

Appendix A: Supplementary material

Appendix A1. Development of resistance maps.

We developed resistance maps for each element type (*i.e.* wooded, grassland, and cropland elements) using a moving window analysis. This method enables to assign a resistance value to each focal pixel of the landscape, the value being calculated and mediated by the neighbouring pixel values (McGarigal & Cushman, 2005). This method avoids assigning resistance values based on a discrete representation of the landscape matrix (*i.e.*, patch-matrix model) in favour of a continuous representation of the landscape matrix (*i.e.* continuum model) (Brudvig et al., 2017; Cushman et al., 2010; Fischer & Lindenmayer, 2006; Lausch et al., 2015; McGarigal & Cushman, 2005). Resistance values were calculated as the reverse of the proportion of the considered landscape element type (*i.e.*, 101 minus the proportion of the considered landscape element type) in a given landscape window, which were simulated as a sliding circular window. The proportion of the considered landscape element type was calculated from the number of pixels in a circular moving window of 55 m in diameter, with displacement and interpolation value of 5 m. A focal pixel for which the proportion of the landscape element type over the window (*i.e.*, its focal neighbourhood) is 100% was assigned a resistance value of 1 (*i.e.*, highly permeable to dispersal). Conversely, a focal pixel for which the proportion of the landscape element type is 0% was assigned a resistance value of 101 (i.e. slightly permeable to dispersal) (Fig. 1). The calculation of three resistance maps, respectively based on the proportion of woodland, grassland and cropland elements reduced subjectivity (*i.e.*, expert knowledge) and avoided hierarchisation of habitat types when assigning resistance values. The three resistance maps were produced using Chloe v4 software (Boussard & Baudry, 2014).




Fig. 1. Schematic representation of the circular moving window analysis used to create resistance maps for each landscape element type. Example of wooded elements.

Appendix A2. Calculation of the “proportion of total potential dispersal flux in the landscape” connectivity index.

For each selected winter cereal field, we computed the “proportion of total potential dispersal flux in the landscape” index (dF_k^* ; Saura & Rubio, 2010) as:

$$dF_k^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1, i \neq k}^{n-1} p_{ik}^*}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, i \neq j}^n p_{ij}^*} \times 100$$

where p_{ij}^* is the maximum product probability of all possible least-cost paths between pairs of habitat patches, i and j , in the landscape, including direct and non-direct (facilitated by other intermediate patches functioning as stepping-stones) dispersal between pairs of habitat patches (Saura & Pascual-Hortal, 2007). The probability of direct dispersal (p_{ij}) between pairs of habitat patches was modelled as a negative exponential function of the effective dispersal distance between habitat patches (Bunn et al., 2000; Gurrutxaga et al., 2011; Saura & Pascual-Hortal, 2007; Urban & Keitt, 2001). The dF_k^* index was calculated using three potential maximal dispersal distances: 250 m, 500 m, and 750 m (*i.e.*, corresponding to the three spatial scales tested). These potential maximal dispersal distances were converted to accumulated cost for each landscape element using the transformation (Foltête et al., 2012): $Dist = e^{intercept + slope \cdot \log(DistM)}$, where $Dist$ is the cumulative cost of the least-cost path between each pair of habitat patches and $DistM$ is the Euclidean distance between each pair of habitat patches. Each “converted” potential maximal dispersal distance was used to set the decay rate of the negative exponential function at $p_{ij} = 0.01$.

Table 1. Distribution of habitat connectivity and habitat amount provided by each landscape element for 250 m, 500 m and 750 m.

| | 250 m | | 500 m | | 750 m | |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Mean ± SE | Min – Max | Mean ± SE | Min – Max | Mean ± SE | Min – Max |
| Habitat connectivity provided by: | | | | | | |
| Wooded elements | 0.45 ± 0.08 | 0.01 – 1.69 | 0.48 ± 0.07 | 0.07 – 1.48 | 0.48 ± 0.07 | 0.13 – 1.47 |
| Grassland elements | 0.42 ± 0.15 | 0.00 – 3.54 | 0.45 ± 0.13 | 0.00 – 2.97 | 0.45 ± 0.11 | 0.00 – 2.55 |
| Cropland elements | 0.52 ± 0.11 | 0.00 – 2.27 | 0.39 ± 0.08 | 0.00 – 1.50 | 0.35 ± 0.07 | 0.00 – 1.24 |
| Habitat amount provided by: | | | | | | |
| Wooded elements | 19.36 ± 2.05 | 5.52 – 44.71 | 18.99 ± 1.41 | 4.12 – 32.16 | 19.18 ± 0.97 | 10.49 – 29.67 |
| Grassland elements | 30.99 ± 3.29 | 2.19 – 66.35 | 35.55 ± 2.54 | 14.38 – 57.84 | 38.83 ± 1.96 | 18.86 – 53.17 |
| Cropland elements | 48.46 ± 3.94 | 14.91 – 85.20 | 44.55 ± 2.77 | 21.00 – 70.95 | 44.48 ± 2.09 | 22.58 – 64.34 |

Table 2. Spearman's correlation (ρ) between habitat connectivity and habitat amount provided by each landscape element for (A) 250 m, (B) 500 m and (C) 750 m . Significant correlations ($P < 0.05$) are in bold.

