

Threshold and weighted-distance methods: a combined multiscale approach improves explanatory power of forest carabid beetle abundance in agricultural landscape

Benjamin Bergerot, Pierre-Gilles Lemasle, Hugues Boussard, Julie Betbeder, Olivier Jambon, Romain Georges, Solene Croci, Françoise Burel, Jacques

Baudry

► To cite this version:

Benjamin Bergerot, Pierre-Gilles Lemasle, Hugues Boussard, Julie Betbeder, Olivier Jambon, et al.. Threshold and weighted-distance methods: a combined multiscale approach improves explanatory power of forest carabid beetle abundance in agricultural landscape. Landscape Ecology, 2022, 37 (1), pp.159-174. 10.1007/s10980-021-01338-z . hal-03413035

HAL Id: hal-03413035 https://hal.science/hal-03413035

Submitted on 29 Nov 2021

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.

- 1 Threshold and weighted-distance methods: A combined
- 2 multiscale approach improves explanatory power of forest
- 3 carabid beetle abundance in agricultural landscape
- 4
- 5 Benjamin Bergerot¹, Pierre-Gilles Lemasle¹, Hugues Boussard², Julie Betbeder^{3,4},
- 6 Olivier Jambon¹, Romain Georges¹, Solène Croci⁵, Françoise Burel¹ & Jacques
 7 Baudry²
- 8
- ⁹ ¹ Univ Rennes, CNRS, ECOBIO UMR 6553, F-35042 Rennes, France
- ¹⁰ ² INRAe, UMR BAGAP, F-35042 Rennes, France
- ³ Forêts et Sociétés, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, F-34398 Montpellier, France
- ⁴ Ecosystems Modelling Unity, Forests, Biodiversity and Climate Change Program,
- Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center (CATIE), Turrialba,
 Cartago, Costa Rica
- ⁵ CNRS, Université Rennes 2, UMR 6554 LETG, F-35043 Rennes, France
- 16
- 17 Correspondence: Benjamin Bergerot, Tel. + 33 223235616
- 18 Email: <u>benjamin.bergerot@univ-rennes1.fr</u>
- 19 Address: UMR CNRS 6553 ECOBIO, Université de Rennes 1, Bât 14B, porte 117, Avenue du
- 20 Général Leclerc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France
- 21

22 Acknowledgments

- 23 This study has been supported by the Woodnet project, funded through the 2015-2016 BiodivERsA
- 24 COFUND call for research proposals, with the national funders ANR (Agence National de la
- 25 Recherche, France), MINECO (Ministerio de Asuntos Económicos y Transformación Digital,
- 26 Spain) and BELSPO (Politique scientifique fédérale, Belgium). We were very grateful to Valentin
- 27 Yamani and Alexane Broussin who kindly collected carabid species. We also thank the farmers for
- allowing us to sample their hedgerows. We thank LETG-Rennes UMR 6554 CNRS for providing
- 29 land cover data of the Zone Atelier Armorique (ZAAr). We thank the French LTER (Long Term

Accepted manuscript

1

- 30 Ecologial Research) ZAAr for facilitating all research in this area. We also thank the three
- 31 anonymous reviewers for their comments, which contributed greatly to the improvement of this
- 32 manuscript.

33 Abstract

34

Context. To analyze the scales at which landscape structure influences ecological processes, two
 approaches with different underlying ecological assumptions exist; the usual threshold method and
 the weighted-distance method.

38

39 *Objectives.* We used abundance of species to test if the combination of weighted-distance and
 40 threshold approaches improves the explained variance of landscape metrics.

41

42 *Methods.* We developed a workflow using the two approaches to calculate metrics computed at 43 multiple scales. The latter was developed using weighted metrics based on different weighted-44 distance functions, and one metric could be selected for more than one spatial scale. Then, we tested 45 the explained variance of species distribution (the activity-density of *Abax parallelepipedus*) by 46 these two approaches applied independently and then together in modeling a specific ecological 47 response.

48

Results. The combination of metrics computed at multiple scales calculated by both weighted-49 50 distance and threshold method improved the predictive performance of the models. More precisely, adding metrics derived from the weighted-distance method to the threshold method significantly 51 52 increased the explained variance when using the same environmental variables. The mean R² values 53 of the selected model for the threshold method was 0.34±0.10, 0.49±0.11 with the weighted-54 distance method, and reached 0.71±0.07 with the two methods combined. These results demonstrate 55 the importance of combining metrics using the weighted-distance method and the threshold method. In addition, activity-density was better explained by metrics selected at multiple scales. 56

57

58	Conclusions. This study highlights the importance of combining threshold and weighted-distance
59	method at several scales to improve the explanation of ecological responses based on species
60	abundance.

61

- 62 Keywords: Abax parallelepipedus, multiscale approach, weighted distance, landscape metric
- 63

64 Introduction

65 Many studies aim to elucidate the scale at which environmental variables explain the abundance and diversity of species (Jackson and Fahrig 2015; Chandler and Hepinstall-Cymerman 66 67 2016). To incorporate landscape effects in models and the scale at which landscape effects occur, landscape metrics are generally computed within buffers around sampling points (Miguet et al. 68 69 2016). As the evidence for a relation between the scale of effect and movement (Desrochers et al. 70 2010; Stuber et al. 2018), the buffers tend to be circular when there is no a priori information about 71 the movement capacity of species in the studied landscape. Metrics are calculated at different scales 72 according to the known or estimated dispersal abilities of species (Bertrand et al. 2016; Serckx et al. 73 2016).

74 To characterize landscape structure within buffers, maps of relevant landscape elements are 75 required (Burel and Baudry 2003). Based on landscape ecology theory (Burel and Baudry 2003; 76 Tscharntke et al. 2012), landscapes have two main components: composition and configuration 77 (Fahrig et al. 2011). Composition defines the proportion of different landscape elements, while 78 configuration represents spatial organization of these elements. In each buffer, landscape metrics 79 are then computed using the composition or configuration of landscape features (e.g., Bertrand et al. 80 2016). The final step defines the "best" scale at which the effect of landscape metrics on 81 biodiversity is highest based on model selection processes and criteria based methods (e.g., 82 correlation coefficient, regression slopes, Akaike Information Criterion, model averaging or posterior probability; Burnham et al. 2011; Jackson and Fahrig 2015; Stuber and Gruber 2020). 83 84 The problem with this approach is that most landscape metrics are scale dependent and 85 often multi-scaled (Wu 2004; Ostapowicz et al. 2008; Cushman et al. 2008; Stuber and Gruber 2020), which might influence the results (Miguet et al. 2016). There is no single adequate scale for 86 87 all landscape metrics, with wrong scale identification generating misleading results. Consequently, 88 an optimal relation between ecological processes and landscape metrics is still being sought in 89 landscape ecology (Jackson and Fahrig 2015). This issue has led to the emergence of multi-scale

5

methods (Mayor et al. 2009; McGarigal et al. 2016) used to measure the different spatial scales at
which relations between landscape metrics and ecological processes are the most meaningful
(Gaucherel et al. 2007; Martin and Fahrig 2012; Miguet et al. 2017; Egerer et al. 2018; Remon et al.
2018).

