



## Meta-ecosystems 2.0: rooting the theory into the field

Isabelle Gounand, Eric Harvey, Chelsea J Little, Florian Altermatt

### ► To cite this version:

Isabelle Gounand, Eric Harvey, Chelsea J Little, Florian Altermatt. Meta-ecosystems 2.0: rooting the theory into the field. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 2018, 33 (1), pp.36-46. 10.1016/j.tree.2017.10.006 . hal-02999991

**HAL Id: hal-02999991**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02999991>**

Submitted on 11 Nov 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

# Meta-ecosystems 2.0: rooting the theory into the field

Authors: Isabelle Gounand<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Eric Harvey<sup>1,2</sup>, Chelsea J. Little<sup>1,2</sup> and Florian Altermatt<sup>1,2</sup>

\*Corresponding author: Gounand, I. ([isabelle.gounand@eawag.ch](mailto:isabelle.gounand@eawag.ch))

## Addresses:

<sup>1</sup>Eawag, Department of Aquatic Ecology, Überlandstrasse 133, CH-8600 Dübendorf, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>University of Zurich, Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies,  
Winterthurerstr. 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland

## E-mail addresses:

IG: [isabelle.gounand@eawag.ch](mailto:isabelle.gounand@eawag.ch)

EH: [Eric.Harvey@eawag.ch](mailto:Eric.Harvey@eawag.ch)

CJL: [chelseajeane.little@eawag.ch](mailto:chelseajeane.little@eawag.ch)

FA: [florian.altermatt@eawag.ch](mailto:florian.altermatt@eawag.ch)

## Keywords

resource flow; metaecosystem; metacommunity; subsidy; animal movement; landscape

## Abstract

The meta-ecosystem framework demonstrates the significance of among-ecosystem spatial flows for ecosystem dynamics and has fostered a rich body of theory. The models' high level of abstraction, however, impedes applications to empirical systems. We argue that further understanding of spatial dynamics in natural systems strongly depends on dense exchanges between field and theory. From empiricists more and specific quantifications of spatial flows are needed, defined by the major categories of organismal movement (dispersal, foraging, life-cycle, migration). In parallel, the theoretical framework must account for the distinct spatial scales at which these naturally common spatial flows occur. Integrating all levels of spatial connections among landscape elements will upgrade and unify landscape and meta-ecosystem ecology into a single framework for spatial ecology.

## Ecosystem couplings outside the metacommunity box

Spatial flows of energy, materials and organisms are ubiquitous in nature: Organisms move to forage for food, migrate or disperse, actively or as propagules [1–3]. All these organismal movements along with passive flows of inorganic nutrients and detritus connect ecosystems and influence local ecosystem dynamics [4,5]. Community ecologists have paid particular attention to spatial flows of species (dispersal; see Glossary), which connect several communities in a metacommunity [6,7]. The metacommunity framework demonstrated how dispersal and environmental heterogeneity determine species coexistence and biodiversity among a set of patches at local and regional scales [4,8–12]. In parallel, the growing recognition that resources are not stationary and spatial flows of resources can also play a significant role in the dynamics of various types of biological communities [5] fostered the development of the meta-ecosystem framework [13,14]. By explicitly integrating local production and spatial movement of resources within metacommunities, this framework demonstrated the feedback between community and resource dynamics across spatial scales [15]. Organisms moving among ecosystems modify the spatial distribution of resources, and thus habitat suitability, through local resource consumption and biomass recycling [16]. In parallel, resource flows connect the dynamics of distinct communities via the local production and export of these resources [17], and can trigger trophic cascades in recipient ecosystems [18]. This mechanistic link between community and ecosystem functioning and spatial dynamics makes the meta-ecosystem framework a powerful tool to investigate the dynamics of connected ecosystems. This is especially relevant in the context of increasing perturbations, where disruptions in local processes can spread in space through changes in spatial flows [17,19–22]. However, while the theoretical

development of the meta-ecosystem framework has been fast [13,16,23–29], adoption by empiricists has generally lagged behind [11], and mostly consisted of conceptual experiments paralleling the modelling work [17,21,30] or a few applications to coastal systems [31,32].

Here, we argue that empirical research on meta-ecosystems is progressing slowly due to the theory's high level of abstraction. As a conceptual extension of metacommunity theory, meta-ecosystem models usually tend to focus on dispersal to be the driver of organismal flows in space, thereby implicitly considering the couplings between ecosystem patches of similar habitats [16,23,24,26]. Dispersal, however, is but a small subset of all organismal movement types that can couple ecosystems (Box 1). The missing piece – other types of organismal movement – prevents current meta-ecosystem theory from providing predictions specific enough to apply to real ecosystems. Meanwhile, empirical ecology faces challenges in understanding how spatial flows induce mutual feedbacks among different ecosystems, partly due to technical challenges of measuring spatial flows [33]. Empirical ecology is also traditionally divided into independent research domains which consider spatial flows only as external inputs to ecosystems of interest (e.g. or terrestrial vs. aquatic ecology [34]) and have different variables of interest and measurement units to describe the same processes (e.g. individuals or species dynamics in community ecology vs. biomass or nutrient cycles in ecosystem ecology). Given that ecosystems are commonly interconnected in complex networks of spatial flows [5,14], a more holistic spatial perspective, considering potential feedbacks among ecosystems, is critically needed to understand the dynamics of ecosystems and their responses to changes [2,22,35–37].