| (A) 250 m | Habitat connectivity provided by woodlands | Habitat connectivity provided by grasslands | Habitat connectivity provided by croplands | Habitat amount provided by woodlands | Habitat amount provided by grasslands |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Habitat connectivity provided by woodlands | | | | | |
| Habitat connectivity provided by grasslands | -0.02 | | | | |
| Habitat connectivity provided by croplands | 0.10 | -0.16 | | | |
| Habitat amount provided by woodlands | 0.27 | -0.08 | -0.47 | | |
| Habitat amount provided by grasslands | -0.07 | 0.80 | -0.44 | 0.13 | |
| Habitat amount provided by croplands | -0.12 | -0.50 | 0.52 | -0.57 | -0.75 |

| (B) 500 m | Habitat connectivity provided by woodlands | Habitat connectivity provided by grasslands | Habitat connectivity provided by croplands | Habitat amount provided by woodlands | Habitat amount provided by grasslands |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Habitat connectivity provided by woodlands | | | | | |
| Habitat connectivity provided by grasslands | -0.13 | | | | |
| Habitat connectivity provided by croplands | 0.07 | -0.31 | | | |
| Habitat amount provided by woodlands | 0.57 | -0.08 | -0.35 | | |
| Habitat amount provided by grasslands | -0.16 | 0.70 | -0.43 | -0.13 | |
| Habitat amount provided by croplands | -0.13 | -0.39 | 0.45 | -0.32 | -0.71 |

| (C) 750 m | Habitat connectivity provided by woodlands | Habitat connectivity provided by grasslands | Habitat connectivity provided by croplands | Habitat amount provided by woodlands | Habitat amount provided by grasslands |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Habitat connectivity provided by woodlands | | | | | |
| Habitat connectivity provided by grasslands | -0.22 | | | | |
| Habitat connectivity provided by croplands | 0.11 | -0.35 | | | |
| Habitat amount provided by woodlands | 0.67 | -0.04 | -0.31 | | |
| Habitat amount provided by grasslands | -0.30 | 0.54 | -0.60 | 0.08 | |
| Habitat amount provided by croplands | 0.05 | -0.34 | 0.64 | -0.40 | -0.76 |

Table 3. Overview of the mechanisms involved in dispersal, establishment and competition processes for the five functional traits selected for this study.

| Functional traits | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|------|----------------------|------|---|------|-------------------------|--|-----------------------|------|--|--|--|--|
| | Seed number per plant | | Type of reproduction | | Seed dry mass | | Plant vegetative height | | Seed germination rate | | | | | |
| | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High | | | | |
| Dispersal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mechanism | Number of dispersers | | Dispersal distance | | Dispersal distance | | Dispersal distance | | | | | | | |
| Sense of variation | Low | High | High | Low | High | Low | Low | High | | | | | | |
| Establishment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mechanism | | | Resprouting | | Amount of metabolic reserve in the seed | | | Successful germination from the seed bank | | | | | | |
| Sense of variation | | | Low | High | Low | High | | | | | | | | |
| Competition | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mechanism | Resource acquisition <i>via</i> lateral spread | | | | Resource acquisition <i>via</i> growth in height | | | | | | | | | |
| Sense of variation | | | Low | High | | | Low | High | | | | | | |

Appendix A3. Processing of the continuous trait values dataset.

Several n continuous trait values for a given trait and for a given species could be available from trait databases. Thus, all n trait values with an error risk ≤ 4 (cf. Kattge et al. 2011) that fell outside the 95% of the normal distribution of the n trait values distribution (if $n \geq 2$) for a given trait and for a given species were considered as outliers and were removed (4.8% of continuous trait values dataset). Then, trait values were averaged per trait and per species. Missing continuous trait values were estimated using Multivariate Imputation by Chained Equation (MICE), which is a procedure that accurately predicts mean matching from functional trait values (Penone et al., 2014; Taugourdeau et al., 2014). This procedure was performed by setting the family of each species as nested blocks assuming phylogenetic conservatism (Baeten et al., 2015), using the “mice” R package.

Table 4. Spearman's correlation (*rho*) between the five functional traits selected for this study before any transformation. Significant correlations ($P < 0.05$) in bold. *semi-quantitative trait, ⁽¹⁾ log-transformed traits, ⁽²⁾ logit-transformed trait

| Functional traits | Seed number per plant ⁽¹⁾ | Type of reproduction* | Seed dry mass ⁽¹⁾ | Plant vegetative height ⁽¹⁾ |
|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Seed number per plant ⁽¹⁾ | | | | |
| Type of reproduction* | -0.12 | | | |
| Seed dry mass ⁽¹⁾ | -0.35 | -0.14 | | |
| Plant vegetative height ⁽¹⁾ | 0.05 | 0.14 | 0.29 | |
| Seed germination rate ⁽²⁾ | 0.03 | 0.09 | 0.15 | 0.20 |

Table 5. Spearman's correlation (*rho*) between the three different metrics used to assess the diversity (total species richness, Piélov's total evenness) and abundance (mean total cover) of weed assemblages in winter cereal fields before any transformation. These metrics were calculated at the field scale, accounting for all species recorded in the ten plots (N = 27). Significant correlations (P < 0.05) are in bold. ⁽¹⁾ logit-transformed metrics.

| | Total species richness | Piélov's total evenness |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Total species richness | | |
| Piélov's total evenness | -0.09 | |
| Mean total cover ⁽¹⁾ | 0.55 | -0.66 |

