

Assessing metacommunity processes through signatures in spatiotemporal turnover of community composition

Franck Jabot^{1*}, Fabien Laroche², François Massol^{3,4}, Florent Arthaud⁵, Julie Crabot⁶, Maxime Dubart⁷,
Simon Blanchet⁸, François Munoz⁹, Patrice David⁷, Thibault Datry⁶

¹Université Clermont Auvergne, Irstea, UR LISC, Centre de Clermont-Ferrand, 9 avenue Blaise Pascal CS 20085, F-63178 Aubière, France

²Irstea, UR EFNO, Centre de Nogent-sur-Vernisson, Nogent-sur-Vernisson, France

³Univ. Lille, CNRS, UMR 8198 - Evo-Eco-Paleo, SPICI group, F-59000 Lille, France

⁴Univ. Lille, CNRS, Inserm, CHU Lille, Institut Pasteur de Lille, U1019 - UMR 8204 - CIIL - Center for Infection and Immunity of Lille, F-59000 Lille, France

⁵Univ. Savoie Mont Blanc, INRA, CARRETEL, 74200 Thonon-les-Bains, France

⁶Irstea, UR MALY, Centre de Lyon-Villeurbanne, 5 rue de la Doua, 69625 Villeurbanne Cedex, France

⁷CEFE UMR 5175, CNRS - Université de Montpellier - Université Paul-Valéry Montpellier – IRD - EPHE, 1919 route de Mende, 34293 Montpellier cedex 5, France

⁸CNRS, Université Toulouse III Paul Sabatier, Station d'Écologie Théorique et Expérimentale, UMR 5321, 2 route du CNRS, 09200 Moulis, France

⁹University Grenoble-Alpes, LECA, Grenoble Cedex 9, France

*Corresponding author: Franck Jabot (franck.jabot@irstea.fr)

Abstract

Although metacommunity ecology has been a major field of research in the last decades, with both conceptual and empirical outputs, the analysis of the temporal dynamics of metacommunities has only emerged recently and still consists mostly of repeated static analyses. Here we propose a novel ~~conceptual analysis~~ framework to assess metacommunity processes using path analyses of spatial and temporal diversity turnovers. We detail the principles and practical aspects of this framework and apply it to ~~simulated four~~ datasets to illustrate its ability to decipher the respective contributions of entangled drivers of metacommunity dynamics. We then apply it to four real datasets. Empirical results support the view that metacommunity dynamics may be generally shaped by multiple ecological processes acting in concert, with environmental filtering being variable across both space and time. These results reinforce our call to go beyond static analyses of metacommunities that are blind to the temporal part of environmental variability.

Key words: beta-diversity; demographic stochasticity; dispersal limitation; environmental filtering; path analysis.

Introduction


One of the main goals of community ecology is to understand the determinants of species diversity at different spatial scales. Based on the inspiring work of Skellam (1952), Preston (1962), MacArthur & Wilson (1967) and Shmida & Wilson (1985), metacommunity theory has emerged as a strong framework to investigate the spatial distribution of species and the dynamics of spatially structured ecosystems (Leibold et al. 2004, Loreau & Holt 2004 ; Massol et al. 2011, Guichard 2017). Metacommunity theory has been originally proposed to revolve around four main paradigms explaining the coexistence of species on patchy habitat landscapes (Leibold et al. 2004, Shoemaker & Melbourne 2016, Fournier et al. 2017; but see also criticism of Brown et al. 2017), which can be better understood as “templates” or typical cases in which a few processes dominate metacommunity assembly and functioning. The patch-dynamic paradigm focuses on the processes of competition, colonization and extinction in networks of patches that can be released due to intrinsic or as a result of extrinsic, ~~possibly dynamical perturbations in patches~~ causes. In this paradigm, a particular emphasis is put on trade-offs to explain species coexistence at a large spatial scale, e.g. through the competition-colonization trade-off (Hastings 1980, Tilman 1994, Calcagno et al. 2006) or the tolerance-competition trade-off (Muller-Landau 2010, Haegeman et al. 2013). The species-sorting paradigm focuses on the differential responses of species, in terms of vital rates and biotic interactions, to environmental heterogeneity across the landscape to explain large-scale and local coexistence as the result of environmental filters and local adaptation (Chase & Leibold 2003). The mass-effect paradigm focuses on source-sink dynamics among communities, with species potentially coexisting in patches where they are maladapted due to the important influx of dispersing individuals (Amarasekare & Nisbet 2001, Mouquet & Loreau 2003). Finally, the neutral paradigm focuses on the interplay of stochasticity and dispersal, in a simplified approach that does not consider ~~environmental heterogeneity and~~ differences of local adaptation between species, thus explaining local species coexistence as a purely stochastic process driven by species frequencies at a larger scale and immigration rates (Hubbell 2001). These four simplistic views of real metacommunities were defined to encompass the main models and assumptions on coexistence mechanisms, both in theory and in empirical studies (Cottenie 2005, Shoemaker & Melbourne 2016, Ulrich et al. 2017).

Metacommunity paradigms and their associated models have mostly been used to analyse spatial patterns of metacommunity composition at a single date, therefore assuming that metacommunities are at a dynamical equilibrium (Logue et al. 2011, Heino et al. 2015), often in an indirect manner (*i.e.* with statistical models quite disconnected from the theoretically grounded dynamical models; but see Azaele et al. 2006 for an exception). Specifically, when spatial environmental variation is hypothesized to play a role, the most common approach has been to perform variance partitioning (Borcard et al. 1992, Cottenie 2005, but see e.g., Leibold and Mikkelsen 2002, Ulrich et al. 2017). It consists in partitioning the observed spatial variation of community composition into spatial and environmental components, measured as multivariate matrices of relevant spatial and environmental explanatory variables respectively (Borcard et al. 1992, Cottenie 2005, Peres-Neto et al. 2006). The effect of the spatial component is then expected to reflect the combined effect of

76 dispersal and ecological drift (neutral and/or patch dynamics and/or mass effect), while the effect of
78 the environmental component should summarize differential species responses to environmental
80 variation (species-sorting, see Cottenie 2005 for a classification). Such analyses of static spatial
82 patterns of metacommunities have produced numerous ecological insights on the processes
84 structuring metacommunities and their variation across biomes, taxa and along environmental
gradients (Cottenie 2005, Henriques-Silva et al. 2013, Heino et al. 2015). However, results on
simulated datasets challenge these findings and suggest that partitioning alone does not allow
unambiguously grasping metacommunity dynamics (Gilbert & Bennett 2010, Peres-Neto & Legendre
2010). Here we address whether and how analysing temporal patterns of diversity in
metacommunities allows better inferring their underlying processes.

86 Ecosystems and their constituent communities are highly dynamic (e.g., Brokaw 1985, Tschamntke et
al. 2005, Malard et al. 2006, Acuña et al. 2014, Bertrand et al. 2016), and this temporal variation in
88 community processes is likely to impair the analysis of metacommunity diversity at a single date.
Temporal data, however, should provide key information on community processes and assembly
90 dynamics (Anderson and Cribble 1998, [Magurran and Henderson 2010](#), Wolkowich et al. 2014,
Buckley et al. 2018), provided a method is able to process signal from noise in metacommunity time
92 series. As a starting point, [Figure-Box 1](#) summarizes how dispersal, ecological drift and ecological
filtering should influence species turnover and lead to distinctive signatures (Massol and Petit 2013).
94 ~~For instance, greater dispersal should entail higher temporal turnover and lower spatial turnover,
while the relative effect of ecological filtering compared to ecological drift could be measured
96 through the indirect effects of community size and habitat variability on spatial and temporal
turnovers (Fig. 1). Box 1 presents simple hypotheses that may apply to many ecological systems (but
98 see some counter-examples in Box 1).~~ While [Fig-Box 1](#) is very general and does not provide a
statistical framework *per se*, it points out predictable patterns that could be used to assess
100 metacommunity processes from metacommunity time series. To date, few studies have examined
the temporal dynamics of metacommunities (Datry et al. 2016). We here argue that this limited
102 emphasis on the temporal dynamics of metacommunities reflects (i) a lack of general ~~conceptual and~~
quantitative framework to analyse temporal changes (but see e.g., Nuvoloni et al. 2016) and (ii) the
104 scarcity of proper empirical datasets involving time series.





106

108

Figure-Box 1 Relationships between processes driving metacommunity dynamics and spatiotemporal diversity patterns.