Incorporating more specific attributes of ecosystem spatial couplings in the meta-ecosystem framework would foster the production of applicable theoretical predictions and

bridge previously less connected empirical fields. Here, we offer a new, synthetic vision of meta-ecosystems. We contend that (1) meta-ecosystems found in nature fall along a gradient of coupling types: some depend mostly on dispersal, and others mostly on spatial flows of resources; (2) these ecosystem coupling types occur at different spatial scales, with (3) different underlying drivers, including different types of organismal movement, which might affect meta-ecosystem dynamics in fundamentally different ways than dispersal alone (Box 1). We believe that integrating these organismal movements into meta-ecosystem models will raise the generality-realism trade-off to the appropriate level needed to further understand the mechanisms underlying spatial dynamics across natural landscapes (Box 2). Joining the ongoing effort to build an integrative and predictive ecology [38,39], we propose a comprehensive framework for spatial ecology acknowledging how spatial flows of organisms and resources occur and interact at contrasting scales in nature. In the next sections we motivate this upgraded meta-ecosystem framework with concrete examples and identify the next theoretical and empirical steps needed for advancing spatial ecology.

## Contrasting natures of ecosystem couplings: dispersal versus resource flows

Meta-ecosystem theory has extended the metacommunity framework with general models that include both dispersal and resource flows to connect ecosystems [13]. However, true dispersal, defined as the settlement and successful reproduction of individuals away from their place of birth [1,40,41], can only occur between ecosystems offering similar enough physical habitats for the dispersing organism to survive in both. Clearly, many organisms have some adaptations to deal with variations in habitat conditions, and often can cope with what is

considered – and built into models – as environmental heterogeneity. However, all organisms have some physiological limits preventing a successful dispersal across very different physical boundaries (e.g., freshwater to terrestrial or marine to freshwater). Generally, individuals crossing habitat barriers die and enter the detrital pool rather than reproduce and establish new populations in the recipient ecosystem (e.g. whales or algae grounding on beaches). Thus, dispersal primarily links similar ecosystems, while massive flows of resources are reported to cross ecosystem boundaries [5,42], therefore linking contrasting ecosystems. Though implicitly clear to most empiricists, theoreticians often do not explicitly make this distinction ([43] for an exception), thereby ignoring implications for the nature of dominant ecosystem couplings (dispersal vs. resource flows). This has, in our eyes, led to the discrepancy between the theoretical advancements in meta-ecosystem theory and a lack of application to empirical systems.

One can imagine a gradient of meta-ecosystem couplings going from dispersal-based to resource-flow based meta-ecosystems (Figure 1A–B): at one end of the gradient, dispersal is more likely to occur between ecosystem patches of similar habitats, including similar abiotic and biotic characteristics, such as networks of ponds, islands, forest patches, or table mountains (Figure 1A). Organisms dispersing in such fragmented landscapes have to cross what is for them an unsuitable matrix of radically different habitats in order to reach the next acceptable patch. For instance, zooplankton transported by birds can only establish and survive in new aquatic habitats but are doomed to die when released during terrestrial stopovers [36,44]. Given that resources transported along with dispersal are probably negligible in comparison to the consumer effect of individuals founding new populations (see Box 1), these dispersal-based meta-ecosystems finally boil down to metacommunity-like dynamics coupled with local recycling (Figure 1A). At the

opposite end of the gradient, massive cross-ecosystem flows of resources occur at the boundaries of contrasting ecosystems, such as at aquatic-terrestrial or pelagic-benthic interfaces (Figure 1B). Resource flows can be mediated by physical processes passively transporting detritus or nutrients, such as wind (e.g. windblown leaves from forests accounting for up to 59% of litter nutrient input in adjacent orchards [45]), gravity (e.g. nutrient leaching in a watershed, zooplankton faecal pellets sinking from pelagic to benthic systems; [46,47]), or aquatic currents and tides (e.g., benthic nutrients re-suspended by upwelling currents, algae or carrion grounding on beaches; [48]). Thus, ecosystems do not have to be suitably similar in order to be connected by these types of resource flows, unlike those connected by dispersal.

Significant resource flows can also consist of organisms approaching the end of their life cycles, such as anadromous fish migrating from oceans to reproduce in streams or insects emerging from freshwater systems and dying on land [49–51]. In Iceland, tundras surrounding lakes receive an additional input of nitrogen of up to 250 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>yr<sup>-1</sup> from aquatic midge fall, a level shown to cascade on plant nitrogen content and eventually increasing the density of herbivorous caterpillars [51,52]. As a product of the animals' life-history cycles, these flows affect local community dynamics in a fundamentally different way than does dispersal, by primarily acting as resource inputs in the recipient ecosystem instead of contributing to population dynamics (Box 1). Finally, foraging movements of consumers searching for food in one habitat type but otherwise residing in another can also induce massive resource flows. As an example, in Kenya, Subaluski and colleagues estimated that a population of hippopotami grazing in savannahs transfers annually the production equivalent of 260 to 1563 hectares of terrestrial biomass through faeces into the Mara river, where the hippopotami rest and defecate [53]. Even if

animal use the whole landscape, this asymmetry in animal activities induces strong resource-based meta-ecosystem dynamics resulting in a huge net flow of resource between two contrasting adjacent ecosystems (other similar and emblematic examples include marine birds fishing in oceans but defecating guano ashore or bears hunting salmon in rivers and pulling their carcasses into forests [50,53–55]).