Table 6. Number of occurrences (calculated as the number of fields where the species is present), total abundance (calculated as the sum of cover values in the 270 plots), life form and life span (according to the Biolflor database, Kühn et al., 2004) of the 80 herbaceous species recorded in fields. Nomenclature: TAXREF v12.0, the French taxonomic register (available at: <https://inpn.mnhn.fr/programme/referentiel-taxonomique-taxref>)

| Name | Occurrence | Total abundance | Life form | Life span |
|--|------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <i>Juncus bufonius</i> L., 1753 | 22 | 1815.5 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Poa trivialis</i> L., 1753 | 22 | 135.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Poa annua</i> L., 1753 | 19 | 1143.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual, Pluriennial |
| <i>Stellaria media</i> (L.) Vill., 1789 | 14 | 109.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Senecio vulgaris</i> L., 1753 | 14 | 65.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Rumex obtusifolius</i> L., 1753 | 13 | 88.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Hypericum humifusum</i> L., 1753 | 13 | 88.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual, Biennial, Pluriennial |
| <i>Polygonum aviculare</i> L., 1753 | 13 | 29.0 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Trifolium repens</i> L., 1753 | 12 | 14.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Persicaria maculosa</i> Gray, 1821 | 11 | 44.0 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Taraxacum officinale</i> F.H.Wigg., 1780 | 11 | 18.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> L., 1753 | 10 | 209.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Cerastium fontanum</i> Baumg., 1816 | 10 | 73.0 | Chamaephytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Plantago major</i> L., 1753 | 10 | 27.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Calystegia sepium</i> (L.) R.Br., 1810 | 9 | 98.0 | Geophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Lamium hybridum</i> Vill., 1786 | 9 | 23.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Veronica arvensis</i> L., 1753 | 8 | 123.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Lysimachia arvensis</i> (L.) U.Manns & Anderb., 2009 | 8 | 65.5 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Lolium multiflorum</i> Lam., 1779 | 8 | 59.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual, Biennial, Pluriennial |
| <i>Mercurialis annua</i> L., 1753 | 8 | 41.5 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Kickxia elatine</i> (L.) Dumort., 1827 | 8 | 21.5 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Lamium purpureum</i> L., 1753 | 7 | 27.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Viola arvensis</i> Murray, 1770 | 6 | 419.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Epilobium tetragonum</i> L., 1753 | 6 | 35.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Aphanes arvensis</i> L., 1753 | 6 | 24.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Fumaria muralis</i> Sond. ex W.D.J.Koch, 1845 | 6 | 14.0 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Fallopia convolvulus</i> (L.) Á.Löve, 1970 | 6 | 10.5 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L., 1753 | 6 | 6.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Solanum nigrum</i> L., 1753 | 6 | 6.5 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Tripleurospermum inodorum</i> (L.) Sch.Bip., 1844 | 5 | 59.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Convolvulus arvensis</i> L., 1753 | 5 | 31.0 | Geophytes | Annual |
| <i>Ranunculus repens</i> L., 1753 | 5 | 19.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Cirsium arvense</i> (L.) Scop., 1772 | 5 | 18.0 | Geophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Galium aparine</i> L., 1753 | 5 | 10.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Lipandra polysperma</i> (L.) S.Fuentes, Uotila & Borsch, 2012 | 5 | 6.0 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Oxalis fontana</i> Bunge, 1835 | 4 | 7.5 | Geophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Veronica chamaedrys</i> L., 1753 | 4 | 4.0 | Chamaephytes, Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Rumex crispus</i> L., 1753 | 3 | 29.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Rumex acetosella</i> L., 1753 | 3 | 23.5 | Geophytes, Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Veronica persica</i> Poir., 1808 | 3 | 20.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Elytrigia repens</i> (L.) Desv. ex Nevski, 1934 | 3 | 13.0 | Geophytes, Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Holcus lanatus</i> L., 1753 | 3 | 12.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Cerastium glomeratum</i> Thuill., 1799 | 3 | 10.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Ranunculus sardous</i> Crantz, 1763 | 3 | 7.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Bromopsis erecta</i> (Huds.) Fourr., 1869 | 3 | 4.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Chenopodium album</i> L., 1753 | 3 | 4.0 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Cardamine hirsuta</i> L., 1753 | 3 | 2.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Holcus mollis</i> L., 1759 | 3 | 2.5 | Geophytes, Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Arrhenatherum elatius</i> (L.) P.Beauv. ex J.Presl & C.Presl, 1819 | 2 | 25.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Agrostis capillaris</i> L., 1753 | 2 | 15.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Panicum dichotomiflorum</i> Michx., 1803 | 2 | 11.5 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Ervilia hirsuta</i> (L.) Opiz, 1852 | 2 | 9.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Gnaphalium uliginosum</i> L., 1753 | 2 | 6.0 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Vicia sativa</i> L., 1753 | 2 | 4.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Geranium dissectum</i> L., 1755 | 2 | 2.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Geranium molle</i> L., 1753 | 2 | 2.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual, Biennial |
| <i>Daucus carota</i> L., 1753 | 2 | 1.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Biennial, Pluriennial |
| <i>Veronica serpyllifolia</i> L., 1753 | 2 | 1.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Agrostis gigantea</i> Roth, 1788 | 1 | 99.5 | Geophytes, Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Mentha arvensis</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 25.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Ceratochloa cathartica</i> (Vahl) Herter, 1940 | 1 | 16.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Echinochloa crus-galli</i> (L.) P.Beauv., 1812 | 1 | 7.5 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Aethusa cynapium</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 7.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Medicago sativa</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 4.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Plantago lanceolata</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 4.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Capsella bursa-pastoris</i> (L.) Medik., 1792 | 1 | 3.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual, Biennial |
| <i>Veronica hederifolia</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 3.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Digitaria sanguinalis</i> (L.) Scop., 1771 | 1 | 3.0 | Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Hypochaeris radicata</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 2.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Lolium perenne</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 2.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Sherardia arvensis</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 2.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Sonchus asper</i> (L.) Hill, 1769 | 1 | 2.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Lapsana communis</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 1.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Matricaria chamomilla</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 1.0 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Poa pratensis</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 1.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Silene latifolia</i> Poir., 1789 | 1 | 1.0 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Euphorbia helioscopia</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 0.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual |
| <i>Oxalis corniculata</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 0.5 | Hemicryptophytes, Therophytes | Annual, Pluriennial |
| <i>Trifolium pratense</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 0.5 | Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |
| <i>Urtica dioica</i> L., 1753 | 1 | 0.5 | Chamaephytes, Hemicryptophytes | Pluriennial |

