A quantitative review of relationships between ecosystem services

Heera Lee[a,*], Sven Lautenbach[a]

[a]*Faculty of Agriculture, Land use modeling and Ecosystem Services, University of Bonn, Nußallee 1, 53115 Bonn, Germany*

Abstract

Ecosystems provide multiple ecosystem services to society. Ignoring the multi-functionality of land systems in natural resource management generates potentially trade-offs with respect to the provisioning of ecosystem services. Understanding relationships between ecosystem services can therefore help to minimize undesired trade-offs and enhance synergies. The research on relationships between ecosystem services has recently gained increasing attention in the scientific community. However, a synthesis on existing knowledge and knowledge gaps is missing so far. We analyzed 67 case studies that studied 476 pairwise combinations of ecosystem services. The relationships between these pairs of ecosystem services were classified into three categories: "trade-off", "synergy" or "no-effect". Most pairs of ecosystem services (74%) had a clear association with one category: the majority of case studies reported similar relationships for pairs of ecosystem services. A synergistic relationship was dominant between different regulating services and between different

*Corresponding author: Tel.: +49 228 732925; Fax: +49 228 733708
Email address: hlee@uni-bonn.de (Heera Lee)

cultural services, whereas the relationship between regulating and provisioning services was trade-off dominated. Increases in cultural services did not influence provisioning services ("no-effect"). We further analyzed the pattern of relationships between ecosystem services across scales, land system archetypes and methods used to determine the relationship. Our analysis showed that the overall pattern of relationships between ecosystem services did not change significantly with scale and land system archetypes. However, some pairs of ecosystem services showed changes in relationships with scale. The choice of methods used to determine the relationship had an effect on the direction of the relationship: studies that employed correlation coefficients showed an increased probability to identify no-effect relationships, whereas descriptive methods had a higher probability of identifying trade-offs. The regional scale was the most commonly considered, and case studies were biased among different land system archetypes which might affect our ability to find the effect of scale or land system archetypes on the pattern of relationships. Our results provide helpful information of which services to include in ecosystem services assessments for the scientific community as well as for practitioners. Furthermore, they allow a first check if critical trade-offs have been considered in an analysis.

Keywords: ecosystem services, trade-offs, synergies, relationship of ecosystem services, quantitative review, pairwise analysis of ecosystem services

1. Introduction

Decision making on resource managements received worldwide attention in the past decades given the urgent need to preserve ecosystems and find a sustainable balance between long-term and short-term benefit and costs of human activities (Berkes and Folke, 1998; MA, 2005; Carpenter et al., 2009; Liu et al., 2015). However, a management decision can cause undesirable consequences if it lacks understanding of the complex nature of ecosystems which lead to the multi-functionality of land systems (Holling, 1996; Bennett et al., 2009). A land system does not provide only one function but combinations of a variety of overlapping functions (Bolliger et al., 2011, p.203), each of which provides different ecosystem goods and services to society. Land systems thus have a potential to provide multiple ecosystem services (ES) (Burkhard et al., 2009; Tallis and Polasky, 2009; Mastrangelo et al., 2014; Schindler et al., 2014). Due to functional trade-offs and synergies among the different components of this multi-functionality within the land, a decision potentially influences which services people can get or lose at the same time (Wiggering et al., 2006; Paracchini et al., 2011). Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of the multi-functional land system and of the different ES derived from it is crucial in natural resource management to avoid undesired and often unaware trade-offs and to enhance synergies among ES (Rodríguez et al., 2006; Hillebrand and Matthiessen, 2009; Bolliger et al., 2011; Mastrangelo et al., 2014). A key challenge that decision makers face now is to consider multiple ES and their potential consequences rather than focusing

3

24 only on a few services in isolation (Cork et al., 2007; Tallis and Polasky,
25 2009).

26 The concept of multi-functionality has originally been developed at the
27 landscape scale (Bolliger et al., 2011; Mastrangelo et al., 2014). However, it
28 can be transferred to larger scales at which parts of the multi-functionality
29 present at the landscape scale might be hidden due to aggregation effects.
30 Likewise, the concept can be applied at smaller scales but one has to keep in
31 mind that some functions might diminish at small scales such as functions
32 that lead to water regulation, seed dispersal, pollination and pest control
33 that connect different parts of the landscape. Therefore, interactions across
34 multiple scales are important to be considered in decision-making.

35 The global research community endeavors to elaborate the concept of ES
36 both in theory and practice to preserve multiple ES (MA, 2005; Carpenter
37 et al., 2009). The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA, 2005) has raised
38 the awareness of the importance of identifying multiple ES and their inter-
39 actions (Raudsepp-Hearne et al., 2010; Willemen et al., 2012). The number
40 of publication has risen rapidly in last decades on this issue (Bennett et al.,
41 2009). Bennett et al. (2009) stressed the importance of understanding direct
42 and indirect relationships among multiple ES. Two recent review studies
43 (Mouchet et al., 2014; Howe et al., 2014) addressed aspects of relationships
44 between ES. Mouchet et al. (2014) provided a methodological guideline for
45 assessing trade-offs between ES, whereas Howe et al. (2014) analyzed re-
46 lationships between ES with a focus of beneficiaries and users. However,

4

47 both studies did not analyze pairwise relationships between ES, which is a

48 first step to investigate relationships among multiple ES (Chan et al., 2006;

49 Raudsepp-Hearne et al., 2010; Jopke et al., 2014). Kandziora et al. (2013)

50 provided a matrix of pairwise relationships between ES on a conceptual level,

51 but the relationships between ES have not been studied so far based on case

52 study results. In this study, we aim at filling this gap with a quantitative

53 review of relationships between ES based on the published literature.