94 Among the multi-scale analytical methods, two main approaches stand out that are based on 95 very different underlying biological assumptions: the classical threshold-based method and the 96 weighted-distance method (Jackson and Fahrig 2015; Miguet et al. 2016, 2017). The threshold 97 method is based on the computation of landscape metrics, and tests the relation between metric and 98 biodiversity variables using a statistical model at a variety of separate scales. This approach aims to 99 identify the scales at which the relation is meaningful. The main issue with this method is that it 100 assumes that the landscape metric has a constant effect up to the edge of the buffer, where it then 101 falls to zero (Miguet et al. 2017), which is biologically unrealistic (Jackson and Fahrig 2015). This 102 issue has led to the recent investigation of weighted-distance methods. These methods assume that 103 the landscape affects ecological process according to distance, following a predefined function 104 (Miguet et al. 2016, 2017). Computed landscape metrics are, thus, distance dependent from the 105 sampling site where the ecological response is measured. The distance weighted landscape variables 106 are obtained by weighting the spatial distribution of each metric by a decreasing function of the 107 distance from the point where the biological response is measured. However, this approach remains 108 primarily theoretical and under development; yet, recent developments in computing yield very 109 promising results (Peterson et al. 2011; Chandler and Hepinstall-Cymerman 2016; Miguet et al. 110 2017; Remon et al. 2018).

In this paper, we present a new workflow approach by combining landscape metrics computed at multiple scales using the weighted-distance method and the more classical threshold method. More precisely, we propose a general framework and reuse existing methodological tools in order to adapt it to a plurality of ecological data. Specifically, we tested various metrics known to affect the activity-density of a forest specialist carabid species, *Abax parallelepipedus*, and we

6

116 calculated the metrics using: i) the threshold method, and ii) the weighted-distance method and iii) 117 the threshold method combined with different weighted-distance functions. We compared the 118 results obtained using the metrics calculated only on the basis of the threshold method, the metrics 119 calculated only on the basis of the weighted-distance method, and the mix of the two. 120 A number of studies have been previously conducted on *A. parallelepipedus* (Work et al. 121 2011; Davies and Asner 2014; Müller et al. 2014), particularly in our study area (Charrier et al. 122 1997; Petit and Burel 1998a; Betbeder et al. 2015). In this study, we analyze if landscape metrics 123 calculated by the combination of the weighted-distance method and threshold method at multiple 124 scales could better explain the ecological response of A. parallelepipedus density-activity than the 125 threshold-based method or weighted-distance method alone (Jackson and Fahrig 2015; Miguet et al. 126 2016, 2017). We know that A. parallelepipedus prefers forest habitat and hedges (Niemela 2001; Davies and Pullin 2007: Roume et al. 2011). Therefore, we expect that heterogeneity indices 127 128 (Niemelä et al. 1992; da Silva et al. 2008) and the micro-climatic effects of the woody elements (Forman and Baudry 1984; Vannier et al. 2011; Baudry and Burel 2019) will influence carabid 129 130 density activity.

131

132 Methods

133 Study Area

This study was conducted in Britany, Western France (Fig. 1A), in the ZAA (Zone Atelier Armorique), which is a French Long Term Ecological Research site (LTER, Fig. 1C). The ZAA is bordered by the sea (48° 36' N, 1° 32' W), and the climate is of oceanic temperate type, with mild winters. The area is mainly agricultural, composed of small fields separated by a hedgerow network called "bocage" (Baudry et al, 2000). Annual crops in this area are winter cereals and maize. In this area, carabids are a key biodiversity component of long-term studies (Baudry and Burel 2019).

140

141 Biological model sampling

142 A. parallelepipedus is a nocturnal, polyphagous and flightless forest carabid of medium size. It is 143 often a dominant species in deciduous forest communities (Loreau 1985, 1990; Fournier and Loreau 144 1999). Its annual period of adult activity, from April to October, is one of the longest for carabid 145 beetles, and this species is characterized by a continuous reproduction so that hibernation can be 146 withstood by both adults and third larval instars (Loreau 1985). A. parallelepipedus has a great 147 longevity as some individuals have been found to be at least four years old in the field (Loreau 148 1990). A. parallelepipedus is a slow-moving species and is mostly carnivorous. It prefers woody 149 habitats, such as woodlots and hedgerows with a high density of tree vegetation and connectivity of 150 hedgerow network (Charrier et al. 1997; Petit and Burel 1998a). It prefers fine grain hedgerow 151 networks (Vannier et al, 2011). This species is an efficient natural control agent of slugs in 152 agricultural environments, particularly in fields bordered by hedges (Symondson and Liddell 1993; 153 Symondson 1994).

154 A. parallelepipedus were sampled from 30 hedgerows in 2017 (Fig. 1C) using pitfall traps (i.e., plastic pitfall traps containing water, salt, and soap). A sample consisted of three pitfall traps placed 155 156 three meters apart per hedgerow. This method was easy to implement and produces high capture 157 rates (Luff 1975; Spence and Niemelä 1994). Traps were set up three times in 2017 (May 9, June 6, 158 and August 29) and were left open for 14 days. Catches by pitfall traps depend on both population 159 density and activity (Thomas et al. 1998), therefore, sampling is a measure of activity-density. 160 Activity-density is calculated as the mean value of catches in the three pitfall traps over the 161 sampling period. We selected the 30 hedgerows based on specific criteria. Specifically, they had to 162 be: (1) in landscape contexts covering a gradient of grain values (described in the metric section), 163 (2) at least 50 m long (to ensure that individuals sampled every 14 days come from this hedgerow), 164 (3) at least 400 m from another sampled hedgerow (to ensure the ecological independence of 165 sampling sites), and (4) with oak as the dominant tree species.

166

167 Maps

We used two raster maps with a resolution of 5 m \times 5 m to calculate landscape metrics (Online 168 169 Resource 1). A preliminary map that was defined by 11 land use categories (Table 1) was obtained 170 by the photo-interpretation of aerial photography generated by LETG (Littoral, Environnement, 171 Télédétection Géomatique laboratory, Rennes) in 2017. These categories were selected following 172 the preferences of the species according to the literature (Loreau and Nolf 1993; Symondson 1994; 173 Charrier et al. 1997; Petit and Burel 1998a,b; Fournier and Loreau 1999; Pichancourt et al. 2006). A 174 second, wooded features map (hedgerows, woodlots), was used to calculate the grain metric (i.e., 175 MD metric, described in the metrics section). This map represented the canopy cover of trees 176 extracted from aerial photographs by KERMAP (a private company) in 2016. 177 178 Metrics Seven classes of landscape metrics (Table 2) led to the calculation of twenty-four metrics. They 179 180 were computed using CHLOE software (Boussard and Baudry 2017). Specifically, we calculated 181 (1) abundance of the different types of land cover (NV), which represent eleven metrics (each 182 representing a type of land use); (2) abundance of the interfaces between the woods and the other 183 land cover types (NC), which represent eight metrics (each representing a possible interface with 184 woods); (3) number of heterogeneous types of adjacent pairs of pixels (NC hete), a landscape-level 185 metric; (4) land cover diversity measured from the Shannon diversity index (SHDI), a landscape-186 level metric; and two landscape-level heterogeneity metrics computing Shannon Diversity based on 187 the number of pixel pairs of different types; specifically, (5) HET, which is the overall 188 heterogeneity; (6) HET-Frag, which is the heterogeneity of dissimilar interfaces; and (7) a grain 189 metric (MD), a landscape-level metric representing the micro-climatic effects of the woody 190 elements. These seven class of metrics were selected according to the ecological preferences of A. 191 parallelepipedus. NV metrics is a composition metric and NC metric is a mixture of composition 9