Table 7. Taxonomic (total species richness, Piérou's total evenness, and mean total cover) and functional (community weighted means [CWMs] for each trait considered) characteristics of weed assemblages These metrics were calculated at the field scale, after removing rare species (*i.e.*, species that were present in fewer than 5% of the winter cereal fields) recorded in the ten plots (N = 27). SE = standard error of the mean. (1) logit-transformed metric. (2) log-transformed trait based metric, (3) logit-transformed trait based metric.

| | Distribution of metrics before transformation | |
|--|---|---------------|
| | Mean ± SE | Min – Max |
| Taxonomic diversity and abundance | | |
| Total species richness | 14.52 ± 1.45 | 3.00 – 30.00 |
| Piérou's total evenness | 0.58 ± 0.04 | 0.10 – 0.91 |
| Mean total cover ⁽¹⁾ | 19.24 ± 3.60 | 0.60 – 77.10 |
| Functional composition (CWMs) | | |
| Seed number per plant ⁽²⁾ | 8.33 ± 0.22 | 6.22 – 10.31 |
| Type of reproduction | 1.57 ± 0.08 | 1.02 – 2.65 |
| Seed dry mass ⁽²⁾ | -1.82 ± 0.21 | -3.72 – 0.23 |
| Plant vegetative height ⁽²⁾ | -1.36 ± 0.05 | -1.69 – -0.81 |
| Seed germination rate ⁽³⁾ | 2.01 ± 0.13 | 1.15 – 3.48 |

Table 8. Summary of the model-averaged estimates [\pm 95% confidence intervals (CI)] and relative importance (RI) of the habitat connectivity and habitat amount provided by (i) woodland, (ii) grassland and (iii) cropland elements for each spatial scale considered (250 m, 500 m and 750 m) to explain weed diversity and abundance in winter cereal fields [diversity: total species richness and Piélou's total evenness; abundance: mean total cover]. Both dependent and independent variables were calculated at the field scale (N = 27). All confidence intervals did encompass zero meaning that the effect of variables was not significant.

| | Adj-R ² | Intercept | Habitat connectivity provided by: | | | | | | Habitat amount provided by: | | | | | | Cropland elements | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------|-----------------------|----|-----------------------|
| | | | Woodland elements | | | Grassland elements | | | Cropland elements | | | Woodland elements | | | Grassland elements | | |
| | | | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate \pm 95% CI |
| 250 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total species richness | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.01 \pm 0.17 | 0.17 | -0.15 \pm 0.43 | 0.45 | 0.00 \pm 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.00 \pm 0.20 | 0.16 | -0.08 \pm 0.37 | 0.31 | 0.06 \pm 0.33 | 0.26 | | | |
| Piélou's total evenness | 0.27 | 0.00 | 0.20 \pm 0.46 | 0.55 | 0.00 \pm 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.11 \pm 0.39 | 0.35 | -0.37 \pm 0.54 | 0.77 | -0.02 \pm 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.02 \pm 0.26 | 0.17 | | | |
| Mean cover | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.09 \pm 0.34 | 0.35 | -0.13 \pm 0.41 | 0.40 | -0.10 \pm 0.38 | 0.36 | 0.05 \pm 0.30 | 0.22 | -0.03 \pm 0.27 | 0.20 | 0.07 \pm 0.35 | 0.25 | | | |
| 500 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total species richness | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.01 \pm 0.17 | 0.15 | -0.08 \pm 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.01 \pm 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.04 \pm 0.24 | 0.23 | -0.21 \pm 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.01 \pm 0.31 | 0.22 | | | |
| Piélou's total evenness | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.10 \pm 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.03 \pm 0.23 | 0.18 | 0.23 \pm 0.48 | 0.60 | 0.00 \pm 0.20 | 0.16 | -0.13 \pm 0.43 | 0.39 | -0.01 \pm 0.24 | 0.16 | | | |
| Mean cover | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.13 \pm 0.40 | 0.42 | -0.12 \pm 0.39 | 0.40 | -0.04 \pm 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.00 \pm 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.01 \pm 0.25 | 0.16 | 0.08 \pm 0.35 | 0.30 | | | |
| 750 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total species richness | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.02 \pm 0.21 | 0.18 | -0.10 \pm 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.02 \pm 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.04 \pm 0.25 | 0.24 | -0.09 \pm 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.01 \pm 0.25 | 0.18 | | | |
| Piélou's total evenness | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.12 \pm 0.40 | 0.41 | 0.02 \pm 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.17 \pm 0.46 | 0.49 | 0.01 \pm 0.19 | 0.16 | -0.15 \pm 0.47 | 0.42 | -0.01 \pm 0.26 | 0.18 | | | |
| Mean total cover | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.12 \pm 0.39 | 0.40 | -0.11 \pm 0.37 | 0.39 | -0.02 \pm 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.00 \pm 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.02 \pm 0.26 | 0.17 | 0.04 \pm 0.27 | 0.21 | | | |

Table 9. Summary of the model-averaged estimates [\pm 95% confidence intervals (CI)] and relative importance (RI) of the habitat connectivity and habitat amount provided by (i) woodland, (ii) grassland and (iii) cropland elements for each spatial scale considered (250 m, 500 m and 750 m) to explain weed diversity and abundance in winter cereal fields [diversity: total species richness and Piélou's total evenness; abundance: mean total cover] after removal of rare species from the dataset (*i.e.*, species that were present in fewer than 5% of the winter cereal fields). Both dependent and independent variables were calculated at the field scale (N = 27). All confidence intervals did encompass zero meaning that the effect of variables was not significant.

