

Functional characteristics rather than co-occurrences determine the outcome of interactions between neighbouring plants in sub-Antarctic ponds: Consequences for macrophyte community biomass

Pauline Douce, Hugo Saiz, Marie-lise Benot, Florian Mermillod-Blondin, Laurent Simon, David Renault, Felix Vallier, Yoann Oury, Matthieu Fontaine, Anne-kristel Bittebiere

▶ To cite this version:

Pauline Douce, Hugo Saiz, Marie-lise Benot, Florian Mermillod-Blondin, Laurent Simon, et al.. Functional characteristics rather than co-occurrences determine the outcome of interactions between neighbouring plants in sub-Antarctic ponds: Consequences for macrophyte community biomass. Freshwater Biology, 2023, 68 (4), pp.561-576. 10.1111/fwb.14047 hal-03987618

HAL Id: hal-03987618 https://hal.science/hal-03987618

Submitted on 14 Apr 2023 $\,$

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 Running head: Macrophyte communities in the lles Kerguelen

2 Functional characteristics rather than co-occurrences determine the outcome of

3 interactions between neighbouring plants in sub-Antarctic ponds:

- 4 consequences for macrophyte community biomass.
- 5 P. Douce^{1*}, H. Saiz^{2, 3}, M.-L Benot⁴, F. Mermillod-Blondin¹, L. Simon¹, D. Renault^{5, 6}, F. Vallier¹,
- 6 Y. Oury⁷, M. Fontaine⁷, A.-K. Bittebiere¹
- 7 *Corresponding author: pauline.douce@univ-lyon1.fr
- 8 H. Saiz: <u>saizhugo@gmail.com</u>
- 9 M.-L Benot: marie-lise.benot@u-bordeaux.fr
- 10 F. Mermillod-Blondin: florian.mermillod-blondin@univ-lyon1.fr
- 11 L. Simon: <u>laurent.simon@univ-lyon1.fr</u>
- 12 D. Renault: <u>david.renault@univ-rennes1.fr</u>
- 13 F. Vallier: <u>felix.vallier@univ-lyon1.fr</u>
- 14 Y. Oury: yoann.oury@laposte.net
- 15 M. Fontaine: <u>matfont@free.fr</u>
- 16 A.-K. Bittebiere: <u>anne-kristel.bittebiere@univ-lyon1.fr</u>
- 17
- ¹Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, ENTPE, UMR5023 LEHNA, F-69622,
- 19 Villeurbanne, France
- ²Institute of Plant Sciences, University of Bern, Altenbergrain 21, CH-3013 Bern, Switzerland
- ³Departamento de Ciencias Agrarias y Medio Natural, Escuela Politécnica Superior, Instituto
- 22 Universitario de Investigación en Ciencias Ambientales de Aragón (IUCA), Universidad de
- 23 Zaragoza; Huesca, Spain.
- ⁴Univ. Bordeaux, INRAE, BIOGECO, F-33615 Pessac, France
- ⁵Univ Rennes, CNRS, ECOBIO [(Ecosystèmes, biodiversité, évolution)], UMR 6553, F 35000
- 26 Rennes, France

⁶Institut Universitaire de France, 1 Rue Descartes, 75231 Paris cedex 05, France

⁷Institut Polaire Français Paul Emile Victor, Technopôle Brest-Iroise, BP 75, 29280 Plouzané,

29 France

30 Abstract

1. Understanding of the mechanisms underlying species coexistence within plant 31 32 communities is crucial to predict their fate given the current context of biodiversity loss. 33 Freshwater ecosystems are among the most abiotically constrained habitats because 34 they harbor clonal macrophyte communities. Strong habitat filtering in these 35 ecosystems influences the functional composition and diversity of macrophyte 36 communities, determining the outcome of interactions between neighbours and 37 ultimately affecting local spatial arrangement between neighbours (LSA). This influence 38 may be modulated by environmental conditions in abiotically constrained habitats, such 39 as freshwater ecosystems.

We focused on macrophyte communities living in ponds in the Iles Kerguelen, in the
sub-Antarctic. These freshwater ecosystems are especially abiotically constrained
(cold climate), and their plant communities are remarkably species-poor, simplifying
the study of interactions between neighbours. We measured several abiotic variables
in the ponds, species LSA and interspecific interactions (using the Log Response Ratio
metric), and the functional composition of the community using aerial, root and clonal
traits. We also determined the biomass of the whole macrophyte community.

Our results showed that LSA does not effectively assess interactions between
neighbours at very small scales, neither at the community (one species *versus* all
neighbouring species) nor the species level (between pairs of species). Secondly,
aerial (leaf and stem) and root traits related to resource acquisition played a more
important role in interactions between neighbours than clonal traits (*i.e.* internode
length and specific internode mass related to space acquisition and resource storage,
respectively).

2

Depending on the target species, (i) interactions responded positively or negatively to
 mean trait and functional diversity of the community, and (ii) different traits of
 neighbours (aerial or root traits) triggered an interaction response. Lastly, abiotic
 variables, in particular water temperature and light intensity, influenced macrophyte
 community biomass and plant community structure (*i.e.* species richness, functional
 diversity and LSA), either directly or through the modulation of other abiotic variables.

5. Our results lead to the two following conclusions: (i) interactions between neighbours do not reflect their local spatial arrangements but are strongly associated with abiotic variables and neighbourhood functional traits (depending on species), (ii) joint integration of biotic and abiotic variables in multivariate analyses enables better inference of biodiversity responses to environment, and the subsequent consequences for ecosystem function, especially in the context of climate change.

66

67 Keywords

Functional traits, community performance, abiotic filters, species coexistence, local spatialarrangement.

70 Introduction

71 Determining the mechanisms underlying species coexistence within plant communities is 72 crucial to predict their fate in the current context of climate change and biodiversity loss 73 (Chapin, 2003). Both abiotic and biotic drivers are known to structure local assemblages within communities (Cadotte & Tucker, 2017; Kraft, Adler, et al., 2015). Indeed, species that do not 74 75 possess the functional traits allowing them to resist particular abiotic conditions are filtered out, 76 leading to similar phenotypes among co-occurring species. Moreover, at finer scales, plants 77 permanently interact with their immediate neighbours (e.g. competition, facilitation), also 78 ultimately shaping specific and functional composition of the community (Connell, 1983; 79 Goldberg & Barton, 1992; Tilman, 1982). Abiotically constrained habitats exacerbate the 80 importance of interactions between neighbours (Choler, Michalet, & Callaway, 2001), with 81 facilitative interactions being more pronounced under stressful and/or resource-limited 82 conditions (Williams, Zeldin, Semski, Hipp, & Larkin, 2021; Zhang, Wang, & Qi, 2017). 83 Freshwater ecosystems are among the most abiotically constrained, often harboring particular 84 plant communities. They host macrophyte (*i.e.* aquatic plant) communities, dominated by clonal plants (Klimeš, Klimešová, Hendriks, & van Groenendael, 1997; Santamaría, 2002) that 85 86 interact in both horizontal (for space) and vertical (for resources) directions (Gioria & Osborne, 2014). Altogether, the underlying mechanisms involved in interactions between neighbours 87 88 and that support species coexistence may vary within a particular freshwater ecosystem, including within abiotically constrained habitats, although this has been poorly tested, 89 especially regarding facilitative interactions (Silknetter et al., 2020). 90

Strong habitat filtering in aquatic ecosystems (Santamaría, 2002) affects the functional
composition and diversity of macrophyte communities (Bornette & Puijalon, 2011; Fu et al.,
2014; Zhang, Liu, Luo, Dong, & Yu, 2019), which may in turn play significant roles in
interactions between neighbours (Suzuki, Rivero, Shulaev, Blumwald, & Mittler, 2014). The
outcome of interactions between neighbours is not only driven by individual functional traits

96 (Gaudet & Keddy, 1988), but may also be determined by the difference between the functional trait values of neighbouring competitors, as predicted by recent theories of species coexistence 97 (Cadotte & Tucker, 2017; Kraft, Godoy, & Levine, 2015). The traits of neighbours are expected 98 to have different effects on the outcome of interactions, in particular when trait values differ 99 100 from those of the focal plant (Kraft, Crutsinger, Forrestel, & Emery, 2014), and according to their role in competitive strategies (tolerance vs. competing traits) (Novoplansky, 2009). On 101 102 the one hand, coexistence is often assumed to arise from high different functional trait values, 103 which alleviate competitive interactions (limiting similarity). On the other hand, small 104 differences in functional traits arising from competitive hierarchies may reduce differences in competitive ability, thereby promoting coexistence of species with similar trait values (Kraft, 105 106 Crutsinger, Forrestel, & Emery, 2014). In abiotically constrained habitats, high functional 107 convergence between species is expected due to environmental filtering (Cornwell, Schwilk, 108 & Ackerly, 2006; Grime, 2006), suggesting reduced importance of mechanisms involved in traits differentiation. Moreover, clonal traits influencing space acquisition could act as tolerance 109 110 traits to abiotic constraints as they provide opportunities to find more suitable environmental 111 conditions, while aerial (e.g. height or Specific Leaf Area) and root traits should be crucial for 112 resource competition (Kunstler et al., 2016; Lau, Shaw, Reich, & Tiffin, 2014). Thus, aerial and root traits (vertical traits) should be more strongly involved in interactions between neighbours 113 than clonal (horizontal) traits. 114

115 Within plant communities, individuals are not randomly distributed. Their spatial distribution can result either from stochastics events (Hubbell, 2011), or from environmental 116 117 heterogeneity, dispersal, and interactions between neighbours (Herben & Hara, 2003). Therefore, the observed local spatial arrangement between neighbours (hereafter referred as 118 to LSA), would be the outcome of environmental filtering and of their interactions as commonly 119 120 demonstrated (Blanchet, Cazelles, & Gravel, 2020). Besides, inter-specific interactions 121 between plants are known to depend on abiotic characteristics (Martin & Coetzee, 2014; 122 Shields & Moore, 2016), with a shift from competition to facilitation in harsh conditions

123 (Bertness & Callaway, 1994, stress gradient hypothesis). Facilitation allows for a better recruitment and survival by improving abiotic conditions at local scales, which is expected to 124 reflect spatial aggregation between plants (Bertness & Callaway, 1994; Kikvidze et al., 2005; 125 Tirado & I. Pugnaire, 2005). Conversely, studies have shown that competition for resources 126 127 leads better competitors to displace other species, commonly reflecting segregated LSA (Pottier, Marrs, & Bédécarrats, 2007; C. Schöb, Kammer, Kikvidze, Choler, & Veit, 2008; 128 Seabloom, Bjørnstad, Bolker, & Reichman, 2005). As a consequence, spatial aggregation and 129 segregation may indicate facilitation and competition respectively in constrained habitats 130 (Eccles, Esler, & Cowling, 1999; Kikvidze et al., 2005; Malkinson, Kadmon, & Cohen, 2003; 131 Raventós, Wiegand, & Luis, 2010). This assertion has never been tested within aquatic 132 133 habitats where resource distribution differs strongly from other constrained habitats (for 134 instance arid systems), due to the major effect of water depth on light availability.