192 and configuration metric as it depends on how the land covers are distributed. These metrics were 193 selected knowing the influence of habitat and edge effect on carabids (Niemelä 2001; Davies and 194 Pullin 2007; Roume et al. 2011). NC metric is a mixture of composition and configuration metric 195 because it depends on how the land covers are distributed (Niemelä 2001; Davies and Pullin 2007). 196 The SHDI (used to measure the land cover diversity) and the two heterogeneity indices (HET and 197 HET-Frag, used to display the diversity of dissimilar interfaces) characterize the landscape 198 heterogeneity, which influences carabids (Niemelä et al. 1992; da Silva et al. 2008). The grain 199 metric (MD) represents micro-climatic effects of the woody elements, which are known to influence 200 the activity of the carabids. As mentioned in Betbeder et al. 2015, the grain metric integrates both 201 the density of hedgerows and the shape of the meshes of the network measured as the mean distance 202 to hedgerows (Forman and Baudry 1984, adapted by Vannier et al., 2011 for hedgerow networks). Hedgerow networks have many discontinuities and, therefore, do not comprise "closed meshes" 203 204 (the space between hedgerows). The size of these meshes controls the local climate by reducing wind speed and capturing the energy from the sun. We used the grain of the imagery as a surrogate 205 206 of these meshes to characterize the more or less open character of the landscape. Hedgerow density 207 alone is not sufficient as for similar densities the spatial distribution of hedgerows, thus the grain metric, may be different. 208

209

210 Threshold method

The threshold method computes landscape metrics within buffers of different radii centered on the same sampling point (Table 3). Metrics were computed in 35 nested concentric circles, at 50 m increments from 50 to 1750 m (radius), following the recommendations of Jackson and Fahrig (2015). Although *A. parallelepipedus* shows a preference for forest habitats, we do not know the dispersal pattern of the individuals, we thus used circular vector buffers. Previous studies show that the area prospected by an individual varies according to the habitat, and the dispersal power of individuals was found to be low—on average 1 m per day and about 2 m per day for the most active

¹⁰

218 males (Charrier et al. 1997; Marcus et al. 2015). The estimated life span is one to two years for 219 large carabid beetles (Coulon et al. 2011). Therefore, we can consider that with 250-280 days of 220 activity per year (from April to November) and an average displacement of 1 m per day (or 2 m in 221 exceptional cases for males), a buffer of 1750 m is able to capture all the displacements of the 222 individuals, on a theoretical high range. Beyond this distance, we assumed that woody elements do 223 not influence the activity-density of A. parallelepipedus (Petit and Burel 1998b; Betbeder et al. 224 2015; Bertrand et al. 2016). Care must be paid to the quantity of empty pixels (i.e., with NA values, 225 pixels outside the map) in a buffer for the calculation of metrics. To calculate metrics at 1750 m 226 (the largest buffer size), the proportion of empty pixels in our study varies between 0 and 40.36%. 227 Only two sites have a proportion of empty cells greater than 30%, and 17 sites have a proportion 228 less than 10%.

229

230 Weighted-distance method

To compute the metrics for this method, a weight was applied to the pixels in the analyzed window 231 232 (i.e., a circular window representing the buffer), depending on the weighting-distance function applied (Table 3). Thus, the threshold method is a special case of the weighted-distance method 233 (i.e., where the weight applied with distance was constant up to a threshold, at which point it 234 dropped to 0). As in other studies (Miguet et al. 2017), we did not know what the best function was 235 236 to characterize the distribution of individuals. Therefore, we chose four types of common ecological functions (Table 3) to test different weights placed on landscape features, divided into two main 237 238 groups. We used functions that gave more weight to a local landscape effect (i.e., decreasing 239 functions, Hill et al. 1996; Stevens et al. 2010; Remon et al. 2018) than to a distant landscape effect (i.e., Gaussian functions, Chandler and Hepinstall-Cymerman 2016). Decreasing functions can take 240 241 different forms, so we used the linear decreasing curve, assuming only a distance effect, and the 242 common decreasing curve, a variant shape giving slightly more weight to nearby landscape 243 elements. We also used two Gaussian functions that gave different weights to a landscape (i.e.,

11

according to the distance at which the species may need its non-immediate environment such asmeadows to complete all or part of its life cycle).

246

247 Statistical and modeling approach

Two steps were required to analyze the data: the metric and scale identification, and then the run of the global model. We ran three independent replicates, one using metrics as variables calculated with the threshold method only, one using metrics as variables calculated with the weighted-distance method only, and one using metrics as variables calculated with the combination of the two. All statistical analyses were performed in R version 3.6.0 (R Core Team 2017). These steps are detailed below.

254

255 Step 1. Metric and scale identification

The first step is to identify (but not yet select) at which scales the explanatory variables 256 257 (metrics) can be related to the activity-density of A. parallelepipedus. Since the distribution of data, as well as the shape of the relation between a predictor and its dependent variables can be unknown, 258 a non-parametric modelling approach using a Multivariate Adaptive Regression Spline (MARS) 259 260 was used (Friedman 1991). MARS models allow the non-linearity of a relation to be captured in a 261 simple form by partitioning the space of a variable into several knots, and assigning a linear model 262 in this space (Friedman 1991). For each metric, we fit a MARS model between the activity-density 263 of A. parallelepipedus (i.e., 30 sampling points; Fig. 2, Step 1.1) and the metrics at each scale for each method (i.e., threshold method only, the weighted-distance method only, and the combination 264 265 of the two). MARS models were fit using the R package 'earth' (Milborrow 2011). For each MARS model, R² was calculated (Step 1.1). Then, using GAMs (General Additive Models), we fitted the 266 267 relation between R² obtained from MARS and scales (Fig. 2, Step 1.2). Finally, we identified the

best scales (i.e., all scales with peak values, not only the highest peak, represented by red stars in
Fig. 2, Step 1.3).

270

271 Step 2. Global model

To select the variables computed at multiple scales explaining the activity-density of *A*.