Overall, on our gradient of ecosystem couplings with increasing habitat dissimilarity, the two extremes represent widespread types of natural meta-ecosystems with opposing characteristics and dynamics: dispersal-based meta-ecosystems dominated by metacommunity-like dynamics occur between distant ecosystems but of similar habitat types at one end of the gradient (Figure 1A), while at the other end of the gradient, resource-flow based meta-ecosystems occur directly at the boundaries of dissimilar ecosystems (Figure 1B). Along this gradient, intermediate cases exist where dispersal and subsidies are both significant. For instance, uphill and downhill terrestrial habitats, or upstream and downstream sites of river networks are similar enough habitats to be coupled by dispersal of some organisms, while also being linked by passive flows of resources. While the existence of these different flow types structuring spatial dynamics within landscapes are generally acknowledged from field observations (Box 2), we still lack quantitative information about the frequency distribution (bimodal or more continuous) of natural meta-ecosystems along the gradient. Collecting and assembling such data is in our eyes one of the major empirical challenge to make further progress in spatial ecology (see last section for details).

## Spatial scales of dispersal versus resource flows

Dispersal and resource-flow based meta-ecosystems do not necessarily operate in isolation from each other. Rather, the two types of flows and associated meta-ecosystem dynamics occur at different spatial scales within the landscape (Figure 1C). Resource-flow based meta-ecosystems occur at a local scale, across boundaries of adjacent ecosystems (e.g. litter fall or insect exchanges at lake-forest interface; [56]), while dispersal-based meta-ecosystems could connect these local meta-ecosystems at a larger scale via organisms crossing unsuitable matrices to disperse into distant but similar ecosystems (e.g. bird-dispersed plankton among lakes; [44]). Thus, this conceptual framework encompasses spatially nested dynamics and integrates the contributions of landscape and meta-ecosystem ecology in a single framework for spatial ecology. On one hand, landscape ecology analyses the structure of heterogeneous landscapes, quantifying the surface and relative positions of the different elements (e.g. forest patches, lakes, fields) and their importance for focal species persistence. On the other hand, meta-ecosystem ecology concentrates on the dynamic aspect, by showing how spatial flows connect these structuring elements (Box 2). Acknowledging the different scales at which various spatial flows connect elements in the landscape is crucial both to understand species persistence and ecological processes in heterogeneous landscapes, and to anticipate how perturbations in one location propagate across the landscape [57]. A local perturbation might trigger spatial cascades between apparently unrelated communities or ecological processes [22,58], such as invasive fish affecting terrestrial arthropod communities [59]. Overall, identifying the main paths of spatial flows between ecosystems, and the different scales at which these flows occur, is key to develop an empirically grounded theory of spatial ecology [14]. Notably, this requires incorporating

organismal movement types other than dispersal into current theory, and accounting for their respective spatio-temporal scales (next section and Box 1).

## A missing theory level

Current meta-ecosystem models have been built on simplest assumptions regarding among-ecosystem spatial flows to identify mechanisms general enough to apply to all systems [13,16,23,25,27,29]. However, model structures and parameterizations are too general to appropriately describe the nature of spatial couplings between real ecosystems. Moreover, equally limiting are empirical approaches based on system-centred models, which are useful for specific applications but lack generality and restrict any predictions to the focal system. To bridge this gap, an intermediate level of model generality must be found that would better capture the structure of ecosystem couplings by incorporating the main organismal movement types and their specific effects and scale in general meta-ecosystem models.

These spatial flows, at a first glance, look very specific to some systems: ‘marine snow’ made of phytoplankton and zooplankton’s faecal pellets sinking from pelagic to benthic systems for instance [46], or salmon carcasses fished by bears supporting productivity in lowland boreal forests [50]. However, such seemingly specific spatial flows actually share similar functional roles. If we abandon a system-centred perspective to categorize spatial flows by type of effects they provoke in the recipient ecosystem, generalities can be drawn among contrasting systems. For instance, marine snow corresponds to a directional detritus input from autotrophic to heterotrophic systems, for which analogues can be found in inland systems with forest litter inputs to stream benthos [60]. Similar functional equivalences are found between net cross-

ecosystem resource flows triggered by bears bringing salmon carcasses on land, hippopotami grazing on savannahs and defecating in tropical rivers [53], or zooplankton feeding in pelagic areas during the night and excreting nutrient at daytime in the deep sea [61]. A commonality of all these cases is the daily net transport of inorganic nutrients or detritus triggered by foraging activity. Such generalizable functional roles of spatial flows are easily identified, incorporated into models, and contribute to build a process-based rather than system-based spatial framework.

Essential features of spatial flows to account for in a process-based spatial framework include consumer versus resource effects, timing (e.g. pulse frequency) and spatial scales. In that respect, the four organismal movement types described in Box 1 each display distinct characteristics (Figure 1C): consumer effects (i.e. demographic + consumption pressure) are the dominant result of dispersal, whereas, on a smaller spatial scale, resource effects dominate common life-cycle movements, such as with emerging aquatic midges or spawning salmon [50,52]. Foraging and seasonal migrations trigger both consumption pressure in the recipient ecosystem and potentially net flows of resource, but act at local versus cross-continental scales, respectively, and on continuous versus pulsed time scales compared to local ecosystem dynamics (examples in Box 1). Overall, these ubiquitous movement types fulfil different functional roles in spatial dynamics, and their integration in models would capture essential characteristics of the spatial linkages between ecosystems, without impairing model generality by not being system-specific. This effort of depicting more accurately the spatio-temporal and functional complexity of spatial couplings will move meta-ecosystem theory from abstraction to realistic generalities.

## Challenges ahead for spatial ecology

Understanding the general effects of spatial flows on ecological dynamics is a first step. Next, theory must identify realistic situations under which spatial flows matter for ecological dynamics by grounding models into empirical knowledge. Extensive data on spatial flows already exist across different fields of the empirical literature, but the broad picture is still missing. A major task is to quantify, unify, and synthesize data across fields.