54   Recent studies focusing on multiple ES have taken several perspectives.

55 The concept of "bundles" of ES has been commonly applied in the assessment

56 of provisioning multiple ES in a landscape (e.g. Raudsepp-Hearne et al.,

57 2010; Martín-López et al., 2013). This approach tries to identify groups of

58 ES that co-occur repeatedly in landscapes showing patterns of the provision

59 of ES derived from the different land use and land cover types (Raudsepp-

60 Hearne et al., 2010; Turner et al., 2014). It is frequently based on a GIS

61 analysis at the landscape or the regional scale (O'Farrell et al., 2010; Nemec

62 and Raudsepp-Hearne, 2012). Often complementary statistical or descriptive

63 analysis have been used to identify the bundles. Another research line tends

64 to focus on ecosystem processes and functions that underpin ES (Dickie et al.,

65 2011; Lavorel et al., 2011). The relationships among multiple ES are either

66 identified by statistical analysis of field data or by the analysis of the output

67 process models such as LPJ-GUESS (Smith et al., 2001) or SWAT (Arnold

68 et al., 1999) see e.g. Lautenbach et al. (2013).

69   Relationships of ES pairs can be categorized into 'trade-off', 'synergy',

5

70 and 'no-effect'. The term 'trade-off' in ES research has been used when one

71 service responds negatively to a change of another service (MA, 2005). An

72 attempt to maximize the provision of a single service will lead to suboptimal

73 results if the increase of one service happens directly or indirectly at the cost

74 of another service (Holling, 1996; Rodríguez et al., 2006; Haase et al., 2012).

75 When both services change positively in the same direction, the relationship

76 between two ES is defined as synergistic (Haase et al., 2012) - this is often

77 called also a 'win-win' relationship (Howe et al., 2014). When there is no

78 interaction or no influence between two ES this is defined as a 'no-effect'

79 relationship.

80   The relationship between a pair of ES can differ across different scales

81 and across different socio-ecological systems (Kremen, 2005; Hein et al., 2006;

82 Bennett et al., 2009). An example for this is the "externality" of a decision

83 on a certain service as pointed out by Rodríguez et al. (2006): a decision that

84 seems to influence ES positively for a specific region might cause substantial

85 trade-offs in areas nearby or faraway (e.g. teleconnection) (Liu et al., 2013).

86 If the effects of this decision are viewed at a larger scale including all those

87 negatively influenced areas, the relationship between ES might be charac-

88 terized by a trade-off. Cimon-Morin et al. (2013) showed in their review

89 study that the relationship between biodiversity and ES changes with scale

90 and region. The relationship between carbon storage and habitat was, for

91 example, described mainly as synergistic at the global scale, but at a finer

92 scale regions of high biodiversity and high carbon storage might be disjunct

6

leading to a trade-off relationship. Furthermore, the relationship can change in different land systems. In other word, a decision on increasing a service can affect the other services differently in different locations. For example, Westa et al. (2010) showed differences in a trade-off relationship between carbon sequestration and food provisioning among regions.

Given the importance of understanding relationships between ES we conducted a quantitative review on relationships between pairs of ES based on case studies. We addressed three key hypotheses to investigate the relationships between ES. First, ES pairs show a preferred interaction and relationship with each other; second, this relationship is influenced by the scale at which the relationship had been studied as well as by the land system; and third, this relationship is further affected by the method applied to characterize the relationship.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Literature search

We carried out a literature search in the ISI Web of Knowledge database based on combinations of keywords including "ecosystem service*" or "environmental service*" or "ecological service*" in the first part, and "trade-off*" or "tradeoff*" or "synerg*" in the second part of the topic field. We limited the time period from 1998 to 2013, but decided to include four relevant studies published in 2014 in addition. Our query resulted in 585 scientific papers.

We only included case studies written in English. Studies that did not

7

115 analyze the relationships between ES were clearly out of scope and therefore

116 not further considered. If a case study analyzed more than one ES pair, we

117 considered all pairwise combinations. In total our analysis is based on 67

118 case studies - with 476 ES pairs.

119 *2.2. Database and classification*

120   The ES categories were defined according to the Common International

121 Classification of Ecosystem Services (CICES) classification V4.3 (Haines-

122 Young and Potschin, 2013). CICES is one of the widely applied ES classifica-

123 tion systems (e.g. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA) (MA, 2005), Na-

124 tional Ecosystem Services Classification System (NESCS) and Final Ecosys-

125 tem Goods and Services Classification System (FEGS-CS) by the United

126 States Environmental Protection Agency (Landers and Nahlik, 2013)), which

127 has been also practically applied as a basis for the national ecosystem as-

128 sessment, for example, in Belgium (Turkelboom et al., 2013), in Germany

129 (Naturkapital Deutschland TEEB DE, 2014) and in Finland (Mononen et al.,

130 2015). One of its advantages is that it contains a nested hierarchical struc-

131 ture (Haines-Young and Potschin, 2013). The highest level of CICES, the

132 'Section', distinguishes between provisioning, regulating and maintenance,

133 and cultural services. The next hierarchical levels are 'Division', 'Group',

134 and 'Class' (Fig 1). The analysis of this study was mainly based on the

135 'Group' level of CICES (Fig 1, see Supplementary table ST1 for the detailed

136 list). From now on 'ES' refers to the 'Group' level of ES in CICES unless

8

137 mentioned.