273 parallelepipedus, since there could be many uninformative combinations of metrics at different 274 scales, we used LASSO optimization algorithm (Least absolute shrinkage and selection operator) 275 for variable selection and regularization (Tibshirani 1996). There are many advantages in using 276 LASSO method. First, it can provide a very good prediction accuracy, because shrinking and 277 removing the coefficients can reduce variance without a substantial increase of the bias. This is 278 especially useful when you have a small number of observations and a large number of features. 279 LASSO shrinks uninformative coefficient estimates to zero, which improves both model prediction 280 and interpretability. Moreover, LASSO is suited to perform variables selection on collinear variables. 281

282 To fit the global model, metrics at their best scales were used as predictors of the densityactivity of A. parallelepipedus. To test our hypotheses, we built three models: (1) one with the 283 metrics obtained from the threshold method only, (2) one with the metrics obtained from the 284 285 weighted-distance method only, and (3) one with the metrics from both the threshold method and weighted-distance method. LASSO models were fit using the R package 'glmnet' (Friedman et al. 286 2011). The R² obtained by LASSO selection procedure for each of the three sets of variables (i.e., 287 288 those identified using the threshold method, the weighted-distance method, and the combination of 289 the two) were bootstrapped 1000 times to obtain a mean value and a standard deviation. Residuals 290 of the different models were checked to make sure that there was not evidence of residual spatial 291 autocorrelation. The results are represented using partial dependence plots (Friedman 1991). These 292 plots show how the selected predictors in the selected model influenced the dependent variable

293 (Greenwell 2017) and whether the relations between the dependent variables and selected predictors294 were linear, monotonic, or more complex.

295

- 296 **Results**
- 297

298 Step 1

299 Considering the seven defined class metrics, a total of 24 metrics were calculated because 300 the NV metric is subdivided into 11 (one for each land use type), and the NC metric is subdivided 301 into eight (eight different interfaces with woods are referenced in our landscape). Considering the 302 35 spatial scales, 840 variables for each method were thus calculated. In total, 4200 metrics were 303 computed in Step 1: 840 for the threshold method and 3,360 for the weighted-distance method (i.e., 840 for each of the functions referenced in Table 3). For the threshold method, out of 840 possible 304 305 variables, 76 were selected. For each of the 24 metrics, the average number of scales selected was 3.17±1.04. For the weighted-distance method, out of 840 possible variables for each function, 306 307 respectively 55, 61, 49 and 58 variables were selected for the Decreasing Curve, Decreasing Linear, 308 Gaussian and Adjusted Gaussian functions. The average number of scales selected was respectively 309 2.14 ± 0.98 , 2.39 ± 1.21 , 2.01 ± 0.91 and 2.26 ± 1.23 for the Decreasing Curve, Decreasing Linear, 310 Gaussian and Adjusted Gaussian functions.

- 311
- 312 Step 2

The mean R^2 value (± standard deviation) of the three models using LASSO were 0.34±0.10 with the metrics derived from the threshold method only, 0.49±0.11 with the metrics derived from the weighted-distance method only and 0.71±0.07 with the metrics derived from the weighteddistance method and threshold method. The metrics selected using LASSO procedure were mainly related to (1) interface metric between wood and dirt-roads (NC 1–12) at 1200 m for the threshold method only (Fig. 3A) and 1500 m for the weighted-distance method only and the combination of

14

319 weighted-distance and threshold method (Fig. 3B); (2) landscape density metrics (NV 16: meadow density) at 550 m and 1750 m for the threshold method only (Fig. 3C) and 950 m for the weighted-320 321 distance method only and for the combination of weighted-distance and threshold method (Fig. 3D); 322 (3) dirt-road density (NV 12) at 1350 m for the combination of weighted-distance and threshold 323 method only (Fig. 3E). Overall, for both the threshold method only, the weighted-distance method 324 only, and the combination of weighted-distance and threshold method, metrics were selected at 325 different scales (i.e., from an intermediate scale of 550 m to 1750 m). The interface metric, NC 1-326 12, had the highest relative importance in models and greatly improved the explanation of A. 327 parallelepipedus density-activity when it was calculated using weighted-distance method 328 (decreasing curve, Fig 3B). Among the three selected metrics, two metrics were found in all of the 329 final models (NC 1-12 and NV 16). The main difference was the method used and the scale selected 330 (Fig. 3).

For each model, the selected metrics are summarized in Figure 4. For the threshold method only, the partial dependence plots (Fig. 4A and B) showed dissimilarities for the density of meadows (NV 16). At the local scale (550 m, Fig. 4A), the activity-density decreased and reached a plateau, whereas it increased and reached a plateau at the landscape scale (1750 m, Fig. 4B). For the combination of weighted-distance and threshold method, the density of meadows (NV 16; Fig. 4D) showed similarities to the weighted-distance method only (i.e., after the activity-density decreased and reached a plateau, Fig. 4H) but used a decreasing linear function.

For the combination of weighted-distance and threshold method, the dirt-road density (NV
12; Fig. 4E) was selected at 1350 m. The activity-density decreased and reached a plateau.

340 The partial dependence plots of the selected metrics highlight some similarities between the three

341 methods. More specifically, these plots show the influence of the interface between wooded features

342 (mainly hedgerows) and dirt-road (i.e., NC 1–12) on the activity-density of A. parallelepipedus. The

- 343 interface between wood and dirt-road shows that, after a plateau was reached, activity-density
- increased (Fig. 4C, Fig. 4F and Fig. 4G) when using a decreasing curve function at 1500 m for the

15

345 combination of the weighted-distance method and the weighted-distance method only (Fig. 4F and
346 4G respectively), and 1200 m for the threshold method only (Fig. 4C).

- 347
- 348 **Discussion**

We tested the power of the combination of the weighted-distance method and threshold-349 350 method to obtain landscape metrics computed at multiple scales to explain a specific ecological response. Compared to the threshold-based method only, as shown by Miguet et al. (2017), we 351 352 demonstrated that using landscape metrics computed at multiple scales (i.e., the same metric could 353 be selected at different scales) with the weighted-distance method better explained the densityactivity of A. parallelepipedus. The mean R² of the model explaining A. parallelepipedus activity-354 density using metrics identified with metrics computed at multiple scales using threshold method 355 356 only was 0.34±0.10 and was lower than previous studies conducted at the same study site (around 0.5, Betbeder et al. 2015). However, Betbeder et al. (2015) used radar SAR (Synthetic Aperture 357 358 Radar) image-based variables to characterize the internal structure of hedgerows. The analyses 359 performed using metrics computed at multiple scales identified through the weighted-distance method yielded better results with a mean R² equal to 0.49±0.11. By combining metrics computed 360 361 at multiple scales using both the threshold method and the weighted-distance method, we greatly 362 improved the variance explained of A. parallelepipedus activity-density and reached 0.71±0.07. The high R² values is attributed to the use of weighted metrics at different spatial scales, which were 363 364 tested individually according to the distance functions. No published study or ecological hypothesis 365 supports that each metric computed at multiple scales should have the same distance function, which our results confirm (Peterson et al. 2011; Chandler and Hepinstall-Cymerman 2016; Miguet 366 367 et al. 2017; Remon et al. 2018). More precisely, our statistical and modelling processes only retained the functions and the scales that best explained the ecological response (Step 1, Fig. 2). 368 Interestingly, two of the three selected metrics were the same. The main difference was the use of 369 370 metrics using weighted-distance functions and multiple scales, which greatly improved metric

importance. Out of the three metrics selected by the combination of the weighted-distance method and threshold method, two were computed using decreasing linear and curve functions. This result further emphasizes the important contribution of the metrics computed at multiple scales using weighted-distance method to the more 'classical' threshold method. The improvement of models through computing metrics using the decreasing linear and decreasing curve functions supported the results of Miguet et al. (2017) who evaluated four species, including a carabid (i.e., *Pterostichus melanarius*).