We currently have only partial knowledge of what kind of flows connect ecosystems, with a bias toward data on resource flows which are easily measured by direct methods, such as passive trapping systems (e.g. terrestrial detritus inputs to freshwater systems, pelagic snow in oceans). In contrast, few studies document active flows of resources (but see [53,62]), and dispersal is mostly analysed through its effect on populations or communities rather than estimated as a flow [33]. Improving methods to track animal displacement [63,64] will fill gaps in our knowledge of the spatial scales associated with organismal movement types, but we still have to quantify how much material is conveyed by these movements. When direct measurements are technically challenging, we need to develop and generalize indirect methods combining estimates of the diverse variables and processes involved in spatial flows, such as organisms' feeding and excretion rates, foraging behaviour, population densities in different habitats, average individual body mass, or dispersal kernels (see examples in [49,53,62,65]). New methods combining isotopic data on diet with consumption rates to estimate resource flows would similarly round out our knowledge of spatial flows.

Synthesizing local and spatial data in homogenized units will provide the material to determine which actual spatial flows drive natural meta-ecosystem dynamics and what the

underlying drivers might be (i.e. organismal movement types or physical processes). As a minimum effort towards this necessary homogenization, we suggest consistently expressing spatial flows in areal units (per meter squared) of both donor and recipient ecosystems, in order to appropriately describe flows linking ecosystems of different sizes. We also need quantifications to be systematically associated with information on timing (i.e. duration and frequency) because whether spatial flows occur as continuous flows or pulses constricted in time (e.g. 15-cycle cicada outbreaks in central US [66]) could provoke contrasting effects on the stability of recipient ecosystem dynamics [67–69].

Using models upgraded by this type of data synthesis to understand the relationship between spatial scales and dominant flow types will improve our ability to forecast changes in connected ecosystems (see Outstanding Questions Box for important aspects to address). This is essential for identifying the relevant spatial flows and species to maintain appropriate levels of connectivity and functioning in the landscape.

## Conclusion

By linking contrasting spatial dynamics along a gradient of dispersal versus resource flows occurring at different scales, we propose a unified framework for spatial ecology. Our framework merges the static, but accurate, view of environmental heterogeneity proposed by landscape ecology with the dynamic view from meta-ecosystem theory. We believe this unification is a crucial step toward more fruitful exchanges between theory and empirical ecology. In particular, we advocate that incorporating a wider range of organismal movements into meta-ecosystem models will provide an appropriate balance between generality and realism when describing the

prominent features of couplings between ecosystems. While improving our understanding of spatial dynamics and their consequences for ecosystem functioning, our framework also helps refine relevant conservation targets and spatial scales.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Dries Bonte and the EMERGE working group for helpful discussions. We thank the editor, Dr. Paul Craze, and two anonymous reviewers for comments on a previous version of this manuscript. Funding is from the Swiss National Science Foundation Grant PP00P3\_150698.

## References

- 1 Clobert, J. *et al.* (2001) *Dispersal*, Oxford University Press.
- 2 Bauer, S. and Hoyer, B.J. (2014) Migratory animals couple biodiversity and ecosystem  
functioning worldwide. *Science* 344, 1242552
- 3 Reiners, W.A. and Driese, K. (2003) Transport of energy, information and material  
through the biosphere. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 28, 107–135
- 4 Holyoak, M. *et al.* (2005) *Metacommunities: spatial dynamics and ecological  
communities*, University of Chicago Press.
- 5 Polis, G.A. *et al.* (2004) *Food Webs at the landscape level*, University of Chicago Press.
- 6 Wilson, D.S. (1992) Complex interactions in metacommunities , with implications for  
biodiversity and higher levels of selection. *Ecology* 73, 1984–2000
- 7 Leibold, M.A. *et al.* (2004) The metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale  
community ecology. *Ecol. Lett.* 7, 601–613
- 8 Carrara, F. *et al.* (2012) Dendritic connectivity controls biodiversity patterns in  
experimental metacommunities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 109, 5761–5766
- 9 Cottenie, K. (2005) Integrating environmental and spatial processes in ecological  
community dynamics. *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 1175–1182
- 10 Grainger, T.N. and Gilbert, B. (2016) Dispersal and diversity in experimental  
metacommunities: linking theory and practice. *Oikos* 125, 1213–1223
- 11 Logue, J.B. *et al.* (2011) Empirical approaches to metacommunities: a review and  
comparison with theory. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 26, 482–491
- 12 Wang, S. and Loreau, M. (2016) Biodiversity and ecosystem stability across scales in

309 metacommunities. *Ecol. Lett.* 19, 510–518

310 13 Loreau, M. *et al.* (2003) Meta-ecosystems: a theoretical framework for a spatial ecosystem  
311 ecology. *Ecol. Lett.* 6, 673–679

312 14 Massol, F. *et al.* (2011) Linking community and ecosystem dynamics through spatial  
313 ecology. *Ecol. Lett.* 14, 313–323

314 15 Guichard, F. (2017) Recent advances in metacommunities and meta-ecosystem theories  
315 [version 1; referees: 2 approved]. *F1000Research* 6, (F1000 FacultyRev) 610

316 16 Gravel, D. *et al.* (2010) Source and sink dynamics in meta-ecosystems. *Ecology* 91, 2172–  
317 2184

318 17 Gounand, I. *et al.* (2017) Subsidies mediate interactions between communities across  
319 space. *Oikos* 126, 972–979

320 18 Leroux, S.J. and Loreau, M. (2008) Subsidy hypothesis and strength of trophic cascades  
321 across ecosystems. *Ecol. Lett.* 11, 1147–1156