110

112

114

116

118

120

The plain boxes represent different components of spatiotemporal diversity patterns, at both local scale (α diversity) and as turnover in diversity among sites (β_{spa} diversity) and within a site in time (β_{temp} diversity). The turnover among sites β_{spa} is decomposed into two components representing turnover between sites in same or different environment, respectively. The dashed boxes represent two components of environmental variation affecting metacommunity dynamics, namely, habitat variation and varying community size. The solid arrows represent expected influences of the processes driving metacommunity dynamics on diversity patterns. The processes at play are labelled on each arrow, and the end of arrow represents expected increase while the origin represent expected decrease (the origin of the arrow) in patterns of corresponding boxes. For instance, dispersal is expected to decrease spatial turnover and to increase local diversity and temporal turnover. Dashed lines indicate how environmental variation mediates these effects: community size negatively affects ecological drift while habitat heterogeneity increases the effect of ecological filtering. Figure improved from an earlier version presented in Massol & Petit (2013).

122

124

126

128

130

132

Greater dispersal should entail higher local diversity (Shmida and Wilson 1985), higher temporal turnover (Nuvoloni et al. 2016) and generally lower spatial turnover (Shmida and Wilson 1985). Ecological drift should lower local diversity (Hubbell 2001), increase spatial turnover (Chave and Leigh 2002) and increase temporal turnover (Leigh et al. 1993). The strength of ecological drift should further be negatively related to the number of individuals in the local community (Hubbell 2001). Positive frequency-dependent selection should lower local diversity and increase temporal turn-over (May 1973), the reverse being true for negative frequency-dependent selection (Janzen 1970). Ecological filtering should lower local diversity (Hutchinson 1957) and temporal turnover (Magurran and Henderson 2003), and increase spatial turnover between communities located in different environmental conditions (Whittaker 1967). Finally, habitat variability in space and time should increase these effects of ecological filtering (Chesson 2000).

134 Counter-examples to these general relationships may appear in specific systems. For instance,
136 Vannette and Fukami (2017) studied nectar-inhibiting microbial communities and demonstrated that
138 dispersal may enhance priority effects and spatial beta-diversity in this transient system that
140 establishes in a previously empty habitat; Shmida and Wilson (1985) explained how dispersal (coupled
to ecological filtering) may actually increase spatial turnover between communities experiencing
similar environmental conditions if they are in peculiar landscape settings (see their Fig. 5); Molofsky
et al. (2001) demonstrated how positive frequency-dependence may actually stabilize communities of
sessile organisms with short interaction ranges.

142 Nuvoloni et al. (2016) proposed to analyse the temporal turnover of community composition and to
144 relate local turnover to environmental variables. We here propose to generalize this approach with
146 two novel ingredients. First, we suggest jointly analysing spatial and temporal turnovers of
148 community composition: spatiotemporal turnover encompasses (i) temporal turnover of the
150 different local communities, (ii) spatial turnover between different communities sampled at a given
152 date, and (iii) turnover between different communities sampled at different dates. A key argument is
that these three components taken together can help teasing apart ecological processes acting on
communities through richer signatures than separate analyses of spatial and temporal turnovers (Box
1). Second, we propose to perform path analyses to study the influence of environmental, dispersal
and community context on the three components simultaneously, so as to fully grasp the complex
direct and indirect relationships among the drivers.

154 The comprehensive scheme of the expected influences of processes on spatiotemporal patterns
156 (Box 1) provides the basis for a heuristic path model (Fig. 2). We predict that dispersal limitation and
158 environmental filtering should cause a positive correlation between community dissimilarity and,
160 respectively, geographical distance and environmental distance (Borcard et al. 1992). Second,
162 demographic stochasticity should cause a negative correlation between mean community size and
164 community dissimilarity, and a positive correlation between temporal distance and community
166 dissimilarity (Lande et al. 2003). Third, differences in community size should be positively linked to
168 differences in species richness (the more-individuals hypothesis, Srivastava & Lawton 1998), which in
turn should cause an increase in community dissimilarity (due to their effects on nestedness, see
Baselga 2010). Finally, we consider that environmental distance may be correlated with temporal
and geographical distance. Our heuristic understanding of spatio-temporal community dissimilarity
patterns makes use of both direct and indirect relationships between explanatory variables. Path
analyses therefore constitute a natural way to perform an exploratory analysis of these putative
drivers of metacommunity dynamics (Kingsolver & Schemske 1991). In particular systems that may
deviate from the general relationships predicted by Box 1 (e.g., Shmida & Wilson 1985, Molofsky
et al. (2001), Vannette & Fukami 2017), alternative heuristic path models may can be used for such an
analysis.




Figure 2 Heuristic path model to test the signature of ecological processes on spatiotemporal diversity patterns. A dashed (resp. plain) arrow represents a negative (resp. positive) correlation. $\langle J \rangle$ stands for the average community size in the metacommunity, t for time, x for space, E for the local environment and S for species richness. Δ values represent difference of statistics in space and time. For instance, because it controls the intensity of ecological drift, the average community size is expected to negatively affect spatial and temporal diversity turnovers (negative arrow between $\langle J \rangle$ and β diversity).

Here, we aim at ~~developing testing at this~~ new ~~conceptual and~~ analytical framework allowing a combined analysis of the spatial and temporal dynamics of metacommunities. We first ~~review existing empirical studies on the temporal dynamics of metacommunities and the statistical methods that have been used to analyse these data. We then devise a general conceptual and methodological framework to model and interpret the temporal dynamics of spatially structured communities. We use this framework to analyse simulated data, and demonstrate that our framework is likely to outperform approaches that do not consider temporal variation, especially when studying communities experiencing strong and varying environmental filters it enables us to detect the signature of simulated processes.~~ We then apply this framework to four real case studies. We find that multiple ecological processes are simultaneously influencing community dynamics and that the environmental conditions that influence community dynamics are generally both spatially and temporally structured.

Materials and methods

Literature search

194 We performed a literature search using ISI Web of Science with the timespan 1975 to 2018 and the
196 keywords “metacommunit*” AND “temporal” on the 26th of September 2018. We obtained 265
198 references. Out of these articles, 147 actually reported temporal data on metacommunity dynamics
(Table S1). We manually extracted information on the types of organisms and habitats studied in
these papers, and on the statistical methods employed to study metacommunities.

200 *Analysing metacommunity dynamics with statistics of spatiotemporal turnover and path analyses*

202 Nuvoloni et al. (2016) proposed to analyse the temporal turnover of community composition and to
204 relate local turnover to environmental variables. We here propose to generalize this approach with
206 two novel ingredients. First, we suggest jointly analysing spatial and temporal turnovers of
208 community composition: spatiotemporal turnover encompasses (i) temporal turnover of the
different local communities, (ii) spatial turnover between different communities sampled at a given
date, and (iii) turnover between different communities sampled at different dates. A key argument is
that these three components taken together can help teasing apart ecological processes acting on
communities through richer signatures than separate analyses of spatial and temporal turnovers.
Second, we propose to perform path analyses to study the influence of environmental, dispersal and
community context on the three components simultaneously, so as to fully grasp the complex direct
and indirect relationships among the drivers.

212 The comprehensive scheme of the expected influences of processes on spatiotemporal patterns
(Fig. 1) provides the basis for a heuristic path model (Fig. 2). We predict that dispersal limitation and
214 environmental filtering should cause a positive correlation between turnover and, respectively,
geographical distance and environmental distance (Borcard et al. 1992). Second, demographic
216 stochasticity should cause a negative correlation between mean community size and turnover, and a
positive correlation between temporal distance and turnover (Lande et al. 2003). Third, differences in
218 community size should be positively linked to differences in species richness (the more individuals
hypothesis, Srivastava & Lawton 1998), which in turn should cause an increase in turnover (due to
220 their effects on nestedness, see Baselga 2010). Finally, we consider that environmental distance may
be correlated with temporal and geographical distance.




Figure 2 Heuristic path model to test the signature of ecological processes on spatiotemporal diversity patterns. A dashed (resp. plain) arrow represents a negative (resp. positive) correlation. $\langle J \rangle$ stands for the average community size in the metacommunity, t for time, x for space, E for the local environment and S for species richness. Δ values represent difference of statistics in space and time. For instance, because it controls the intensity of ecological drift, the average community size is expected to negatively affect spatial and temporal diversity turnovers (negative arrow between $\langle J \rangle$ and β diversity).

Assessing the *path analysis* framework with simulated data

We first devised an individual-based simulation algorithm of metacommunity dynamics in a discrete virtual landscape where communities are distributed across a two-dimensional grid. We simulated varying kinds of metacommunity dynamics in discrete time and analysed the simulated patterns to assess the performance of the proposed framework. We here first describe the simulation algorithm and then explain the simulated scenarios.