135 Studies on joint effects of biotic and abiotic filters on macrophyte communities remain 136 limited (Shields & Moore, 2016, but see: Anderson & Kalff, 1988; Chambers & Prepas, 1990; Gopal & Goel, 1993; McCreary, 1991), and this highly fragmented knowledge necessarily 137 leads to inconsistencies in the reported effect of abiotic variables on the outcome of 138 interactions between neighbours. In particular, this literature gap does not enable the 139 respective roles of abiotic and biotic variables or their interactions to be determined for the 140 141 taxonomic and functional composition of the aquatic plant community, and subsequently for its biomass. The biomass of the aquatic plant community can indeed be affected by abiotic 142 variables either directly through their effects on plant physiology [e.g. aquatic system 143 morphology, water or sediment chemistry (i.e. nutrient cycling) (Dhir, 2015; Hossain et al., 144 2017; MacKay et al., 2009; Velthuis et al., 2018; Wrona et al., 2006; Zhang et al., 2020)] or 145 indirectly through species selection caused by environmental filtering (Kraft, Godoy, & Levine, 146 2015) combined with interactions between neighbours (stress gradient hypothesis, Bertness 147 1994), and functional traits (Dar, Pandit, & Ganai, 2014; James, Fisher, Russell, Collings, & 148 149 Moss, 2005; Kim & Nishihiro, 2020; Mouchet, Villéger, Mason, & Mouillot, 2010). In ponds,

water temperature, dissolved nutrients, and light intensity are expected to be the main abiotic
variables acting directly on plant community biomass and indirectly through the modulation of
plant community structure.

In this study, we focused on macrophyte communities living in the ponds of the lles 153 154 Kerguelen, located in the sub-Antarctic region. These ponds are particularly useful for testing questions about interactions between neighbours in the context of abiotically constrained 155 habitat, as the climate is very cold, yet warming (Lebouvier et al., 2011), and the remarkably 156 157 low plant richness provides simplified natural communities (Frenot, Gloaguen, Massé, & 158 Lebouvier, 2001; Van der Putten, Macel, & Visser, 2010). To that aim, within each pond, we measured several abiotic variables, plant species LSA, interactions between neighbours, and 159 the functional composition of the community. We additionally assessed the biomass of the 160 161 whole macrophyte community in each pond. Through this field sampling approach, we tested 162 the following hypotheses: (i) interactions between neighbours can be inferred by LSA because 163 spatial segregation should reflect negative effects of the neighbour's cover on target species 164 biomass, thus indicating competition; (ii) vertical functional traits (*i.e.* aerial and root traits) influence interactions between neighbours, while horizontal traits (i.e. clonal traits) are less 165 significant, so functional characteristics of neighbours influence their interactions; (iii) abiotic 166 variables (water temperature, dissolved nutrients, and light intensity) should influence plant 167 community biomass, either directly or through the modulation of plant community structure (i.e. 168 species richness, functional diversity, and LSA). 169

170 Materials and methods

171

172 Study model

The study was carried out in situ, at the Iles Kerguelen in the French sub-Antarctic (South 173 174 Indian Ocean) (48°30–50°S,68°27–70°35E). The climate of this archipelago is characterized by cold temperatures (annual mean of 4.6°C with few variations - Frenot et al., 2006; Lebouvier 175 et al., 2011), and abundant precipitations (range from 500 mm to 3200 mm along an East-176 West gradient - Frenot, Gloaguen, Cannavacciuolo, & Bellido, 1998, and Meteo France). 177 178 Although remarkably well adapted to cold temperatures, native macrophyte communities are characterized by very low species richness (zero to four co-occurring species per pond) (Frenot 179 et al., 2006). They thus constitute ideal simplified models to infer mechanisms of plant 180 181 community assembly, especially within constrained abiotic environments (Bergstrom & Chown, 182 1999).

183 The study was conducted in ponds at three sites located along the shore of the main 184 island of the archipelago (Fig. 1a): Cap Molloy, Isthme Bas and Cap Ratmanoff. These three sites are less than 40 km apart, and display similar climates. Conversely, abiotic conditions 185 are more variable within ponds than between sites. The ponds investigated have relatively 186 187 small sizes (average area = $181.57 \pm 382.39 \text{ m}^2$ except for one pond 180800 m^2 , Table S1). They are shallow freshwater systems, enriched by nutrient inputs from marine fauna like 188 seabirds and seals owing to their proximity to the ocean littoral (Smith, 2008). At each site, 15 189 ponds of varying area were selected to represent the variation in pond size, which influences 190 water temperatures (Bornette & Puijalon, 2011). In contrast, mean water depth did not differ 191 among ponds (19.03 ± 9.12 cm). 192

Macrophyte communities colonizing ponds are composed of six native species that can all co-occur locally: *Limosella australis* R.Br. (Scrophulariaceae), *Callitriche antarctica* Engelm (Plantaginaceae), *Juncus scheuchzerioides* Gaudich. (Juncaceae), together with three

196 Ranunculaceae species: Ranunculus biternatus Smith, R. pseudotrullifolius Skottsb., and R. moseleyi Hook.f. These species are only found in the sub-Antarctic region, and R. moseleyi 197 may even be endemic to lles Kerguelen. All species are perennial, displaying a clonal network 198 structure (i.e. plants are composed of related ramets (shoots with leaves and roots) that are 199 200 connected through plagiotropic stems). Callitriche antarctica, L. australis, R. pseudotrullifolius and *R. moseleyi* are hydrophytes, while *R. biternatus* and *J. scheuchzerioides* are helophytes. 201 Only C. antarctica develops a floating canopy, while the five other species possess a rosette 202 growth form rooted in pond sediments. Ranunculus pseudotrullifolius, R. moseleyi, and L. 203 204 australis are mostly submerged (Hennion et al. 1994; Chau et al. 2021). However, R. 205 pseudotrullifolius may also produce floating leaves (Figure S1). Ranunculus biternatus and J. 206 scheuchzerioides can also be entirely submerged, depending on variations in pond water level 207 (Figure S1). Most ramets of these species were therefore submerged within ponds (ramet 208 height = 6.02 ± 3 cm, water depth = 19.03 ± 9 cm).

209 Abiotic and biotic characterization of ponds

210 We characterized abiotic conditions every three months over a year, starting from February 2020 and ending in March 2021 (Fig. 1b). At each sampling date and pond, water and sediment 211 212 samples were collected from three zones and mixed to obtain one composite water sample 213 (30 mL) and one composite sediment sample (50 mL) taking into account potential spatial heterogeneity within each pond. As other abiotic conditions may also vary spatially in the pond, 214 we randomly positioned three (pond area $< 5 \text{ m}^2$) to five (pond area $> 5 \text{ m}^2$) quadrats (1 m²). 215 216 In these quadrats, three abiotic variables were measured: water depth (calculated as the average of three measurements within the quadrats), electric conductivity (EC), and 217 concentration of dissolved oxygen (DO) (calculated as the average of three measurements 218 219 performed below water surface, in the middle of the water column, and at the pond bottom) using a multiparameter HQ40D HACH sensor (EC \pm 0.1 mS.cm⁻¹, DO \pm 0.01 mg.L⁻¹). In 220 221 addition, light intensity and water temperature were continuously recorded in each pond, every half hour since September 2020, using loggers (Hobo MX2202) positioned in the middle of the water column. Based on this dataset, water temperatures and light intensity fluctuations were then simulated for the period of February 2020 to August 2020 (winter season) which was not monitored. Water temperatures were simulated using their relationship with air temperatures recorded by Meteo France (2020 records, Port-aux-Français), and winter luminosity from its relationship with summer luminosity (Table S2). Finally, pond area (length × width) and proximity to the closest pond were also measured in March 2021.

229 For the measurements of water nutrient and chlorophyll-a concentrations, water 230 samples were filtered through GF/F filters (0.7 µm pore size, Whatman GF/C) to eliminate coarse and fine particles within the 24 hours after field sampling. All samples (filtered water 231 and sediments) and GF/F filters were then stored at -20°C for several weeks before analyses. 232 233 Chlorophyll a pigments collected on GF/F Whatman filters were quantified using the Unesco method (Vohra, 1966) with a spectrophotometer. This measure was used to estimate the 234 235 quantity of phytoplankton per volume of water for each pond. N-NH, N-NO, and P-PO. 236 concentrations of water samples were determined using standard colorimetric methods 237 (Grasshoff, Ehrhardt, Kremling, & Anderson, 1999) with a sequential analyzer (SmartChem200, AMSAlliance). 238

239 In sediment samples, organic carbon to nitrogen ratio (C:N) was measured using the "capsule method" (Brodie et al., 2011). For each sample, five mg ± 10% of dry sediment 240 previously lyophilized and homogenized were weighted in a silver capsule and acidified with 241 HCI (2 mol.L⁻¹) to eliminate carbonates. Capsule liquids were evaporated on a 65°C hot plate 242 for 12 hours, before capsules were oven-dried at 80°C for 48 hours. Organic carbon and 243 244 nitrogen total content were then measured with an elementary analyzer (FlashEA; Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham MA, USA). The bioavailable P concentration in sediments was 245 determined following the protocol of Ni et al. (2016). Bioavailable P was extracted with NaOH 246 (1 M). Then the supernatant was collected, its pH was stabilized with HCI (3.5 M), and its 247 concentration was quantified using the molybdate/ascorbic acid blue method. 248

10

249 Local spatial arrangements of macrophyte species

In December 2020, within each of the 45 ponds, spatial distribution of all plant species was 250 recorded using five square lattices of 50 × 50 cm², randomly positioned on vegetation. The 251 lattice was divided into 5 × 5 cm² cells (100 cells in total) and the presence/absence of each 252 253 macrophyte species within each cell was recorded (Fig. 1b). Non-floating species (i.e. all species except C. antarctica) were considered as present when a ramet was rooted in the 254 target cell, whereas C. antarctica was considered as present when a ramet was observed at 255 256 the cell vertical. The cell size was selected as it corresponds to the scale at which plants are 257 likely to interact (Purves & Law, 2002).