322 19 Fey, S.B. *et al.* (2015) Recognizing cross-ecosystem responses to changing temperatures:  
323 soil warming impacts pelagic food webs. *Oikos* 124, 1473–1481

324 20 Krell, B. *et al.* (2015) Aquatic prey subsidies to riparian spiders in a stream with different  
325 land use types. *Limnologica* 51, 1–7

326 21 Harvey, E. *et al.* (2016) Spatially cascading effect of perturbations in experimental meta-  
327 ecosystems. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 283, 20161496

328 22 Harvey, E. *et al.* (2017) Bridging ecology and conservation: From ecological networks to  
329 ecosystem function. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 54, 371–379

330 23 Gounand, I. *et al.* (2014) The Paradox of Enrichment in Metaecosystems. *Am. Nat.* 184,

331 752–763

332 24 Gravel, D. *et al.* (2016) Stability and complexity in model meta-ecosystems. *Nat.*  
333 *Commun.* 7, 12457

334 25 Gravel, D. *et al.* (2010) Patch dynamics, persistence, and species coexistence in  
335 metaecosystems. *Am. Nat.* 176, 289–302

336 26 Haegeman, B. and Loreau, M. (2014) General relationships between consumer dispersal,  
337 resource dispersal and metacommunity diversity. *Ecol. Lett.* 17, 175–184

338 27 Marleau, J.N. *et al.* (2014) Meta-ecosystem dynamics and functioning on finite spatial  
339 networks. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 281, 20132094

340 28 Marleau, J.N. *et al.* (2010) Nutrient flows between ecosystems can destabilize simple food  
341 chains. *J. Theor. Biol.* 266, 162–174

342 29 Marleau, J.N. *et al.* (2015) Emergence of nutrient co-limitation through movement in  
343 stoichiometric meta-ecosystems. *Ecol. Lett.* 18, 1163–1173

344 30 Limberger, R. *et al.* (2017) Ecosystem flux and biotic modification as drivers of  
345 metaecosystem dynamics. *Ecology* 98, 1082–1092

346 31 Spiecker, B. *et al.* (2016) Reciprocal feedbacks between spatial subsidies and reserve  
347 networks in coral reef meta-ecosystems. *Ecol. Appl.* 26, 264–278

348 32 Menge, B.A. *et al.* (2015) Are meta-ecosystems organized hierarchically? A model and  
349 test in rocky intertidal habitats. *Ecol. Monogr.* 85, 213–233

350 33 Jacobson, B. and Peres-neto, P.R. (2010) Quantifying and disentangling dispersal in  
351 metacommunities : how close have we come ? How far is there to go ? *Landsc. Ecol.* 25,  
352 495–507

353 34 Soininen, J. *et al.* (2015) Toward More Integrated Ecosystem Research in Aquatic and  
354 Terrestrial Environments. *Bioscience* 54, 174–182

355 35 Mitchell, M.G.E. *et al.* (2013) Linking Landscape Connectivity and Ecosystem Service  
356 Provision: Current Knowledge and Research Gaps. *Ecosystems* 16, 894–908

357 36 Viana, D.S. *et al.* (2016) Migratory Birds as Global Dispersal Vectors. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*  
358 31, 763–775

359 37 van Kleunen, M. *et al.* (2015) Global exchange and accumulation of non-native plants.  
360 *Nature* 525, 100–103

361 38 Mouquet, N. *et al.* (2015) Predictive ecology in a changing world. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 52, 1293–  
362 1310

363 39 Petchey, O.L. *et al.* (2015) The ecological forecast horizon, and examples of its uses and  
364 determinants. *Ecol. Lett.* 18, 597–611

365 40 Ronce, O. (2007) How Does It Feel to Be Like a Rolling Stone? Ten Questions About  
366 Dispersal Evolution. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 38, 231–253

367 41 Massol, F. *et al.* (2017) How life-history traits affect ecosystem properties: effects of  
368 dispersal in meta-ecosystems. *Oikos* 126, 532–546

369 42 Polis, G. a. *et al.* (1997) Toward an Integration of Landscape and Food Web Ecology: The  
370 Dynamics of Spatially Subsidized Food Webs. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 28, 289–316

371 43 Leroux, S.J. and Loreau, M. (2012) Dynamics of Reciprocal Pulsed Subsidies in Local and  
372 Meta-Ecosystems. *Ecosystems* 15, 48–59

373 44 Figuerola, J. and Green, A.J. (2002) Dispersal of aquatic organisms by waterbirds: A  
374 review of past research and priorities for future studies. *Freshw. Biol.* 47, 483–494

375 45 Shen, W. *et al.* (2011) Blowing litter across a landscape: Effects on ecosystem nutrient  
376 flux and implications for landscape management. *Landsc. Ecol.* 26, 629–644

377 46 Turner, J.T. (2015) Zooplankton fecal pellets, marine snow, phytodetritus and the ocean's  
378 biological pump. *Prog. Oceanogr.* 130, 205–248

379 47 Didham, R.K. *et al.* (2015) Agricultural intensification exacerbates spillover effects on soil  
380 biogeochemistry in adjacent forest remnants. *PLoS One* 10, e0116474

381 48 Polis, G.A. *et al.* (1996) Linking Marine and Terrestrial Food Webs: Allochthonous Input  
382 from the Ocean Supports High Secondary Productivity on Small Islands and Coastal Land  
383 Communities. *Am. Nat.* 147, 396–423