| Adj-R ² | Intercept | Habitat connectivity provided by: | | | | | | Habitat amount provided by: | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|------|
| | | Woodland elements | | Grassland elements | | Cropland elements | | Woodland elements | | Grassland elements | | Cropland elements | | |
| | | Estimate \pm 95% | CI | Estimate \pm 95% | CI | Estimate \pm 95% | CI | Estimate \pm 95% | CI | Estimate \pm 95% | CI | Estimate \pm 95% | CI | |
| 250 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total species richness | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.01 \pm 0.16 | 0.16 | -0.20 \pm 0.48 | 0.55 | 0.00 \pm 0.17 | 0.16 | 0.00 \pm 0.19 | 0.16 | -0.07 \pm 0.36 | 0.29 | 0.04 \pm 0.30 | 0.23 |
| Piélou's total evenness | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.16 \pm 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.00 \pm 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.15 \pm 0.43 | 0.43 | -0.30 \pm 0.54 | 0.68 | -0.02 \pm 0.20 | 0.15 | 0.01 \pm 0.26 | 0.17 |
| Mean cover | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.10 \pm 0.37 | 0.38 | -0.13 \pm 0.41 | 0.41 | -0.09 \pm 0.36 | 0.33 | 0.05 \pm 0.31 | 0.23 | -0.03 \pm 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.05 \pm 0.32 | 0.21 |
| 500 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total species richness | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.00 \pm 0.17 | 0.14 | -0.13 \pm 0.41 | 0.41 | 0.01 \pm 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.03 \pm 0.22 | 0.21 | -0.17 \pm 0.49 | 0.47 | 0.00 \pm 0.29 | 0.21 |
| Piélou's total evenness | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.10 \pm 0.36 | 0.35 | 0.02 \pm 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.23 \pm 0.48 | 0.61 | 0.01 \pm 0.20 | 0.16 | -0.13 \pm 0.44 | 0.40 | -0.02 \pm 0.27 | 0.17 |
| Mean cover | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.15 \pm 0.42 | 0.46 | -0.12 \pm 0.39 | 0.41 | -0.04 \pm 0.26 | 0.22 | 0.00 \pm 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.00 \pm 0.24 | 0.16 | 0.06 \pm 0.31 | 0.26 |
| 750 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total species richness | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.01 \pm 0.20 | 0.18 | -0.14 \pm 0.41 | 0.46 | 0.02 \pm 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.03 \pm 0.22 | 0.20 | -0.07 \pm 0.33 | 0.28 | 0.01 \pm 0.23 | 0.18 |
| Piélou's total evenness | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.12 \pm 0.40 | 0.40 | 0.01 \pm 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.17 \pm 0.46 | 0.50 | 0.01 \pm 0.19 | 0.16 | -0.15 \pm 0.48 | 0.42 | -0.02 \pm 0.29 | 0.18 |
| Mean total cover | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.14 \pm 0.42 | 0.44 | -0.11 \pm 0.37 | 0.39 | -0.02 \pm 0.21 | 0.18 | 0.00 \pm 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.02 \pm 0.26 | 0.18 | 0.03 \pm 0.27 | 0.21 |

Table 10. Summary of the model-averaged estimates [\pm 95% confidence intervals (CI)] and relative importance (RI) of the habitat connectivity and habitat amount provided by (i) woodland, (ii) grassland and (iii) cropland elements for each spatial scale considered (250 m, 500 m and 750 m) to explain the community weighted mean (CWM) trait values [Seed number per plant (SNPP), type of reproduction (ToR), seed dry mass (SDM), plant vegetative height (PVH) and seed germination rate (SGR)]. Both dependent and independent variables were calculated at the field scale ($N = 27$). Confidence intervals that did not encompass zero are in bold.