Figure 1: CICES nested hierarchy structure (left) and example of provisioning section and ES code in brackets (adapted from Haines-Young and Potschin (2013))

138   In this study, we focused on the pairwise relationships between ES as de-

139 scribed in case studies. The relationship between each pair of ES was classi-

140 fied into three categories: "trade-off", "synergy" and "no-effect". "Trade-off"

141 was assigned when one service increased with reduction of another service,

142 whereas when both services interacted positively, "synergy" was assigned.

143 When there was no interaction between two services, "no-effect" was as-

144 signed. If the direction of the relationship between the pair of ES was not

145 clearly described, it was classified as "other".

146   For case studies using correlation coefficients a threshold had to be defined

147 to distinguish "no-effect" relationships from relevant relationships. There is

148 no clear vote from the literature about such a threshold in the ES literature.

149 Applied statistics textbooks agree that a Pearson's correlation coefficient

150 under 0.35 is characterizing either a negligible (Hinkel et al., 2003) or a weak

9

relationship (Weber and Lamb, 1970; Mason and Lind, 1983; Taylor, 1990). In ES literature, however, a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.2 is often considered as a meaningful correlation (e.g. Chan et al., 2006; Jopke et al., 2014). In this study, we assigned the "no-effect" label to relationships with a correlation coefficient between -0.25 and 0.25.

It was even more difficult for case studies using multivariate statistics to set a threshold to distinguish a "no-effect" relationship from a synergistic or trade-off relationship. The square of the factor loadings is the proportion of variance in each of the items (the observed traits) explained by the factor (the unobserved trait). For example, the factor loading of 0.32 is equivalent to 10% explained variance (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1989). In this study, we used a threshold: if the loading was reported and it was greater than 0.32, the relationship was identified according to the direction (+ for "synergy" or - for "trade-off") over the different factors or PCs. When the loading was too small, "no-effect" was assigned. When the loading was not reported at all and only the bi-plot was reported from the study, the direction of variables (+ for "synergy" or - for "trade-off") was considered for the relationship.

The dominant relationship for each pair of ES was determined based on the relative importance of each relationship category. The ratio of studies in the dominant relationship category (Eq. 1) was calculated across all case studies – the category with the highest ratio was assigned as the dominant relationship for each pair of ES. We used the term "level of agreement" to describe the certainty of relationships from the case studies.

174   The level of agreement of a pair of ES_i and ES_j is calculated as

$$Level \ of \ agreement_{i,j} = max(obs_{i,j,k})/ \sum_k (obs_{i,j,k}) \times 100, \qquad (1)$$

175   where $obs_{i,j,k}$ is the number of observations for the pair of ESi and j in

176   the relationship category k. The higher the level of agreement for a pair of

177   ES, the higher the percentage of studies that showed the same direction of

178   relationship. If there was a tie between two or three categories for a pair or if

179   the level of agreement did not exceed 50%, we assigned the pair to the "not

180   decided" category.

181   The spatial scale of the case study was determined following the criteria

182   provided by Martínez-Harms and Balvanera (2012) (Table 1) according to

183   the size of the study area. The land system in which a case study took

184   place was assigned according to the map of land system archetype (LSA) of

185   Václavík et al. (2013) that matched the location of the study site. The LSA

186   is a classification schemes of land systems based socio-economic, ecological

187   and land use intensity factors (Václavík et al., 2013). When several LSAs

188   overlapped within a study area, the dominant LSA was assigned if it covered

189   more than 50% of the study area. Otherwise, all LSAs were considered - at

190   maximum three LSAs were assigned to one pair of ES.

191   We differentiated between the method used to quantify ES (preparation

192   of the results) and the method used to identify the relationship between the

193   ES (analysis of the results). We only considered the latter in the analysis.

11

¹⁹⁴ If, for example, a study used GIS modeling to quantify ES and described ¹⁹⁵ the relationship between ES - based on the GIS analysis - qualitatively, we ¹⁹⁶ categorized the method for this pair as "descriptive". The method used ¹⁹⁷ to identify the relationship was categorized into five groups: "descriptive", ¹⁹⁸ "correlation", "regression analysis", "multivariate statistics", and "other" ¹⁹⁹ (Table 1).

²⁰⁰ *2.3. Statistical Analysis*

²⁰¹ To test our hypotheses that the scale, the LSA as well as the method used ²⁰² affect the dominant relationship of ES, we applied two statistical analyses. In ²⁰³ the first step we focused on the overall pattern of relationships between pairs ²⁰⁴ of ES. In the second step we tested each pair of ES separately for effects of ²⁰⁵ scale, the LSA and the method used. Subsets of the data were prepared for ²⁰⁶ each category of scale, LSA and method (Table 1). The minimum number of ²⁰⁷ case studies to participate in the comparison was set to 10 for each subset. ²⁰⁸ We combined the national, the continental and the global scale into one ²⁰⁹ category, "large scale", due to the limited number of case studies in these ²¹⁰ categories. Among 12 LSAs, only three LSAs (i.e. "boreal systems of the ²¹¹ western world" (LSA3), "extensive cropping systems" (LSA7), and "intensive ²¹² cropping systems" (LSA10)) satisfied this threshold to participate in the ²¹³ comparison. The method used could not be performed for the overall pattern ²¹⁴ analysis due to the limited number of case studies in the categories.