384 49 Gratton, C. and Vander Zanden, M.J. (2009) Flux of aquatic insect productivity to land:  
385 Comparison of lentic and lotic ecosystems. *Ecology* 90, 2689–2699

386 50 Gende, S.M. *et al.* (2004) Magnitude and fate of salmon-derived nutrients and energy in a  
387 coastal stream ecosystem. *J. Freshw. Ecol.* 19, 149–160

388 51 Bultman, H. *et al.* (2014) Terrestrial deposition of aquatic insects increases plant quality  
389 for insect herbivores and herbivore density. *Ecol. Entomol.* 39, 419–426

390 52 Gratton, C. *et al.* (2008) Ecosystem Linkages Between Lakes and the Surrounding  
391 Terrestrial Landscape in Northeast Iceland. *Ecosystems* 11, 764–774

392 53 Subalusky, A.L. *et al.* (2015) The hippopotamus conveyor belt: vectors of carbon and  
393 nutrients from terrestrial grasslands to aquatic systems in sub-Saharan Africa. *Freshw.*  
394 *Biol.* 60, 512–525

395 54 Adame, M. *et al.* (2015) Nutrient subsidies delivered by seabirds to mangrove islands.  
396 *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 525, 15–24

397 55 Maron, J.L. *et al.* (2006) An Introduced Predator Alters Aleutian Island Plant  
398 Communities by Thwarting Nutrient Subsidies. *Ecol. Monogr.* 76, 3–24

399 56 Richardson, J.S. and Sato, T. (2015) Resource subsidy flows across freshwater-terrestrial  
400 boundaries and influence on processes linking adjacent ecosystems. *Ecohydrology* 8, 406–  
401 415

402 57 Dreyer, J. and Gratton, C. (2014) Habitat linkages in conservation biological control:  
403 Lessons from the land-water interface. *Biol. Control* 75, 68–76

404 58 Richardson, J.S. and Béraud, S. (2014) Effects of riparian forest harvest on streams: A  
405 meta-analysis. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 51, 1712–1721

406 59 Baxter, C. V. *et al.* (2004) Fish invasion restructures stream and forest food webs by  
407 interrupting reciprocal prey subsidies. *Ecology* 85, 2656–2663

408 60 Wallace, J.B. *et al.* (2015) Stream invertebrate productivity linked to forest subsidies: 37  
409 stream-years of reference and experimental data. *Ecology* 96, 1213–1228

410 61 Stukel, M.R. *et al.* (2013) Contributions of mesozooplankton to vertical carbon export in a  
411 coastal upwelling system. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 491, 47–65

412 62 Subalusky, A.L. *et al.* (2017) Annual mass drownings of the Serengeti wildebeest  
413 migration influence nutrient cycling and storage in the Mara River. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*  
414 114, 7647–7652

415 63 Hussey, N.E. *et al.* (2015) Aquatic animal telemetry: A panoramic window into the  
416 underwater world. *Science* 348, 1255642

417 64 Kays, R. *et al.* (2015) Terrestrial animal tracking as an eye on life and planet. *Science* 348,  
418 aaa2478

419 65 Abbas, F. *et al.* (2012) Roe deer may markedly alter forest nitrogen and phosphorus  
420 budgets across Europe. *Oikos* 121, 1271–1278

421 66 Pray, C.L. *et al.* (2009) Deposition and decomposition of periodical cicadas (Homoptera:  
422 Cicadidae: Magicicauda) in woodland aquatic ecosystems. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* 28,  
423 181–195

424 67 Sato, T. *et al.* (2016) A test of the effects of timing of a pulsed resource subsidy on stream  
425 ecosystems. *J. Anim. Ecol.* 85, 1136–1146

426 68 Reigada, C. *et al.* (2015) Metapopulation Dynamics on Ephemeral Patches. *Am. Nat.* 185,  
427 183–195

428 69 Hastings, A. (2012) Temporally varying resources amplify the importance of resource  
429 input in ecological populations. *Biol. Lett.* 8, 1067–1069

430 70 Stevens, V.M. *et al.* (2014) A comparative analysis of dispersal syndromes in terrestrial  
431 and semi-terrestrial animals. *Ecol. Lett.* 17, 1039–1052

432 71 Jeltsch, F. *et al.* (2013) Integrating movement ecology with biodiversity research -  
433 exploring new avenues to address spatiotemporal biodiversity dynamics. *Mov. Ecol.* 1, 6

434 72 Yang, D. *et al.* (2016) Stepping-stones and dispersal flow: establishment of a meta-  
435 population of Milu (*Elaphurus davidianus*) through natural re-wilding. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 27297

436 73 Jefferies, R.L. *et al.* (2004) Agricultural Food Subsidies, Migratory Connectivity and  
437 Large-Scale Disturbance in Arctic Coastal Systems: A Case Study. *Integr. Comp. Biol.* 44,  
438 130–139

439 74 Vanschoenwinkel, B. *et al.* (2011) Passive external transport of freshwater invertebrates by  
440 elephant and other mud-wallowing mammals in an African savannah habitat. *Freshw. Biol.*

441 56, 1606–1619

442 75 Green, A.J. (2015) The importance of waterbirds as an overlooked pathway of invasion for  
 443 alien species. *Divers. Distrib.* 22, 239–247

444 76 Courchamp, F. *et al.* (2003) Mammal invaders on islands: impact, control and control  
 445 impact. *Biol. Rev.* 78, 347–383

446 77 Gende, S.M. (2002) Pacific salmon in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. *Bioscience* 52,  
 447 917–928

448 78 Novak, P.A. *et al.* (2017) Do upstream migrating, juvenile amphidromous shrimps,  
 449 provide a marine subsidy to river ecosystems? *Freshw. Biol.* 62, 880–893