258 We calculated the species by species co-occurrence matrix in each lattice. In this matrix, the intersection between species i and j indicates the number of times both species co-259 260 occur in a cell of the lattice. We used the matrix to characterize local spatial arrangements 261 between neighbours at two scales: (i) for all pairs of species (species scale), (ii) and for one 262 species versus all neighbouring species (community scale). LSA corresponded to the 263 difference between the observed number of co-occurrences within a quadrat and the expected 264 number of co-occurrences at the pond level based on species cover (number of cells where species is present/total number of cells in the pond, considering all pond lattices 265 266 simultaneously). Thus, negative values of LSA indicate local spatial segregation while positive values indicate local spatial aggregation. For the species scale, the observed number of co-267 occurrences was the total number of cells where a pair of species i and j co-occurred, and for 268 the community scale, the total number of cells where species i co-occurred with any other 269 species. Besides, for the species scale, the expected number of co-occurrences Nexp between 270 species i and j were calculated by pooling the five lattices of each pond as follows: 271

272 $N_{exp} = coverspecies_i \in thepond \times coverspecies_i \in thepond \times totalnumber of cells$

273

 \in thepond

where the cover of a given species is the number of cells in which the species occurred divided by the total number of cells in the pond. For the community scale, the expected number of cooccurrences was the sum of the expected number of pairwise co-occurrences between species i and all the other species present in the pond.

278 Assessing neighbours' interactions within ponds

279 In March 2021 (*i.e.* at the end of the growing season), for each macrophyte species in each 280 pond, we collected mature ramets with and without interspecific plant interactions (i.e. 281 presence of other individuals in their neighbourhood) (Fig. 1b). Ramet neighbourhood was 282 characterized within a surrounding circle of 20 cm diameter (Purves & Law, 2002). We 283 considered 10% of vegetation cover in the neighbourhood as a threshold for the occurrence of 284 interactions between neighbours (*i.e.* target ramet with interactions had neighbourhood cover 285 > 10% while ramet without interactions (control ramet) had neighbourhood cover < 10%). 286 Nevertheless, we further checked that this threshold value of 10% had no influence on our 287 results (threshold value of 35%, see Table S3). For all target ramets, neighbouring species 288 abundances were also recorded (within 5% precision), along with bare soil to take into account the overall interaction intensity. 289

290 For each ramet collected, we measured total biomass, *i.e.* including the leaves, stems, 291 roots, and one internode of clonal connection. When present, fruits were also included in ramet 292 biomass although their biomass was negligible (only 9% of collected ramets had fruits) compared to vegetative growth, in line with previous works conducted on macrophyte species 293 (Barrat-Segretain, 1996; Barrett, Eckert, & Husband, 1993). Measurements of biomass were 294 295 performed after oven-drying ramets for 48 hours at 65°C. Ramet biomass was used as a proxy of its performance. The effect of neighbouring species on species i ramet in pond j on site k 296 297 was used as a proxy of interactions between neighbours and was estimated using the Log Response Ratio (hereafter referred as to biomass LRR) (Hedges, Gurevitch, & Curtis, 1999) 298 299 as follows:

12

301 Neighbourhood functional characteristics

302 To assess the functional characteristics of plant neighbourhood, we collected one ramet (with its leaves and roots, and one connection internode) of each of the six above-mentioned species 303 when present, within each quadrat of each pond (n = 3 to 5 quadrats per pond). Collection 304 305 occurred in November 2020, and three categories of traits were measured on the ramets: (i) above-ground competition traits: aerial traits including height, Specific Leaf Area (SLA) and 306 Leaf Dry Matter Content (LDMC) to characterize the plant photosynthetic efficiency and tissue 307 conservation; (ii) below-ground competition traits: root traits including maximum root length 308 309 and specific root mass to characterize nutrient uptake; (iii) competition for horizontal space traits: clonal traits including internode length to characterize the avoidance response, and 310 specific internode mass to characterize ramet investment into resource storage. 311

To measure SLA and LDMC following Cornelissen et al. (2003), one healthy mature leaf was randomly selected per ramet. Internode length was measured on one of the internodes attached to the ramet. Specific internode mass was calculated as the ratio between internode dry mass and length (g.cm⁻¹). Specific root mass was calculated as the ratio between root dry mass and maximum root length (g.cm⁻¹). Measurements of dry masses were performed after oven-drying plant parts for 48 hours at 65°C. All plants were cleaned before measurements were taken.

We tested for correlations between all pairs of traits using Spearman rank correlations to detect possible co-variations among traits. We did not detect significant correlations between any pair of traits (Spearman's rho < 0.7, Dormann et al., 2013). The functional neighbourhood of the plant community of each target ramet was characterized by two types of metrics: the community weighted mean (CWM) (Lavorel et al., 2007) of each trait calculated using each species cover and mean trait values at the pond level (we expected plant traits to

13

differ between ponds with different abiotic conditions), and the functional dispersion of traits (then referred as FDis), calculated using the *fdisp* function of package FD (Laliberté & Legendre, 2010), of each of the three trait categories (aerial, clonal, and root traits).

328 Data analyses

The means of daily (day and night) water temperatures and light intensity from February 2020 to March 2021 were calculated for each pond, and all abiotic variables were averaged at the pond scale. Abiotic dimensions describing pond conditions were reduced to the first-three axes of a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) performed on abiotic variables, and in which data were centered and standardized by standard deviation (Figure S2).

334 Association between interactions between neighbours and their local spatial335 arrangement

336 Firstly, we used linear models to test for the effects of local spatial arrangements between neighbours at the community scale (between a target species and all its neighbouring species) 337 and pond abiotic conditions on the biomass LRR for five out of the six macrophyte species (L. 338 australis omitted due to a lack of points). We included LSA and the first three axes of the PCA 339 performed on abiotic variables as explanatory variables in the full model. Then we applied a 340 341 stepwise model selection based on the AIC criteria (MuMIn package), and selected the most 342 parsimonious model using an ANOVA test (type II). The same procedure was applied to test relationships between biomass LRR of target species i and LSA calculated at the species level 343 344 (*i.e.* between species i and j). To that purpose, we only chose biomass LRR values calculated 345 for ramets of species i having species j in their neighbourhood.

346 Responses of interactions between neighbours to their traits

We tested the response of biomass LRR for three out of the six macrophyte species (due to a lack of points), to its functional neighbourhood at community level. That is, the CWM of the traits of all neighbours and FDis of aerial, clonal, and root traits, together with pond abiotic conditions (first-three axes of the PCA performed on pond abiotic variables), and bare soil (to take into account the overall interaction intensity) using linear models. We started with the full model and then applied a model selection procedure through a stepwise selection based on AIC criteria (see previous model).

354 Direct and indirect associations between abiotic and biotic variables and macrophyte 355 community biomass

356 Macrophyte community biomass, was calculated at the pond level using the sum of the mean ramet biomass per species, and the cover of each species at the pond scale (total number of 357 cells in which the species occur / total number of cells, considering all quadrats). We used 358 Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) (Grace, Anderson, Olff, & Scheiner, 2010) to decipher 359 direct and indirect effects of abiotic and biotic variables on community biomass. We included 360 variables thought to affect macrophyte community biomass, either directly or through the 361 362 modulation of interactions between neighbours. The variables were: nutrient concentration in water and sediments (Dar et al., 2014; Schneider, Cunha, Marchese, & Thomaz, 2015), pond 363 morphometry [pond area (Rolon & Maltchik, 2006), water depth (Wang, Zhang, Xu, & Yu, 364 2016)], and water quality variables [electric conductivity (Lévesque, Hudon, James, & 365 366 Legendre, 2017), O₂ concentration (Morris, Harrison, Bailey, & Boon, 2004), mean temperature 367 (Dar et al., 2014), light intensity (Su et al., 2019)]. We added chlorophyll a concentration to 368 reflect competition between macrophytes and phytoplankton (Phillips, Willby, & Moss, 2016). Distance to the closest pond was also included as a proxy of the degree of proximity between 369 ponds, as this is known to impact plant species dispersal, and thus plant community richness 370 371 and functional diversity (Favre-Bac, Mony, Burel, Seimandi-Corda, & Ernoult, 2017). Finally, biotic variables such as richness, FDis, and LSA allowed us to quantify macrophyte community 372 structure and test for an association with biomass (Hooper et al., 2005; Monzeglio & Stoll, 373 2005; Qi et al., 2021). All possible relationships between variables were built based on the 374 375 literature (Figure S3).

To build these relationships, LSA was calculated at the pond scale, taking the total 376 number of co-occurrences between all pairs of species at the pond scale into account. 377 FDis was calculated at the pond scale (calculated by pooling all lattices), including all 378 measured traits and species cover. Nutrient concentrations in water (N-NH₄⁺, N-NO₃⁻, P-PO₄³⁻ 379) and in sediments (C:N ratio, bioavailable P) were each reduced to the first axis of a PCA 380 analysis, in which data were centered and standardized. Variables were normalized (log or 381 square-root transformations) and standardized before analysis. We performed a path analysis 382 with the lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) and reduced the full model by variable selection 383 based on AIC values. All statistical analyses were carried out with R 4.0.3. 384

385 Results

A Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was performed on abiotic parameters measured at the pond level to reduce abiotic dimensions (Figure S2). PCA Axis 1 was positively related to the light intensity in ponds which was highest when nutrient availability in sediments was low. PCA Axis 2 was positively related to the concentration of N-NH₄⁺ in the water column and negatively to the density of phytoplankton (represented by the concentration of chlorophyll a per mL of water), especially when habitat temperatures were cold. PCA Axis 3 was positively related to N-NO₃⁻ concentration in water and conductivity.

393 Local spatial arrangements between neighbours did not reflect their394 interactions

395 At the community scale (interactions with all species in neighbourhood), we found no significant relationship between biomass LRR and LSA in all species ("All" in Table 1). Pond abiotic 396 conditions, however, significantly explained biomass LRR in two out of the five species tested, 397 398 either positively or negatively. Water nutrient concentration (PCA Axes 2 and 3) was strongly associated with interactions for C. antarctica and R. moseleyi (Table 1). At the species scale 399 (LSA of pairwise combinations of species, including the target species), biomass LRR was 400 401 significantly associated with LSA (species aggregation or segregation) for only one out of the 402 five target species (Table 1). In J. scheuchzerioides, spatial aggregation had a positive effect 403 on the biomass LRR of *R. moseleyi*. Biomass LRR was nevertheless mostly predicted by pond 404 abiotic conditions in the tested species, except in *R. pseudotrullifolius* (Table 1). In particular, 405 biomass LRR of C. antarctica and J. scheuchzerioides were predicted by the dissolved N-NH4⁺ 406 concentration (PCA Axis 2), likely depending on the presence of phytoplankton. Conversely, biomass LRR of R. biternatus and R. moseleyi was impacted by the water N-NO₃⁻ 407 concentration and electric conductivity (PCA Axis 3). 408

409 Interactions depend on the functional characteristics of neighbours

Biomass LRR significantly responded to functional characteristics of neighbours in two out of 410 the three target species (Table 2). Indeed, CWM of the neighbours' traits explained a total of 411 23.5% of biomass LRR variations in J. scheuchzerioides, and FDis of neighbours' traits 412 contributed to 76.2% of biomass LRR variations in R. biternatus. More specifically, biomass 413 LRR of these two species was only associated with CWM of aerial traits (Table 2), which had 414 positive (describing facilitation) and negative (describing competition) effects, depending on 415 the target species. However, this effect was limited in R. biternatus (tCWM SLA= -0.02*, 416 tCWM LDMC= -0.006*, both traits explaining about 3.5% of biomass LRR variations). Much 417 of biomass LRR variations in R. biternatus were actually explained by FDis (68.88%). More 418 precisely, FDis of aerial and root traits displayed respectively positive (t=2.61***) and negative 419 420 effects (t=-2.55***) on R. biternatus biomass LRR (Table 2).