378 Interfaces including wood (NC 1–12) strongly influence the distribution of A. 379 parallelepipedus (Charrier 1997; Niemela 2001; Roume et al. 2011). The activity-density of A. 380 parallelepipedus increased with the importance of the interface between wood and dirt-road at a 381 large scale when using a decreasing curve. To the best of our knowledge, previous studies have not 382 included this specific interface with wood in their analyses, nor have they included a decreasing 383 curve to calculate this metric (Duflot et al. 2014; Bertrand et al. 2016). This result highlighted the role of dirt roads adjacent to wooded elements as potential ecological corridors in fragmented 384 385 landscapes (Burel 1989; Vermeulen 1993, 1994; Niemela 2001; Pichancourt et al. 2006) and could 386 suggest that dirt roads bordered by woody habitats could provide high quality corridors for A. 387 parallelepipedus (Charrier et al. 1997).

Metrics computed at multiple scales based on landscape element density for the combination 388 389 of the weighted-distance method and threshold method also showed expected results. The amount 390 of meadows (NV 16) is negatively related to A. parallelepipedus density-activity at < 950 m. The 391 negative relation of this landscape element might be attributed to the high specialization of A. 392 parallelepipedus for woody elements and the sensitivity of this species to fragmentation (Petit and 393 Burel 1998b). Interestingly, for metrics using threshold method alone, the density of meadows (NV 394 16) had a positive effect at broader scale (1750 m). This result suggests that meadows could act as 395 an ecological filter (e.g. against herbicides) when they are adjacent to hedgerows (Vermeulen 1993, 396 1994; Niemela 2001; Pichancourt et al. 2006), particularly in agricultural landscapes, such as our

17

397 study area (Fournier and Loreau 1999; Aviron et al. 2018). These results clearly support the necessity of integrating multiple spatial scales for one or more variables in models to understand 398 399 ecological processes (Niemelä et al. 1992). In this study, spatially, we worked on raster maps where 400 the resolution is constant (5 \times 5 m). Therefore, when the metrics were calculated in a buffer, the 401 number of pixels increased, so the spatial resolution did not change. Since our resolution was 402 constant whatever the spatial scale considered. The metrics were then comparable. However, due to 403 lack of information, we did not take into consideration the temporal dimension and the stationarity 404 of landscape metrics (Fortin et al. 2003; Remmel and Csillag 2003) that may influence the 405 conclusions of this study. More generally, our results suggested that the surrounding environment 406 were the main factors explaining A. parallelepipedus density-activity (5/8 metrics were selected at 407 distances ≤ 1350 m). This result is often sought in landscape ecology, because landscape 408 composition and heterogeneity represent the main drivers of species and diversity distributions 409 (Batary et al. 2011; Vasseur et al. 2013; Kennedy et al. 2013; Shackelford et al. 2013). 410 One limitation of this study was that sampling did not cover the full period of activity of A. 411 parallelepipedus (Pichancourt et al. 2006; Niemelä et al. 1992; Magura 2000), which would have 412 provided a better understanding of how this species is distributed in the landscape. Another issue may lie in the automated selection process of LASSO variables, which may hide common metrics 413 414 used to explain ecological processes. As for example the grain metric MD (Forman and Baudry 415 1984; Vannier et al. 2011), which has been demonstrated to explain A. parallelepipedus densityactivity (Betbeder et al. 2015), but was not found in our selected metrics. Finally, our ecological 416 417 results are based on small sample sizes, and thus should be interpreted with caution. But 418 nevertheless, the framework and workflow can be useful across systems and taxa when sample sizes 419 are appropriate for individual studies' goals.

To improve the results, several solutions can be considered. For the sake of simplicity, we
have also considered in Step 1 the identification of scale of interest on a variable by variable basis.
This method ignores the potential for covariates to be synergistically effected by others. Although

18

423 our final results show a strong explanatory power of the models, the models could be improved in this way. Regarding the weighted-distance analysis, first, it was limited when not all scales were 424 425 available. Specifically, when the scale was changed, the maximum distance in the metrics using 426 weighting functions also changed, but did not generate the best scale for the effect (i.e., the weight 427 given by the function). Miguet et al. (2017) overcome this problem by deducing a cumulative 428 distance function from the weighting function, which corresponded to "the proportion of the 429 landscape weight that is modelled within each distance". This approach made it possible, for 430 example, to determine at which scale 50% of the landscape effect is contained, with the decision 431 threshold being left to the experimenter. Second, even when our results generated high R² values 432 and support known results based on the published literature for A. parallelepipedus, we used four a 433 priori weighted-distance functions (decreasing linear, decreasing curve, Gaussian, and adjusted-434 Gaussian functions). Other ecological functions should be tested according to the species (Remon et 435 al. 2018). It would also be interesting to test these methods using variables derived from remotely sensed data that reflect the internal structure of landscape elements (such as hedgerow structure and 436 437 crop phenology, Betbeder et al. 2015). Third, the interpretation and extrapolation of the results in 438 other studies must consider the metrics used. Indeed, metrics could be very sensitive to 439 compositional changes and when sites with different compositions are compared or lumped, 440 differences may be driven by a subtle imbalance in the composition differences (e.g., inclusion of 441 an additional minor land cover category) rather than an actual ecological difference (Fortin et al. 2003; Cushman et al. 2008). Moreover, using more than two categories increases the possible 442 443 configurations beyond a reasonable ability to enumerate all possibilities and thus making comparisons among maps or sites challenging (Boots 2003; Csillag and Boots 2005; Turner 2005). 444 445 Caution should also be taken in the consideration of non-linear relations between metrics with 446 changes to composition and configuration (Hargis et al. 1998). Changing the extent, the grain, the composition and/or the configuration may result in a change in the metric value. Thus, correlating 447 448 metrics with physical measurements may be biased, particularly if the underlying structures are not

19

449 properly controlled for. Finally, in this study, while it might be interesting to implement all calculated metrics at once in a LASSO model, we did not consider this option. Indeed, we 450 451 calculated 24 metrics at 35 scales following different calculation modes (landscape metrics 452 computed using threshold and weighted-distance method with 4 different functions) and we 453 obtained 4200 metrics (840 per mode). Although LASSO is a robust method when presenting a 454 dataset with a small number of rows compared to a large number of variables (Tibshirani 1996), it 455 does not work with so many variables. However, as soon as the number of explanatory variables is 456 reduced, LASSO method is particularly interesting and Steps 1.2 and 1.3 can be avoided to select 457 the best scales.