| Adj-R ² | Intercept | Habitat connectivity provided by: | | | | | | | | Habitat amount provided by: | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|------------------|------|------------------------------------|--------------|----|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|----|-------------------|--------------|----|
| | | Woodland elements | | | Grassland elements | | | Cropland elements | | | Woodland elements | | | Grassland elements | | | Cropland elements | | |
| | | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI |
| 250 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CWM SNPP | 0.35 | 0.00 | -0.14 \pm 0.39 | 0.45 | -0.57 \pm 0.54 | 0.93 | | -0.03 \pm 0.21 | 0.13 | 0.02 \pm 0.24 | 0.14 | 0.12 \pm 0.50 | 0.24 | -0.35 \pm 0.62 | 0.66 | | | | |
| CWM ToR | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.03 \pm 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.60 \pm 0.51 | 0.98 | | 0.01 \pm 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.02 \pm 0.24 | 0.17 | -0.12 \pm 0.45 | 0.33 | 0.08 \pm 0.39 | 0.28 | | | | |
| CWM SDM | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.03 \pm 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.13 \pm 0.44 | 0.38 | | 0.03 \pm 0.22 | 0.18 | -0.06 \pm 0.34 | 0.27 | -0.04 \pm 0.40 | 0.24 | 0.31 \pm 0.60 | 0.65 | | | | |
| CWM PVH | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.05 \pm 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.36 \pm 0.62 | 0.72 | | 0.00 \pm 0.15 | 0.12 | -0.02 \pm 0.25 | 0.19 | -0.09 \pm 0.45 | 0.26 | 0.15 \pm 0.49 | 0.40 | | | | |
| CWM SGR | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.04 \pm 0.23 | 0.21 | 0.49 \pm 0.60 | 0.88 | | 0.06 \pm 0.29 | 0.25 | -0.05 \pm 0.28 | 0.24 | -0.14 \pm 0.51 | 0.34 | 0.08 \pm 0.36 | 0.26 | | | | |
| 500 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CWM SNPP | 0.43 | 0.00 | -0.05 \pm 0.24 | 0.21 | -0.72 \pm 0.38 | 1.00 | | -0.09 \pm 0.32 | 0.32 | -0.03 \pm 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.63 \pm 0.45 | 0.97 | 0.01 \pm 0.20 | 0.09 | | | | |
| CWM ToR | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.05 \pm 0.25 | 0.22 | 0.61 \pm 0.40 | 1.00 | | 0.03 \pm 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.10 \pm 0.34 | 0.39 | -0.11 \pm 0.40 | 0.35 | 0.01 \pm 0.23 | 0.17 | | | | |
| CWM SDM | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.03 \pm 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.11 \pm 0.41 | 0.35 | | 0.16 \pm 0.43 | 0.46 | 0.07 \pm 0.32 | 0.28 | -0.21 \pm 0.55 | 0.50 | 0.01 \pm 0.26 | 0.17 | | | | |
| CWM PVH | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.06 \pm 0.30 | 0.28 | 0.24 \pm 0.51 | 0.61 | | 0.02 \pm 0.19 | 0.16 | 0.06 \pm 0.29 | 0.27 | -0.07 \pm 0.37 | 0.26 | -0.01 \pm 0.22 | 0.16 | | | | |
| CWM SGR | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.03 \pm 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.55 \pm 0.52 | 0.93 | | 0.06 \pm 0.30 | 0.21 | 0.04 \pm 0.25 | 0.17 | -0.46 \pm 0.86 | 0.66 | -0.22 \pm 0.63 | 0.44 | | | | |
| 750 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CWM SNPP | 0.35 | 0.00 | -0.09 \pm 0.35 | 0.29 | -0.52 \pm 0.42 | 0.97 | | -0.07 \pm 0.32 | 0.22 | -0.08 \pm 0.31 | 0.29 | 0.39 \pm 0.62 | 0.74 | 0.03 \pm 0.32 | 0.16 | | | | |
| CWM ToR | 0.35 | 0.00 | 0.08 \pm 0.32 | 0.32 | 0.58 \pm 0.35 | 1.00 | | 0.03 \pm 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.16 \pm 0.39 | 0.52 | -0.02 \pm 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.01 \pm 0.15 | 0.13 | | | | |
| CWM SDM | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.03 \pm 0.25 | 0.18 | 0.05 \pm 0.27 | 0.24 | | 0.17 \pm 0.45 | 0.48 | 0.20 \pm 0.46 | 0.56 | -0.15 \pm 0.50 | 0.41 | -0.01 \pm 0.32 | 0.17 | | | | |
| CWM PVH | 0.10 | 0.00 | 0.04 \pm 0.27 | 0.21 | 0.18 \pm 0.45 | 0.54 | | 0.01 \pm 0.17 | 0.14 | 0.23 \pm 0.47 | 0.61 | -0.05 \pm 0.30 | 0.21 | 0.00 \pm 0.24 | 0.17 | | | | |
| CWM SGR | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.01 \pm 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.53 \pm 0.46 | 0.94 | | 0.02 \pm 0.20 | 0.09 | 0.06 \pm 0.29 | 0.18 | -0.70 \pm 0.92 | 0.81 | -0.47 \pm 0.79 | 0.67 | | | | |

Table 11. Summary of the model-averaged estimates [\pm 95% confidence intervals (CI)] and relative importance (RI) of the habitat connectivity and habitat amount provided by (i) woodland, (ii) grassland and (iii) cropland elements for each spatial scale considered (250 m, 500 m and 750 m) to explain the community weighted mean (CWM) trait values [Seed number per plant (SNPP), type of reproduction (ToR), seed dry mass (SDM), plant vegetative height (PVH) and seed germination rate (SGR)] after removing rare species from the dataset (*i.e.*, species that were present in fewer than 5% of the winter cereal fields). Both dependent and independent variables were calculated at the field scale (N = 27). Confidence intervals that did not encompass zero are in bold.