²¹⁵ In the first step we tested the null hypothesis that the overall structure

12

Table 1: Criteria used for classification

Criteria	Categories	Rationale	Reference
Spatial Scale	Patch	$10\text{-}10^2\ km^2$	Martínez-Harms and Balvanera (2012)
	Local	$10^2\text{-}10^3\ km^2$	
	Regional	$10^3\text{-}10^5\ km^2$	
	National	$10^5\text{-}10^6\ km^2$	
	Global[a]	$> 10^6\ km^2$	
Archetype	LSA 1	Forest systems in the tropics	Václavík et al. (2013)
	LSA 2	Degraded forest/crop land systems in the tropics	
	LSA 3	Boreal systems of the western world	
	LSA 4	Boreal systems of the eastern world	
	LSA 5	High-density urban agglomerations	
	LSA 6	Irrigated cropping systems with rice yield gap	
	LSA 7	Extensive cropping systems	
	LSA 8	Pastoral systems	
	LSA 9	Irrigated cropping systems	
	LSA 10	Intensive cropping systems	
	LSA 11	Marginal lands in the developing world	
	LSA 12	Barren lands n the developing world	
Method	Descriptive	Qualitative description without any explicit quantitative measures	
	Correlation	Measures of the degree of statistical dependency between two variables such as Pearson's correlation coefficient or Spearman's rank correlation coefficient	
	Regression analysis	Regression analysis such as (generalized) linear models	
	Multivariate statistics	Analysis of pattern in multidimensional data without assuming a dependent variable such as PCA, cluster and factor analysis	
	Other	The relationship between ES was already built in the quantifying ES process	

[a] When a study considered a certain continent (e.g. Europe), we considered it as a continental scale.

of the relationships between ES pairs was independent of scale and LSA. To compare the outcomes of different subsets of scales and LSAs, a bootstrap approach (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994) was used. The subset membership was permuted at the case study level during the bootstrap because case studies often analyzed multiple pairs of ES leading non-independence between ES pairs from the same case study. For each bootstrap sample a measure of similarity between the original data and the permuted subset was calculated. As the measure of similarity, the Euclidean distance between the two subsets of ES relationships normalized by the total number of ES pairs in the subset was used. This allowed us to test the null hypothesis that both subsets belong to the same underlying distribution.

Afterwards, we tested each pair of ES separately for effects of scale, the LSA and the method based on the contingency table. After the contingency table for each pair was created, we fitted generalized linear model with a Poisson distribution for a model with the number of elements in a category as the response and the type of relationships and scales, LSAs or the methods as predictors. We tested for the significance of the differences of deviances by comparing the saturated model which contained the interaction between both factors to the model with just the main effects (Faraway, 2005). Since this analysis can only be applied for pairs studied at all scales or LSAs, we were only able to analyze 14 pairs of ES with respect to effects of scale. For the effect of LSA none of pairs was studied in all 12 LSAs. Therefore, we tested for the pairs which were studied in multiple LSAs: this led to the

14

₂₃₉ analysis of 19 ES pairs. The analysis of the effect of the method used to

₂₄₀ identify the type of relationship was done at the level of the case studies

₂₄₁ and not at the ES pair level since case studies typically applied the same

₂₄₂ method. We excluded the "other" category for the analysis. All analyses

₂₄₃ were performed using R version 3.2.0 (R Core Team, 2015).

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Empirical pattern of the relationships between ecosystem services

₂₄₆ Among the 48 types of ES defined at the class level in CICES, 33 -

₂₄₇ including one abiotic service (i.e. renewable abiotic energy source) - were

₂₄₈ found in our data set (Fig 1, Supplementary table ST1). The most studied ES

₂₄₉ class was "global climate regulation service" ($n = 114$) followed by "cultivated

₂₅₀ crops" ($n = 103$), "physical use of landscape" such as hiking ($n = 93$), and

₂₅₁ "maintaining nursery population and habitats" ($n = 85$). We found 207

₂₅₂ different combinations of ES at the CICES class level (Fig 1). More than

₂₅₃ half of those combinations at the class level ($n = 105$) were, however, recorded

₂₅₄ only one time. Since this did not provide enough support to analyze patterns,

₂₅₅ we decided to drop the analysis at the class level. At the group level in CICES

₂₅₆ 94 types of combinations of ES pairs were analyzed (Fig 1, Supplementary

₂₅₇ table ST1). A pair of two ES that belonged to the same CICES group but to

₂₅₈ different CICES classes was analyzed as well. Figure 2 shows the empirical

₂₅₉ pattern of pairwise relationships between ES groups – non-empty cells at the

₂₆₀ main diagonal refer to pairs of ES classes that belong to the same CICES

15

group. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study in which such a comprehensive matrix of relationships between ES has been compiled based on case study results.

The number of observations available to identify the dominant relationship ranged between 1 and 29. Twenty-one types of pairs of ES at the group level were observed only one time and more than half of the pairs (n = 61) were supported by less than 5 observations. Only 12% of the pairs were supported by more than 10 observations. The most studied pair of ES at the group level was the pair "atmospheric composition and climate regulating" (R10) and "biomass provisioning" (P1) services with 29 observations.

The level of agreement ranged from 25% to 100% (Fig 3). For 74% of the pairs, the level of agreement to determine the dominant relationship was higher than 50% – the other pairs were assigned to the "not decided" category (n=24).

The relationship between regulating services was dominated by a synergistic relationship, which means that regulating services are likely to increase if a management action increases other regulating services. On the other hand, provisioning services and regulating services tended to trade-offs (Fig 2), which means that when a provisioning service increases, a regulating service is likely to decrease and vice versa. Cultural services showed a trend for synergistic effects mainly with other cultural and regulating services, and a no-effect relationship with provisioning services. Note that this pattern of relationships shown here does not necessarily imply causality.

