

Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: reconciling the results of experimental and observational studies

A. HECTOR^{1#}, J. JOSHI¹, M. SCHERER-LORENZEN^{2*}, B. SCHMID¹, E. M. SPEHN³, L. WACKER¹, M. WEILENMANN¹, E. BAZELEY-WHITE⁴, C. BEIERKUHNLEIN⁵, M. C. CALDEIRA⁶, P. G. DIMITRAKOPOULOS⁷, J. A. FINN⁸, K. HUSS-DANELLE⁹, A. JUMPPONEN^{9,10†}, P. W. LEADLEY¹¹, M. LOREAU¹², C. P. H. MULDER^{9,10‡}, C. NEBHÖVER^{5¶}, C. PALMBORG⁹, D. J. READ¹³, A. S. D. SIAMANTZIOURAS⁷, A. C. TERRY^{13§} and A. Y. TROUMBIS⁷

¹Institute of Environmental Sciences, University of Zurich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zurich, Switzerland,

²Max-Planck-Institute for Biogeochemistry, Postfach 10 01 64, D-07701 Jena, Germany, ³Institute of Botany, University of Basel, Schoenbeinstrasse 6, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland, ⁴Natural Environmental Research Council (NERC), Centre for Population Biology, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, Ascot, Berkshire GB-SL5 7PY, UK, ⁵Lehrstuhl Biogeographie, Universitaet Bayreuth, D-95440 Bayreuth, Germany, ⁶Departamento de Engenharia Florestal, Universidade Técnica de Lisboa, Tapada da Ajuda, PT-1349-017 Lisboa, Portuga,

⁷Biodiversity Conservation Laboratory, Department of Environmental Studies, University of the Aegean, GR-811 00 Mytilene, Lesbos, Greece, ⁸Teagasc Environment Research Centre, Johnstown Castle, Wexford, Ireland,

⁹Department of Agricultural Research for Northern Sweden, Crop Science Section, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Box 4097, SE-904 03 Umeå, Sweden, ¹⁰Department of Forest Ecology, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SE-901 83 Umeå, Sweden, ¹¹Ecologie des Populations et Communautés, Université Paris Sud XI, URA CNRS 2154, Bâtiment 326, FR-91405 Orsay Cedex, France, ¹²Department of Biology, McGill University, 1205 ave Docteur Penfield, Montreal, Québec H3A 1B1, Canada, ¹³Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, South Yorkshire GB-S10 2TN, UK

OnlineOpen: This article is available free online at www.blackwell-synergy.com

Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning research has been some of the most controversial of the last decade but rapid progress has been made by deriving hypotheses from the differing view points and challenging them with appropriate experimental and analytical tests (Loreau *et al.* 2001). Here we address some recent criticisms of the BIODEPTH project (Thompson *et al.* 2005) and show that:

1. While legume species play an important role in the BIODEPTH results, patterns are not generally consistent with the multispecies sampling effect for legumes proposed by Huston & McBride (2002) as suggested in Thompson *et al.* (2005).

#Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: ahector@uwinst.uzh.ch

*Present address: Institute of Plant Sciences, ETH Zurich, Universitaetsstrasse 2, ETH Zentrum LFW C55-2, CH-8092 Zurich, Switzerland.

†Present address: Division of Biology, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA.

‡Present address: Institute of Arctic Biology, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK 99775, USA.

§Present address: Environment Department, University of York, Heslington, York YO10 5DD, UK.

¶Present address: Department of Conservation Biology, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research – UFZ, Permoserstrasse 15, 04318 Leipzig, Germany.

Re-use of this article is permitted in accordance with the Creative Commons Deed, Attribution 2.5, which does not permit commercial exploitation.

2. The BIODEPTH results are also not consistent with transient biodiversity effects. Levels of species diversity were generally maintained over the 3 years of the project (i.e. little competitive exclusion) and diversity-productivity relationships in BIODEPTH generally strengthened during the experiments.