458

459 **Conclusions**

460 This study demonstrated the utility of combining metrics computed at multiple scales using 461 threshold and weighted-distance method at several scales to calculate variables and explain 462 ecological responses of species, such as activity-density. This study highlights with an in situ 463 experiment the promising advances offered by metrics computed at multiple scales using weighteddistance method in combination with more traditional metrics computed at multiple scales using 464 threshold method. Compared metrics computed at multiple scales using threshold method or 465 466 weighted-distance method separately, the combination of these two methods significantly improved explained variance of the activity-density of A. parallelepipedus. Combining metrics computed at 467 468 multiple scales using the two methods to calculate the explanatory variables results in a coefficient 469 of determination of the final model of 0.71. This result confirms our hypothesis and the ecological interest of using metrics computed at multiple scales using weighted-distance method to improve 470 the predictive power of explanatory landscape variables in models. Because we tested this approach 471 472 on a well-known species, its utility for other species must also be explored, such as more generalist species like Pterostichus melanarius (Fournier and Loreau 2002; Retho et al. 2008), as well as with 473 474 other weighted-distance functions and other taxa. Indeed, several functions frequently derived from

20

- 475 species dispersal kernels explain the effects of landscape as a function of distance, such as the
- 476 negative exponential function (e.g., butterflies, Baguette 2003; Remon et al. 2018) and power law
- 477 (e.g., carabids or birds, Miguet et al. 2017; butterflies, Baguette 2003; Fric and Konvicka 2007).

478

479

References

482	Aviron S, Lalechère E, Duflot R, Parisey N, Poggi S (2018) Connectivity of cropped vs. semi-
483	natural habitats mediates biodiversity: A case study of carabid beetles communities. Agric
484	Ecosyst Environ 268:34-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2018.08.025
485	Baguette M (2003) Long distance dispersal and landscape occupancy in a metapopulation of the
486	cranberry fritillary butterfly. Ecography 26:153-160. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-
487	0587.2003.03364.x
488	Batary P, Baldi A, Kleijn D, Tscharntke T (2011) Landscape-moderated biodiversity effects of agri-
489	environmental management: a meta-analysis. Proc R Soc B Biol Sci 278:1894–1902.
490	https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.1923
491	Baudry J, Burel F (2019) Multi-scale control of carabid assemblages in hedgerow network
492	landscapes. In: The Ecology of Hedgerows and Field Margins, Routledge. Routledge, New
493	York, USA, pp 147–162
494	Baudry J, Bunce RGH, Burel F (2000) Hedgerow diversity: An international perspective on their
495	origin, function and management. J Environ Manage 60:7-22.
496	https://doi:10.1006/jema.2000.035
497	Bertrand C, Burel F, Baudry J (2016) Spatial and temporal heterogeneity of the crop mosaic
498	influences carabid beetles in agricultural landscapes. Landsc Ecol 31:451-466.
499	https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-015-0259-4
500	Betbeder J, Hubert-Moy L, Burel F, et al (2015) Assessing ecological habitat structure from local to
501	landscape scales using synthetic aperture radar. Ecol Indic 52:545–557.
502	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.11.009
503	Boots B (2003) Developing local measures of spatial association for categorical data. J Geograph
504	Syst 5:139–160. https://doi-org/10.1007/s10109-003-0110-3Boussard H, Baudry J (2017)
505	Chloe 4.0: A software for landscape pattern analysis
506	Burel F, Baudry J (2003) Landscape ecology: concepts, methods, and applications, Science
507	Publishers. Enfield

- 508 Burel F (1989) Landscape structure effects on carabid beetles spatial patterns in western France.
 509 Landsc Ecol 2:215-226.
- Burnham KP, Anderson DR, Huyvaert KP (2011) AIC model selection and multimodel inference in
 behavioral ecology: some background, observations, and comparisons. Behav Ecol
 Sociobiol 65:23–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1029-6
- 513 Chandler R, Hepinstall-Cymerman J (2016) Estimating the spatial scales of landscape effects on
 514 abundance. Landsc Ecol 31:1383–1394. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-016-0380-z
- 515 Charrier S (1997) Movements of Abax parallelepipedus (Coleoptera, Carabidae) in woody habitats
 516 of a hedgerow network landscape: a radio-tracing study. Agric Ecosyst Environ 61:133–144.
 517 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(96)01101-2
- 518 Charrier S, Petit S, Burel F (1997) Movements of Abax parallelepipedus (Coleoptera, Carabidae) in
 519 woody habitats of a hedgerow network landscape: a radio-tracing study. Agric Ecosyst
 520 Environ 61:133–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(96)01101-2
- 521 Coulon J, Pupier R, Quéinnec E, Ollivier E, Richoux P (2011) Coléoptères carabiques : faune de
 522 France. Faune De France, Paris
- 523 Csillag F, Boots B (2005) Toward Comparing Maps as Spatial Processes. In: Developments in
 524 Spatial Data Handling. (Ed. P.F. Fisher), pp. 641–652. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- 525 Cushman SA, Mc Garigal K, Neel MC (2008). Parsimony in landscape metrics: Strength,
 526 universality, and consistency. Ecol Indic 8:691–703.
 527 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2007.12.002.
- 528 Cushman SA, McGarigal K, Neel MC (2008) Parsimony in landscape metrics: Strength,
 529 universality, and consistency. Ecol Indic 8:691–703.
 530 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2007.12.002
- da Silva PM, Aguiar CAS, Niemelä J, Sousa JP, Serrano ARM (2008) Diversity patterns of ground beetles (Coleoptera: Carabidae) along a gradient of land-use disturbance. Agric Ecosyst
 Environ 124:270–274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2007.10.007
- Davies AB, Asner GP (2014) Advances in animal ecology from 3D-LiDAR ecosystem mapping.
 Trends Ecol Evol 29:681–691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2014.10.005

- 536 Davies ZG, Pullin AS (2007) Are hedgerows effective corridors between fragments of woodland
- 537 habitat? An evidence-based approach. Landsc Ecol 22:333–351.
- 538 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-006-9064-4
- 539 Desrochers A, Renaud C, Hochachka WM, Cadman M (2010) Area-sensitivity by forest songbirds:
- 540 theoretical and practical implications of scale-dependency. Ecography 33:921–931.
- 541 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2009.06061.x
- 542 Duflot R, Georges R, Ernoult A, Aviron S, Farhig L, Burel F (2014) Landscape heterogeneity as an
 543 ecological filter of species traits. Acta Oecologica 56:19–26.
 544 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2014.01.004
- 545 Egerer M, Li K, Ong TWY (2018) Context Matters: Contrasting Ladybird Beetle Responses to
 546 Urban Environments across Two US Regions. Sustainability 10:1–17
- 547 Fahrig L, Baudry J, Brotons L, Burel F, Crist TO (2011) Functional landscape heterogeneity and
 548 animal biodiversity in agricultural landscapes. Ecol Lett 14:101–112.
 549 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01559.x
- Forman RTT, Baudry J (1984) Hedgerows and hedgerow networks in landscape ecology. Environ
 Manage 8:495–510. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01871575
- Fortin MJ, Boots B, Csillag F, Remmel TK (2003) On the role of spatial stochastic models in
 understanding landscape indices in ecology. Oikos 102:203–212.
 https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2003.12447.x
- Fournier E, Loreau M (1999) Effects of newly planted hedges on ground-beetle diversity
 (Coleoptera, Carabidae) in an agricultural landscape. Ecography 22:87–97.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.1999.tb00457.x
- Fournier E, Loreau M (2002) Foraging activity of the carabid beetle Pterostichus melanarius III. in
 field margin habitats. Agric Ecosyst Environ 89:253–259. https://doi.org/10.1016/S01678809(01)00216-X
- Fric Z, Konvicka M (2007) Dispersal kernels of butterflies: Power-law functions are invariant to
 marking frequency. Basic Appl Ecol 8:377–386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2006.06.005