16

Figure 2: Result from analysis of 67 case studies with 476 pairs of ecosystem services, showing the empirical pattern of relationships between them. X and Y axis represent the ecosystem service classification code used in the analysis. The size of the symbol indicates the square root scaled number of studies. The color intensity represents the level of agreement. C: Cultural services, P: Provisioning services, R: Regulating services. C1: Physical and experiential interactions, C2: Intellectual and representative interactions, C4: Existence and bequest, P1: Biomass provisioning, P2: Water provisioning , P3: Materials for production and agricultural uses, P4: Water provisioning (i.e. non-drinking purpose), P5: Energy, Pa: Abiotic provisioning , R10: Atmospheric composition and climate regulation, R2: Mediation by ecosystems, R3: Mass flows regulation, R4: Liquid flows regulation, R6: Life cycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection, R7: Pest and disease control, R8: Soil formation and composition regulation, R9: Water condition

3.1.1. Trade-off dominated relationships

The level of agreement for the trade-off relationships ranged between 54% and 100%. The most agreed trade-off relationship among those pairs with

17

more than 5 observations was "biomass for production such as timber and fodder" (P3) and "atmospheric composition and climate regulation" (R10) with a level of agreement of 75% (n=8). On the one hand forests are important in terms of carbon fixation and storage, but on the other hand they are in many land systems used for timber production. In this case, a decision on how long forests are kept as carbon sinks or when trees are cut to be used for timber production generates trade-offs. Different forest management schemes influence the type of services from which people obtain benefits, which generates such trade-off among them (Backéus et al., 2005; Seidl et al., 2007; Olschewski et al., 2010).

A clear agreement on a trade-off relationship was also found for the relationship between the pair of "life cycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection" (R6) and "food provisioning" services (P1) with a level of agreement 72% (n=18). Previous studies pointed out a negative relationship between agricultural intensity and natural habitat (Mattison and Norris, 2005; Reidsma et al., 2006; Phalan et al., 2011). In order to compensate the loss of habitat in agricultural areas, more sustainable farming managements were often suggested (Altieri, 1999; Landis et al., 2000; Altieri, 2004; Lichtfouse et al., 2009) such as organic farming, which promises to increase ES nursery and habitat protection. However, there are doubts whether this allows producing sufficient food to feed the world population (Bengtsson et al., 2005; Zhang et al., 2007; de Ponti et al., 2012). Organic farming was found to increase species richness by providing better habitats and nursing ES (Bengts-

18

310 son et al., 2005), but at the same time, meta-analyses showed that crop

311 yield could be lowered by up to 20-34% compared to conventional farming

312 (de Ponti et al., 2012; Seufert et al., 2012).

313 However, "pollination and seed dispersal" (R61) in the CICES class level,

314 which belongs to "life cycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection"

315 (R6) in the CICES group level, showed a synergistic relationship (e.g. Boreux

316 et al., 2013). Overall 35% of the global production comes from crops that

317 depend on animal pollinators (Klein et al., 2007), which might lead to a syn-

318 ergistic relationship between food provisioning and habitat protection (Aizen

319 et al., 2008; Lautenbach et al., 2012; Garibaldi et al., 2013). It was not seen

320 at the aggregated group level of CICES due to the limited number of case

321 studies on R61.

322 *3.1.2. Synergy dominated relationships*

323 The level of agreement for synergistic relationships varied between 55%

324 and 100% (Fig. 3). The strongest synergistic relationship was found in the

325 group of regulating services. Especially "habitat and gene pool protection

326 services" (R6) showed a clear synergistic relationship with most other regulat-

327 ing services. Regulating services have been described as generally associated

328 with ecosystem processes and functions (Kremen, 2005; Bennett et al., 2009;

329 de Groot et al., 2010) and mostly positively related to biodiversity (Balvan-

330 era et al., 2006; Mace et al., 2012; Harrison et al., 2014). de Groot et al.

331 (2002) defined "habitat and gene pool protection services" (R6) as a basis

19

332 for other functions, which is in line with its observed synergistic relationship

333 with other regulating services. The synergistic relationship between "habi-

334 tat and gene pool protection services" (R6) and "soil formation regulating

335 services" (R8) with a high level of agreement (88%) has been reported by

336 studies that emphasized the interactions between soil functions and the role

337 of soils in living habitats (e.g. Young and Ritz, 2000; Crawford et al., 2005;

338 de Groot et al., 2010; Larvelle, 2012).

339 Another relatively strong synergistic relationship was found among the

340 group of cultural services. Among pairs of cultural services, four out of five

341 showed a dominant synergistic relationship. This is in line with findings from

342 Daniel et al. (2012) on interrelationships between cultural service categories

343 such as aesthetic services that contribute to the provisioning of recreation

344 services, which leads to the synergistic relationship between them.

