Heterogeneity in sedimentary deposits: A review of structure-imitating, process-imitating, and descriptive approaches. *Water Resources Research, 32*(9), 2617–2658. https://doi.org/10.1029/96WR00025

Kopac, S., Wang, Z., Wiedenbeck, J., Sherry, J., Wu, M., & Cohan, F. M. (2014). Genomic heterogeneity and ecological speciation within one subspecies of Bacillus subtilis. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 80*(16), 4842–4853.

Krause, S., Mattner, L., James, R., Guttal, V., Romanczuk, P., & Krause, J. (2017). Social network analysis and temporal dynamics in animal collectives. In J. Krause, R. James, D. Franks, & D. Croft (Eds.), *Animal Social Networks* (pp. 38–53). Oxford University Press.

Kun, A., & Dieckmann, U. (2013). Resource heterogeneity can facilitate cooperation. *Nature Communications*, 4, 2453. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms3453

Lake, L. W., & Jensen, J. L. (1991). A review of heterogeneity measures used in reservoir characterization. *In Situ, 15*(4), 409–439.

Leal, M. C., Seehausen, O., & Matthews, B. (2017). The ecology and evolution of stoichiometric phenotypes. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 32*(2), 108–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.11.006

Leinonen, T., McCairns, R. J. S., O'Hara, R. B., & Merila, J. (2013). QST–FST comparisons: Evolutionary and ecological insights from genomic heterogeneity. *Nature Reviews Genetics, 14*(3), 179–190.

Levin, S. A., Anderies, J. M., Adger, N., Barrett, S., Bennett, E. M., Cardenas, J. C., Carpenter, S. R., Crépin, A.-S., Ehrlich, P., Fischer, J., Folke, C., Kautsky, N., Kling, C., Nyborg, K., Polasky, S., Scheffer, M., Segerson, K., Shogren, J., van den Bergh, J., & Wilen, J. (2022). Governance in the face of extreme events: Lessons from evolutionary processes for structuring interventions, and the need to go beyond. *Ecosystems, 35*, 697–711.

Li, H., & Reynolds, J. F. (1993). A new contagion index to quantify spatial patterns of landscapes. *Landscape Ecology, 8*(3), 155–162. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00125336

Li, H., & Reynolds, J. F. (1994). A simulation experiment to quantify spatial heterogeneity in categorical maps. *Ecology, 75*(8), 2446–2455. https://doi.org/10.2307/1940898

Li, H., & Reynolds, J. F. (1995). On definition and quantification of heterogeneity. *Oikos, 73*(2), 280–284. https://doi.org/10.2307/3545921

Liang, M., Yang, Q., Chase, J. M., Isbell, F., Loreau, M., Schmid, B., Seabloom, E. W., Tilman, D., & Wang, S. (2025). Unifying spatial scaling laws of biodiversity and ecosystem stability. *Science, 387*, eadl2373. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adl2373

Liu, J., Huang, J., & Ma, S. (2013). Integrative analysis of multiple cancer genomic datasets under the heterogeneity model. *Statistics in Medicine, 32*(7), 1109–1125.

Loke, L. H. L., & Chisholm, R. A. (2022). Measuring habitat complexity and spatial heterogeneity in ecology. *Ecology Letters, 25*(10), 2269–2288. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14084

Lovett, G. M., Jones, C. G., Turner, M. G., & Weathers, K. C. (Eds.). (2005). *Ecosystem function in heterogeneous landscapes*. Springer.

Luna, P., Corro, E. J., Antoniazzi, R., & Dáttilo, W. (2020). Measuring and linking the missing part of biodiversity and ecosystem function: The diversity of biotic interactions. *Diversity, 12*(3), 86. https://doi.org/10.3390/d12030086

Ma, Z. S. (1991). Further interpreted Taylor's power law and population aggregation critical density. *Transactions of the Ecological Society of Chinese Youth, 1*, 284–288.