421 Direct and indirect effects of abiotic and biotic variables characterizing
422 ponds on macrophyte community biomass

Five out of the 13 variables tested did not have any direct or indirect effects on macrophyte CWM biomass (*i.e.* community biomass) (Fig. 2): distance to pond (*i.e.* between-pond proximity), pond area, and concentrations of dissolved O_2 , water and sediment nutrients. Regarding the eight variables that were significantly associated with community biomass, four had direct effects: water temperature (-0.32***), chlorophyll a (-0.46***), richness (0.36***) and LSA (-0.49***). A negative association between LSA macrophyte community biomass.

There were also multiple indirect effects on community biomass. Firstly, several abiotic variables modulated the effect of other abiotic variables. For example, light intensity increased water temperature (0.51***), thereby indirectly decreasing macrophyte community biomass. Secondly, biotic variables modulated each other, amplifying indirect biotic effects (Fig. 2). FDis was correlated with species richness (0.65***) and had a negative effect on LSA (-0.28*),

18

thereby indirectly increasing community biomass. In addition, biotic variables were influenced
by abiotic variables, strengthening indirect abiotic effects on macrophyte community biomass
(Fig. 2). FDis was negatively affected by water depth (-0.34**), while LSA was positively
affected by electric conductivity (0.45***). Ultimately, water depth and electric conductivity
indirectly decreased macrophyte community biomass.

440 Discussion

441 Interactions between neighbours depend on abiotic variables and their

442 functional characteristics in polar ponds

Interactions between neighbours shape plant communities, and thus drive variations in their biomass. Indeed, a reduction in competitive interactions, or an increase in facilitative interactions between species, can lead to complementary effects, subsequently increasing community biomass (Callaway, 2007; Mulder, Uliassi, & Doak, 2001). We observed that interactions between neighbours depend on the functional traits of the target ramet and of its neighbours, as well as on abiotic variables (Schneider et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2020).

449 In these sub-polar ponds, the direction and strength of interactions were mostly associated with patterns in abiotic variables, reemphasizing the need to consider abiotic 450 451 factors as major influences on interactions between neighbours (Biswas & Wagner, 2014; 452 Eränen & Kozlov, 2008). Changes in the net outcome of interactions caused by abiotic 453 stressors could be inferred from fine scale observations of species spatial co-occurrences 454 within communities (Kikvidze et al., 2005). Similarly, we expected interactions between the 455 different species and their neighbours to be inferred from their LSA, both at the community and 456 species scales. However, LSA did not reflect changes in the interactions between neighbours 457 at very small scales, neither at the community (multispecies interactions) nor the species level. Our results are in line with Delalandre & Montesinos-Navarro (2018), who showed that LSA 458 459 does not capture the underlying processes involving pairwise interactions at patch scale (about 0.05m²). Several non-exclusive hypotheses may explain these results. Firstly, the very low 460 species richness of the Ile Kerguelen macrophyte community (four species at most) might 461 cause more species segregation (Delalandre & Montesinos-Navarro, 2018). Indeed, we 462 showed that more than 70% of the significant LSA at the pond scale represented species 463 464 segregations (Table S5). Secondly, different processes may generate similar LSA in situ (MacKenzie, Bailey, & Nichols, 2004; McIntire & Fajardo, 2009; Rayburn & Monaco, 2011). 465

466 Segregation may indeed reflect competitive interactions but also habitat heterogeneity, allowing species with different abiotic preferences to establish within different suitable micro-467 sites. Similarly, aggregation is usually interpreted as facilitation but can also indicate species 468 aggregation within the same, most suitable micro-site in an heterogeneous habitat (Blanchet 469 470 et al., 2020). Finally, LSA calculation in situ has limitations. For example, if two species have opposite effects on each other (*i.e.* one species is facilitated by another that in turn competes 471 with the first one), these will result in null LSA (we recorded 53 null LSA out of the 156 tested 472 ones, Table S5). Moreover, the indirect effect of a third species on pairwise species 473 interactions (Castillo, Verdu, & Valiente-Banuet, 2010; Christian Schöb, Armas, & Pugnaire, 474 475 2013) or asymmetric interactions (Delalandre & Montesinos-Navarro, 2018) are not 476 measurable despite affecting the outcome of interactions between neighbours, and thus the 477 resulting patterns of co-occurrence.

478 In abiotically constrained habitats, high functional convergence between species is expected, resulting from habitat filtering (Cornwell et al., 2006; Grime, 2006). Yet, coexistence 479 within a community (*i.e.* the outcome of interactions) could be due to two possible processes, 480 481 both based on differences in trait values between species: limiting similarity (Kraft, Godoy, & 482 Levine, 2015; Turcotte & Levine, 2016) and the competitive hierarchy (Chesson, 2000; Mayfield & Levine, 2010). As expected, vertical traits (i.e. aerial and root traits related to 483 484 resource acquisition) appeared to play a stronger role in interactions between neighbours than 485 horizontal traits (clonal traits), in two out of the three species. Originally, we highlighted that 486 there are two possible processes of species coexistence occurring within macrophyte 487 communities, based on different traits and relationships with interacting species identities. 488 Furthermore, these results indicate that the balance between competition and facilitation within 489 abiotically constrained habitat, results from functional characteristics of neighbours related to 490 resource acquisition, not just from functional characteristics of target species. More specifically, CWM of height had positive effects on J. scheuchzerioides biomass LRR 491 492 (explaining 24% of its variation), that is, tall neighbours have facilitative effects on this species.

493 Juncus scheuchzerioides stands among the tallest species, and its neighbourhood is mostly composed of conspecifics (34.8 \pm 18.1%, Figure S4). Since most contacts between J. 494 scheuchzerioides ramets are intra-specific, and likely intraclonal, we conclude that intraspecific 495 facilitation or even intra-clonal cooperation [physiological integration (Wang et al., 2021)] are 496 497 important for this species. In *R. biternatus*, ramets responded more to the variability of aerial and root traits than to their average within the neighbourhood (68.88% against 7.3% of biomass 498 499 LRR variation). More precisely, R. biternatus is facilitated by a high aerial and a low root 500 functional diversity, indicating above-ground resource partitioning (*i.e.* niche differentiation 501 along the aerial trait axis). Thus, functionally redundant species can coexist at the community 502 scale if their neighbourhood comprises species displaying different trait values (Maire et al., 503 2012). For example, R. moseleyi and R. pseudotrullifolius, two species closely related to R. 504 biternatus and sharing similar resource use and functional roles, are very rare in its 505 neighbourhood composition (Figure S4).

In conclusion, we confirmed that both abiotic and biotic characteristics are related to 506 interactions between neighbours at species level. Multiple assembly processes operate 507 simultaneously within the macrophyte community (Spasojevic & Suding, 2012) either through 508 509 community weighted mean or neighbour dissimilarity (Copeland & Harrison, 2017) depending 510 on traits. Ultimately, this shows the importance of multi-trait approaches to better infer 511 community assembly processes (Kraft, Godoy, & Levine, 2015). Plus, we emphasize that LSA 512 does not reflect interactions between neighbours. Therefore, interpreting significant spatial co-513 occurrences as evidence of interactions between neighbours should be done cautiously. By specifically focusing on interactions, mesocosm experiments are one way to control for multiple 514 abiotic factors and environmental heterogeneity that can modulate interactions between 515 neighbours and produce similar LSA (Bittebiere, Saiz, & Mony, 2019; Brazeau & Schamp, 516 517 2019). Consequently, community-level characterization of LSA is needed as well as pairwise relationships. Furthermore, biotic and abiotic variables, either jointly or separately, should 518

indirectly influence community biomass through their modulations of interactions betweenneighbours, and thereby also influence species biomasses.

521 Joint effects of biotic and abiotic variables on macrophyte community 522 biomass

523 Five out of the 13 abiotic and biotic variables tested had no direct or indirect effect on macrophyte community biomass, confirming the need to study pond systems as a whole. The 524 distance to the closest pond (*i.e.* between-pond connectivity), pond area, dissolved O_2 525 526 concentration, and (contrary to our expectations) water and sediment nutrient concentrations, 527 do not have any direct or indirect effects on macrophyte community biomass. Ponds may not be limited by nutrients, since inputs by marine fauna are frequent, especially during summer 528 (Smith, 2008), leading to minimal impact on biomass. Indeed, the species studied tended to 529 530 have relatively high SLA and low LDMC (Figure S5), making them nutrient acquisitive, in line with similar studies of systems with high resource availability (Stanisci et al., 2020). 531

532 Our holistic approach confirmed our third hypothesis, demonstrating that abiotic 533 variables were associated with macrophyte community biomass, either directly or through the 534 modulation of inextricably connected biotic variables (*i.e.* the local spatial arrangement of the macrophyte community and its functional diversity, also related to its species richness). This 535 is consistent with Sanaei, Sayer, Saiz, Yuan, & Ali (2021), who showed that biotic and abiotic 536 variables are important drivers of plant assemblages and community biomass in relationships 537 538 with nutrients and spatial co-occurrences within arid systems (semi-steppe rangelands). In our 539 case, abiotic and biotic variables had negative and positive effects on community biomass, respectively. 540

We demonstrated that few variables were directly associated with macrophyte community biomass: water temperatures, phytoplankton quantity (chlorophyll a), species richness, and the LSA. Spatial structure with segregated species supports macrophyte community biomass by limiting competitive interactions with superior competitors (Porensky,

23

Vaughn, & Young, 2012). Furthermore, richness was positively associated with the 545 macrophyte community biomass. Several studies have already demonstrated that higher 546 species richness leads to higher community biomass because of the complementary use of 547 resources among species, and of the sampling effect (increased probability of sampling highly 548 549 productive species) (Engelhardt & Ritchie, 2001; Loreau & Hector, 2001; Schmid, 2002; Tilman, Lehman, & Thomson, 1997a). In addition, higher species richness leads to better 550 ecosystem functioning (Loreau et al., 2001; Schwartz et al., 2000; Tilman, Knops, et al., 551 1997b), and maintains some abiotic conditions beneficial to the growth of macrophytes. 552 Importantly, macrophyte community biomass is negatively affected by increased water 553 temperatures. The importance of water temperature is not surprising since macrophyte species 554 in the sub-Antarctic are adapted to cold temperatures. Indeed, although rising water 555 556 temperatures can stimulate increases in macrophyte community biomass within the optimum 557 thermal range (Dar et al., 2014), their negative impact suggests that this optimal thermal range has already been exceeded at the lles Kerguelen (Frenot et al., 2006). As water temperatures 558 559 continue to warm, the consequences for macrophyte community structure and its biomass will 560 likely be severe. We found that light intensity increased water temperatures leading to an 561 indirect negative impact on macrophyte community biomass. This observation calls into 562 question results from the literature where only the positive direct effect of light intensity on plant 563 growth rate in aquatic ecosystems was considered, and thus effects on community biomass 564 were not reported (Jin, Ibrahim, Muhammad, Khan, & Li, 2020). Furthermore, since macrophytes greatly influence ecosystem-level processes in ponds (lacarella, Barrow, Giani, 565 Beisner, & Gregory-Eaves, 2018; Lürig, Best, Dakos, & Matthews, 2021; Mo, Deng, Gao, Guo, 566 & Yu, 2015), climate warming could negatively affect trophic chains and ecosystem function 567 568 (Gutt et al., 2021).