345 3.1.3. No-effect dominated relationships

346 The level of agreement for no-effect relationships varied between 52% and

347 100%. The dominant no-effect relationship was found between provisioning

348 and cultural services. Among pairs of provisioning and cultural services, "wa-

349 ter provisioning service" (P2) and "physical and experimental interactions"

350 (C1) was the most agreed no-effect relationship with a level of agreement of

351 100% (n = 7)

352 The dominant no-effect relationship between provisioning and cultural

353 services could be explained by common drivers (Bennett et al., 2009) and dif-

20

354 ferent land use designs when the services occur in different locations (Raudsepp-

355 Hearne et al., 2010). Bennett et al. (2009) proposed "common drivers" to

356 understand relationships between ES. For example, introducing agricultural

357 tourism by allowing people to watch the production process increases cul-

358 tural services, but does not affect the amount of the agricultural production

359 (Bennett et al., 2009, p.4). In this case, cultural and provisioning services

360 do not share a common driver, therefore the relationship between them is

361 no-effect. Another explanation for the no-effect relationship between provi-

362 sioning and cultural services would be that cultural services such as tourism

363 and cultural heritage are often captured in protected areas (e.g. national

364 parks) where no production activity would be allowed (e.g. Martín-López

365 et al., 2007; Raudsepp-Hearne et al., 2010). However, there was a disagree-

366 ment on this relationship. Rodríguez et al. (2006) described the relationship

367 between provisioning and cultural services as a 'trade-off' relationship – forest

368 management for timber production could for example discourage recreational

369 visits to this forest. It might depend on the types of ES whether they share

370 a common driver or location to derive synergies or trade-offs.

371 Here we note that the types of cultural services that were covered in the

372 analysis were rather limited; 69% of those case studies that analyzed cultural

373 services focused on "physical and experimental interactions" (C1), whereas

374 "spiritual services" (C3) were not considered at all in the studies analyzed.

21

Figure 3: The distribution of the level of agreement (jittered for clarity) to determine the dominant relationship excluding pairs with a single observation. The shape of symbols indicates the dominant relationship.

3.1.4. Sensitivity of the pattern towards changes in the threshold of the level of agreement

To determine the dominant relationship, we used 50% as a threshold for the level of agreement (Eq. 1) following majority rule. If the threshold was raised up to 70%, about 20% of pairs of ES were influenced by the decision and changed to the "not decided" category (see Table 2 and Fig 3). However, the overall direction of the dominant relationships between groups of ES (i.e. the "section" level of ES (Fig 1)) did not change thereby. See Supplementary Figure SF4 where we present the relationship matrix of pairs of ES with the threshold 70%.

22

Table 2: The number of pairs of ecosystem services in each category of relationships under the 50% and 70% threshold conditions.

	Trade-off	Synergy	No-effect	Not decided
50% threshold	13	33	24	20
70% threshold	10	24	16	40

385 *3.1.5. Sensitivity of the pattern towards the analysis at the CICES group level*

386   Results might be potentially influenced by using the CICES group level

387 for the analysis. However, we assume that only a single "not-decoded" pair

388 has to be considered as an artifact from the aggregation of ES at the CI-

389 CES group level (Fig 1): the pair of "physical and experiential interactions"

390 (C1) and "soil formation and composition" (R8). While most case studies

391 for this pair were conducted at the same scale and in the same LSA using

392 the same methodology, the direction of the relationship was different across

393 the case studies. Six observations were synergistic, whereas five observa-

394 tions were identified as no-effect. All no-effect relationships were observed in

395 "physical activities such as hiking and leisure fishing" (C12), whereas four

396 among six synergy relationships were observed in "experiential use such as

397 bird watching" (C11) at the class level in CICES (Fig 1).

398   Except this one case it was not possible to use the class level of CICES

399 for the analysis due to the limited number of observations at this level. Our

400 analysis at the group level in CICES provides an overall pattern of relation-

401 ships over 94 pairs of ES. Furthermore, to our knowledge, the analysis of

402 relationships between ES at the group level was rarely done before. Previous

23

review studies provided results at a section level in CICES (e.g. provisioning, regulating, cultural services) (Rodríguez et al., 2006), or based only on examples (Bennett et al., 2009).

3.2. Scale and land system archetypes of ecosystem service pairs

The bootstrap approach did not reveal any significant difference between subgroups of the case studies based on scale or LSA. Neither spatial scale nor LSA membership had a significant influence on the overall pattern of the relationships between the services – p-values for each test are given in the Supplementary table ST3 and ST4.

The spatial scale of the studies was spread unevenly. The regional scale was most frequently studied (38%), followed by the plot scale (22%) and the continental scale (10%). The global scale was the least studied (6%) (Supplementary figure SF2). Forty-one pairs of ES (44%) were studied only at a single type of scale, which hindered the comparison of the relationship pattern among scales.

Among the 14 pairs of ES that were included in the contingency analysis, significant differences across scale were only identified for two pairs of ES: the pair of "soil formation and composition regulation" (R8) and "biomass provisioning" (P1) (p = 0.0067) and the pair of "soil formation and composition regulation" (R8) and "atmospheric composition and climate regulation" (R10) (p = 0.0321). Both pairs included "soil formation and composition regulation" (R8). The result for both pairs showed a synergistic relationship

24

at the small scale, whereas at the larger scale, the relationship was no-effect and not-decided for the pair of R8 and P1, and the pair of R8 and R10, respectively. "Soil formation and composition regulation " (R8) are generally considered not only as a direct driver for enhancing "biomass provisioning" (P1) in agricultural lands (Hobbs et al., 2008), but also as an indirect driver for enhancing carbon and nutrient cycling which can influence "atmospheric composition and climate regulation" (R10) by affecting biotic processes (van Breemen, 1993; Barrios, 2007). This synergistic role of "soil formation and composition regulation" (R8) was often studied in experiments at a finer scale (Six et al., 2000; Hobbs et al., 2008). At a larger scale, this relationship did not clearly appear – e.g. Jopke et al. (2014) showed a no-effect relationship at the continental scale.