Ma, Z. S. (2012a). A note on extending Taylor's power law for characterizing human microbial communities: Inspiration from comparative studies on the distribution patterns of insects and galaxies, and as a case study for medical ecology. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/1205.3504

Ma, Z. S. (2012b). Chaotic populations in genetic algorithms. *Applied Soft Computing, 12*(8), 2409–2424.

Ma, Z. S. (2013). Stochastic populations, power law and fitness aggregation in genetic algorithms. *Fundamenta Informaticae, 122*(1–2), 173–206.

Ma, Z. S. (2015). Power law analysis of the human microbiome. *Molecular Ecology, 24*(24), 5428–5445.

Ma ZS. (2018) Extending species-area relationships (SAR) to diversity-area relationships (DAR), *Ecology and Evolution*, DOI: 10.1002/ece3.4425

Ma ZS. (2019) A new DTAR (diversity–time–area relationship) model demonstrated with the indoor microbiome. *Journal of Biogeography*, https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.13636

Ma, Z. S. (2020a). Heterogeneity–disease relationship in the human microbiome-associated diseases. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology, 96*(7), fiaa093.

Ma, Z. S. (2020b). Assessing and interpreting the metagenome heterogeneity with power law. *Frontiers in Microbiology, 11*, 648.

Ma, Z. S. (2021). Spatial heterogeneity analysis of the human virome with Taylor's power law. *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal, 19*, 2921–2927.

Ma, Z. S. (2024a). Species specificity and specificity diversity (SSD) framework: a novel method for detecting the unique and enriched species associated with disease by leveraging the microbiome heterogeneity. *BMC Biology, 22*(1), 283.

Ma, Z. S. (2025a). Taylor's power law meets ecological networks: Introducing TPLoN as a novel framework for heterogeneity analysis. *Oikos, 2025*(e10956), 1–17.

Ma, Z. S. (2025b). How host phylogeny and diet shape the specificity and specificity diversity of animal gut microbiomes. *Environmental Microbiology Reports, 17*(1), e70253.

Ma, Z. S., & Ellison, A. M. (2018). A unified concept of dominance applicable at both community and species scales. *Ecosphere, 9*(11), e02477.

Ma, Z. S., & Ellison, A. M. (2019). Dominance network analysis provides a new framework for studying the diversity-stability relationship. *Ecological Monographs, 89*(3), e01358.

Ma, Z. S., & Ellison, A. M. (2024). Cross-scale scaling-law analyses for the heterogeneity and diversity of animal gut microbiomes from community to landscape. *Oikos, 2024*(e10598), 1–14.

Ma, Z. S., & Ellison, A. M. (2025). A novel three-layer methodology for heterogeneity analysis: From metrics, through statistical tests and modeling to applications. bioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.64898/2025.12.18.695221

Ma, Z. S., & Li, L. (2024). Biodiversity metrics on ecological networks: demonstrated with animal gastrointestinal microbiomes. *Zoological Research: Diversity and Conservation, 1*(1), 51–65.

Ma, Z. S., & Taylor, R. A. J. (2020). Human reproductive system microbiomes exhibited significantly different heterogeneity scaling with gut microbiome, but the intra-system scaling is invariant. *Oikos, 129*(6), 903–911.

Ma, Z. S., & Ellison, A. M. (2024). Comparative investigation of heterogeneity across the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. *Harvard Forest Bullard Spotlight*. https://harvardforest.fas.harvard.edu/notes/bullard-spotlight-comparative-investigation-of-heterogeneity-across-the-natural-sciences-social-sciences-and-humanities/

Ma, Z. S., & Taylor, R. A. J. (2025). Six decades post-discovery of Taylor's power law: From ecological and statistical universality, through prime number distributions and tipping-point signals, to heterogeneity and stability of complex networks. arXiv. https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.18154