563	Friedman JH, Hastie T, Tibshirani R (1990) Regularization paths for generalized linear models via			
564	coordinate descent. J Stat Softw 33:1-22. PMCID: PMC2929880.			
565	Friedman JH (1991) Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines. Ann Stat 19:1-67.			
566	https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176347963			
567	Gaucherel C, Burel F, Baudry J (2007) Multiscale and surface pattern analysis of the effect of			
568	landscape pattern on carabid beetles distribution. Ecol Indic 7:598-609.			
569	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2006.07.002			
570	Greenwell BM (2017) pdp: An R Package for Constructing Partial Dependence Plots. R J 9:421-			
571	436			
572	Hargis CD, Bissonette JA, David JL (1998). The behavior of landscape metrics commonly used in			
573	the study of habitat fragmentation. Landsc Ecol 13:167–186.			
574	https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007965018633			
575	Hill JK, Thomas CD, Lewis OT (1996) Effects of habitat patch size and isolation on dispersal by			
576	Hesperia comma butterflies: Implications for metapopulation structure. J Anim Ecol			
577	65:725–735. https://doi.org/10.2307/5671			
578	Jackson HB, Fahrig L (2015) Are ecologists conducting research at the optimal scale? Glob Ecol			
579	Biogeogr 24:52-63. https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12233			
580	Kennedy CM, Lonsdorf E, Neel MC, et al (2013) A global quantitative synthesis of local and			
581	landscape effects on wild bee pollinators in agroecosystems. Ecol Lett 16:584-599.			
582	https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12082			
583	Loreau M (1985) Annual activity and life cycles of carabid beetles in two forest communities.			
584	Ecography 8:228–235. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.1985.tb01173.x			
585	Loreau M (1990) Competition in a carabid beetle community: a field experiment. Oikos 58:25–38.			
586	https://doi.org/10.2307/3565357			
587	Loreau M, Nolf CL (1993) Occupation of space by the carabid beetle Abax ater. Acta Oecologica			
588	14:247–258. ISSN : 1146-609X			
589	Luff ML (1975) Some features influencing the efficiency of pitfall traps. Oecologia 19:345–357.			
590	https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00348110			

- Magura T (2000) Effects of nature management practice on carabid assemblages (Coleoptera:
 Carabidae) in a non-native plantation. Biol Conserv 8
- Marcus T, Boch S, Durka W, Fischer M, Gossner MM, Müller J, Schöning I, Weisser WW, Drees
 C, Assmann T (2015) Living in heterogeneous woodlands Are habitat continuity or quality
 drivers of genetic variability in a flightless ground beetle? PLoS ONE 10:.
- 596 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0144217
- Martin AE, Fahrig L (2012) Measuring and selecting scales of effect for landscape predictors in
 species-habitat models. Ecol Appl 22:2277-2292. https://doi.org/10.1890/11-2224.1
- Mayor SJ, Schneider DC, Schaefer JA, Mahoney SP (2009) Habitat selection at multiple scales.
 Écoscience 16:238–247. https://doi.org/10.2980/16-2-3238
- McGarigal K, Wan HY, Zeller KA, Timm BC, Cushman SA (2016) Multi-scale habitat selection
 modeling: a review and outlook. Landsc Ecol 31:1161–1175.
- https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-016-0374-xMiguet P, Fahrig L, Lavigne C (2017) How to
 quantify a distance-dependent landscape effect on a biological response. Methods Ecol Evol
 8:1717–1724. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12830
- Miguet P, Jackson HB, Jackson ND, Martin AE, Farhig L (2016) What determines the spatial extent
 of landscape effects on species? Landsc Ecol 31:1177–1194.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-015-0314-1
- Milborrow S (2011) Derived from mda:mars by T. Hastie and R. Tibshirani. earth: Multivariate
 Adaptive Regression Splines. R Package
- Müller J, Bae S, Röder J, Didham RK (2014) Airborne LiDAR reveals context dependence in the
 effects of canopy architecture on arthropod diversity. For Ecol Manag 312:129–137.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.10.014
- Niemelä J (2001) Carabid beetles (Coleoptera: Carabidae) and habitat fragmentation: a review. Eur
 J Entomol 98:127–132. https://doi.org/10.14411/eje.2001.023
- Niemelä J, Haila Y, Halme E, Pajunen T, Punttila P (1992) Small-scale heterogeneity in the spatial
 distribution of Carabid beetles in the Southern Finnish Taiga. J Biogeogr 19:173–181.
- 618 https://doi.org/10.2307/2845503

- Ostapowicz K, Vogt P, Riitters KH, Kozak J, Estreguil C (2008) Impact of scale on morphological
 spatial pattern of forest. Landsc Ecol 23:1107–1117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-0089271-2
- Peterson EE, Sheldon F, Darnell R, Bunn SE, Harch BD (2011) A comparison of spatially explicit
 landscape representation methods and their relationship to stream condition. Freshw Biol
 56:590–610. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2010.02507.x
- Petit S, Burel F (1998a) Effects of landscape dynamics on the metapopulation of a ground beetle
 (Coleoptera, Carabidae) in a hedgerow network. Agric Ecosyst Environ 69:243–252.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(98)00111-X
- Petit S, Burel F (1998b) Connectivity in fragmented populations: Abax parallelepipedus in a
 hedgerow network landscape. Comptes Rendus Académie Sci Ser III Sci Vie 321:55–61.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0764-4469(97)89626-6
- Pichancourt JB, Burel F, Auger P (2006) Assessing the effect of habitat fragmentation on
 population dynamics: An implicit modelling approach. Ecol Model 192:543–556.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2005.07.027
- R Core Team (2017) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria
- Remmel TK, Csillag F (2003) When are two landscape pattern indices significantly different? J
 Geogr Syst 5:331–351. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10109-003-0116-x
- Remon J, Chevallier E, Prunier JG, Prunier JG, Baguette M, Moulherat S (2018) Estimating the
 permeability of linear infrastructures using recapture data. Landsc Ecol 33:1697–1710.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-018-0694-0
- Retho B, Gaucherel C, Inchausti P (2008) Modeling spatially explicit population dynamics of
 Pterostichus melanarius II1. (Coleoptera: Carabidae) in response to changes in the
 composition and configuration of agricultural landscapes. Landsc Urban Plan 84:191–199.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.07.008
- Roume A, Deconchat M, Raison L, Balent G, Ouin A (2011) Edge effects on ground beetles at the
 woodlot-field interface are short-range and asymmetrical. Agric For Entomol 13:395–403