The role of legume/non-legume interactions

Thompson *et al.* (2005) suggest that the effects of diversity on biomass production seen in the BIODEPTH project can be explained adequately by the mechanisms described by Huston & McBride (2002). Huston & McBride's proposed explanation is a complex multispecies sampling effect in which more diverse plots have a higher chance of simultaneously containing legume species, productive non-legume species and of occurring on nitrogen-limited patches. We cannot address initial soil nitrogen heterogeneity much in our experiment except at the Sheffield site where nutrients were evenly applied in solution on a sand substrate. Here, the presence of a positive diversity-productivity relationship (Fig. 1g) in the absence of soil nitrogen heterogeneity does not seem to be consistent with Huston & McBride (2002). To further examine the role of legume and non-legume species we briefly report the relationship between diversity and total plant biomass at the end of the BIODEPTH project for communities with




Fig. 1. The relationship between sown species richness and total biomass (sum of above- and below-ground biomass at the end of the third growing season) for communities with (closed symbols, solid lines) and without legumes (open symbols, broken lines) in (a) Germany, (b) Portugal, (c) Switzerland, (d) Greece, (e) Ireland, (f) Sweden, (g) Sheffield, UK and (h) Silwood Park, UK. Lines are linear regression slopes from the statistical model with significant site-by-legume interaction that is presented in Supplementary Table S1. Note differences in Y axis limits and that symbols have been staggered to avoid overlap.

and without nitrogen fixers (Supplementary Tables S1 and S2; data from Spehn *et al.* 2005). The BIODEPTH design is limited in how far it can distinguish between different aspects of diversity (including legume species) because these different aspects are collinear (Schmid *et al.* 2002). In a sequential statistical model the presence of legumes can be fitted before testing for additional effects of diversity although this runs the risk of attributing to legumes some of the effects of collinear aspects of diversity. Nonetheless, when we do this conservative analysis we usually do find additional significant effects of other aspects of diversity such as numbers of species and plant functional groups (Loreau & Hector 2001; Spehn *et al.* 2005). For total plant biomass (Fig. 1) there is a highly-significant interaction between the effects of species richness and legumes ($F_{1,159} = 10.7$, $P < 0.001$; Supplementary Table S1). Main effects are of limited interest and use in the presence of an interaction (but here it may be justified to cautiously examine them since they generally explain more variation than the interaction) but even when tested after legumes the residual main effect of species richness is of similar size to that of this group (Supplementary Tables S1a vs S1b). Individual site relationships vary (Supplementary Table S2) but only in Germany does the species richness effect depend on the presence of legumes (Fig. 1a; but see Scherer-Lorenzen *et al.* (2003) for consideration of effects on nitrate leaching as well as productivity). At other sites the species richness effects for communities with and without legumes are similar to each other (e.g. Ireland, Fig. 1e) and in Greece there is no effect of species richness on total biomass whether legumes are present or not (Fig. 1d). Therefore, with the possible exception of one site our results are not consistent with the

multispecies sampling effect proposed by Huston & McBride (2002). Further detailed information on the complex effects of legume species in BIODEPTH can be found in many previously published papers (see Hector *et al.* 1999; Loreau & Hector 2001; Jumpponen *et al.* 2002; Mulder *et al.* 2002; Spehn *et al.* 2002; Gastine, Scherer-Lorenzen & Leadley 2003; Scherer-Lorenzen *et al.* 2003; Palmborg *et al.* 2005; Spehn *et al.* 2005).

More generally, a biodiversity experiment that deliberately omitted legumes produced results that were similar to the overall pattern from BIODEPTH: a loglinear relationship between diversity and productivity that strengthened over time and which was largely driven by complementarity effects (Van Ruijven & Berendse 2005). To date only one other biodiversity experiment without legumes exists. Grime (2001, p. 309) and colleagues found that a 12-species mixture, and a particular subset of three species that it contained, showed strong complementary nitrogen uptake (long-term results for productivity and other ecosystem processes are currently unpublished).

Are the results of biodiversity experiments transient?

If the results of biodiversity experiments are a feature of the first year or two as Thompson *et al.* suggest then they should weaken in the longer-term. While we could only maintain weeded communities at all sites for 3 years (but for up to eight at some) patterns were generally weakest in the first year and strengthened or maintained thereafter (Pfisterer *et al.* 2004; Spehn *et al.* 2005), as were those from comparable studies (Tilman *et al.* 2001; Hooper & Dukes 2004; Van Ruijven &




Fig. 2. Target, observed and reference diversity levels at individual BIODEPTH fieldsites. Horizontal lines show the target (sown) levels for the highest level of diversity, 'Exp' shows average observed diversities of the same experimental plots in the third year of the experiments (with SEMs) and 'Ref' shows average diversity levels in neighbouring unmanipulated reference plots in the same year. Note that all experimental communities were at or below levels observed in the reference communities.

Berendse 2005; Tilman, Reich & Knops 2006). The relationship between biodiversity and many ecosystem processes observed from these experiments therefore appears to strengthen over time, not weaken.