Ma, Z. S., Liu, S. & Ellison, A. M. (2026) Heterogeneity in Statistics: A Conceptual and Methodological Review. (Submitted)

Massó Estaje, C., Rothacher, J., Vujić, A., Miličić, M., Chao, A., Mitesser, O., Müller, J., Claßen, A., & Steffan-Dewenter, I. (2025). Experimental enhancement of structural heterogeneity in forest landscapes promotes multidimensional hoverfly diversity. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 00*, e70252. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.70252

Matilla, A., Gallardo, M., & Puga-Hermida, M. I. (2005). Structural, physiological and molecular aspects of heterogeneity in seeds: a review. *Seed Science Research, 15*(2), 63–76. https://doi.org/10.1079/SSR2005203

May, R. M. (1972). Will a large complex system be stable? *Nature, 238*(5364), 413–414. https://doi.org/10.1038/238413a0

McDonnell, J. J., Sivapalan, M., Vaché, K., Dunn, S., Grant, G., Haggerty, R., & Weiler, M. (2007). Moving beyond heterogeneity and process complexity: A new vision for watershed hydrology. *Water Resources Research, 43*(7), W07301. https://doi.org/10.1029/2006WR005467

McIntosh, R. P. (1991). Concept and terminology of homogeneity and heterogeneity in ecology. In J. Kolasa & S. T. A. Pickett (Eds.), *Ecological heterogeneity* (pp. 24–46). Springer-Verlag.

Meyers, B., Thanopoulos, D. L., Munteanu, C., & Scherer-Lorenzen, M. (2025). The effect of light availability and spatio-temporal heterogeneity on the soil seed bank diversity in temperate forests. *Oikos, 2025*, e11694. https://doi.org/10.1002/oik.11694

Michael, M. (2000). *Reconnecting culture, technology, and nature: From society to heterogeneity*. Routledge.

Minor, E. S., & Urban, D. L. (2008). A graph-theory framework for evaluating landscape connectivity and conservation planning. *Conservation Biology, 22*(2), 297–307. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2007.00871.x

Moudrá, L., Barták, V., Moudrý, V., Remelgado, R., Roilo, S., Rocchini, D., Bejček, V., Šťastný, K., Volf, O., Musil, P., & Šálek, M. (2025). Habitat heterogeneity from lidar and hyperspectral data: Implications for bird guilds and restoration management of coal mines. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 62*(6), 1659–1673. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.70071

Nicholson, C. C., & Williams, N. M. (2021). Cropland heterogeneity drives frequency and intensity of pesticide use. *Environmental Research Letters, 16*(7), Article 074008. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac0a12

Nunes, A., Trappenberg, T., & Alda, M. (2020). The definition and measurement of heterogeneity. *Translational Psychiatry, 10*(1), 299.

Ohlmann, M., Miele, V., Dray, S., Chalmandrier, L., O'Connor, L., & Thuiller, W. (2019). Diversity indices for ecological networks: a unifying framework using Hill numbers. *Ecology Letters, 22*(4), 737–747. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13221

O'Shea-Wheller, T. A., Hunt, E. R., & Sasaki, T. (2020). Functional heterogeneity in superorganisms: Emerging trends and concepts. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America, 113*(6), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1093/aesa/saaa039

Palmer, M. A., Bely, A. E., & Berg, K. E. (1997). Ecological heterogeneity in streams: Why variance is an important metric for lotic ecologists. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society, 16*(1), 189–199. https://doi.org/10.2307/1468250

Pellett, C., & Valbuena, R. (2025). Disentangling dispersion from mean reveals true heterogeneity-diversity relationships. *Nature Communications, 16*(1), 8532. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-025-64287-0

Pellissier, L., Albouy, C., Bascompte, J., Farwig, N., Graham, C., Loreau, M., Maglianesi, M. A., Melián, C. J., Pitteloud, C., Roslin, T., Rohr, R., Saavedra, S., Thuiller, W., Woodward, G., Zimmermann, N. E., & Gravel, D. (2018). Comparing species interaction networks along environmental gradients. *Biological Reviews, 93*(2), 785–800. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12366

Perc, M. (2011). Does strong heterogeneity promote cooperation by group interactions? *New Journal of Physics, 13*(12), 123027.