The metacommunity simulator

- Regional species pool

We consider a fixed regional species pool of S species ($S=100$), each species i having a fixed regional frequency χ_i and a fixed trait value τ_i . In the following, all species have the same regional frequency ($\chi_i=0.01$) and trait values are regularly spaced between 0 and 1 ($\tau_i=i/100$).

244 • Landscape

We consider a gridded landscape of 400 cells (20 x 20) with fixed null boundary conditions. Abiotic environmental conditions within each cell k are assumed homogeneous within the cell and are measured with a single environmental variable $E_k(t)$ that can vary in time (t). This environmental variable will influence the processes of adult mortality and propagule establishment in each cell. There are $J_k(t)$ individuals per cell, this number varying across space and time, depending on the balance between recruitment/immigration and mortality in each cell.

252 • Environmental dynamics

The environmental variable $E_k(t)$ in cell k at time t is decomposed into three components:

254
$$E_k(t) = g_k + a_t + a_k(t) \tag{Eq. 1}$$

where g_k represents an average environmental context in cell k , a_t represents a temporal trend common to all cells, and $a_k(t)$ represents a cell-specific temporal anomaly.

More specifically, we consider in the following a linear environmental gradient from the left to the right of the two-dimensional grid, so that g_k regularly varies from $0.5 - e_1/2$ to $0.5 + e_1/2$ according to the column of the cell, g_k being constant on each column; a_t is uniformly drawn between $-e_2/2$ and $e_2/2$ at each time step t ; $a_k(t)$ is uniformly drawn between $-e_3/2$ and $e_3/2$ at each time step t and for each cell k .

Environmental dynamics are parameterized with the three parameters e_1 , e_2 and e_3 controlling the magnitude of the spatial environmental gradient, of the spatially synchronous temporal environmental variability and of the spatially asynchronous temporal environmental variability, respectively. Note that with these modelling choices, we are able to simulate a spatial environmental gradient, but we do not consider a directional temporal trend in environmental conditions. Besides, we control the magnitude of temporal variations, but we do not control their autocorrelation (equal to zero in all simulations). Valuable information on the temporal autocorrelation of both a_t and $a_k(t)$ could also be extracted from temporal diversity patterns and in turn inform about ecological processes (Jabot & Lohier 2016), but here we will instead focus on the magnitude of these variables.

272 • Community dynamics

In each cell and during each time step, the dynamics of the community is governed by four processes taking place sequentially: 1) reproduction, 2) propagule dispersal, 3) adult mortality and 4) propagule establishment. All cells are simultaneously updated.

276 1) *Reproduction*

Each individual of the community produces propagules at a constant rate r so that the number of propagules produced by each individual during one time step is a random draw from a Poisson distribution with parameter r (with $r \leq 1$).

280 2) *Dispersal*

282 A proportion (1-m) of the propagules stays in their home cell, while a proportion m disperses in the
284 eight neighbouring cells (uniform random draws). On top of this local dispersal, additional propagules
284 arrive from the regional species pool (described above) at a constant rate I in each cell, so that the
284 number of such long-distance dispersal propagules is computed as a Poisson draw with parameter I.

 3) *Mortality*

286 Each individual of species i has a local fitness $f_i(k,t)$ in cell k at time t that depends on the match
288 between its trait value τ_i and the environmental variable $E_k(t)$ in cell k at time t. More precisely, $f_i(k,t)$
288 is given by the equation:

$$f_i(k,t) = 1 + A \times \exp \left[- (\tau_i - E_k(t))^2 / (2\sigma^2) \right] \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

290 where parameter A controls the strength of environmental filtering (complete maladaptation leads
292 to a local fitness of 1 while perfect adaptation to a local fitness of 1 + A) and parameter σ controls its
292 specificity (a relatively good local adaptation is obtained when $|\tau_i - E_k(t)|$ is less than σ).

294 The survival of adult individuals of species i is modelled at each time step t in cell k as a Bernoulli
294 draw with probability $(1-r) \times f_i(k,t) / (1+A)$. This implies that each individual has a probability of dying
294 that is at least equal to r, this death probability increasing as individual fitness decreases.

296 4) *Establishment*

298 We consider that each cell has a carrying capacity of J individuals. We therefore model the number of
298 recruited individuals $N_r(k,t)$ in a cell k at time t as a random variable having a Poisson distribution
300 with mean equal to $J - N_k(t)$, where $N_k(t)$ is the number of surviving adults in the cell after the mortality
302 step. If $N_k(t)$ is already larger than J, then no individual is recruited. This modelling choice enables the
302 number of individuals per cell to vary temporally. The $N_r(k,t)$ recruited individuals are chosen through
304 a multinomial draw with species probabilities of being drawn proportional to their number of
304 propagules that have reached the focal cell. This modelling does not therefore consider cases in
304 which propagules would be in insufficient numbers to fill available recruitment opportunities.

- 306 • Initialization of the metacommunity, burn-in period and sampling

308 The metacommunity is initialized with a multinomial random draw of J individuals from the regional
310 species pool in each cell. A burn-in period of 10,000 time steps is used, which was empirically found
312 to be sufficient to reach a dynamical equilibrium of species richness (Fig. S5). Afterwards,
312 metacommunity dynamics continues for 20 time steps and the local community composition of 50
312 randomly selected cells (out of the 400) is recorded at each time step for subsequent analyses. The
312 C++ code of this metacommunity simulator is provided in Supplementary material S1.

314 *Simulated scenarios*

We devised 6 different scenarios representing archetypical assembly situations: two neutral scenarios, two scenarios with environmental filtering and no dispersal between neighbouring cells, and two scenarios with both environmental filtering and dispersal. Our aim was 1) to qualitatively assess whether our heuristic predictions were confirmed in archetypical situations and 2) to examine situations in which temporal data on metacommunity dynamics bring additional insights on assembly processes compared to analyses solely based on snapshot data.

Table 1. Ecological processes and environmental spatiotemporal variations included in the six simulated scenarios.

Scenario	Ecological processes				Environmental variables		
	I	m	A	σ	e_1	e_2	e_3
1	+	-	-	-	-	-	+
2	+	+	-	-	-	-	+
3	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
4	+	-	+	+	-	+	-
5	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
6	+	+	+	+	-	+	+

More precisely, the first scenario represents a case of neutral assembly without dispersal between neighbouring cells ($A=0; m=0$) very similar to Hubbell's metacommunity model (Hubbell 2001). The second scenario represents a case of neutral assembly with dispersal between neighbouring cells ($A=0; m \neq 0$) similar to models such as Gascuel et al.'s (2016). The third scenario represents a case of strong environmental filtering in a temporally constant environmental gradient and without dispersal between neighbouring cells ($A \neq 0; m=0; e_2=e_3=0$). The fourth scenario represents a case of strong environmental filtering in spatially homogeneous but temporally varying environmental conditions and without dispersal between neighbouring cells ($A \neq 0; m=0; e_1=e_3=0$). The fifth scenario represents a case of strong environmental filtering with both a constant environmental gradient and spatially homogeneous temporal environmental variations, and with dispersal between neighbouring cells ($A \neq 0; m \neq 0; e_3=0$). The sixth scenario represents a case of strong environmental filtering with no spatial environmental gradient but with environmental conditions that are temporally varying in a spatially inhomogeneous way, and with dispersal between neighbouring cells ($A \neq 0; m \neq 0; e_1=0$). Detailed parameter settings and some descriptive statistics of the different scenarios are given in Appendix S23. These parameter settings were manually determined by trials and errors so that average local community size was about 500 and average local richness in the cells was about 20 in all scenarios.

Path analyses

We computed Sorensen community dissimilarity indices for all pairs of sampled communities. In this way, pairs of communities sampled at the same date report purely spatial dissimilarity, pairs of communities sampled at the same site but at different dates report purely temporal dissimilarity and the remaining pairs of communities report spatio-temporal dissimilarity. Similarly, we computed

348 spatial distances (Δx), temporal distances (Δt) and environmental distances (ΔE) for each pair of
350 communities, as well as their mean community size ($\langle J \rangle$), their absolute difference in community size
352 (ΔJ) and in species richness (ΔS). For each scenario, we ran a path analysis on such datasets based
354 on the heuristic causal model (Fig. 2) with the function “sem” of the R package “lavaan” (Rosseel
356 2012) and reporting standardized path coefficients. Since path analyses were based on distance
matrices, we used the permutation-based approach developed by Fournelle et al. (2018) that takes
into account the non-independence of the data points and that allows to confidently test for the
significance of each path. We followed a Benjamini-Hochberg procedure to adjust the significance
criterion (of 1%) for multiple testing. We assessed model fit with the Standardized Root Mean Square
Residual (SRMR) that is a standard measure of model fit for path analyses.