Thompson *et al.* also argue that high diversity and productivity only coincide in biodiversity experiments in the first year or two before competitive exclusion erodes the high-diversity mixtures. In BIODEPTH we generally aimed to set our highest level of diversity at each site to approximate levels of diversity seen in unmanipulated 'reference' plots in neighbouring grasslands, in anticipation that these realistic levels of species richness would be maintained (Spehn *et al.* 2005). For four of the five sites with reference plots levels did indeed match relatively well (Fig. 2) and we did not observe substantial reductions in species richness. The main exception comes from the Portuguese experiment where diversity did decline substantially in the final year but due to an unusually extreme winter (see Caldeira *et al.* 2005). Another minor exception is the Swiss site where, although there were no reference plots, the highest level of diversity was apparently set slightly above that which could be maintained (at 32 species to complete the \log_2 diversity gradient) and declined slightly during the main weeded period of the experiment (Pfisterer *et al.* 2004).

Reconciling observational and experimental approaches

We propose that the apparent conflict in the results of biodiversity experiments and observational biodiversity studies arises because they use different approaches (experimental *vs* correlational) to address different questions (within- *vs* across-habitat relationships) (Loreau

et al. 2001; Schmid 2002). It is because the direct influence of diversity on ecosystem processes can be obscured by variation in environmental conditions (Fridley 2002; Mulder *et al.* 2002; Dimitrakopoulos & Schmid 2004) that it is necessary to perform biodiversity experiments and why it is not surprising that observational surveys and biodiversity manipulation experiments sometimes show different relationships (e.g. Wardle *et al.* 1997 *vs.* Wardle & Zackrisson 2005; Levine 2000). However, there are ways in which observational and experimental studies could be made more comparable.

First, biodiversity experiments like BIODEPTH become more comparable to observational studies like the one at Bibury reported in Thompson *et al.* (2005) once the designed experiment is over and the weeding treatment that maintained the differences in diversity and composition is stopped, as has now happened at all of the BIODEPTH sites (Troumbis, Galanidis & Kokkoris 2002; Pfisterer *et al.* 2004; Dimitrakopoulos *et al.* 2005). Once weeding ceases (i.e. the simulation of species loss is stopped) the diversity-productivity relationship degrades as the diversity gradient decays through low-diversity plots gaining species and high-diversity plots losing species following exclusion by invaders. As biodiversity experiments generally attempt to remove underlying environmental heterogeneity (like soil depth at Bibury) no clear environmentally-driven pattern emerges in our experiments and species richness and productivity appear to be unrelated, at least in the first few years following the cessation of weeding (e.g. Pfisterer *et al.* 2004; Neßhöver 2005).

On the other hand, Bibury could be made more closely comparable with BIODEPTH by creating an

experimentally-controlled diversity gradient (by removing species from plots – cf. Symstad & Tilman 2001 – or by synthesizing communities of differing diversity from the Bibury species pool). Indeed the herbicide application experiments that existed at Bibury prior to 1990 could serve as a removal experiment as long as the herbicide reduced diversity of the treatment plots relative to controls.

More generally, comparison of experimental and observational studies may reveal something about the processes influencing diversity at different scales because biodiversity experiments show the effects of dispersal limitation in homogeneous environments while observational surveys show the effects of environmental heterogeneity in sites with presumably little variation in the propagule pool. If natural plant communities are mainly limited by dispersal of species from the pool into local areas, and competitive interactions amongst species are small and equal, we would expect surveys to show that plots with many species also have high biomass. At the largest scales plant diversity and productivity are often positively associated but the fact that regional surveys sometimes show negative or unimodal relationships suggests that interactions between environmental conditions and competition have played an important role in shaping these patterns. Such comparisons could inspire a new generation of biodiversity experiments in which the size of the effects of biodiversity are compared to those of other factors (fertility, soil depth, dispersal limitation, etc.).

Nevertheless, biodiversity experiments may indicate the future impacts of species loss through processes that may impose dispersal limitation (habitat fragmentation, over-harvesting, climate change, etc.). The results of biodiversity experiments like BIODEPTH have turned out to be highly repeatable and have established that changes in biodiversity (both richness and composition) do have the potential to impact many different ecosystem processes (Loreau *et al.* 2001; Hooper *et al.* 2005; Balvanera *et al.* 2006; Cardinale *et al.* 2006; Worm *et al.* 2006). More generally, the first generation of biodiversity experiments has also led to new advances in relative-yield and covariance-based analytical methods (Loreau 1998; Loreau & Hector 2001), has added to the previously limited evidence for niche differentiation and complementarity effects in plant communities and has produced some unexpected results on the relationship between species traits and dominance (e.g. widespread negative selection effects (Hector *et al.* 2002)).