Perez-Nieves, N., Leung, V. C. H., Dragotti, P. L., & Goodman, D. F. M. (2021). Neural heterogeneity promotes robust learning. *Nature Communications, 12*(1), 5791.

Pickett, S. T. A., & Cadenasso, M. L. (1995). Landscape ecology: Spatial heterogeneity in ecological systems. *Science, 269*(5222), 331–334.

Pickett, S. T. A., Ostfeld, R. S., Shachak, M., & Likens, G. E. (Eds.). (1997). *The ecological basis of conservation: Heterogeneity, ecosystems, and biodiversity*. Springer.

Pilosof, S., Porter, M. A., Pascual, M., & Kéfi, S. (2017). The multilayer nature of ecological networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution, 1*(4), 0101. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0101

Poff, N. L., & Ward, J. V. (1990). Physical habitat template of lotic systems: Recovery in the context of historical pattern of spatiotemporal heterogeneity. *Environmental Management, 14*(5), 629–645. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02394715

Poisot, T., Canard, E., Mouillot, D., Mouquet, N., & Gravel, D. (2012). The dissimilarity of species interaction networks. *Ecology Letters, 15*(12), 1353–1361. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12002

Priyadarshana, T. S., Martin, E. A., Sirami, C., Woodcock, B. A., Goodale, E., Martínez-Núñez, C., Lee, M.-B., Pagani-Núñez, E., Raderschall, C. A., Brotons, L., Rege, A., Ouin, A., Tscharntke, T., & Slade, E. M. (2024). Crop and landscape heterogeneity increase biodiversity in agricultural landscapes: A global review and meta-analysis. *Ecology Letters, 27*(3), e14412. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14412

Quévreux, P., Brose, U., Galiana, N., Potapov, A., Thébault, É., Travers-Trolet, M., Wollrab, S., & Jabot, F. (2024). Perspectives in modelling ecological interaction networks for sustainable ecosystem management. *Journal of Applied Ecology, 61*(2), 410–416. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14584

Rafols, I., & Meyer, M. (2010). Diversity and network coherence as indicators of interdisciplinarity: case studies in bionanoscience. *Scientometrics, 82*(2), 263–287. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-009-0041-y

Ramette, A., & Tiedje, J. M. (2007). Multiscale responses of microbial life to spatial distance and environmental heterogeneity in a patchy ecosystem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 104*(8), 2761–2766.

Ratzke, C., Barrere, J., & Gore, J. (2020). Strength of species interactions determines biodiversity and stability in microbial communities. *Nature Ecology & Evolution, 4*(3), 376–383.

Roff, D. A. (1974). Spatial heterogeneity and the persistence of populations. *Oecologia, 15*(3), 245–258. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00345178

Rosenbaum, P. R. (2005). Heterogeneity and causality. *The American Statistician, 59*(2), 147–152.

Ross, C. T., McElreath, R., & Redhead, D. (2024). Modelling animal network data in R using STRAND. *Journal of Animal Ecology, 93*(2), 254–266.

Roth, R. R. (1976). Spatial heterogeneity and bird species diversity. *Ecology, 57*(4), 773–782. https://doi.org/10.2307/1936190

Rother, D. C., Cosmo, L. G., Tavella, J., Windsor, F. M., Devoto, M., Evans, D. M., & Guimarães Jr., P. R. (2025). Spatial networks reveal how forest cover decreases the spread of agricultural pests. *Perspectives in Ecology and Conservation, 23*, 93–103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecon.2025.03.006

Saboyá-Acosta, L. P., Watling, J., & Urbina-Cardona, J. N. (2025). Heterogeneity does matter: estimating relationships between anuran diversity and the environment at different spatial scales in a protected páramo of Colombia. *Landscape Ecology, 40*(98). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-024-02015-7

Sanya, J., Gross, M., Mwampamba, T. H., Pearson, J., Sesabo, J. K., Riechers, M., Kinabo, N. R., Krail, V., & Martin-López, B. (2025). Heterogeneity of demands for nature's contributions to people and nature's values by farmers: Insights from the Kilimanjaro social-ecological system. *Ecology and Society, 30*(2), 25.