In addition, there was only one pair which was considered at every scale. The results at each scale showed different relationships but the result was not statistically significant (p = 0.4213). It was the pair of "atmospheric composition and climate regulation" (R10) and "biomass provisioning" (P1): at the small scale (i.e. the plot, local scale) the dominant result was synergy (50%; n=3), whereas it was trade-off (54%; n=6) at the regional scale and no-effect (46%; n=5) at the large scale (national, continental and global).

Case studies were also unevenly distributed across LSAs (Supplementary figure SF3): only three types of LSAs (i.e. "boreal systems of the western world" (LSA3), "extensive cropping systems" (LSA7), and "intensive cropping systems" (LSA10)) among 12 were studied in more than 10 case stud-

25

ies. A geographical bias of the distribution of ES case studies was already stressed by Seppelt et al. (2011). The land system "boreal systems of the eastern world" (LSA4), "high-density urban agglomerations" (LSA5), and "irrigated cropping systems with rice yield gap" (LSA6) were not at all considered in the case studies. Thirty-two pairs of ES (34%) were studied at a single LSA. LSA10 was most frequently observed when only a single type of LSA was considered. At maximum, seven LSAs were considered for a pair of ES, the pair of "atmospheric composition and climate regulation" (R10) and "life cycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection" (R6).

   While the overall pattern of relationships between ES at the group level was indifferent to LSA, a few ES pairs showed interesting differences across LSAs from the contingency analysis. The relationship for the pair of "life cycle maintenance, habitat and gene pool protection" (R6) and "atmospheric composition and climate regulating" (R10) showed significantly different across the LSAs (p = 0.0269): synergy in "forest systems in the tropics" (LSA1), "extensive cropping systems" (LSA7), and "intensive cropping systems" (LSA10), no-effect in "irrigated cropping system" (LSA9) and "marginal lands in the developed world" (LSA11), and not decided in "boreal systems of the western world" (LSA3). Stored carbon in vegetation and soil was generally measured to quantify climate regulating services (R10) in every LSA. However, for "habitat protection services" (R6) different approaches were used in different LSAs. A possible explanation is that in "forest systems in the tropics" (LSA1) and "extensive cropping system" (LSA7) species rich-

26

ness as well as carbon sequestration are positively influenced by the presence of forest instead of arable land areas, while in "irrigated cropping system" (LSA9) and "marginal land" (LSA11) such a clear common driver is missing. Other pairs which differed significantly across LSAs were the pair of "existence and bequest" (C4) and "biomass provisioning" (P1) (p = 0.0152) and the pair of "biomass provisioning" (P1) and "Water provisioning (i.e. non-drinking purpose) " (P4) (p = 0.0331).

3.3. Methods used to determine the relationship

The results from the difference of deviance test showed that the influence of the choice of methods applied on the direction of the results was marginally significant (p = 0.0294). Correlation coefficient methods showed a higher probability to identify a no-effect relationship, whereas descriptive methods showed a higher probability to identify a trade-off relationship and less no-effect relationships. Multivariate statistics showed less no-effect relationships (Fig 5 and Fig 4).

It was problematic for case studies using multivariate statistics to set a threshold to distinguish "no-effect". While it is possible to identify thresholds for the strength of the relationship based on the loadings in PCA or factor analysis as well as for the uncertainty of assigning an ES to a cluster, this was rarely done in practice. Multivariate statistics were frequently applied in trade-off of ES researches to identify bundles of ES by using PCA or factor analysis in order to find ES that tend to occur together (e.g. La-

27

vorel et al., 2011; Maes et al., 2012). However, without an agreed threshold within ES research communities, using multivariate statistics to define relationships between ES might lead to ignorance of no-effect relationship. Since the assignment of ES to different bundles does typically neither include the strength of the association nor the attached uncertainty, no-effect relationships might be undetectable by the approach. Correlation approaches make it easier to define no-effect relationships based on the absolute strength of the correlation. If the correlation is stronger than a threshold, significance of the correlation should be tested – potentially corrected for nuisances such as spatial auto-correlation (Dormann et al., 2007).

Regression type I models were frequently used to describe the relationship between ES. From a theoretical point of view, the use of a regression type I model seems questionable to describe relationships between ecosystem services since the approach distinguishes ecosystem services into dependent and independent variables - errors are only considered for the dependent variable not for the independent variables. Only regression type II models (Legendre and Legendre, 2003) - which have not been used in the case studies-, in which errors for both predictors and response are considered seem appropriate to model ES relationships.

Methods were evenly distributed across the types of pairs of ecosystem services and across the scales. In other word, the decision on which types of method to use to define the relationship was neither influenced by the type of ecosystem services nor by the scale of the study.

28

Figure 4: Mosaic plot for method used and the relationships between two ecosystem services

It has been already reported (Vatn and Bromley, 1994; Jacobs, 1997; Martín-López et al., 2013) that the choice of the method to value ES can bias results. We emphasize here that not only valuation methods but also method used to define relationships should be chosen with a care. Researchers should be aware that their decision on methods used might limit the result in a certain direction.

Figure 5: Association plot for method used in the relationships between two ecosystem services

3.4. Further limitations

Although our review was comprehensive and thoroughly conducted, we imposed constraints on our review that might have biased our result. We only considered peer-reviewed scientific articles written in English found in Web of Knowledge for our analysis. This might have excluded some pairs of ES that are only considered for a certain region in gray literature. However, using non peer-reviewed literature has the drawback that quality standards are lower (Pullin and Stewart, 2006; Nieto-Romero et al., 2014; Harrison et al., 2014).