Empirical datasets

A-Freshwater fishes

We tested the applicability of our conceptual framework on four case studies. The first case study is
based on the AFB (“Agence Française pour la Biodiversité”, i.e. the French Agency for Biodiversity)
database synthesizing freshwater fish communities from yearly samples in more than 1500 sites in
France (Poulet et al. 2011). Here, we restrain our analysis to a subset synthesizing temporal data
from the Garonne-Dordogne river drainage in South-Western France (see Fournelle et al. 2016 for
details). This sub-dataset included 32 sites that were thoroughly monitored each year between 1995
and 2011 and for which precise environmental variables were available. This dataset included 51 fish
species, for a total of 257,393 sampled fishes. Six environmental variables were recorded for each
site: elevation, slope, average temperature in January 2011, average temperature in July 2011, width
of the minor bed, and width of the water slide. The first five variables were temporally constant,
while the last variable varied from year to year. Geographical distance between sites was computed
along the river using the Carthage dataset of the IGN (French National Geographical Institute). We
used log-transformed distances in the analyses reported here, but results were qualitatively similar
when using raw distances.

B-Aquatic invertebrates

The second dataset compiles aquatic invertebrate communities across the Rhône river drainage in
France. Benthic invertebrates were sampled on 6 sites of 11 different watersheds for a total of 66
sites. They were sampled for six months consecutively from the end of autumn to the beginning of
summer for two years, 2014 and 2015, for a total of 12 sampling dates. The rivers considered are
intermittent and as such, subject to temporary cessation of flow and/or absence of surface water;
when some sites were dry, they were not sampled at this date. Invertebrates were identified to the
genus level but information was kept at the family level when no taxa were identified at the genus
level for this family, resulting in a total of 231 taxa. Five environmental variables were measured for
each site at each sampling date: temperature, pH, conductivity, concentration in dioxygen and
number of days since the last rewetting event of the watershed. Log-transformed Euclidean
distances between sites were used as a proxy of spatial effect.

C-Freshwater snails

388 The third dataset concerns the malacological fauna – 27 species - of a freshwater ponds network in
the Guadeloupe Island (Lesser Antilles). 250 sites are yearly sampled since 2001 (17 years), where
390 species densities are recorded. Species densities were multiplied by pond area to obtain estimated
species abundances in each pond that were subsequently log-transformed. Each site is characterized
392 by six temporally constant environmental variables (size, depth, vegetation cover, water quality,
litter and a synthetic index of hydrological and vegetation stability, see Lamy et al. 2013 for
394 additional details), and one temporally varying but spatially constant variable (annual rainfall).
Geographical distances among sites were computed as Euclidean distances and were log-
396 transformed. Missing data and empty sites were removed prior to analyses leading to a total of ca.
2800 samples.

398 *D-Aquatic plants*


The fourth dataset compiles aquatic plant communities in shallow lakes used for fish farming. These
400 lakes are in general dried out during one year every 3 years. Twenty-four shallow lakes were sampled
from 2 to 7 years between 2008 and 2015, for a total of 81 sampling events and 84 sampled plant
402 species (Arthaud et al. 2013). Average species cover was multiplied by lake areas to obtain estimated
species abundances in each lake. Two environmental variables were used: chlorophyll a
404 concentration that corresponds to water turbidity and light transmission, and the number of years
since the last drying event.

406

Results

408 *Empirical studies of the temporal dynamics of metacommunities*

~~The number of studies addressing temporal dynamics of metacommunities (147 studies in total) is
410 rather small compared to the large number of references on metacommunities (1679 references for
the single keyword “metacommunit*” for the same timespan) but they are increasing, especially
412 since 2010 (Fig. 3A). The studies primarily concerned freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems, with
marine ecosystems being less studied (Fig. 3B). Terrestrial studies were performed essentially in
414 grasslands and forests (Table S1). Freshwater studies were for one half located in lakes and ponds
and for one half in river systems (Table S1). A wide range of taxa were represented (Fig. 3D, Table
416 S1). Among the statistical approaches used, the most common consisted in repeating static analyses
across sampling periods (Fig. 3C). Temporal turnover analyses were also used in almost half of the
418 studies, while other statistical approaches were less frequently used (Fig. 3C).~~




420 **Figure 3** Results of the literature search. Panel A: Yearly numbers (dashed line) and cumulative
 422 numbers (plain line) of scientific articles with temporal data on metacommunities. Panel B: repartition
 across main types of ecosystems. Panel C: repartition across methodologies used. Panel D: repartition
 across main taxa. More details are provided in Table S1.

424

Analysis of simulated data

426 The path analysis on simulated data confirmed our heuristic predictions regarding the paths
 produced by each ecological process. In the two neutral scenarios, a positive correlation between
 428 geographical distance and spatiotemporal community dissimilarity was found (Fig. 34a,b). For the
 first scenario without local dispersal (Fig. 34a), this correlation was modest and was solely due to
 430 smaller values of dissimilarity across time within a patch, compared to values of dissimilarity among
 distinct communities, but without any effect of distance past this distinction (Fig. S56). The
 432 correlation was larger in the second scenario with local dispersal since distance is expected to affect
 the degree of overlap of local communities (Fig. 34b). Under the species-sorting scenarios without

434 local dispersal among patches, environmental filtering was found to produce a positive correlation
 between environmental distance and community dissimilarity (Fig. 34c,d), as well as a positive
 436 correlation between geographical distance and environmental distance in the spatially structured
 environmental scenario (Fig. 34c). When all processes were simultaneously at play, the path analysis
 438 successfully detected all the predicted paths (Fig. 34e). Finally, in the last temporally varying
 environmental scenario without spatial structure, the path analysis successfully detected the effect
 440 of environmental distance and temporal distance on community dissimilarity (Fig. 34f). Some
 scenarios also led to positive correlations between the difference in community size and the
 442 difference in local species richness and between the difference in local species richness and
 community dissimilarity, as initially predicted (Fig. 34a-e). Note that no simulated scenario enabled
 444 us to evidence a direct link between mean community size and community dissimilarity, since
 communities did not much vary in size in the simulations (by construction). In summary, our
 446 application of a causal modelling framework to simulated data enabled us to validate our heuristic
 448 predictions and to show that the modelling framework allows reliable inference of the ecological
processes driving spatiotemporal variation in community composition, for contrasted simulation
scenarios.



450
 452 **Figure 34** Path analyses on the six simulated scenarios. Arrows depict significant effects. Arrow width
 represents the strength of the standardized estimates. Numerical values are reported in Table S43.
 454 The average community size ($\langle J \rangle$) was omitted from these figures since it never had a significant
 effect in the simulations that harboured almost constant community sizes in the landscape.


456 ~~Our application of a causal modelling framework to simulated data enabled us to validate our~~
458 ~~heuristic predictions and to show that the modelling framework allows reliable inference of the~~
~~ecological processes driving spatiotemporal variation in community composition, for contrasted~~
~~simulation scenarios. Furthermore, we investigated whether this spatiotemporal framework could~~
460 ~~provide greater statistical power to detect the signature of environmental filtering in temporally~~
~~varying environments, compared to standard spatial approaches. For this purpose, we studied the~~
462 ~~sixth scenario representing a case in which environmental filtering is strong and in which~~
~~environment varies both spatially and temporally. In this last scenario, we did find a stronger~~
464 ~~correlation between environmental distance and community dissimilarity when considering the full~~
~~spatiotemporal dataset ($\rho = 0.73$) or the temporal dataset alone comprising intra-site temporal~~
466 ~~community dissimilarities ($\rho = 0.72$), than when considering the spatial dataset alone comprising~~
~~inter-site community dissimilarities ($\rho = 0.48$). In the fifth scenario in which environmental variation~~
468 ~~is spatially structured and temporally varying, the spatiotemporal approach is again the most~~
~~efficient ($\rho = 0.91$), followed by the pure spatial approach ($\rho = 0.88$) and the pure temporal approach~~
470 ~~($\rho = 0.73$).~~

472 *Analysis of empirical datasets*

Applied to the four datasets, our statistical framework revealed very consistent patterns across case
474 studies (Fig. 54). The influence of demographic stochasticity was evidenced in all case studies (see
the dashed lines from $\langle J \rangle$ to β_{sor}). Geographic distances Δx were found to affect community
476 dissimilarity (β_{sor}) in all case studies, both directly (putatively through dispersal limitation) and
indirectly through environmental distances ΔE . Environmental distances ΔE were found to influence
478 community dissimilarity (β_{sor}) in all case studies. Temporal distances Δt were found to impinge on
environmental distances in three of the four case studies and directly affect community dissimilarity
480 in half of the case studies. Finally, differences in local species richness ΔS were found to affect
community dissimilarity in all case studies, with differences in local community sizes ΔJ influencing
482 ΔS in three of the four case studies. This last result confirms the importance of taking this variable ΔS
into account when assessing the drivers of community dissimilarity.