| Adj-R ² | Intercept | Habitat connectivity provided by: | | | | | | | | Habitat amount provided by: | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----|
| | | Woodland elements | | Grassland elements | | Cropland elements | | Woodland elements | | Grassland elements | | Cropland elements | | | | |
| | | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI |
| 250 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CWM SNPP | 0.26 | 0.00 | -0.07 \pm 0.29 | 0.28 | -0.65 \pm 0.54 | 0.98 | -0.05 \pm 0.27 | 0.22 | 0.01 \pm 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.22 \pm 0.62 | 0.42 | -0.21 \pm 0.55 | 0.46 | | |
| CWM ToR | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.07 \pm 0.28 | 0.29 | 0.58 \pm 0.49 | 0.98 | 0.02 \pm 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.02 \pm 0.21 | 0.17 | -0.10 \pm 0.42 | 0.30 | 0.04 \pm 0.28 | 0.20 | | |
| CWM SDM | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.02 \pm 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.13 \pm 0.44 | 0.39 | 0.03 \pm 0.23 | 0.19 | -0.06 \pm 0.33 | 0.26 | -0.05 \pm 0.41 | 0.24 | 0.32 \pm 0.61 | 0.67 | | |
| CWM PVH | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.06 \pm 0.28 | 0.27 | 0.30 \pm 0.58 | 0.67 | 0.01 \pm 0.17 | 0.15 | -0.02 \pm 0.22 | 0.18 | -0.07 \pm 0.4 | 0.25 | 0.06 \pm 0.34 | 0.25 | | |
| CWM SGR | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.06 \pm 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.43 \pm 0.59 | 0.83 | 0.07 \pm 0.30 | 0.27 | -0.04 \pm 0.25 | 0.21 | -0.10 \pm 0.45 | 0.29 | 0.04 \pm 0.28 | 0.19 | | |
| 500 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CWM SNPP | 0.45 | 0.00 | -0.02 \pm 0.17 | 0.14 | -0.77 \pm 0.37 | 1.00 | -0.09 \pm 0.31 | 0.34 | -0.02 \pm 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.63 \pm 0.42 | 1.00 | 0.02 \pm 0.21 | 0.11 | | |
| CWM ToR | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.08 \pm 0.32 | 0.30 | 0.64 \pm 0.39 | 1.00 | 0.03 \pm 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.18 \pm 0.41 | 0.53 | -0.16 \pm 0.48 | 0.43 | -0.01 \pm 0.27 | 0.16 | | |
| CWM SDM | 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.01 \pm 0.20 | 0.15 | 0.09 \pm 0.38 | 0.32 | 0.19 \pm 0.46 | 0.54 | 0.07 \pm 0.32 | 0.27 | -0.18 \pm 0.51 | 0.45 | 0.01 \pm 0.25 | 0.18 | | |
| CWM PVH | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.07 \pm 0.31 | 0.27 | 0.26 \pm 0.52 | 0.65 | 0.02 \pm 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.11 \pm 0.37 | 0.37 | -0.10 \pm 0.46 | 0.29 | -0.03 \pm 0.31 | 0.18 | | |
| CWM SGR | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.02 \pm 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.62 \pm 0.46 | 0.97 | 0.02 \pm 0.19 | 0.08 | 0.03 \pm 0.21 | 0.10 | -0.75 \pm 0.87 | 0.85 | -0.47 \pm 0.72 | 0.71 | | |
| 750 m | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CWM SNPP | 0.32 | 0.00 | -0.05 \pm 0.27 | 0.21 | -0.59 \pm 0.38 | 1.00 | -0.09 \pm 0.36 | 0.28 | -0.05 \pm 0.25 | 0.21 | 0.39 \pm 0.64 | 0.73 | 0.06 \pm 0.37 | 0.20 | | |
| CWM ToR | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.13 \pm 0.39 | 0.42 | 0.59 \pm 0.34 | 1.00 | 0.02 \pm 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.23 \pm 0.44 | 0.64 | -0.02 \pm 0.18 | 0.16 | 0.01 \pm 0.14 | 0.12 | | |
| CWM SDM | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.02 \pm 0.23 | 0.16 | 0.04 \pm 0.26 | 0.22 | 0.21 \pm 0.48 | 0.56 | 0.19 \pm 0.45 | 0.55 | -0.13 \pm 0.46 | 0.36 | -0.02 \pm 0.30 | 0.17 | | |
| CWM PVH | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.03 \pm 0.26 | 0.19 | 0.20 \pm 0.45 | 0.58 | 0.02 \pm 0.18 | 0.15 | 0.34 \pm 0.49 | 0.78 | -0.07 \pm 0.38 | 0.26 | -0.01 \pm 0.29 | 0.16 | | |
| CWM SGR | 0.45 | 0.00 | 0.01 \pm 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.59 \pm 0.38 | 0.99 | 0.00 \pm 0.08 | 0.01 | 0.03 \pm 0.21 | 0.08 | -0.96 \pm 0.75 | 0.95 | -0.71 \pm 0.68 | 0.88 | | |

Table 12. Summary of the model-averaged estimates [\pm 95% confidence intervals (CI)] and relative importance (RI) of the community weighted mean trait values [Seed number per plant (SNPP), type of reproduction (ToR), seed dry mass (SDM), plant vegetative height (PVH) and seed germination rate (SGR)] to explain weed diversity and abundance in winter cereal fields [diversity: total species richness and Piélov's total evenness; abundance: mean total cover]. Both dependent and independent variables were calculated at the field scale ($N = 27$). Confidence intervals that did not encompass zero are in bold.

| | Adj-R ² | Incercept | CWM SNPP | | CWM ToR | | CWM SDM | | CWM PVH | | CWM SGR | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------|------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| | | | Estimate \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate \pm 95% CI | RI |
| Total species richness | 0.22 | 0.00 | -0.02 \pm 0.28 | 0.13 | 0.17 \pm 0.50 | 0.44 | 0.33 \pm 0.69 | 0.62 | -0.07 \pm 0.44 | 0.23 | -0.34 \pm 0.75 | 0.59 |
| Piélov's total evenness | 0.52 | 0.00 | 0.02 \pm 0.25 | 0.17 | -0.01 \pm 0.15 | 0.15 | 0.21 \pm 0.50 | 0.54 | -0.02 \pm 0.26 | 0.20 | 0.59 \pm 0.55 | 0.94 |
| Mean total cover | 0.48 | 0.00 | -0.19 \pm 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.12 \pm 0.36 | 0.42 | 0.06 \pm 0.32 | 0.25 | 0.01 \pm 0.23 | 0.12 | -0.92 \pm 0.50 | 1.00 |

Table 13. Summary of the model-averaged estimates [\pm 95% confidence intervals (CI)] and relative importance (RI) of the community weighted mean trait values [Seed number per plant (SNPP), type of reproduction (ToR), seed dry mass (SDM), plant vegetative height (PVH) and seed germination rate (SGR)] to explain weed diversity and abundance in winter cereal fields [diversity: total species richness and Piélov's total evenness; abundance: mean total cover] after removing rare species from the dataset (i.e., species that were present in fewer than 5% of the winter cereal fields). Both dependent and independent variables were calculated at the field scale ($N = 27$). Confidence intervals that did not encompass zero are in bold.