- 647 Serckx A, Huynen M-C, Beudels-Jamar RC, Vimond M, Bogaert J, Kühl HS (2016) Bonobo nest
- site selection and the importance of predictor scales in primate ecology. Am J Primatol
 78:1326–1343. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.22585
- Shackelford G, Steward PR, Benton TG, Kunin WE, Potts SG, Biesmeijer JC, Sait SM (2013)
 Comparison of pollinators and natural enemies: a meta-analysis of landscape and local
 effects on abundance and richness in crops: Comparison of pollinators and natural enemies.
- 653 Biol Rev 88:1002–1021. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12040
- Spence JR, Niemelä J (1994) Sampling carabid assemblages with pitfall traps: The madness and the
 method. Can Entomol 126:881–894
- 656 Stevens VM, Turlure C, Baguette M (2010) A meta-analysis of dispersal in butterflies. Biol Rev
 657 85:625–642. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2009.00119.x
- Stuber EF, Gruber LF (2020) Recent methodological solutions to identifying scales of effect in
 multi-scale modeling. Curr Landsc Ecol Rep. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40823-020-00055-8
- Stuber EF, Gruber FL, Fontaine JJ (2018) Predicting species-habitat relationships: does body size
 matter? Landsc Ecol 33:1049–1060. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-018-0648-6

662 Symondson WOC (1994) The potential of Abax parallelepipedus (Col.: Carabidae) for mass 663 breeding as a biological control agent against slugs. Entomophaga 39:323–333. 664 https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02373037

- 665 Symondson WOC, Liddell JE (1993) The detection of predation by Abax parallelepipedus and
 666 Pterostichus madidus (Coleoptera: Carabidae) on Mollusca using a quantitative Elisa. Bull
 667 Entomol Res 83:641–647. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007485300040074
- Thomas CFG, Parkinson L, Marshall EJP (1998) Isolating the components of activity-density for
 the carabid beetle Pterostichus melanarius in farmland. Oecologia 116:103–112.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420050568
- Tibshirani R (1996) Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. J R Stat Soc B 58:267–288
- Tscharntke T, Tylianakis JM, Rand TA, et al (2012) Landscape moderation of biodiversity patterns
 and processes eight hypotheses. Biol Rev 87:661–685. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469185X.2011.00216.x

675	Turner MG (2005). Landscape ecology: what is the state of science? Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst
676	36:319-344. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.102003.152614
677	Vannier C, Vasseur C, Hubert-Moy L, Baudry J (2011) Multiscale ecological assessment of remote
678	sensing images. Landsc Ecol 26:1053-1069. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-011-9626-y

- Vasseur C, Joannon A, Aviron S, Burel F, Meynard JM, Baudry J (2013) The cropping systems
 mosaic: How does the hidden heterogeneity of agricultural landscapes drive arthropod
 populations? Agric Ecosyst Environ 166:3–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2012.08.013
- 682 Vermeulen HJW (1993) The composition of the carabid fauna on poor sandy road-side verges in
 683 relation to comparable open areas. Biodivers Conserv 2:331–350.
 684 https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00114038
- Vermeulen HJW (1994) Corridor function of a road verge for dispersal of stenotopic heathland
 ground beetles carabidae. Biol Conserv 69:339–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/00063207(94)90433-2
- Work T, Onge BS, Jacobs J (2011) Response of female beetles to LIDAR derived topographic
 variables in Eastern boreal mixedwood forests (Coleoptera, Carabidae). ZooKeys 147:623–
 639. https://doi.org/10.3897/zookeys.147.2013
- Wu J (2004) Effects of changing scale on landscape pattern analysis: scaling relations. Landsc Ecol
 19:125–138. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:LAND.0000021711.40074.ae

693

694

- 695 Figure captions
- 696

Fig. 1 (A) Location of Brittany in France. (B) Location of Zone Atelier Armorique (ZAAR) in Britany
(48° 30' N, 1° 34' W). (C) Sampling point locations. The borders of the study area are shown in dark
grey in (B); black icons represent the 30 points where carabid beetles were sampled.

700

Fig. 2. Statistical and modeling scheme for the step 1 "metric and scale identification" (MARS:
Multivariate Adaptive Regression Spline, TM: threshold method, DWM: weighted-distance method,
GAM: General Additive Model). For each metric, the model with the highest R-squared (R²)
represented the best scale.

705

Fig. 3. Graphs showing the R² values depending on the scale (Fig. 2, Step 1.2) of the five selected
metrics. Metric terms: NV i = density of landscape element i, NC i-j = Interfaces i-j, 1 = Wood, 12 =
Dirt-roads, 16 = Meadows.

709

Fig. 4. Partial dependence plots between the activity-density of *Abax parallelepipedus* and the selected metrics using the threshold method (A–C), the combination of weighted-distance and threshold methods (D-F) and the weighted-distance method (G–H). Metric terms: NV i = density of landscape elements i, NC i-j = Interfaces i-j, 1 = Wood, 12 = Dirt-roads, 16 = Meadows.

714

715 Online Resource 1: Raster maps of the land use categories and the wooded features.

716 717

Land cover type	Percentage (%)
Meadow (16)	30.55
Maize (7)	21.94
Cereals (8)	20.85
Wood (1)	16.64
Artificial areas (13)	5.14
Dirt-road (12)	2.03
Uncultivated (4)	1.06
Water (2)	1.01
Other crop (9)	0.63
Rails road (14)	0.08
Grass strip (17)	0.08

Table 1. Percentage of each land cover type in the study area for 2017.

Table 2. Metrics computed with CHLOE software, i represents the elements of a specific land cover type, i-j the interfaces between two elements of a specific land cover type, d represents the distance chosen for the metric calculation, wd represents the weighted-distance function used, n represents the number, p represents the proportion.

Motrio	Description	Formula	Formula
weuro		(Threshold Method)	(Weighted-distance method)
NV i	Number of pixels of class i	n(i)	$\sum wd(i)$
NC i-j	Number of pair values i-j	n(i,j)	$\sum wd(i,j)$
NC-hete	C-hete Number of pair values where i ≠ j	$\sum n(i,j)$	$\sum \sum wd(i,j)$
		with i ≠ j	with i ≠ j
SHDI	Shannon diversity of the land cover	$-\sum p(i) \times \ln(p(i))$	$-\sum p(i) \times \ln(p(i))$ with $p(i) = \frac{\sum wd(i)}{\sum \sum wd}$
HET	Heterogeneity metric (i.e., SHDI for pair values)	$-\sum_{j=1}^{n} p(i,j) \times \ln(p(i,j))$	$-\sum p(i,j) \times \ln(p(i,j))$ with $p(i,j) = \frac{\sum wd(i,j)}{\sum \sum wd}$
HET-frag	Structural heterogeneity metric (i.e., SHDI for heterogenous pair values)	$-\sum_{\substack{p(i,j) \times \ln(p(i,j)) \\ i \neq j}} p(i,j) \times \sum_{\substack{i \neq j}} p(i,j)$	$-\sum p(i,j) \times \ln(p(i,j))$ with $i \neq j$ and $p(i, j) = \frac{\sum wd(i,j)}{\sum \sum wd}$
MD	The grain metric	$\frac{\sum \min(d, 100)}{n}$	$\frac{\sum wd \times \min(d, 100)}{\sum wd}$

Table 3. Summary of the threshold and the four weighted-distance functions used for the weighteddistance method. Terms and formulae are presented (radius: radius for a given buffer size). The center of the weight pixel window is the sampling point (the lighter the color, the more important the effect is).