450 79 Lavery, T.J. *et al.* (2010) Iron defecation by sperm whales stimulates carbon export in the  
 451 Southern Ocean. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 277, 3527–3531

452 80 Dong, C. *et al.* (2017) The underlying processes of a soil mite metacommunity on a small  
 453 scale. *PLoS One* 12, e0176828


454

455






**Figure 1:** Gradient of meta-ecosystem types and their spatial integration in the landscape. Natural meta-ecosystems fall along a gradient along which the pre-eminence of dispersal versus resource flows varies. At one end, (A) dispersal-based meta-ecosystems, displaying meta-community like dynamics, connect distant ecosystem patches of similar habitat and functioning via dispersal (curved blue arrows), while at the other end, (B) resource-flow based meta-ecosystems connect adjacent ecosystems of radically different habitats via resource flows crossing their boundaries (horizontal straight black arrows). Resource flows might be driven by physical processes (e.g. gravity, wind or water currents) as well as biotic processes (e.g. life-cycle movement of organisms). (C) These two types of meta-ecosystem dynamics occur at different scales: dispersal can connect individual resource-flow based meta-ecosystems within landscapes. Foraging activities might trigger consumption pressure as well as transfer of matter between ecosystems within the landscape (vertical pink arrows), while seasonal migrations connect the landscape to more distant ecosystems (curved dotted orange arrow).



**Figure I. Scales of organism movement types and effects on meta-ecosystem dynamics.**

Top panels (A-D) show the qualitative relationships between organism size, the distance crossed for a given type of movement, and the time spent relative to the organism's lifespan (inverse frequency). For instance, dispersal movement (A) or life-cycle migration (which corresponds to movement between contrasting habitats associated with specific ontogenic stages) (B) occur only once in a lifetime, whereas seasonal migration (C) occurs several times at regular intervals, and movement linked to foraging (D) occurs on a short time basis and multiple times during the life of an organism. The distance crossed during these movements might depend on the size and the mobility (e.g. flying ability) of the organisms, with larger or more mobile ones dispersing and migrating farther or foraging on larger spatial scales (A-D) (see [70,71]). However, small organisms can also cross large distances through passive dispersal driven by air or water currents or larger organisms (A). Bottom diagrams (E-H) illustrate how spatial flows of an herbivore H (black arrows) driven by these different movement types might couple two ecosystems in which the herbivore feeds on a plant P, itself up-taking a resource R (grey boxes and arrows). In the meta-ecosystem framework, dispersal corresponds to movement among populations of the same species (E), whereas life-cycle movements represent added resources into the recipient ecosystem, since adults most often die immediately after reproducing (F). Dotted arrows denote that these flows are often as temporally-specific pulses. In seasonal migrations, pulsed flows can be of a magnitude that constitutes a shift in the recipient community structure compared to otherwise prevailing local dynamics (G). Lastly, foraging activity can constitute a net flow from an ecosystem to another, even if the animal uses the whole landscape and does not perceive it as a structured meta-ecosystem (H).



**Figure II. Spatial dynamics at the landscape scale.** Both flows of dispersal (curve blue arrows) and resource (white arrows) coupled different types of habitat patches in the landscape, thereby inducing contrasting meta-ecosystem dynamics at regional and local scales respectively. Flows of resources can be driven by physical forces such as gravity, wind or water current (arrows 1), by animal movement such as insect emergence (arrows 2) or consumer foraging (arrow 3 next to a white bird), or by human transport (arrows 4). These flows affect biodiversity (e.g. denoted by a food web in a lake) and ecosystem processes (productivity, recycling), which themselves affect global cycles in different ways: example of the carbon cycle depicted by wide black arrows, with net carbon uptake by a forest patch and net carbon release to the atmosphere by a lake. Human populations benefit from ecosystem services provided by the landscape (right box), and human actions (left box) conducted at the landscape scale modulate biodiversity and ecosystem functioning, and ultimately biogeochemical cycles, which in turn induce the services.

## Boxes

### **Box 1. Feeding meta-ecosystem models with organismal movement types**

Meta-ecosystem models explicitly consider only dispersal among the possible organismal movement types linking ecosystems. However, other common types of organismal movement are relevant for ecosystem couplings, such as life-cycle movement, seasonal migration, or foraging movement. When focusing on how the spatial flows resulting from organismal movements affect recipient ecosystem dynamics, we distinguish two contrasting types of effects: consumer and resource effects (Table I). Dispersal, which implies settlement away from an organism's place of birth [41], essentially conveys consumer effects by adding individuals to the recipient ecosystem (Figure IA, E). The immigrants and their subsequent offspring, for instance Milu deer individuals re-colonizing Chinese forests [72], primarily exert a top-down pressure on local resources, even if their production of detritus might ultimately enrich recipient ecosystems. On the contrary, life-cycle movements, such as emerging aquatic insects moving to terrestrial systems for mating, oviposition and subsequent death, essentially convey resources by transporting individuals which do not settle or consume anything in the recipient ecosystem (Figure IB, F). For instance, clouds of midges emerging from arctic ponds can substantially enrich nearby tundras in nitrogen by their carcasses [52], and trigger bottom-up effects on local terrestrial herbivores [51]. Seasonal migration and foraging movements involve both consumer and resource effects (Figure IC,D,G,H). They are distinct from one another by their spatio-temporal scales: Migratory animals couple ecosystems across biogeographic scales, for instance with geese feeding on crops in the Mississippi basin and breeding in arctic tundras [73], while the foraging behaviour of large consumers can couple adjacent ecosystems, such as hippopotami grazing in savannahs and

defecating in rivers [53]. For both types of movement, the asymmetry in animal activity constitutes a net flow of resource from one ecosystem to another (from feeding to breeding sites or grazing to resting sites) in addition to the consumption pressure organisms exert where they are. Finally, these movement types, and their effects, can interact across organismal scales: a large consumer, such as an elephant, might couple ecosystem resources through its foraging activity while searching for water points, and in parallel drive the dispersal of small aquatic organisms among ponds via the mud that cover its skin [74]. It is so far theoretically unexplored how the co-occurrence of such contrasting but interacting spatial processes might affect ecosystem dynamics. Lastly, whether other movement types involving complex behaviours, such as mating aggregations or refuges from predation also commonly induce meta-ecosystem dynamics remains an open question.