569 Finally, very few studies in freshwater ecosystems have thoroughly assessed both 570 abiotic and biotic variables in habitats (but see Wood, Stillman, Clarke, Daunt, & O'Hare, 2012 571 and Liu et al., 2020). This gap in the literature limits our understanding of the fate of macrophyte species concomitantly exposed to abiotic and biotic filters, especially in a context of climate change. The interconnection between abiotic and biotic variables shown here raises questions about the sequential influence of abiotic and biotic filters on plant community assembly (Keddy, 1992; Violle et al., 2012; but see Cadotte & Tucker, 2017). In addition, we provide strong evidence for the urgent need to approach biodiversity structure and its influence on ecosystem function, by jointly integrating biotic and abiotic variables in multivariate analyses (Chalmandrier et al. 2022).

579 Conclusion

580 Our study brings new insights into the mechanisms involved in interactions between 581 neighbours that supports species coexistence within freshwater ecosystems and other 582 abiotically constrained habitats. In particular, we showed that abiotic variables had a stronger 583 effect on species interactions than the spatial structure of macrophyte communities. In 584 addition, we provided new evidence that biotic and abiotic variables influencing the assembly 585 of macrophyte communities are interconnected, and we encourage reseachers to consider 586 their combined effects in future studies to get a better picture of the processes underlying plant community assembly. Longer-term studies will be needed to better assess changes in plant 587 588 communities, especially within poorly studied freshwater systems vulnerable to climate 589 changes.

590

591 Acknowledgments

592 We thank all volunteers for their precious help in the field and for laboratory work. This study 593 was funded by the French National Research Agency, project 'PONDS' (ANR-21-CE02-0003-01, JCJC call 2020-2021), the BiodivERsA 'ASICS' project (ANR-20-EBI5-0004, BiodivClim 594 call 2019-2020), the French Polar Institute Paul-Emile Victor (Project IPEV 136 595 596 'SUBANTECO'), and the long-term research network on biodiversity in Antarctic and sub-597 Antarctic ecosystems (Zone Atelier InEE-CNRS Antarctique et Terres Australes). H. Saiz is supported by a María Zambrano fellowship funded by the Ministry of Universities and European 598 599 Union-Next Generation plan.

600 Conflict of interest

601 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

602 Data availability statement

All data are available in figshare (https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.21187183.v1).

26

604 Author Contributions

- 605 Conceptualization: P.D., H.S., M-L.B., A-K.B. Developing methods: H.S., M-L.B., A-K.B.
- 606 Conducting the research: P.D., F.M-B., L.S., F.V., Y.O., M.F., A-K.B. Data analysis and
- 607 interpretation: P.D., H.S., M-L.B., A-K.B. Preparation figures and tables, and writing: P.D.,
- 608 H.S., M-L.B., F.M-B., L.S., D.R., F.V., Y.O., M.F., A-K.B.

609 References

Anderson, M. R., & Kalff, J. (1988). Submerged aquatic macrophyte biomass in relation to
sediment characteristics in ten temperate lakes. Freshwater Biology, 19(1), 115-121.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.1988.tb00333.x

- Barrat-Segretain, M. H. (1996). Strategies of reproduction, dispersion, and competition in river
 plants : A review. Vegetatio, 123(1), 13-37. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00044885</u>
- 615 Barrett, S. C. H., Eckert, C. G., & Husband, B. C. (1993). Evolutionary processes in aquatic 616 plant populations. Aquatic Botany, 44(2), 105-145. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-</u> 617 <u>3770(93)90068-8</u>
- Bergstrom, D. M., & Chown, S. L. (1999). Life at the front : History, ecology and change on
 southern ocean islands. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 14(12), 472-477.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(99)01688-2</u>
- Bertness, M. D., & Callaway, R. (1994). Positive interactions in communities. Trends in Ecology
 & Evolution, 9(5), 191-193. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-5347(94)90088-4</u>
- Biswas, S. R., & Wagner, H. H. (2014). A temporal dimension to the stress gradient hypothesis
 for intraspecific interactions. Oikos, 123(11), 1323-1330. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.00878</u>
- Bittebiere, A., Saiz, H., & Mony, C. (2019). New insights from multidimensional trait space
 responses to competition in two clonal plant species. Functional Ecology, 33(2), 297-307.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13220
- Blanchet, F. G., Cazelles, K., & Gravel, D. (2020). Co-occurrence is not evidence of ecological
 interactions. Ecology Letters, 23(7), 1050-1063. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13525</u>
- Bolker, B. M., & Pacala, S. W. (1999). Spatial moment equations for plant competition:
 understanding spatial strategies and the advantages of short dispersal. The American
 Naturalist, 153(6), 575-602. <u>https://doi.org/10.1086/303199</u>
- Bornette, G., & Puijalon, S. (2011). Response of aquatic plants to abiotic factors: a review.
 Aquatic Sciences, 73(1), 1-14. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-010-0162-7</u>
- Brazeau, H. A., & Schamp, B. S. (2019). Examining the link between competition and negative
 co-occurrence patterns. Oikos, 128(9), 1358-1366. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.06054</u>
- Brodie, C. R., Leng, M. J., Casford, J. S. L., Kendrick, C. P., Lloyd, J. M., Yongqiang, Z., &
 Bird, M. I. (2011). Evidence for bias in C and N concentrations and δ13C composition of
 terrestrial and aquatic organic materials due to pre-analysis acid preparation methods.
 Chemical Geology, 282(3-4), 67-83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2011.01.007
- 641 Cadotte, M. W., & Tucker, C. M. (2017). Should environmental filtering be abandoned? Trends
 642 in Ecology & Evolution, 32(6), 429-437. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.03.004</u>
- 643 Callaway, R. M. (2007). Direct mechanisms for facilitation. In R. M. Callaway (Éd.), Positive
- interactions and interdependence in plant communities (p. 15-116). Dordrecht: Springer
 Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6224-7 2
- 646 Castillo, J. P., Verdu, M., & Valiente-Banuet, A. (2010). Neighborhood phylodiversity affects 647 plant performance. 91(12), 8.

Chalmandrier, L., Stouffer, D. B., Purcell, A. S. T., Lee, W. G., Tanentzap, A. J., & Laughlin,
D. C. (2022). Predictions of biodiversity are improved by integrating trait-based competition
with abiotic filtering. Ecology Letters, 00, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13980

Chambers, P. A., & Prepas, E. E. (1990). Competition and coexistence in submerged aquatic
plant communities: the effects of species interactions *versus* abiotic factors. Freshwater
Biology, 23(3), 541-550. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.1990.tb00293.x

- Chapin, F. S. (2003). Effects of plant traits on ecosystem and regional processes: a conceptual
 framework for predicting the consequences of global change. Annals of Botany, 91(4),
 455-463. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcg041</u>
- Chau, J. H., Greve, M., & Jansen van Vuuren, B. (2021). Molecular evidence for hybridization
 in the aquatic plant *Limosella* on sub-Antarctic Marion Island. Antarctic Science, 33(3),
 243-251. <u>https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954102021000079</u>
- 660 Chesson, P. (2000). Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. Annual Review of 661 Ecology and Systematics, 31(1), 343-366. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.343</u>
- Choler, P., Michalet, R., & Callaway, R. M. (2001). Facilitation and competition on gradients in
 alpine plant communities. Biological Sciences, 82(12), 15.
- Connell, J. H. (1983). On the prevalence and relative importance of interspecific competition:
 evidence from field experiments. The American Naturalist, 122(5), 661-696.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1086/284165</u>
- 667 Copeland, S. M., & Harrison, S. P. (2017). Community traits affect plant-plant interactions 668 across climatic gradients. Oikos, 126(2). <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.03376</u>
- Cornelissen, J. H. C., Lavorel, S., Garnier, E., Díaz, S., Buchmann, N., Gurvich, D. E., ...
 Poorter, H. (2003). A handbook of protocols for standardised and easy measurement of plant
 functional traits worldwide. Australian Journal of Botany, 51(4), 335.
- 672 <u>https://doi.org/10.1071/BT02124</u>
- 673 Cornwell, W. K., Schwilk, D. W., & Ackerly, D. D. (2006). A trait-based test for habitat filtering:
 674 convex hull volume. Ecology, 87(6), 1465-1471. <u>https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-</u>
 675 <u>9658(2006)87[1465:ATTFHF]2.0.CO;2</u>
- Dale, M. R. T. (2000). Spatial Pattern Analysis in Plant Ecology. Cambridge University Press.
- Dar, N. A., Pandit, A. K., & Ganai, B. A. (2014). Factors affecting the distribution patterns of
 aquatic macrophytes. Limnological Review, 14(2), 75-81. <u>https://doi.org/10.2478/limre-2014-</u>
 0008
- Delalandre, L., & Montesinos-Navarro, A. (2018). Can co-occurrence networks predict plant plant interactions in a semi-arid gypsum community? Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution
 and Systematics, 31, 36-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ppees.2018.01.001
- Detto, M., & Muller-Landau, H. C. (2016). Stabilization of species coexistence in spatial models
 through the aggregation–segregation effect generated by local dispersal and nonspecific local
 interactions. Theoretical Population Biology, 112, 97-108.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tpb.2016.08.008
- 687Dhir, B. (2015). Status of aquatic macrophytes in changing climate: a perspective. Journal of688EnvironmentalScienceandTechnology,8(4),139-148.689https://doi.org/10.3923/jest.2015.139.148

Dormann, C. F., Elith, J., Bacher, S., Buchmann, C., Carl, G., Carré, G., ... Lautenbach, S.
(2013). Collinearity: a review of methods to deal with it and a simulation study evaluating their
performance. Ecography, 36(1), 27-46. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.07348.x

Eccles, N. S., Esler, K. J., & Cowling, R. M. (1999). Spatial pattern analysis in Namaqualand
desert plant communities: evidence for general positive interactions. Plant Ecology, 142,
71-85.