Acknowledgements

We thank all our previous co-authors on earlier BIODEPTH papers for their past contributions to the project and an anonymous reviewer for useful comments. Diane Srivastava suggested the regional species pool and dispersal limitation perspective.

References

- Balvanera, P., Pfisterer, A.B., Buchmann, N., He, J.-S., Nakashizuka, T., Raffaelli, D. & Schmid, B. (2006) Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning and services. *Ecology Letters*, **9**, 1146–1156.
- Caldeira, M., Hector, A., Loreau, M. & Pereira, J.S. (2005) Species richness, temporal variability and resistance of biomass production in a Mediterranean grassland. *Oikos*, **110**, 115–123.
- Cardinale, B.J., Srivastava, D.S., Duffy, J.E., Wright, J.P., Downing, A.L., Sankaran, M. & Jouseau, C. (2006) Effects of biodiversity on the functioning of trophic groups and ecosystems. *Nature*, **443**, 989–992.
- Dimitrakopoulos, P.G. & Schmid, B. (2004) Biodiversity effects increase linearly with biotope space. *Ecology Letters*, **7**, 574–583.
- Dimitrakopoulos, P.G., Galanidis, A., Siamantziouras, A.-S.D. & Troumbis, A.Y. (2005) Short-term invasibility patterns in burnt and unburnt experimental Mediterranean grassland communities of varying diversities. *Oecologia*, **143**, 428–437.
- Fridley, J.D. (2002) Resource availability dominates and alters the relationship between species diversity and ecosystem productivity in experimental plant communities. *Oecologia*, **232**, 271–277.
- Gastine, A., Scherer-Lorenzen, M. & Leadley, P.W. (2003) No consistent effects of plant diversity on root biomass, soil biota and soil abiotic conditions in temperate grassland communities. *Applied Soil Ecology*, **24**, 101–111.
- Grime, J.P. (2001) *Plant Strategies, Vegetation Processes and Ecosystem Properties*. Wiley, New York.
- Hector, A., Bazeley-White, E., Loreau, M., Otway, S. & Schmid, B. (2002) Overyielding in plant communities: testing the sampling effect hypothesis with replicated biodiversity experiments. *Ecology Letters*, **5**, 502–511.
- Hector, A., Schmid, B., Beierkuhnlein, C., Caldeira, M.C., Diemer, M., Dimitrakopoulos, P.G. *et al.* (1999) Plant diversity and productivity experiments in European grasslands. *Science*, **286**, 1123–1127.
- Hooper, D.U. & Dukes, J.S. (2004) Overyielding among plant functional groups in a long-term experiment. *Ecology Letters*, **7**, 95–105.
- Hooper, D.U., Ewel, J.J., Hector, A., Inchausti, P., Lavorel, S., Lawton, J.H., Lodge, D., Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Schmid, B., Setälä, H., Symstad, A.J., Vandermeer, J. & Wardle, D.A. (2005) Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge and needs for future research. *Ecological Monographs*, **75**, 3–36.
- Huston, M.A. & McBride, A.C. (2002) Evaluating the relative strengths of biotic versus abiotic controls on ecosystem processes. In *Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning: Synthesis and Perspectives* (eds M. Loreau, S. Naeem & P. Inchausti), pp. 36–46. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Jumpponen, A., Högberg, P., Huss-Danell, K. & Mulder, C.P.H. (2002) Interspecific and spatial differences in N uptake in monocultures and two-species mixtures in north European grasslands. *Functional Ecology*, **16**, 454–461.
- Levine, J.M. (2000) Species diversity and biological invasions: relating local process to community pattern. *Science*, **288**, 852–854.
- Loreau, M. (1998) Separating sampling and other effects in biodiversity experiments. *Oikos*, **82**, 600–602.
- Loreau, M. & Hector, A. (2001) Partitioning selection and complementarity in biodiversity experiments. *Nature*, **412**, 72–76.
- Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Inchausti, P., Bengtsson, J., Grime, J.P., Hector, A., Hooper, D.U., Huston, M.A., Raffaelli, D., Schmid, B., Tilman, D. & Wardle, D.A. (2001) Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: current knowledge and future challenges. *Science*, **294**, 804–809.