| | Adj-R ² | Incercept | CWM SNPP | | CWM ToR | | CWM SDM | | CWM PVH | | CWM SGR | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------|--------------|---------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------|------------------|---------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| | | | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | \pm 95% CI | RI | Estimate | |
| | | | | | | | CI | | | | | | |
| Total species richness | 0.17 | 0.00 | -0.02 \pm 0.26 | | 0.14 | 0.14 \pm 0.47 | 0.39 | 0.35 \pm 0.69 | 0.64 | -0.04 \pm 0.39 | 0.19 | -0.38 \pm 0.76 | 0.64 |
| Piélov's total evenness | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.06 \pm 0.42 | | 0.23 | -0.01 \pm 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.31 \pm 0.59 | 0.68 | -0.03 \pm 0.28 | 0.17 | 0.52 \pm 0.60 | 0.88 |
| Mean total cover | 0.55 | 0.00 | -0.19 \pm 0.28 | | 0.51 | 0.06 \pm 0.27 | 0.29 | 0.13 \pm 0.41 | 0.39 | 0.03 \pm 0.22 | 0.10 | -0.99 \pm 0.48 | 1.00 |

References

- Baeten, L., Davies, T. J., Verheyen, K., Calster, H. V., & Vellend, M. (2015). Disentangling dispersal from phylogeny in the colonization capacity of forest understorey plants. *Journal of Ecology*, 103(1), 175–183.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12333>
- Boussard, H., & Baudry, J. (2014). *Chloe2012: A software for landscape pattern analysis*.
<http://www.rennes.inra.fr/sad/Tools-Produits/Outils-informatiques/Chloe>
- Brudvig, L. A., Leroux, S. J., Albert, C. H., Bruna, E. M., Davies, K. F., Ewers, R. M., Levey, D. J., Pardini, R., & Resasco, J. (2017). Evaluating conceptual models of landscape change. *Ecography*, 40(1), 74–84.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02543>
- Bunn, A. G., Urban, D. L., & Keitt, T. H. (2000). Landscape connectivity: A conservation application of graph theory. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 59(4), 265–278. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.2000.0373>
- Cushman, S. A., Gutzweiler, K., Evans, J. S., & McGarigal, K. (2010). The Gradient Paradigm: A Conceptual and Analytical Framework for Landscape Ecology. In S. A. Cushman & F. Huettmann (Eds.), *Spatial Complexity, Informatics, and Wildlife Conservation* (pp. 83–108). Springer Japan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-4-431-87771-4_5
- Fischer, J., & Lindenmayer, D. B. (2006). Beyond fragmentation: The continuum model for fauna research and conservation in human-modified landscapes. *Oikos*, 112(2), 473–480. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2006.14148.x>
- Foltête, J.-C., Clauzel, C., & Vuidel, G. (2012). A software tool dedicated to the modelling of landscape networks. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 38, 316–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.07.002>
- Gurrutxaga, M., Rubio, L., & Saura, S. (2011). Key connectors in protected forest area networks and the impact of highways: A transnational case study from the Cantabrian Range to the Western Alps (SW Europe). *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 101(4), 310–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2011.02.036>
- Kattge, J., Díaz, S., Lavorel, S., Prentice, I. C., Leadley, P., Bönisch, G., Garnier, E., Westoby, M., Reich, P. B., Wright, I. J., Cornelissen, J. H. C., Violle, C., Harrison, S. P., Bodegom, P. M. V., Reichstein, M., Enquist, B. J., Soudzilovskaia, N. A., Ackerly, D. D., Anand, M., ... Wirth, C. (2011). TRY – a global database of plant traits. *Global Change Biology*, 17(9), 2905–2935. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02451.x>
- Kühn, I., Durka, W., & Klotz, S. (2004). BiolFlor: A new plant-trait database as a tool for plant invasion ecology. *Diversity and Distributions*, 10(5–6), 363–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1366-9516.2004.00106.x>
- Lausch, A., Blaschke, T., Haase, D., Herzog, F., Syrbe, R.-U., Tischendorf, L., & Walz, U. (2015). Understanding and quantifying landscape structure – A review on relevant process characteristics, data models and landscape metrics. *Ecological Modelling*, 295, 31–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2014.08.018>
- McGarigal, K., & Cushman, S. A. (2005). The Gradient Concept of Landscape Structure. In *Issues and Perspectives in Landscape Ecology* (pp. 112–119). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614415.013>

- Penone, C., Davidson, A. D., Shoemaker, K. T., Marco, M. D., Rondinini, C., Brooks, T. M., Young, B. E., Graham, C. H., & Costa, G. C. (2014). Imputation of missing data in life-history trait datasets: Which approach performs the best? *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 5(9), 961–970. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12232>
- Saura, S., & Pascual-Hortal, L. (2007). A new habitat availability index to integrate connectivity in landscape conservation planning: Comparison with existing indices and application to a case study. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 83(2–3), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.03.005>
- Saura, S., & Rubio, L. (2010). A common currency for the different ways in which patches and links can contribute to habitat availability and connectivity in the landscape. *Ecography*, 33(3), 523–537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2009.05760.x>
- Taugourdeau, S., Villerd, J., Plantureux, S., Huguenin-Elie, O., & Amiaud, B. (2014). Filling the gap in functional trait databases: Use of ecological hypotheses to replace missing data. *Ecology and Evolution*, 4(7), 944–958. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.989>
- Urban, D., & Keitt, T. (2001). Landscape Connectivity: A Graph-Theoretic Perspective. *Ecology*, 82(5), 1205–1218. [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2001\)082\[1205:LCAGTP\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2001)082[1205:LCAGTP]2.0.CO;2)