484 Although we found support for the three main types of ecological drivers (demographic stochasticity,
environmental variation and dispersal limitation), environmental variation was generally the
486 strongest driver of community dissimilarity. This environmental variation was both spatially and
temporally structured in three of the four case studies (see the arrows from Δx and Δt towards ΔE).
488 This further supports our call for an integrated spatiotemporal appraisal of metacommunity patterns.

490



492

Figure 45 Path analyses for the four empirical datasets. a: freshwater fishes. b: aquatic invertebrates. c: molluscs. d: aquatic plants. Arrow width represents the strength of the standardized estimates. Dashed lines represent negative relationships. Paths from and towards ΔE were pooled in single arrows by summing the absolute values of the significant paths associated to each environmental variable. Only significant paths are shown. Numerical values of the standardized coefficients and of the associated p-values are reported in Tables S121-145. [Values of the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual \(SRMR\) are mentioned for each dataset.](#) Fish by Vladimir Belochkin, shrimp by Ana María Lora Macias, snail by Vega Asensio and cattail by Alex Muravev from the Noun Project.

500

Discussion

502 **The benefits of analysing spatiotemporal community turnover**

Our analyses of simulated metacommunities demonstrate that the causal analysis of spatiotemporal
504 turnover indices allows detecting the influences of dispersal, demographic stochasticity and
environmental filtering on metacommunity dynamics (Fig. 34). We are confident that the proposed
506 framework is robust and general since we examined strongly contrasted scenarios that all lead to
path analysis results that were consistent with simulation choices. These analyses also point out that
508 a spatiotemporal analysis is more powerful than purely spatial or purely temporal analyses for
detecting the effect of environmental filtering, especially for spatially heterogeneous and temporally
510 varying environmental conditions (Fig. 34e,f). In such conditions, knowing both the previous and
current compositional states of the local community is indeed likely to be key to understand its
512 driving forces, hence the power of analysing temporal turnover rather than solely spatial turnover.
Still, even in such cases, the spatial structure in terms of mean environmental conditions is likely to
514 contain valuable signal indicative of metacommunity processes (in particular dispersal limitation and
environmental filtering), hence the larger power of a spatiotemporal analysis compared to a purely
516 temporal one.

518 **Detecting the contributions of entangled ecological processes**

In the proposed causal modelling framework, the relative strengths of the paths can be interpreted
520 as reflecting the respective impacts of the underlying ecological processes on community turnover:
the path from geographical distance (Δx) to β sor represents the effect of dispersal on community
522 turnover, the one from environmental distance (ΔE) encapsulates the effect of environmental
filtering and the ones from mean community size ($\langle J \rangle$) and temporal distance (Δt) encapsulate the
524 effect of demographic stochasticity (ecological drift). Indirect paths from Δx and Δt through ΔE
encapsulate the spatiotemporal structure of environmental variability, that is, whether
526 environmental variation is mainly spatial or temporal. Finally, differences in community size (ΔJ) can
affect differences in species richness (ΔS) through the so-called more-individuals hypothesis
528 (Srivastava & Lawton 1998; Storch et al. 2018), and this may in turn affect community turnover
(Fig. 2). Specific hypotheses on the drivers of these differences could be easily included in this
530 framework, by adding other paths and driving variables to represent these hypotheses.

Applied to the fish metacommunity data, this spatiotemporal framework revealed that the turnover
532 in fish community composition at yearly and regional scales is mainly driven by environmental
filtering, although demographic stochasticity and dispersal do contribute to community turnover (Fig.
534 45a). Another main driver of community turnover is the heterogeneity in richness among local
communities (ΔS), which we interpret as a nuisance variable here, since we do not have specific
536 hypotheses on what may drive this heterogeneity beyond differences in community size (ΔJ).
Alternative – yet non-exclusive – explanations for the observed variability in local species richness
538 include the presence of a natural upstream-downstream gradient in species richness with more
species near the outlet of the river networks (Muneepeerakul et al. 2008, Blanchet et al. 2014) and
540 the introduction of non-native species that may not be homogeneous across the river network. Our
analysis reveals that such potential drivers may have a dominant impact on the overall fish
542 metacommunity structure at the regional scale.

544 Applied to the invertebrate metacommunity data, the main driver of community turnover was also
546 the heterogeneity in richness among local communities (Fig. 54b). This may result from the fact that
548 this dataset comprises perennial and intermittent sites, and the latter ones generally harbour
550 species-poor, original communities with taxa especially adapted to recover from disturbances (Datry
et al. 2014). The other main drivers were demographic stochasticity and dispersal which may be
explained by the intensity of local disturbances and regional disconnections caused by drying events.
Temporal and spatial distances also have a strong effect on environmental distances as expected for
intermittent rivers, as the stochasticity of drying events leads to a high spatiotemporal variability of
the environment.

552 For the last two datasets, environmental variation was found to be the main driver of community
dissimilarity. This environmental variation was found to be both spatially and temporally structured.
554 This highlights the fact that environmental filtering is both varying across space and time. This further
supports our call for an integrated spatiotemporal approach to analyse metacommunity patterns and
556 to better decipher the ecological drivers that shape metacommunity dynamics.

558 More generally, we found very consistent results among the four case studies despite the variety of
sampled taxonomic groups (plants, aquatic invertebrates, molluscs and fishes) and habitats (lakes,
ponds, perennial streams and intermittent rivers). This may indicate the generality of the significance
560 of the spatiotemporal variation of environmental conditions for metacommunity dynamics.
Ecologists should therefore urgently embrace a more dynamical view of metacommunity assembly
562 and look beyond the predominant perspective which considers communities as assembled through
temporally fixed environmental filters. This present contribution offers a pragmatic way forward in
564 this direction.

566 Applying the proposed framework to metacommunity data

568 The proposed framework requires temporal data of metacommunity composition and temporal
environmental variables that are thought to be influential for the system studied. Since the approach
is exploratory, it does not require a minimal amount of sampled dates nor of sampled locations
570 (beyond 2) to be operational. In the studied datasets, the number of sampled dates varied
from 2 to 17, while the number of sampled locations varied from 24 to 250. Our approach relies on
572 the analysis of community dissimilarity indices, so that it can be applied to species-rich communities
that contain a substantial amount of rare species with low occurrence frequencies. The proposed
574 approach is easy to conduct, since it does not require any advanced statistical training. It enables
to allow performing a first exploratory analysis of empirical data to assess the respective influences
576 of complementary drivers of metacommunity dynamics (see Kingsolver & Schemske 1991 and
Shiple 2000 for related discussions).

578 As explained in Box 1, some ecological systems may deviate from our general predictions for a
variety of reasons. For such systems, users should consider to building alternative heuristic path
580 models that may be biologically more pertinent relevant biologically. Such alternative path models
may assume a different set of paths between the variables depicted in Fig. 2, or they may assume
582 opposite signs for the predicted relationships, or they may even make use of alternative variables in
the analysis. For instance, environmental variables may have display cyclic temporal dynamics. In

584 such cases, it may be more pertinent to consider phase difference rather than absolute time
586 difference (Δt). Another example is the one of disease or population outbreaks that travel through
588 space and sometimes constitute a genuine environmental perturbation for entire communities (e.g.,
590 a polyphagous moth defoliator for tree communities, Tenow et al. 2013). In this case again, absolute
592 time may not be a pertinent variable and may be fruitfully replaced by the state of outbreak ($x-vt$)
where v is the speed of the travelling wave and x is the position of the site considered. Besides, we
proposed as Our proposition is a simple and versatile approach to analyse standardized path
coefficients, although this may not always be the choice to be favoured (Grace & Bollen 2005), so
that researchers should evaluate the pros and cons of this choice for their particular case study.