**Table I. Effects and empirical illustrations of the different movement types.**

	Effect <sup>1</sup>		Some emblematic examples	References
	C	R		
Dispersal	X		Meta-population of Milu (a species of deer) re-establishment in China; passive dispersal of plants and small aquatic organisms via birds; all kinds of biological invasions.	[72]; [36,75]; [76].
Life-cycle migration		X	Midge emergence from arctic ponds enriching tundras in Iceland; salmon carcasses or shrimps subsidizing freshwater reproductive sites with marine nutrients.	[52]; [77] or [78].
Seasonal migration	X	X	Geese linking agrosystems in Mississippi and arctic tundras in Canada; all migratory birds and large herbivore herds transporting nutrients across African savannahs or boreal systems.	[73]; [2].
Foraging	X	X	Hippopotami grazing in savannahs and pupping in the Mara river; seabirds bringing nutrients from the sea on islands; large marine mammal defecation or zooplankton vertical migrations transporting nutrients from pelagic to benthic systems.	[53]; [55]; [79] or [61].

<sup>1</sup> C and R stand for consumer and resource effects on the recipient ecosystem, respectively. Consumer effects encompass demographic effects (population addition) and consumption pressure, while resource refers to transport of material serving as resources.

## **Box 2. Meta-ecosystem theory at the landscape scale**

The original definition of a meta-ecosystem as “*a set of ecosystems connected by spatial flows of energy, materials and organisms across ecosystem boundaries*” [13] is general enough to apply to very different scales, from microbial (e.g. mites in soil [80]) to biogeographic (e.g. temperate and arctic grasslands linked by migratory birds; [73]). This flexibility, arising itself from the flexibility of the ecosystem concept, makes meta-ecosystems relevant to address questions on spatial dynamics between any coherent ecological entities linked by biotic or abiotic flows, with the scale varying with the organism or process of interest.

To link this concept and associated theory to empirical ecosystems—with the underlying motivation of facing the consequences of global changes—there is, however, a special interest in focusing on scales adapted to understand human impacts on ecosystems (habitat patches) and to link these spatial dynamics to large-scale processes such as global cycles. The landscape scale is especially interesting in that respect, because it encompasses the environmental heterogeneity produced by human activities, which fragment ecosystems into mosaics of patches (Figure I).

These ecosystem patches of different habitat types often correspond to traditionally independent domains of ecology, such as river ecology, agriculture or forestry. By showing how spatial flows circulating within the landscape generate interdependencies between these different habitats, meta-ecosystem theory has a crucial role to play in identifying efficient actions to control the spread of local perturbations. Moreover, studying the impacts of spatial flows at the landscape scale provides tools to understand the spatial dynamics of regional biodiversity, but also to bridge it via ecological processes (productivity, recycling) to biogeochemical fluxes (carbon, water, nitrogen) at a larger scale (Figure I).

569

## 570 Glossary Box

571 **Dispersal:** *‘the tendency of organisms to live, compete and reproduce away from their birth*  
572 *place’*[41].

573 **Habitat:** in this paper used as synonymous of ‘biotope’, that is a set of uniform environmental  
574 conditions.

575 **Life-cycle-movement:** cross-ecosystem movement occurring in an organism life to complete its  
576 ontogenic development.

577 **Metacommunity:** *‘a set of local communities that are linked by dispersal of multiple potentially*  
578 *interacting species’* [4,7].

579 **Meta-ecosystem:** *‘a set of ecosystems connected by spatial flows of energy, materials and*  
580 *organisms across ecosystem boundaries’* [13].

581 **Organismal movement:** any behaviour that leads to the displacement of an organism from one  
582 place to another; here the organismal movement types considered are dispersal, life-cycle  
583 movement, foraging and seasonal migration (see Box 1).

584 **Resource flow:** spatial flow of inorganic nutrients, detritus or organisms dying, which constitute  
585 an increase of resource for the recipient community. Resource flow can be driven by passive  
586 physical processes or organismal movement (see Box 1).

587

588   **Highlights**

589

590   Cross-ecosystem movements drive landscape dynamics

591   Among-ecosystem couplings are either dispersal- or resource-dominated

592   Dispersal-based couplings occur at the regional scale between similar habitat types

593   Resource-based couplings occur at the local scale between different habitat types

594

595    **Outstanding Questions Box**

596

597    How are different types of spatial flows distributed within landscapes?

598    How do community structure and biodiversity affect the quality and quantity of cross-ecosystem  
599    flows?

600    How do perturbations influence cross-ecosystem flows?

601    How can meta-ecosystem dynamics explain the spreading of perturbations between ecosystems?

602    Which organisms play keystone roles in spatial dynamics, and how do they contribute to the  
603    spread of perturbations across ecosystems?

604    How frequent are spatial cascades in natural landscapes?

605