696

Eränen, J. K., & Kozlov, M. V. (2008). Increasing intraspecific facilitation in exposed
environments: consistent results from mountain birch populations in two subarctic stress
gradients. Oikos, 117(10), 1569-1577. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2008.16772.x</u>

Favre-Bac, L., Mony, C., Burel, F., Seimandi-Corda, G., & Ernoult, A. (2017). Connectivity
drives the functional diversity of plant dispersal traits in agricultural landscapes: the example
of ditch metacommunities. Landscape Ecology, 32(10), 2029-2040.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-017-0564-1

Frenot, Y., Gloaguen, J. C., Cannavacciuolo, M., & Bellido, A. (1998). Primary succession on
 glacier forelands in the subantarctic Kerguelen Islands. Journal of Vegetation Science, 9(1),
 75-84. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/3237225</u>

Frenot, Y., Gloaguen, J. C., Massé, L., & Lebouvier, M. (2001). Human activities, ecosystem
disturbance and plant invasions in subantarctic Crozet, Kerguelen and Amsterdam Islands.
Biological Conservation, 101(1), 33-50. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00052-0</u>

Frenot, Y., Lebouvier, M., Gloaguen, J.-C., Hennion, F., Vernon, P., & Chapuis, J.-L. (2006).
Impact des changements climatiques et de la fréquentation humaine sur la biodiversité des
îles subantarctiques françaises. Belgeo. Revue belge de géographie, (3), 363-372.
<u>https://doi.org/10.4000/belgeo.12097</u>

Fu, H., Yuan, G., Lou, Q., Dai, T., Xu, J., Cao, T., ... Fang, S. (2018). Functional traits mediated
cascading effects of water depth and light availability on temporal stability of a macrophyte
species. Ecological Indicators, 89, 168-174. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.02.010</u>

Fu, H., Zhong, J., Yuan, G., Xie, P., Guo, L., Zhang, X., ... Ni, L. (2014). Trait-based community
assembly of aquatic macrophytes along a water depth gradient in a freshwater lake.
Freshwater Biology, 59(12), 2462-2471. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12443

Gaudet, C. L., & Keddy, P. A. (1988). A comparative approach to predicting competitive ability
from plant traits. Nature, 334(6179), 242-243. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/334242a0</u>

Gioria, M., & Osborne, B. A. (2014). Resource competition in plant invasions: emerging
patterns and research needs. Frontiers in Plant Science, 5.
<u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00501</u>

Goldberg, D. E., & Barton, A. M. (1992). Patterns and consequences of interspecific
competition in natural communities: a review of field experiments with plants. The American
Naturalist, 139(4), 771-801. <u>https://doi.org/10.1086/285357</u>

Gopal, B., & Goel, U. (1993). Competition and allelopathy in aquatic plant communities. The
Botanical Review, 59(3), 155-210. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02856599</u>

Grace, J. B., Anderson, T. M., Olff, H., & Scheiner, S. M. (2010). On the specification of
structural equation models for ecological systems. Ecological Monographs, 80(1), 67-87.
https://doi.org/10.1890/09-0464.1

- Grasshoff, K., Ehrhardt, M., Kremling, K., & Anderson, L. G. (Éds.). (1999). Methods of 733 734 seawater analysis (3rd, completely rev. and extended ed éd.). Weinheim; New York: Wiley-735 VCH.
- Grime, J. P. (2006). Trait convergence and trait divergence in herbaceous plant communities: 736 mechanisms and consequences. Journal of Vegetation Science, 17(2), 255-260. 737 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2006.tb02444.x 738
- Gutt, J., Isla, E., Xavier, J. C., Adams, B. J., Ahn, I., Cheng, C. -H. C., ... Wall, D. H. (2021). 739 740 Antarctic ecosystems in transition - life between stresses and opportunities. Biological 741 Reviews, 96(3), 798-821. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12679
- 742 Hedges, L. V., Gurevitch, J., & Curtis, P. S. (1999). The meta-analysis of response ratios in 743 experimental ecology. 80(4), 7.
- Hennion, F., Fiasson, J. L., & Gluchoff-Fiasson, K. (1994). Morphological and phytochemical 744 relationships between Ranunculus species from Iles Kerguelen. Biochemical Systematics and 745 Ecology, 22(5), 533-542. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-1978(94)90048-5 746
- 747 Herben, T., & Hara, T. (2003). Spatial pattern formation in plant communities. In T. Sekimura, S. Noji, N. Ueno, & P. K. Maini (Éds.), Morphogenesis and pattern formation in biological 748 749 svstems: experiments and models (p. 223-235). Tokyo: Springer Japan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-4-431-65958-7 19 750
- Hooper, D. U., Chapin, F. S., Ewel, J. J., Hector, A., Inchausti, P., Lavorel, S., ... Wardle, D. 751 752 A. (2005). Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. Ecological Monographs, 75(1), 3-35. https://doi.org/10.1890/04-0922 753
- 754 Hossain, K., Yadav, S., Quaik, S., Pant, G., Maruthi, A. Y., & Ismail, N. (2017). Vulnerabilities 755 of macrophytes distribution due to climate change. Theoretical and Applied Climatology, 129(3-4), 1123-1132. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-016-1837-3 756
- Hubbell, S. P. (2011). The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography (MPB-32). 757 In The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography (MPB-32). Princeton 758 University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400837526 759
- lacarella, J. C., Barrow, J. L., Giani, A., Beisner, B. E., & Gregory-Eaves, I. (2018). Shifts in 760 algal dominance in freshwater experimental ponds across differing levels of macrophytes and 761 762 nutrients. Ecosphere, 9(1), e02086. https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.2086
- 763 James, C., Fisher, J., Russell, V., Collings, S., & Moss, B. (2005). Nitrate availability and hydrophyte species richness in shallow lakes. Freshwater Biology, 50(6), 1049-1063. 764 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2005.01375.x 765
- Jin, S., Ibrahim, M., Muhammad, S., Khan, S., & Li, G. (2020). Light intensity effects on the 766 growth and biomass production of submerged macrophytes in different water strata. Arabian 767 Journal of Geosciences, 13(18), 948. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12517-020-05924-4 768
- Keddy, P. A. (1992). Assembly and response rules: two goals for predictive community 769 ecology. Journal of Vegetation Science, 3(2), 157-164. https://doi.org/10.2307/3235676 770
- Kikvidze, Z., Pugnaire, F. I., Brooker, R. W., Choler, P., Lortie, C. J., Michalet, R., & Callaway, 771
- 772 R. M. (2005). Linking patterns and processes in alpine plant communities: a global study.
- 773 Ecology, 86(6), 1395-1400. https://doi.org/10.1890/04-1926

- Kim, J. Y., & Nishihiro, J. (2020). Responses of lake macrophyte species and functional traits
 to climate and land use changes. Science of The Total Environment, 736, 139628.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139628
- Klimeš, L., Klimešová, J., Hendriks, R., & van Groenendael, J. (1997). Clonal plant
 architecture: a comparative analysis of form and function. The Ecology and Evolution of Clonal
 Plants, 1-29.
- Kraft, N. J. B., Crutsinger, G. M., Forrestel, E. J., & Emery, N. C. (2014). Functional trait
 differences and the outcome of community assembly: an experimental test with vernal pool
 annual plants. Oikos, 123(11), 1391-1399. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.01311</u>
- Kraft, N. J. B., Adler, P. B., Godoy, O., James, E. C., Fuller, S., & Levine, J. M. (2015).
 Community assembly, coexistence and the environmental filtering metaphor. Functional
 Ecology, 29(5), 592-599. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12345
- Kraft, N. J. B., Godoy, O., & Levine, J. M. (2015). Plant functional traits and the
 multidimensional nature of species coexistence. Proceedings of the National Academy of
 Sciences, 112(3), 797-802. <u>https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1413650112</u>
- Kunstler, G., Falster, D., Coomes, D. A., Hui, F., Kooyman, R. M., Laughlin, D. C., ... Westoby,
 M. (2016). Plant functional traits have globally consistent effects on competition. Nature,
 529(7585), 204-207. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nature16476</u>
- Laliberté, E., & Legendre, P. (2010). A distance-based framework for measuring functional
 diversity from multiple traits. Ecology, 91(1), 299-305. <u>https://doi.org/10.1890/08-2244.1</u>
- Lau, J. A., Shaw, R. G., Reich, P. B., & Tiffin, P. (2014). Indirect effects drive evolutionary
 responses to global change. New Phytologist, 201(1), 335-343.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12490
- Lavorel, S., Grigulis, K., McIntyre, S., Williams, N. S. G., Garden, D., Dorrough, J., ... Bonis,
 A. (2007). Assessing functional diversity in the field methodology matters! Functional
 Ecology, 99(5), 967-985. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01339.x</u>
- Lebouvier, M., Laparie, M., Hullé, M., Marais, A., Cozic, Y., Lalouette, L., ... Renault, D. (2011).
 The significance of the sub-Antarctic Kerguelen Islands for the assessment of the vulnerability
 of native communities to climate change, alien insect invasions and plant viruses. Biological
 Invasions, 13(5), 1195-1208. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-011-9946-5
- Lévesque, D., Hudon, C., James, P. M. A., & Legendre, P. (2017). Environmental factors structuring benthic primary producers at different spatial scales in the St. Lawrence River (Canada). Aquatic Sciences, 79(2), 345-356. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-016-0501-4</u>
- Liu, H., Zhou, W., Li, X., Chu, Q., Tang, N., Shu, B., ... Xing, W. (2020). How many submerged
 macrophyte species are needed to improve water clarity and quality in Yangtze floodplain
 lakes? Science of The Total Environment, 724, 138267.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.138267
- Lürig, M. D., Best, R. J., Dakos, V., & Matthews, B. (2021). Submerged macrophytes affect the
 temporal variability of aquatic ecosystems. Freshwater Biology, 66(3), 421-435.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13648</u>
- MacKay, M. D., Neale, P. J., Arp, C. D., De Senerpont Domis, L. N., Fang, X., Gal, G., ...
 Stokesr, S. L. (2009). Modeling lakes and reservoirs in the climate system. Limnology and
 Oceanography, 54(6part2), 2315-2329. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2009.54.6 part 2.2315

MacKenzie, D. I., Bailey, L. L., & Nichols, James. D. (2004). Investigating species cooccurrence patterns when species are detected imperfectly. Journal of Animal Ecology, 73(3),
546-555. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8790.2004.00828.x</u>

Maire, V., Gross, N., Börger, L., Proulx, R., Wirth, C., Pontes, L. da S., ... Louault, F. (2012).
Habitat filtering and niche differentiation jointly explain species relative abundance within
grassland communities along fertility and disturbance gradients. New Phytologist, 196(2),
497-509. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2012.04287.x</u>