Although the proposed framework appears powerful and robust, it is important to keep in mind that
only simple linear relationships are modelled in the path analysis. Our analysis of simulated datasets
supports this simple assumption (Fig. S5-10) and variable transformation procedures ~~may~~ can be used
to correct obvious non-linearities, as done here for some empirical case studies using log-
transformation of geographical distances. Still, results should be solely interpreted as rough
estimates of the respective influences of dispersal, demographic stochasticity and environmental
filtering on community dynamics. Explored path models are therefore not meant to be predictive.
For such an endeavour, process-based dynamical models of metacommunity dynamics may be a
much more suited way forward.

602

604 **Linking the proposed framework to process-based dynamical models**

Although the proposed framework appears powerful and robust, it is important to keep in mind that
only simple statistical relationships are modelled in the path analysis. Consequently, results should
be solely interpreted as rough estimates of the respective influences of dispersal, demographic
stochasticity and environmental filtering on community dynamics. ~~To go beyond the exploratory~~
~~analysis enabled by the present approach, M~~ more detailed inferences need to be grounded on more
mechanistic modelling tailored to the particular case study (Evans et al. 2013, Mouquet et al. 2015).
Such process-based dynamical models, however, require much more data on the system studied to
be ~~pertinent~~ relevant.

By enabling the identification of important drivers of metacommunity dynamics, the proposed
framework can help design relevant process-based models that focus on the most influential
processes.

Several types of process-based models can be distinguished in this respect. Ovaskainen et al. (2017)
recently proposed to devise community models as hierarchical models of individual species
dynamics. Such an approach is best suited for communities with a modest number of species that
have sufficiently large occurrence frequencies to inform the model parameters. This approach is still
to be extended to deal with temporal abundance data (Ovaskainen et al. 2017). Other even more
demanding approaches rely on detailed individual-based models of metacommunity dynamics
~~that~~ Such models can ~~then~~ be compared to field data thanks to computer-intensive statistical
techniques such as approximate Bayesian computation (ABC, Beaumont 2010, Jabot et al. 2013).

624 Although several metacommunity simulators have been developed and distributed (e.g.,
Münkemüller & Gallien 2015, Keyel et al. 2016, Sokol et al. 2017, Munoz et al. 2018), tailoring a
626 spatially explicit metacommunity simulator to a specific case study to perform a genuine model-
based ABC inference from metacommunity time series is still a challenge ahead.

628

Acknowledgments

630 This work has been funded by the Irstea-Carnot project “MetaRISC”. This research was financed by
the French government IDEX-ISITE initiative 16-IDEX-0001 (CAP 20-25). It has been partly undertaken
632 at SETE, a laboratory which is part of the “Laboratoire d’Excellence” (LABEX) entitled TULIP (ANR-10-
LABX-41). FM is funded by the CNRS and the ANR-funded ARSENIC and NGB projects (grants no. ANR-
634 14-CE02-0012 and ANR-17-CE32-0011).

636

References

- 638 Acuña, V., Datry, T., Marshall, J., Barceló, D., Dahm, C.N., Ginebreda, A. *et al.* (2014). Why should we
care about temporary waterways? *Science*, 343, 1080-1081.
- 640 Anderson, M.J. & Cribble, N.A. (1998). Partitioning the variation among spatial, temporal and
environmental components in a multivariate data set. *Austr. Ecol.*, 23, 158-167.
- 642 Amarasekare, P. & Nisbet, R.M. (2001). Spatial heterogeneity, source-sink dynamics, and the local
coexistence of competing species. *Am. Nat.*, 158, 572-584.
- 644 Arthaud, F., Vallod, D., Wezel, W., Robin, J. & Bornette, G. (2013). Short-term succession of aquatic
plant species richness along ecosystem productivity and dispersal gradients in shallow lakes. *J. Veg.*
646 *Sci.*, 24, 148-156.
- Azaele, S., Pigolotti, S., Banavar, J.R. & Maritan, A. (2006). Dynamical evolution of ecosystems.
648 *Nature*, 444, 926-928.
- [Baselga, A. \(2010\). Partitioning the turnover and nestedness components of beta diversity. *Global*
650 *Ecology and Biogeography*, 19, 134-143.](#)
- Beaumont, M.A. (2010). Approximate Bayesian computation in evolution and ecology. *Annu. Rev.*
652 *Ecol. Evol. Sys.*, 41, 379-406.
- Bertrand, C., Burel, F. & Baudry, J. (2016). Spatial and temporal heterogeneity of the crop mosaic
654 influences carabid beetles in agricultural landscapes. *Land. Ecol.*, 31, 451-466.
- Blanchet, S., Helmus, M.R., Brosse, S. & Grenouillet, G. (2014). Regional vs local drivers of
656 phylogenetic and species diversity in stream fish communities. *Fresh. Biol.*, 59, 450-462.
- Borcard, D., Legendre, P. & Drapeau, P. (1992). Partialling out the spatial component of ecological
658 variation. *Ecology*, 73, 1045-1055.
- Brokaw, N.V. (1985). Gap-phase regeneration in a tropical forest. *Ecology*, 66, 682-687.
- 660 Brown, B.L., Sokol, E.R., Skelton, J. & Tornwall, B. (2017). Making sense of metacommunities:
dispelling the mythology of a metacommunity typology. *Oecologia*, 183, 643-652.
- 662 Buckley, H.L., Day, N.J., Case, B.S., Lear, G. & Ellison, A.M. (2018). Multivariate methods for testing
hypotheses of temporal community dynamics. *bioRxiv*, 362822.
- 664 Calcagno, V., Mouquet, N., Jarne, P. & David, P. (2006). Coexistence in a metacommunity: the
competition-colonization trade-off is not dead. *Ecol. Lett.*, 9, 897-907.
- 666 Chase, J.M. & Leibold, M.A. (2003). *Ecological Niches: Linking Classical and Contemporary*
Approaches. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.
- 668 [Chave, J., & Leigh Jr, E. G. \(2002\). A spatially explicit neutral model of \$\beta\$ -diversity in tropical forests.
Theor. Popul. Biol., 62, 153-168.](#)
- 670 [Chesson, P. \(2000\). Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual review of Ecology and*
Systematics, 31, 343-366.](#)
- 672 Cottenie, K. (2005). Integrating environmental and spatial processes in ecological community
dynamics. *Ecol. Lett.*, 8, 1175-1182.
- 674 Datry, T., Larned, S.T., Fritz, K.M., Bogan, M.T., Wood, P.J., Meyer, E.I. *et al.* (2014). Broad-scale
patterns of invertebrate richness and community composition in temporary rivers: effects of flow
676 intermittence. *Ecography*, 37, 94-104.
- Datry, T., Bonada, N. & Heino, J. (2016). Towards understanding the organisation of
678 metacommunities in highly dynamic ecological systems. *Oikos*, 125, 149-159.
- Evans, M.R., Bithell, M., Cornell, S.J., Dall, S.R., Díaz, S., Emmott, S. *et al.* (2013). Predictive systems
680 ecology. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 280, 20131452.
- Fournier, B., Mouquet, N., Leibold, M.A. & Gravel, D. (2017). An integrative framework of coexistence
682 mechanisms in competitive metacommunities. *Ecography*, 40, 630-641.
- [Fournier, B., Mouquet, N., Leibold, M.A., Gravel, D., & Blanchet, S. \(2016\). Lessons from the fish: a multi-
684 species analysis reveals common processes underlying similar species-genetic diversity
correlations. *Freshwater Biology*, 61, 1830-1845.](#)