Scheufele, D. A., Hardy, B. W., Brossard, D., Waismel-Manor, I. S., & Nisbet, E. (2006). Democracy based on difference: Examining the links between structural heterogeneity, heterogeneity of discussion networks, and democratic citizenship. *Journal of Communication, 56*(4), 728–753.

Schlägel, U. E., Grimm, V., Blaum, N., Colangeli, P., Dammhahn, M., Eccard, J. A., Hertel, M., Joshi, J., Laurent, S., Radchuk, V., Scherer, C., Schurr, F. M., & Jeltsch, F. (2020). Movement-mediated community assembly and coexistence. *Biological Reviews, 95*(4), 1073–1096. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12602

Serra, L., Arnaud, N., Selka, F., Rechenmann, C., Andrey, P., & Laufs, P. (2018). Heterogeneity and its multiscale integration in plant morphogenesis. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology, 46*, 18–24.

Shavit, A., & Ellison, A. M. (2021). Diverse populations are conflated with heterogeneous collectives. *The Journal of Philosophy, 118*(10), 525–548.

Shen, G., Yu, M., Hu, X.-S., Mi, X., Ren, H., Sun, I.-F., & Ma, K. (2009). Species–area relationships explained by the joint effects of dispersal limitation and habitat heterogeneity. *Ecology, 90*(11), 3033–3041. https://doi.org/10.1890/08-1646.1

Silk, M. J., Croft, D. P., Delahay, R. J., Hodgson, D. J., Weber, N., Boots, M., & McDonald, R. A. (2017). Using social network measures in wildlife disease ecology, epidemiology, and management. *BioScience, 67*(3), 245–257. https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biw175

Simmons, N. A., Forte, A. M., & Grand, S. P. (2009). Joint seismic, geodynamic and mineral physical constraints on three-dimensional mantle heterogeneity: Implications for the relative importance of thermal versus compositional heterogeneity. *Geophysical Journal International, 177*(3), 1284–1304.

Sirami, C., Gross, N., Bosem Baillod, A., Bertrand, C., Carrié, R., Hass, A., Henckels, L., Miguet, P., Vuillot, C., Alignier, A., Girard, J., Batáry, P., Clough, Y., Violle, C., Giralt, D., Bota, G., Badenhausser, I., Lefebvre, G., Gauffre, B., & Fahrig, L. (2019). Increasing crop heterogeneity enhances multitrophic diversity across agricultural regions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 116*(33), 16442–16447. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906419116

Smith, H. F. (1938). An empirical law describing heterogeneity in the yields of agricultural crops. *The Journal of Agricultural Science, 28*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021859600050516

Sola, J., Fairchild, T. P., Perkins, M. J., Bull, J. C., & Griffin, J. N. (2025). Counteracting cascades challenge the heterogeneity–stability relationship. *Ecology Letters, 28*(9), e70158. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.70158

Sola, J., & Griffin, J. N. (2025). Resolving the context-dependency of local heterogeneity–diversity relationships across rocky reefs worldwide. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 292*(2032), 20242723. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.20242723

Sparrow, A. D. (1999). A heterogeneity of heterogeneities. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 14*(11), 422–423. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01735-8

Spiegel, O., Leu, S. T., Sih, A., & Bull, C. M. (2016). Socially interacting or indifferent neighbours? Randomization of movement paths to tease apart social preference and spatial constraints. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 7*(8), 971–979. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12553