- Malkinson, D., Kadmon, R., & Cohen, D. (2003). Pattern analysis in successional communities:
 an approach for studying shifts in ecological interactions. Journal of Vegetation Science, 14(2),
 213-222.
- Martin, G. D., & Coetzee, J. A. (2014). Competition between two aquatic macrophytes,
 Lagarosiphon major (Ridley) Moss (Hydrocharitaceae) and Myriophyllum spicatum Linnaeus
 (Haloragaceae) as influenced by substrate sediment and nutrients. Aquatic Botany, 114, 1-11.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2013.11.001</u>
- Mayfield, M. M., & Levine, J. M. (2010). Opposing effects of competitive exclusion on the
 phylogenetic structure of communities. Ecology Letters, 13(9), 1085-1093.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01509.x</u>
- McCreary, N. J. (1991). Competition as a mechanism of submersed macrophyte community
 structure. Aquatic Botany, 41(1-3), 177-193. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3770(91)90043-5</u>
- McIntire, E. J. B., & Fajardo, A. (2009). Beyond description: the active and effective way to infer processes from spatial patterns. Ecology, 90(1), 46-56. <u>https://doi.org/10.1890/07-2096.1</u>
- Mo, Y., Deng, Z.-H., Gao, J.-Q., Guo, Y.-X., & Yu, F.-H. (2015). Does richness of emergent
 plants affect CO 2 and CH 4 emissions in experimental wetlands? Freshwater Biology, 60(8),
 1537-1544. https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12586
- Monzeglio, U., & Stoll, P. (2005). Spatial patterns and species performances in experimental
 plant communities. Oecologia, 145(4), 619-628. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-005-0168-3
- Morris, K., Harrison, K. A., Bailey, P. C. E., & Boon, P. I. (2004). Domain shifts in the aquatic
 vegetation of shallow urban lakes: the relative roles of low light and anoxia in the catastrophic
 loss of the submerged angiosperm Vallisneria americana. Marine and Freshwater Research,
 55(8), 749. <u>https://doi.org/10.1071/MF03193</u>
- Mouchet, M. A., Villéger, S., Mason, N. W. H., & Mouillot, D. (2010). Functional diversity
 measures: an overview of their redundancy and their ability to discriminate community
 assembly rules: functional diversity measures. Functional Ecology, 24(4), 867-876.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2010.01695.x
- Mulder, C. P. H., Uliassi, D. D., & Doak, D. F. (2001). Physical stress and diversity-productivity relationships: the role of positive interactions. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 98(12), 6704-6708. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.111055298
- Murphy, J., & Riley, J. P. (1962). A modified single solution method for the determination of phosphate in natural waters. Analytica Chimica Acta, 27, 31-36.

Ni, Z., Wang, S., & Wang, Y. (2016). Characteristics of bioavailable organic phosphorus in
sediment and its contribution to lake eutrophication in China. Environmental Pollution, 219,
537-544. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.05.087

Novoplansky, A. (2009). Picking battles wisely: plant behaviour under competition. Plant, Cell
& Environment, 32(6), 726-741. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2009.01979.x</u>

Phillips, G., Willby, N., & Moss, B. (2016). Submerged macrophyte decline in shallow lakes:
what have we learnt in the last forty years? Aquatic Botany, 135, 37-45.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2016.04.004

Porensky, L. M., Vaughn, K. J., & Young, T. P. (2012). Can initial intraspecific spatial
aggregation increase multi-year coexistence by creating temporal priority? Ecological
Applications, 22(3), 927-936. <u>https://doi.org/10.1890/11-0818.1</u>

- Pottier, J., Marrs, R. H., & Bédécarrats, A. (2007). Integrating ecological features of species in
 spatial pattern analysis of a plant community. Journal of Vegetation Science, 18(2), 223-230.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-1103.2007.tb02533.x</u>
- Purves, D. W., & Law, R. (2002). Fine-scale spatial structure in a grassland community:
 quantifying the plant's-eye view. Journal of Ecology, 90(1), 121-129.
- Qi, L.-Y., Zeng, H.-Y., Bai, Z.-X., Wang, Y.-H., Liu, L., Zhong, W., ... Wu, A.-P. (2021). The
 effects of biodiversity gradient on plant mass and metabolism of individual submerged
 macrophytes. Ecological Processes, 10(1), 38. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s13717-021-00316-2</u>
- Raventós, J., Wiegand, T., & Luis, M. D. (2010). Evidence for the spatial segregation
 hypothesis: a test with nine-year survivorship data in a Mediterranean shrubland. Ecology,
 91(7), 2110-2120. https://doi.org/10.1890/09-0385.1
- Rayburn, A. P., & Monaco, T. A. (2011). Linking plant spatial patterns and ecological processes
 in grazed great basin plant communities. Rangeland Ecology & Management, 64(3), 276-282.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.2111/REM-D-10-00130.1</u>
- Rolon, A. S., & Maltchik, L. (2006). Environmental factors as predictors of aquatic macrophyte
 richness and composition in wetlands of southern brazil. Hydrobiologia, 556(1), 221-231.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-005-1364-1</u>
- Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for Structural Equation Modeling. Journal of
 Statistical Software, 48(2). <u>https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02</u>
- Sanaei, A., Sayer, E. J., Saiz, H., Yuan, Z., & Ali, A. (2021). Species co-occurrence shapes
 spatial variability in plant diversity–biomass relationships in natural rangelands under different
 grazing intensities. Land Degradation & Development, 32(15), 4390-4401.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4044</u>
- Santamaría, L. (2002). Why are most aquatic plants widely distributed? Dispersal, clonal
 growth and small-scale heterogeneity in a stressful environment. Acta Oecologica, 23(3),
 137-154. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1146-609X(02)01146-3
- Schneider, B., Cunha, E. R., Marchese, M., & Thomaz, S. M. (2015). Explanatory variables
 associated with diversity and composition of aquatic macrophytes in a large subtropical river
 floodplain. Aquatic Botany, 121, 67-75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2014.11.003
- Schöb, C., Kammer, P. M., Kikvidze, Z., Choler, P., & Veit, H. (2008). Changes in species
 composition in alpine snowbeds with climate change inferred from small-scale spatial patterns.
 Web Ecology, 8(1), 142-159. <u>https://doi.org/10.5194/we-8-142-2008</u>
- Schöb, C., Armas, C., & Pugnaire, F. I. (2013). Direct and indirect interactions co-determine
 species composition in nurse plant systems. Oikos, 122(9), 1371-1379.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00390.x

Seabloom, E. W., Bjørnstad, O. N., Bolker, B. M., & Reichman, O. J. (2005). Spatial signature
of environmental heterogeneity, dispersal, and competition in successional grasslands.
Ecological Monographs, 75(2), 199-214. https://doi.org/10.1890/03-0841

Shields, E. C., & Moore, K. A. (2016). Effects of sediment and salinity on the growth and
competitive abilities of three submersed macrophytes. Aquatic Botany, 132, 24-29.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2016.03.005

Silknetter, S., Creed, R. P., Brown, B. L., Frimpong, E. A., Skelton, J., & Peoples, B. K. (2020).
Positive biotic interactions in freshwaters: a review and research directive. Freshwater Biology,

- 910 65(4), 811-832. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13476</u>
- Smith, V. R. (2008). Energy flow and nutrient cycling in the Marion Island terrestrial ecosystem:
 30 years on. Polar Record, 44(3), 211-226. <u>https://doi.org/10.1017/S0032247407007218</u>
- 913 Spasojevic, M. J., & Suding, K. N. (2012). Inferring community assembly mechanisms from
- 914 functional diversity patterns: the importance of multiple assembly processes: functional 915 diversity along gradients. Journal of Ecology, 100(3), 652-661. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-
- 916 2745.2011.01945.x
- Stanisci, A., Bricca, A., Calabrese, V., Cutini, M., Pauli, H., Steinbauer, K., & Carranza, M. L.
 (2020). Functional composition and diversity of leaf traits in subalpine *versus* alpine vegetation
- 919 in the Apennines. AoB PLANTS, 12(2), plaa004. https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plaa004
- Su, H., Chen, J., Wu, Y., Chen, J., Guo, X., Yan, Z., ... Xie, P. (2019). Morphological traits of
 submerged macrophytes reveal specific positive feedbacks to water clarity in freshwater
 ecosystems. Science of The Total Environment, 684, 578-586.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.05.267</u>
- Suzuki, N., Rivero, R. M., Shulaev, V., Blumwald, E., & Mittler, R. (2014). Abiotic and biotic
 stress combinations. New Phytologist, 203(1), 32-43. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12797</u>
- Tilman, D. (1982). Resource Competition and Community Structure. Princeton UniversityPress.
- Tilman, D., Lehman, C. L., & Thomson, K. T. (1997a). Plant diversity and ecosystem
 productivity: Theoretical considerations. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,
 94(5), 1857-1861. <u>https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.94.5.1857</u>
- Tilman, D., Knops, J., Wedin, D., Reich, P., Ritchie, M., & Siemann, E. (1997b). The influence
 of functional diversity and composition on ecosystem processes. Science, 277(5330),
 1300-1302. <u>https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5330.1300</u>
- Tirado, R., & I. Pugnaire, F. (2005). Community structure and positive interactions in
 constraining environments. Oikos, 111(3), 437-444. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2005.14094.x
- Turcotte, M. M., & Levine, J. M. (2016). Phenotypic plasticity and species coexistence. Trends
 in Ecology & Evolution, 31(10), 803-813. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.07.013</u>

Uriarte, M., Swenson, N. G., Chazdon, R. L., Comita, L. S., John Kress, W., Erickson, D., ...
Thompson, J. (2010). Trait similarity, shared ancestry and the structure of neighbourhood
interactions in a subtropical wet forest: implications for community assembly: traits, phylogeny,
neighbourhood interactions. Ecology Letters, 13(12), 1503-1514.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01541.x

Van der Putten, W. H., Macel, M., & Visser, M. E. (2010). Predicting species distribution and
abundance responses to climate change: why it is essential to include biotic interactions across
trophic levels. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences,
365(1549), 2025-2034. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0037

Velthuis, M., Kosten, S., Aben, R., Kazanjian, G., Hilt, S., Peeters, E. T. H. M., ... Bakker, E.
S. (2018). Warming enhances sedimentation and decomposition of organic carbon in shallow
macrophyte-dominated systems with zero net effect on carbon burial. Global Change Biology,
24(11), 5231-5242. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14387

- Violle, C., Enquist, B. J., McGill, B. J., Jiang, L., Albert, C. H., Hulshof, C., ... Messier, J. (2012).
 The return of the variance : intraspecific variability in community ecology. Trends in Ecology &
 Evolution, 27(4), 244-252. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.11.014
- 955 Vohra, F. (1966). Determination of photosynthetic pigments in sea-water. Monographs 956 Onocéanographie Methodology, p. 66.
- Wang, J., Xu, T., Wang, Y., Li, G., Abdullah, I., Zhong, Z., ... Yu, F. (2021). A meta-analysis
 of effects of physiological integration in clonal plants under homogeneous *vs*. Heterogeneous
 environments. Functional Ecology, 35(3), 578-589. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13732</u>
- Wang, P., Zhang, Q., Xu, Y.-S., & Yu, F.-H. (2016). Effects of water level fluctuation on the
 growth of submerged macrophyte communities. Flora, 223, 83-89.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.flora.2016.05.005</u>
- 963 Wantzen, K. M., Rothhaupt, K.-O., Mörtl, M., Cantonati, M., Tóth, L. G.-, & Fischer, P. (2008). Ecological effects of water-level fluctuations in lakes: an urgent issue. In K. M. Wantzen, K.-O. 964 Rothhaupt, M. Mörtl, M. Cantonati, L. G. -Tóth, & P. Fischer (Éds.), Ecological Effects of Water-965 966 Level Fluctuations in Lakes (p. 1-4). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. 967 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9192-6 1

