

Short Communication

Whittaker's Beta Diversity as the Inverse of Matrix Density: A Structural Reframing

Enrico Feoli¹¹. Department of Life Science, University of Trieste, Italy

Whittaker's beta diversity is traditionally interpreted as a measure of species turnover among ecological communities. In this short note, I show that—when applied to a presence–absence matrix—Whittaker's beta diversity is mathematically equivalent to the inverse of matrix density, defined as the proportion of occupied cells in the species-by-site matrix. This simple equivalence invites a structural and ontological reinterpretation of beta diversity, shifting the focus from compositional change to the sparsity of ecological realization within a matrix of potential associations. I also clarify the distinction between matrix-wide and pairwise beta diversity, highlighting their respective structural and compositional meanings.

Correspondence: papers@team.qeios.com — Qeios will forward to the authors

1. Introduction

Beta diversity, as introduced by Whittaker^[1], captures the differentiation of species composition among ecological communities. It is classically defined as the ratio between regional (γ) and local (α) diversity:

$$\beta = \gamma / \alpha$$

This formulation has inspired decades of ecological research (see Tuomisto ^{[2][3]}), yet its structural implications have remained underexplored. Here, I propose a simple but overlooked equivalence: when species occurrence data are considered as a binary matrix, Whittaker's beta diversity is precisely the inverse of the matrix density. This observation, while mathematically trivial, opens a conceptual window into the architecture of ecological systems.

2. Mathematical Derivation

Let us consider a presence–absence matrix with:

- M: number of species (rows)
- N: number of sites or stands (columns)
- T: total number of occupied cells (i.e., species occurrences)

The average species richness per site is: $\alpha = T/N$

The total species richness across all sites is: $\gamma = M$

Matrix density D is defined as: $D = T/(MN)$

Therefore: $\beta = \gamma/\alpha = MN/T = 1/D$

This identity reveals that Whittaker’s beta diversity is not only a measure of compositional turnover, but also a direct function of the matrix’s structural sparsity.

3. Philosophical Reflection: Diversity as Structured Absence

The equivalence between beta diversity and the inverse of matrix density invites a shift in perspective. Rather than viewing beta diversity solely as a biological or ecological phenomenon, we may interpret it as a structural property of the data matrix—a measure of how incompletely the potential associations between species and sites are realized.

In this light, the ecological matrix becomes a logical space of possibilities. Each cell represents a potential co-occurrence of a species and a site. The density of this matrix reflects how much of this potential is actualized. A fully filled matrix (density = 1) implies no differentiation; every species occurs everywhere. Conversely, a sparse matrix (low density) reflects high beta diversity—not because of dynamic turnover, but because of the withholding of presence.

This resonates with a broader systems-theoretical intuition: complexity often arises not from maximal expression, but from patterned absence. The gaps in the matrix are not voids—they are the very fabric of ecological structure. From this perspective, beta diversity becomes a measure of structured absence. It quantifies not how much diversity is expressed, but how much is withheld—a ratio of unrealized potential.

4. Structural vs. Compositional Diversity

This reframing also clarifies a common confusion in ecological analysis: the difference between structural and compositional interpretations of beta diversity. When calculated for the entire matrix, beta diversity becomes a structural metric—it reflects the overall sparsity of ecological realization, without regard to which species are shared across sites. It is blind to composition.

By contrast, when beta diversity is calculated pairwise between sites, it behaves as a compositional dissimilarity measure. In this form, it ranges from 1 (identical composition) to 2 (completely disjoint), and is sensitive to species overlap. It closely parallels the Jaccard dissimilarity index, which explicitly measures shared presence.

Thus, Whittaker's beta diversity has a dual nature. In its matrix-wide form, it is structural: a measure of how much ecological potential is withheld. In its pairwise form, it is compositional: a measure of how much species composition differs between communities. The reframing proposed here focuses on the former, offering a new lens on ecological differentiation as a function of unrealized possibility.

5. Outlook

Recognizing beta diversity as the inverse of matrix density offers:

- A computational shortcut for large-scale analyses
- A conceptual bridge between ecological diversity and matrix theory
- A philosophical lens on diversity as a measure of structured absence

This perspective may also inform fuzzy extensions of beta diversity, where degrees of presence replace binary entries, and density becomes a continuous measure of ecological realization. In such contexts, the inverse-density interpretation could serve as a foundation for generalizing Whittaker's beta to fuzzy or probabilistic assemblages.

References

1. [^]Whittaker RH (1960). "Vegetation of the Siskiyou Mountains, Oregon and California." *Ecological Monographs*. 30(3):279–338. doi:[10.2307/1943563](https://doi.org/10.2307/1943563).
2. [^]Tuomisto H (2010). "A Diversity of Beta Diversities: Straightening Up a Concept Gone Awry. Part 1. Defining Beta Diversity as a Function of Alpha and Gamma Diversity." *Ecography*. 33(1):2–22. doi:[10.1111/j.1600-0587](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587).

2009.05880.x.

3. [^]Tuomisto H (2010). "A Diversity of Beta Diversities: Straightening Up a Concept Gone Awry. Part 2. Quantifying Beta Diversity and Related Phenomena." *Ecography*. 33(1):23–45. doi:[10.1111/j.1600-0587.2009.06148.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2009.06148.x).

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.