- 686 [Fourtune, L., Prunier, J. G., Paz-Vinas, I., Loot, G., Veyssi re, C., & Blanchet, S. \(2018\). Inferring](#)
688 [causalities in landscape genetics: An extension of Wright’s causal modeling to distance matrices.](#)
[The American Naturalist, 191, 491-508.](#)
- 690 Gascuel, F., Laroche, F., Bonnet-Lebrun, A.-S. & Rodrigues, A.S.L. (2016). The effects of archipelago
692 spatial structure on island diversity and endemism: predictions from a spatially-structured neutral
694 model. *Evolution*, 70, 2657-2666.
- 696 Gilbert, B. & Bennett, J.R. (2010). Partitioning variation in ecological communities: do the numbers
698 add up? *J. App. Ecol.*, 47, 1071-1082.
- 700 [Grace, J. B., & Bollen, K. A. \(2005\). Interpreting the results from multiple regression and structural](#)
702 [equation models. The Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America, 86, 283-295.](#)
- 704 Guichard, F. (2017). Recent advances in metacommunities and meta-ecosystem theories.
706 *F1000Research*, 6, 610.
- 708 Haegeman, B., Sari, T. & Etienne, R.S. (2013). Predicting coexistence of plants subject to a tolerance-
710 competition trade-off. *J. Math. Biol.*, 68, 1815-1847.
- 712 Hastings, A. (1980). Disturbance, coexistence, history, and competition for space. *Theor. Popul. Biol.*,
714 18, 363-373.
- 716 Heino, J., Melo, A.S., Siqueira, T., Soininen, J., Valanko, S. & Bini, L.M. (2015). Metacommunity
718 organisation, spatial extent and dispersal in aquatic systems: patterns, processes and prospects.
720 *Fresh. Biol.*, 60, 845-869.
- 722 Henriques-Silva, R., Lindo, Z. & Peres-Neto, P.R. (2013). A community of metacommunities: exploring
724 patterns in species distributions across large geographical areas. *Ecology*, 94, 627-639.
- 726 Hubbell, S.P. (2001). *The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography*, Princeton
728 University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- 730 Jabot, F., Faure, T. & Dumoulin, N. (2013). EasyABC: performing efficient approximate Bayesian
732 computation sampling schemes using R. *Meth. Ecol. Evol.*, 4, 684-687.
- 734 Jabot, F. & Lohier, T. (2016). Non-random correlation of species dynamics in tropical tree
736 communities. *Oikos*, 125, 1733-1742.
- 738 [Janzen, D. H. \(1970\). Herbivores and the number of tree species in tropical forests. Am. Nat., 104,](#)
740 [501-528.](#)
- 742 Kalyuzhny, M., Kadmon, R. & Shnerb, N.M. (2015). A neutral theory with environmental stochasticity
744 explains static and dynamic properties of ecological communities. *Ecol. Lett.*, 18, 572-580.
- 746 Keyel, A.C., Gerstenlauer, J.L. & Wiegand, K. (2016). SpatialDemography: a spatially explicit, stage-
748 structured, metacommunity model. *Ecography*, 39, 1129-1137.
- 750 [Kingsolver, J. G. & Schemske, D. W. \(1991\). Path analyses of selection. Trends Ecol. Evol., 6, 276-280.](#)
- 752 Lamy, T., Jarne, P., Laroche, F., Pointier, J. P., Huth, G., Segard, A. *et al.* (2013). Variation in habitat
754 connectivity generates positive correlations between species and genetic diversity in a
756 metacommunity. *Mol. Ecol.*, 22, 4445-4456.
- 758 Leibold, M.A. & Mikkelsen, G.M. (2002). Coherence, species turnover, and boundary clumping:
760 elements of meta-community structure. *Oikos*, 97, 237-250.
- 762 Leibold, M.A., Holyoak, M., Mouquet, N., Amarasekare, P., Chase, J.M., Hoopes, M.F. *et al.* (2004).
764 The metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale community ecology. *Ecol. Lett.*, 7, 601-
766 613.
- 768 [Leigh, E. G., Wright, S. J., Herre, E. A., & Putz, F. E. \(1993\). The decline of tree diversity on newly](#)
770 [isolated tropical islands: a test of a null hypothesis and some implications. Evol. Ecol. 7, 76-102.](#)
- 772 Logue, J.B., Mouquet, N., Peter, H., Hillebrand, H. & Metacommunity Working Group. (2011).
774 Empirical approaches to metacommunities: a review and comparison with theory. *Trends Ecol.*
776 *Evol.*, 26, 482-491.
- 778 Loreau, M. & Holt, R.D. (2004). Spatial flows and the regulation of ecosystems. *Am. Nat.*, 163, 606-
780 615.
- 782 MacArthur, R.H. & Wilson, E.O. (1967). *The Theory of Island Biogeography*, Princeton University
784 Press, Princeton, NJ.

738 [Magurran, A. E., & Henderson, P. A. \(2003\). Explaining the excess of rare species in natural species abundance distributions. *Nature*, 422, 714.](#)

740 [Magurran, A. E., & Henderson, P. A. \(2010\). Temporal turnover and the maintenance of diversity in ecological assemblages. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 365, 3611-3620.](#)

742 Malard, F., Uehlinger, U., Zah, R. & Tockner, K. (2006). Flood-pulse and riverscape dynamics in a braided glacial river. *Ecology*, 87, 704-716.

744 Massol, F. & Petit, S. (2013). Interaction networks in agricultural landscape mosaics. *Adv. Ecol. Res.*, 49, 291-338.

746 Massol, F., Gravel, D., Mouquet, N., Cadotte, M.W., Fukami, T. & Leibold, M.A. (2011). Linking community and ecosystem dynamics through spatial ecology. *Ecol. Lett.*, 14, 313-323.

748 [May, R. M. \(1973\). *Stability and complexity in model ecosystems* \(Vol. 6\). Princeton university press.](#)

750 [Molofsky, J., Bever, J. D., & Antonovics, J. \(2001\). Coexistence under positive frequency dependence. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 268, 273-277.](#)

752 Mouquet, N. & Loreau, M. (2003). Community patterns in source-sink metacommunities. *Am. Nat.*, 162, 544-557.

754 Mouquet, N., Lagadeuc, Y., Devictor, V., Doyen, L., Duputié, A., Eveillard, D. *et al.* (2015). Predictive ecology in a changing world. *J. App. Ecol.*, 52, 1293-1310.

756 Muller-Landau, H.C. (2010). The tolerance-fecundity trade-off and the maintenance of diversity in seed size. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 107, 4242-4247.

758 Muneeppeerakul, R., Bertuzzo, E., Lynch, H.J., Fagan, W.F., Rinaldo, A. & Rodriguez-Iturbe, I. (2008). Neutral metacommunity models predict fish diversity patterns in Mississippi–Missouri basin. *Nature*, 453, 220.

760 Münkemüller, T. & Gallien, L. (2015). VirtualCom: a simulation model for eco-evolutionary community assembly and invasion. *Meth. Ecol. Evol.*, 6, 735-743.

762 Munoz, F., Grenié, M., Denelle, P., Taudière, A., Laroche, F., Tucker, C. *et al.* (2018). ecolottery: Simulating and assessing community assembly with environmental filtering and neutral dynamics in R. *Meth. Ecol. Evol.*, 9, 693-703.

764 Nuvoloni, F.M., Feres, R.J.F. & Gilbert, B. (2016). Species turnover through time: colonization and extinction dynamics across metacommunities. *Am. Nat.*, 187, 786-796.

766 Peres-Neto, P.R. & Legendre, P. (2010). Estimating and controlling for spatial structure in the study of ecological communities. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, 19, 174–184.

768 Peres-Neto, P.R., Legendre, P., Dray, S. & Borcard, D. (2006). Variation partitioning of species data matrices: Estimation and comparison of fractions. *Ecology*, 87, 2614-2625.

770 Poulet, N., Beaulaton, L. & Dembski, S. (2011). Time trends in fish populations in metropolitan France: insights from national monitoring data. *J. Fish Biol.*, 79, 1436-1452.

772 Preston, F.W. (1962). The canonical distribution of commonness and rarity: Part I. *Ecology*, 43, 185-215.

774 [Rosseel, Y. \(2012\). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling and more. Version 0.5–12 \(BETA\). *Journal of statistical software*, 48, 1-36.](#)

776 [Shipley, B. \(2000\). A new inferential test for path models based on directed acyclic graphs. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 7, 206-218.](#)

778 Shmida, A. & Wilson, M.V. (1985). Biological determinants of species diversity. *J. Biogeogr.*, 12, 1-20.

780 Shoemaker, L.G. & Melbourne, B.A. (2016). Linking metacommunity paradigms to spatial coexistence mechanisms. *Ecology*, 97, 2436-2446.

782 Skellam, J.G. (1952). Studies in Statistical Ecology: I. Spatial Pattern. *Biometrika*, 39, 346-362.

784 Sokol, E.R., Brown, B.L. & Barrett, J.E. (2017). A simulation-based approach to understand how metacommunity characteristics influence emergent biodiversity patterns. *Oikos*, 126, 723-737.

786 Srivastava, D.S. & Lawton, J.H. (1998). Why More Productive Sites Have More Species: An Experimental Test of Theory Using Tree-Hole Communities. *Am. Nat.*, 152, 510-529.