Weigelt, A., Steinlein, T., & Beyschlag, W. (2002). Does plant competition intensity rather
depend on biomass or on species identity? Basic and Applied Ecology, 3(1), 85-94.
<u>https://doi.org/10.1078/1439-1791-00080</u>

Wiegand, T., Uriarte, M., Kraft, N. J. B., Shen, G., Wang, X., & He, F. (2017). Spatially explicit
metrics of species diversity, functional diversity, and phylogenetic diversity: insights into plant
community assembly processes. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics,
48(1), 329-351. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110316-022936</u>

- Williams, E. W., Zeldin, J., Semski, W. R., Hipp, A. L., & Larkin, D. J. (2021). Phylogenetic distance and resource availability mediate direction and strength of plant interactions in a competition experiment. Oecologia, 197(2), 459-469. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-021-978</u>
 05024-4
- Wood, K. A., Stillman, R. A., Clarke, R. T., Daunt, F., & O'Hare, M. T. (2012). Understanding
 plant community responses to combinations of biotic and abiotic factors in different phases of
 the plant growth cycle. PLoS ONE, 7(11), e49824.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0049824</u>

Wrona, F. J., Prowse, T. D., Reist, J. D., Hobbie, J. E., Lévesque, L. M. J., & Vincent, W. F.
(2006). Climate change effects on aquatic biota, ecosystem structure and function. AMBIO: A
Journal of the Human Environment, 35(7), 359-369. <u>https://doi.org/10.1579/0044-</u>
<u>7447(2006)35[359:CCEOAB]2.0.CO;2</u>

- Zhang, B., Hautier, Y., Tan, X., You, C., Cadotte, M. W., Chu, C., ... Chen, S. (2020). Species
 responses to changing precipitation depend on trait plasticity rather than trait means and
 intraspecific variation. Functional Ecology, 34(12), 2622-2633. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-</u>
 2435.13675
- Zhang, L., Wang, B., & Qi, L. (2017). Phylogenetic relatedness, ecological strategy, and stress
 determine interspecific interactions within a salt marsh community. Aquatic Sciences, 79(3),
 587-595. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-017-0519-2
- Zhang, P., Kuramae, A., van Leeuwen, C. H. A., Velthuis, M., van Donk, E., Xu, J., & Bakker, 994 995 E. S. (2020). Interactive effects of rising temperature and nutrient enrichment on aquatic plant growth. 996 stoichiometry, and palatability. Frontiers in Plant Science, 11, 58. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00058 997
- 298 Zhang, Q., Liu, Y.-P., Luo, F.-L., Dong, B.-C., & Yu, F.-H. (2019). Does species richness affect 299 the growth and water quality of submerged macrophyte assemblages? Aquatic Botany, 153,
- 1000 51-57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquabot.2018.11.006

1001 Tables

Table 1. Results of ANOVAs performed on the most probable models determined based on the AIC 1002 1003 selection method, and relationships between biomass LRR of each target species and the local spatial 1004 arrangements calculated between this target species and (i) all species in its neighbourhood without 1005 distinction (community scale), or (ii) one particular neighbouring species (species scale). See Materials 1006 and Methods section for more details on the calculation of local spatial arrangements between 1007 neighbours. To characterize the abiotic conditions of the ponds and test their effects on biomass LRR 1008 (without interactions with LSA), we used the first-three axes of a PCA performed on abiotic variables 1009 (Figure S2). Some species pairwise combinations were not tested because of a lack of observations, 1010 and thus do not appear in the table.

| Biomass LRR of the target species | Neighbouring species | | Explanatory variables of selected model | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|----|---|-------|------|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | n | Predictor | F | d.f. | Model coefficient and its significance | Local spatial arrangements between the target species and neighbouring species | | | |
| C. ant | All | 21 | Axis2 | 29.4 | 1 | 0.21*** | None | | | |
| | J. sch | 18 | Axis2 | 24.07 | 1 | 0.30*** | None | | | |
| | R. bit | 16 | Axis2 | 28.42 | 1 | 0.18*** | None | | | |
| J. sch | All | 30 | Axis2 | 2.73 | 1 | -0.17 (n.s.) | None | | | |
| | C. ant | 15 | Axis2 | 7.62 | 1 | -0.29* | None | | | |
| | R. bit | 30 | Axis2 | 4.09 | 1 | -0.19. | None | | | |
| | R. mos | 8 | LSA | 13.03 | 1 | 0.14* | Aggregation | | | |
| | R. pseudo | 8 | x | х | х | х | None | | | |
| R. bit | All | 28 | х | х | х | х | None | | | |
| | C. ant | 13 | x | х | х | x | None | | | |
| | J. sch | 30 | х | х | х | х | None | | | |
| | R. mos | 8 | х | х | х | х | None | | | |
| | R. pseudo | 10 | Axis3 | 21.41 | 1 | 0.33** | None | | | |
| R. mos | All | 8 | Axis3 | 8.94 | 1 | -0.81* | None | | | |
| | J. sch | 8 | Axis3 | 8.94 | 1 | -0.81* | None | | | |
| | R. bit | 7 | Axis3 | 11.44 | 1 | -0.78* | None | | | |
| R. pseudo | All | 8 | x | x | х | x | None | | | |
| | J. sch | 8 | x | х | х | x | None | | | |
| | R. bit | 9 | x | х | х | x | None | | | |

1011 Notes: * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001; '.' 0.05 ; n.s. = not significant (<math>p > 0.1). 'x' none 1012 of the tested predictors actually influenced the response variable (model selection). *C. ant = C.* antarctica; J. sch = J. scheuchzerioides; R. bit = R. biternatus; R. mos = R. moseleyi; R. pseudo = R.
pseudotrullifolius. 'LSA' local spatial arrangements. 'n' number of points to calculate relationship.

1015 Table 2. Results of ANOVAs performed on the most probable models determined based on AIC selection method, and testing responses of biomass LRR calculated for each target species to functional 1016 1017 characteristics (i.e. CWM and FDis of traits) of their neighbours. Predictors in bold characters were significantly associated with biomass LRR. Functional characteristics were calculated on ramets within 1018 the 20cm neighbourhood of each target ramet, and included the CWM of seven traits and FDis 1019 1020 calculated for three types of traits (aerial, root, and clonal). To characterize abiotic conditions and to test for their effects on biomass LRR (without interactions with functional characteristics), we used the 1021 1022 first-three axes of a PCA performed on abiotic variables (Figure S2). Biomass LRR response was not 1023 tested in three species (L. australis, R. moseleyi, and R. pseudotrullifolius), because of a lack of 1024 observations (n=4), thus these species are not presented in the table.

| Biomass LRR of the target species | Explanatory variables of selected model | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|-------|------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | n | Predictor | F | d.f. | Model coefficient and its significance | Part of explained variance (%) | | | | | |
| C. ant | 24 | CWM max. root length | 3.31 | 1 | 0.05. | 7.91 | | | | | |
| | | Axis2 | 14.0 | 1 | 0.31** | 33.39 | | | | | |
| | | Bare soil | 4.61 | 1 | 0.01* | 11.01 | | | | | |
| | | Residuals | | 20 | | 47.69 | | | | | |
| J. sch | 24 | CWM height | 8.07 | 1 | 0.11** | 23.51 | | | | | |
| | | Bare soil | 5.26 | 1 | 0.008* | 15.33 | | | | | |
| | | Residuals | | 21 | | 61.16 | | | | | |
| R. bit | 27 | CWM SLA | 5.17 | 1 | -0.02* | 3.56 | | | | | |
| | | CWM LDMC | 5.44 | 1 | -0.006* | 3.74 | | | | | |
| | | FDis aerial traits | 47.14 | 1 | 2.61*** | 32.43 | | | | | |
| | | FDis root traits | 55.89 | 1 | -2.55*** | 36.45 | | | | | |
| | | Axis3 | 13.63 | 1 | 0.28** | 9.38 | | | | | |
| | | Residuals | | 21 | | 14.44 | | | | | |

1025 Notes: * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001; '.' 0.05 < p < 0.1. 'x' none of the tested predictors actually
1026 influenced the response variable (model selection). C. ant = C. antarctica; J. sch = J. scheuchzerioides;
1027 R. bit = R. biternatus; R. mos = R. moseleyi; R. pseudo = R. pseudotrullifolius. Max. root length =

1028 maximum root length. 'n' number of points to calculate relationship.

1029 Figure captions

Figure 1. a) Locations (red points) of the three sampled sites and their associated ponds on the French
 sub-Antarctic Iles Kerguelen (48°30–50°S,68°27–70°35E). b) Sampling design within each pond: abiotic
 variables, neighbours' traits to assess neighbourhood functional characteristics, species co occurrences to calculate local spatial arrangements between neighbours, targets biomass to calculate
 LRR and finally the neighbouring species abundance (%).

1035

1036 Figure 2. a) Structural equation model representing the direct and indirect effects of abiotic and biotic 1037 variables characterizing ponds, on macrophyte community biomass. The initial model is presented in 1038 the Supplementary Information and was reduced with lavaan package through variable selection 1039 based on AIC criteria. All variables were calculated at pond level. CWM biomass was calculated based 1040 on the mean of biomass per species and their cover at pond level. Water and sediment nutrient 1041 dimensions were each reduced to the first axis of a PCA analysis. Single dark headed arrows indicate 1042 direct effects. Double headed blue arrows indicate correlation between two model variables. 1043 Standardized path coefficients are given in blue for correlations and in black for direct effects with their *p*-values: ***p < 0.001; **p < 0.01; '.' 0.05 < p < 0.1; no asterisk $p \ge 0.1$ not significant. The widths 1044 1045 of the lines are proportional to the strength of relationships (values of path coefficients). Solid and 1046 dashed lines respectively indicated positive or negative direct effects. Grey paths and grey variables 1047 indicated paths and variables that did not have significant direct or indirect effects on CWM biomass. 1048 R^2 values were the variance proportion of response variables explained by their explanatory variables. 1049 Local spatial arrangements between neighbours were calculated at pond scale, taking into account the 1050 total number of co-occurrences between all pairs of species. FDis was calculated at pond scale (taking 1051 into account all present species per pond), including aerial, clonal and root traits. b) Absolute direct 1052 and indirect effects of abiotic and biotic variables on macrophyte community biomass.