Start, D. (2020). A black swan event drives eco-evolutionary heterogeneity. DOI: 10.22541/au.157523044.48655276
https://www.authorea.com/doi/full/10.22541/au.157523044.48655276

Steele, J. H. (1974). Spatial heterogeneity and population stability. *Nature, 248*(5443), 83. https://doi.org/10.1038/248083a0

Stein, A., Gerstner, K., & Kreft, H. (2014). Environmental heterogeneity as a universal driver of species richness across taxa, biomes and spatial scales. *Ecology Letters, 17*(7), 866–880. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12277

Stein, A., & Kreft, H. (2015). Terminology and quantification of environmental heterogeneity in species-richness research. *Biological Reviews, 90*(2), 487–508. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12135

Stirling, A. (2007). A general framework for analysing diversity in science, technology and society. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface, 4*(15), 707–719. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2007.0213

Stixrude, L., & Lithgow-Bertelloni, C. (2012). Geophysics of chemical heterogeneity in the mantle. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 40*, 569–595.

Taylor, L. R. (1961). Aggregation, variance and the mean. *Nature, 189*, 732–735.

Tews, J., Brose, U., Grimm, V., Tielbörger, K., Wichmann, M. C., Schwager, M., & Jeltsch, F. (2004). Animal species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of keystone structures. *Journal of Biogeography, 31*(1), 79–92. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0305-0270.2003.00994.x

Thomsen, M. S., Altieri, A. H., Angelini, C., Bishop, M. J., Bulleri, F., Farhan, R., Frühling, V. M. M., Gribben, P. E., Harrison, S. B., He, Q., Klinghardt, M., Langeneck, J., Lanham, B. S., Mondardini, L., Mulders, Y., Oleksyn, S., Ramus, A. P., Schiel, D. R., Schneider, T., & Zot, G. (2022). Heterogeneity within and among co-occurring foundation species increases biodiversity. *Nature Communications, 13*(1), 581. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-28194-y

Tonetti, V., Pena, J. C., Scarpelli, M. D., Sugai, L. S., Barros, F. M., Anunciação, P. R., Santos, P. M., Tavares, A. L., & Ribeiro, M. C. (2023). Landscape heterogeneity: concepts, quantification, challenges and future perspectives. *Environmental Conservation, 50*(3), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892923000097

Torresani, M., Rossi, C., Mina, M., Menegaldo, I., Cappuccio, M., Perrone, M., Hakkenberg, C. R., Rocchini, D., Puletti, N., Stendardi, L., Montagnani, L., & Tognetti, R. (2025). Spectral heterogeneity from the spaceborne imaging spectrometer EnMAP reveals biodiversity patterns in forest ecosystems. *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 144*, 104902. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2025.104902

Trinquier, A., Elliott, T., Ulfbeck, D., Coath, C., Krot, A. N., & Bizzarro, M. (2009). Origin of nucleosynthetic isotope heterogeneity in the solar protoplanetary disk. *Science, 324*(5925), 374–376.

Turajlic, S., Sottoriva, A., Graham, T., & Swanton, C. (2019). Resolving genetic heterogeneity in cancer. *Nature Reviews Genetics, 20*(7), 404–416.

Turcotte, M. M., & Levine, J. M. (2016). Phenotypic plasticity and species coexistence. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 31*(10), 803–813. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.07.013

Turner, M. G. (Ed.). (1987). *Landscape heterogeneity and disturbance*. Springer-Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-4742-5

Udy, K., Fritsch, M., Meyer, K. M., Grass, I., Hanß, S., Hartig, F., Kneib, T., Kreft, H., Kukunda, C. B., Pe'er, G., Reininghaus, H., Tietjen, B., Tscharntke, T., van Waveren, C.-S., & Wiegand, K. (2021). Environmental heterogeneity predicts global species richness patterns better than area. *Global Ecology and Biogeography, 30*(4), 842–851. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.13261

Uhl, B., Schall, P., & Bässler, C. (2025). Achieving structural heterogeneity and high multi-taxon biodiversity in managed forest ecosystems: a European review. *Biodiversity and Conservation, 34*, 3327–3358.