- Mulder, C.P.H., Jumpponen, A., Hogberg, P. & Huss-Danell, K. (2002) How plant diversity and legumes affect nitrogen dynamics in experimental grassland communities. *Oecologia*, **133**, 412–441.
- Neñhöver, C. (2005) The role of plant functional diversity in Central European grassland systems for ecosystem functioning. *Bayreuther Forum Ökologie*, **110**, 1–273.
- Palmborg, C., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Jumpponen, A., Carlsson, G., Huss-Danell, K. & Högberg, P. (2005) Inorganic soil nitrogen under grassland plant communities of different species composition and diversity. *Oikos*, **110**, 271–282.
- Pfisterer, A.B., Schmid, B., Joshi, J. & Fischer, M. (2004) Rapid decay of diversity–productivity relationships after invasion of experimental plant communities. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, **5**, 5–14.
- Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Palmborg, C., Prinz, A. & Schulze, E.-D. (2003) The role of plant diversity and composition for nitrate leaching in grasslands. *Ecology*, **84**, 1539–1552.
- Schmid, B. (2002) The species richness–productivity controversy. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **17**, 113–114.
- Schmid, B., Hector, A., Huston, M.A., Inchausti, P., Nijs, I., Leadley, P.W. & Tilman, D. (2002). The design and analysis of biodiversity experiments. In *Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning* (eds M. Loreau, S. Naeem & P. Inchausti), pp. 61–78. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Spehn, E.M., Hector, A., Joshi, J., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Schmid, B., Bazeley-White, E. *et al.* (2005) Ecosystem effects of the manipulation of plant diversity in European grasslands. *Ecological Monographs*, **75**, 37–63 [Data: Ecological Archives, M075–001-S1].
- Spehn, E.M., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Schmid, B., Hector, A., Caldeira, M.C., Dimitrakopoulos, P.G., Finn, J.A., Jumpponen, A., O'Donovan, G., Pereira, J.S., Schulze, E.-D., Troumbis, A.Y. & Körner, C. (2002) The role of legumes as a component of biodiversity in a cross-European study of grassland biomass nitrogen. *Oikos*, **98**, 205–218.
- Symstad, A.J. & Tilman, D. (2001) Diversity loss, recruitment limitation and ecosystem functioning: lessons learned from a removal experiment. *Oikos* **81**, 389–397.
- Thompson, K., Askew, A.P., Grime, J.P., Dunnett, N.P. & Willis, A.J. (2005) Biodiversity, ecosystem function and plant traits in mature and immature plant communities. *Functional Ecology*, **19**, 355–358.
- Tilman, D., Reich, P.B. & Knops, J.M.H. (2006) Biodiversity and ecosystem stability in a decade-long grassland experiment. *Nature*, **441**, 629–632.
- Tilman, D., Reich, P.B., Knops, J.M.H., Wedin, D., Mielke, T. & Lehman, C. (2001) Diversity and productivity in a long-term grassland experiment. *Science*, **294**, 843–845.
- Troumbis, A.Y., Galanidis, A. & Kokkoris, G. (2002) Components of short-term invasibility in experimental Mediterranean grasslands. *Oikos*, **98**, 239–250.
- Van Ruijven, J. & Berendse, F. (2005) Diversity–productivity relationships: initial effects, long-term patterns, and underlying mechanisms. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, **102**, 695–700.
- Wardle, D.A. & Zackrisson, O. (2005) Effects of species and functional group loss on island ecosystem properties. *Nature*, **435**, 806–810.
- Wardle, D.A., Zackrisson, O., Hörnberg, G. & Gallet, C. (1997) The influence of island area on ecosystem properties. *Science*, **277**, 1296–1299.
- Worm, B., Barbier, E.B., Beaumont, N., Duffy, J.E., Folke, C., Halpern, B.S., Jackson, J.B.C., Lotze, H.K., Micheli, F., Palumbi, S.R., Sala, E., Selkoe, K.A., Stachowicz, J.J. & Watson, J.J. (2006) Impacts of biodiversity loss on ocean ecosystem services. *Science*, **314**, 787–790.

Received 10 January 2007; accepted 5 June 2007

Editor: Charles Fox

Supplementary material

The following supplementary material is available for this article.

Table S1. Analysis of variance summary for the combined site analysis of species richness and legume presence/absence.

Table S2 (a) and (b). Analysis of variance summary for the individual site analyses of species richness and legume presence/absence.

This material is available as part of the online article from: <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01308.x>

(This link will take you to the article abstract).

Please note: Blackwell Publishing is not responsible for the content or functionality of any supplementary materials supplied by the authors. Any queries (other than missing material) should be directed to the corresponding author for the article.