- 788 Storch, D., Bohdalková, E. & Okie, J. (2018). The more-individuals hypothesis revisited: the role of
community abundance in species richness regulation and the productivity–diversity relationship.
Ecol. Lett., 21, 920-937.
- 790 [Tenow, O., Nilssen, A. C., Bylund, H., Pettersson, R., Battisti, A., Bohn, U., et al. \(2013\). Geometrid
outbreak waves travel across Europe. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 82, 84-95.](#)
- 792 Tilman, D. (1994). Competition and biodiversity in spatially structured habitats. *Ecology*, 75, 2-16.
- 794 Tschardtke, T., Klein, A.M., Kruess, A., Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Thies, C. (2005). Landscape perspectives
on agricultural intensification and biodiversity–ecosystem service management. *Ecol. Lett.*, 8, 857-
874.
- 796 Ulrich, W., Kryszewski, W., Sewerniak, P., Puchałka, R., Strona, G. & Gotelli, N. J. (2017). A
comprehensive framework for the study of species co-occurrences, nestedness and turnover.
798 *Oikos*, 126, 1607-1616.
- 800 [Vannette, R. L., & Fukami, T. \(2017\). Dispersal enhances beta diversity in nectar microbes. *Ecol. Lett.*,
20, 901-910.](#)

~~Table S1: csv file containing the list of studies compiled for the meta-analysis.~~

804 File [S12](#): C++ Code of the metacommunity model

Appendix [S23](#): Additional information on the simulated scenarios.

806 Appendix [S34](#): Additional information on empirical analyses.

808 **Appendix S32: Additional information on the simulated scenarios.**

810 We here provide some details on the simulated scenarios: the parameter sets used (Table S23) and
 812 some descriptive patterns of the various scenarios (Fig. S56-S104). These supplementary figures
 depict for each of the six scenarios the response of community dissimilarity to the various simulated
 drivers: temporal distance, spatial distance and environmental distance.


Scenario	l	m	A	σ	e_1	e_2	e_3
1	1.4	0	0	-	0	0	1
2	0.1	0.03	0	-	0	0	1
3	80	0	10	0.05	0.2	0	0
4	5000	0	1000	0.01	0	0.1	0
5	500	0.5	1000	0.04	0.1	0.1	0
6	10	0.1	1000	0.06	0	0.3	0.1

814 **Table S23:** model parameters used in the simulated scenarios. In addition, all simulations were
 performed with a value of r equal to 0.2.


Scenario	1	2	3	4	5	6
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \langle J \rangle$	-0.003 – 0.35	0.006 – 0.45	$2 \cdot 10^{-4}$ – 0.39	-0.02 – 0.27	-0.01 – 0.31	-0.01 – 0.19
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta S$	0.12 – 0	0.17 – 0	0.03 – 0	0.17 – 0	0.05 – 0	0.01 – 0.13
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta t$	0.002 – 0.37	$4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ – 0.42	-0.003 – 0.39	0.01 – 0.06	0.006 – 0.26	0.04 – 0
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta E$	-0.002 – 0.46	0.002 – 0.44	0.85 – 0	0.65 – 0	0.87 – 0	0.73 – 0
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta x$	0.20 – 0	0.54 – 0	0.01 – 0.07	0.003 – 0.25	0.07 – 0	0.01 – 0.08
$\Delta S \leftarrow \Delta J$	0.005 – 0.46	0.005 – 0.46	0.08 – 0	0.008 – 0.26	0.04 – 0	0.07 – 0.01
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta t$	0.008 – 0.16	0.008 – 0.19	$3 \cdot 10^{-5}$ – 0.51	-0.01 – 0.04	-0.02 – 0.02	0.06 – 0
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta x$	-0.003 – 0.32	-0.001 – 0.45	0.71 – 0	-0.003 – 0.33	0.43 – 0	$2 \cdot 10^{-4}$ – 0.49
SRMR	0.009	0.019	0.009	0.023	0.021	0.042

816 **Table S4:** Standardized estimates and p-values for the path analyses on simulated scenarios (Fig.4).
 p-values equal to 0 actually mean <0.001. Significant effects at the 1% level with a Benjamini-
 818 Hochberg correction are depicted in bold. The last line reports the Standardized Root Mean Square
 Residual (SRMR) that is a standard measure of model fit for path analyses.

820



822 **Fig. S45.** Mean local species richness during the burn-in period in the six simulated scenarios. Note
 824 that there is no directional trend that would indicate that the transient dynamics from the initial
 conditions are not terminated. Note also that in the second scenario (b), the temporal dynamics is
 slower, but without trend.



826

Fig. S56 – Descriptive plots for the first scenario

828





Fig. S67 – Descriptive plots for the second scenario



832

Fig. S78 – Descriptive plots for the third scenario

834




Fig. S89 – Descriptive plots for the fourth scenario




Fig. S910 – Descriptive plots for the fifth scenario




Fig. S101 – Descriptive plots for the sixth scenario

844 **Appendix S34: Additional information on empirical analyses.**

846 We here provide the numerical results of the path analyses conducted for the four datasets (Tables S5-8).

Environmental variables		Width of the water slide	Width of the minor bed	Elevation	Slope	Average temperature in January 2011	Average temperature in July 2011
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \langle J \rangle$	-0.06 - 0.001						
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta S$	0.69 - 0						
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta t$	0.02 - 0.02						
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta E$		0.04 - 0.002	0.08 - 0	0.19 - 0	0.13 - 0	0.04 - 0.004	0.03 - 0.03
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta x$	0.13 - 0						
$\Delta S \leftarrow \Delta J$	0.03 - 0.09						
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta t$		0.007 - 0.36					
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta x$		0.06 - 0.01	0.07 - 0.007	0.25 - 0	0.17 - 0	0.26 - 0	0.12 - 0

Table S112: Standardized estimates and p-values for the path analysis of the AFB freshwater fish dataset. p-values equal to 0 actually mean <0.001. Significant effects at the 5% level with a Benjamini-Hochberg correction are depicted in bold. SRMR = 0.178.

848

850

Environmental variables		Temperature	pH	Conductivity	Concentration in dioxygen	Number of days since the last rewetting event of the watershed
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \langle J \rangle$	-0.31 - 0					
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta S$	0.47 - 0					
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta t$	0.01 - 0.17					
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta E$		0.07 - 0	0.11 - 0	0.10 - 0	-0.06 - 0	0.03 - 0.02
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta x$	0.25 - 0					
$\Delta S \leftarrow \Delta J$	0.28 - 0					
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta t$		0.08 - 0	0.11 - 0	0.04 - 0	0.02 - 0.08	0.18 - 0
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta x$		0.02 - 0.01	0.27 - 0	0.31 - 0	0.04 - 0	0.02 - 0

Table S123: Standardized estimates and p-values for the path analysis of the Irstea aquatic invertebrate dataset. p-values equal to 0 actually mean <0.001. Significant effects at the 5% level with a Benjamini-Hochberg correction are depicted in bold.

852

854

Environmental variables		Pond size	Pond depth	Vegetation cover	Water quality	Litter amount	Stability	Annual rainfall
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \langle J \rangle$	-0.10 - 0							
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta S$	0.12 - 0							
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta t$	0.08 - 0							
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta E$		0 - 0.32	0.10 - 0	0.15 - 0	0.06 - 0	-0.02 - 0.005	0.05 - 0	0.01 - 0.06
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta x$	0.06 - 0							
$\Delta S \leftarrow \Delta J$	0.06 - 0							
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta t$								0.09 - 0
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta x$		0.07 - 0	0.02 - 0.004	0.01 - 0.10	0.07 - 0	0.13 - 0	0.15 - 0	

856 **Table S143:** Standardized estimates and p-values for the path analysis of the mollusc dataset. p-
858 values equal to 0 actually mean <0.001. Significant effects at the 5% level with a Benjamini-Hochberg
correction are depicted in bold.

Environmental variables		Chlorophyll a concentration	Number of years since the last drying event
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \langle J \rangle$	-0.24 - 0		
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta S$	0.47 - 0		
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta t$	0.01 - 0.33		
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta E$		0.16 - 0	-0.06 - 0.04
$\beta_{\text{sor}} \leftarrow \Delta x$	0.09 - 0.01		
$\Delta S \leftarrow \Delta J$	0.29 - 0		
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta t$		0.09 - 0.02	-0.03 - 0.29
$\Delta E \leftarrow \Delta x$		0.002 - 0.44	0.13 - 0.001

860 **Table S145:** Standardized estimates and p-values for the path analysis of the aquatic plant dataset. p-
862 values equal to 0 actually mean <0.001. Significant effects at the 5% level with a Benjamini-Hochberg
correction are depicted in bold.

864