Ulanowicz, R. E. (2004). Quantitative methods for ecological network analysis. *Computational Biology and Chemistry, 28*(5), 321–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compbiolchem.2004.09.001

van der Ploeg, J. D., & Ventura, F. (2014). Heterogeneity reconsidered. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 8*, 23–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2014.07.001

Vazquez-Prokopec, G. M., Perkins, T. A., Waller, L. A., Lloyd, A. L., Reiner, R. C., Scott, T. W., & Kitron, U. (2016). Coupled heterogeneities and their impact on parasite transmission and control. *Trends in Parasitology, 32*(5), 356–367.

Vinatier, F., Tixier, P., Duyck, P.-F., & Lescourret, F. (2011). Factors and mechanisms explaining spatial heterogeneity: a review of methods for insect populations. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 2*(1), 11–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2010.00059.x

Vranken, I., Baudry, J., Aubinet, M., Visser, M., & Bogaert, J. (2014). A review on the use of entropy in landscape ecology: heterogeneity, unpredictability, scale dependence and their links with thermodynamics. *Landscape Ecology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-014-0105-0

Wan, J.-Z., & Wang, X. (2025). Environmental heterogeneity drives the dark diversity of global plant communities. *Journal of Biogeography, 52*, e70043. https://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.70043

Wang, E., & Wang, J. (2016). Systems heterogeneity: An integrative way to understand cancer heterogeneity. *Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology, 58*, 1–9.

Wang, J.-F., Zhang, T.-L., & Fu, B.-J. (2016). A measure of spatial stratified heterogeneity. *Ecological Indicators, 67*, 250–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.02.052

Wang, L., Wei, F., Tagesson, T., Fang, Z., & Svenning, J.-C. (2025). Transforming forest management through rewilding: Enhancing biodiversity, resilience, and biosphere sustainability under global change. *One Earth, 8*(3), 101195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2025.101195

Wang, X., Wu, Y., Manevski, K., Fu, M., Yin, X., & Chen, F. (2021). A framework for the heterogeneity and ecosystem services of farmland landscapes: An integrative review. *Sustainability, 13*(22), 12463. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212463

Weiss, K. M. (1993). *Genetic variation and human disease: Principles and evolutionary approaches*. Cambridge University Press.

Wu, J., Jelinski, D. E., Luck, M., & Tueller, P. T. (2000). Multiscale analysis of landscape heterogeneity: Scale variance and pattern metrics. *Geographic Information Sciences, 6*(1), 6–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/10824000009480529

Yang, Y., Noble, D. W. A., Spake, R., Senior, A. M., Lagisz, M., & Nakagawa, S. (2025). A pluralistic framework for measuring, interpreting and decomposing heterogeneity in meta-analysis. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 16*(11), 2710–2725.

Yuan, Q., Li, M., Desch, S. J., Ko, B., Deng, H., Garnero, E. J., Gabriel, T. S. J., Kegerreis, J. A., Miyazaki, Y., Eke, V., & Asimow, P. D. (2023). Moon-forming impactor as a source of Earth's basal mantle anomalies. *Nature, 623*(7985), 95–99. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06589-1

Zelnik, Y. R., Galiana, N., Barbier, M., Loreau, M., Galbraith, E., & Arnoldi, J.-F. (2024). How collectively integrated are ecological communities? *Ecology Letters, 27*(1), e14358. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.14358

Zhao, L., Li, J., Barrett, R. L., Liu, B., Hu, H., Lu, L., & Chen, Z. (2024). Spatial heterogeneity of extinction risk for flowering plants in China. *Nature Communications, 15*(1), 6352. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-50704-3