4. Conclusions

Comprehensive information is required for well-informed policy decisions which do not ignore side-effects in multi-functional land systems. However, this information is often expensive and difficult to obtain. The missing information can directly and indirectly influence the policy decision as well as its impact on multi-functional land systems, and therefore human well-being (OECD, 2003). The fundamental challenge in practice is to minimize the inefficient and inappropriate impacts on provisioning of multiple ES by enhancing understanding of multi-relationships between ES. Making this information more explicit and accessible is more likely to drive at more balanced conditions (Carpenter et al., 2009).

In this study, we tried to fill the knowledge gap on relationships between ES by a synthesis of relationships between ES studied in published case

31

studies. We identified typical relationships between a number of pairs of ES. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study in which such a comprehensive matrix of relationships between ES has been complied. Our results provide an overview of relationships of ES studied so far together with the information on the level of agreement between study results. This equips practitioners with a practical summary to examine the underlying impacts of their decision in advance. Furthermore, our results might highlight pairs of ES for which more input is needed from the scientific community. The results might help further during the design of research programs and give important hints for decision makers and reviewers to check research plans and to ask critical questions with respect to research outcomes. If important relationships between ES could not be studied, our analysis might provide hints on the direction of the neglected effect.

   While we were able to show that for a few pairs of ES the dominant relationship changed as a function of scale or of land system, we were not able to show this for the majority of cases. The limited number of case studies and the uneven distribution across ES groups, scales and land system archetypes is a potential explanation for it. Therefore, we encourage the development of a research agenda that allows filling those gaps to come to a more complete picture on relationships between different ES. Being able to predict the direction of a relationship between ES as a function of scale and land system would be an important step for decision support and ecosystem management but it would be by no means the end of the research agenda.

567 We need higher quality studies that follow good modeling practice or analyze
568 their data properly, reporting uncertainties along with point estimates, more
569 evenly spread across the scales and land systems which reports not only
570 the direction but also the strength of the relationship in a comparable way.
571 Bundle analysis based on an overlay of relatively simple GIS tools presumably
572 would not fulfill high quality standards and should be therefore treated with
573 care. Based on the results of such data, a next step would be the performance
574 of a meta-analysis to untangle more details on ES relationships.

Acknowledgements

References

582 Aizen, M.A., Garibaldi, L.A., Cunningham, S.A., Klein, A.M., 2008. Long-
583 term global trends in crop yield and production reveal no current polli-
584 nation shortage but increasing pollinator dependency. Current Biology
585 18(20), 1572–1575. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2008.08.066.

586 Altieri, M.A., 1999. The ecological role of biodiversity in agroecosystems.
587 Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment 74, 19–31.

33

Altieri, M.A., 2004. Linking ecologists and traditional farmers in the search for sustainable agriculture. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 2, 35–42. doi:`10.1890/1540-9295(2004)002[0035:LEATFI]2.0.CO;2`.

Arnold, J.G., Srinivasan, R., Muttiah, R.S., Allen, P.M., 1999. Continental scale simulation of the hydrologic balance. Journal of the American Water Resources Association 35(5), 1037–1051.

Backéus, S., Wikström, P., Lämås, T., 2005. A model for regional analysis of carbon sequestration and timber production. Forest Ecology and Management 216(1-3), 28–40. doi:`10.1016/j.foreco.2005.05.059`.

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(10), 1146–1156.

Barrios, E., 2007. Soil biota, ecosystem services and land productivity. Ecological Economics 64, 269–285. doi:`10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.03.004`.

Bengtsson, J., Ahnström, J., Weibull, A.C., 2005. The effects of organic agriculture on biodiversity and abundance: a meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Ecology 42, 261–269. doi:`10.1111/j.1365-2664.2005.01005.x`.

Bennett, E.M., Peterson, G.D., Gordon, L.J., 2009. Understanding relationships among multiple ecosystem services. Ecology Letters 12, 1394–1404. doi:`10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01387.x`.

34

609   Berkes, F., Folke, C., 1998. Linking social and ecological systems for resilience

610   and sustainabitliy, in: Berkes, F., Folke, C. (Eds.), Linking sociological

611   and ecological systems: management practices and social mechanisms for

612   building resilience. Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–25.

613   Bolliger, J., Bättig, M., Gallati, J., Kläy, A., Stauffacher, M., Kienast, F.,

614   2011. Landscape multifunctionality: a powerful concept to identify effects

615   of environmental change. Regional Environmental Change 11, 203–206.

616   doi:10.1007/s10113-010-0185-6.

617   Boreux, V., Kushalappa, C.G., Vaast, P., Ghazoul, J., 2013. Interactive

618   effects among ecosystem services and management practices on crop pro-

619   duction: Pollination in coffee agroforestry systems. Proceedings of the

620   National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 110, 8387–

621   8392. doi:10.1073/pnas.1210590110.

622   van Breemen, N., 1993. Soils as biotic constructs favouring net primary pro-

623   ductivity. Geoderma 57, 183–211. doi:10.1016/0016-7061(93)90002-3.

624   Burkhard, B., Kroll, F., Müller, F., Windhorst, W., 2009. Landscapes ca-

625   pacities to provide ecosystem services a concept for land-cover based as-

626   sessments. Landscape Online 15, 1–22. doi:10.3097/LO.200915.

627   Carpenter, S.R., Mooney, H.A., Agard, J., Capistrano, D., DeFries, R.S.,

628   Díaz, S., Dietz, T., Duraiappah, A.K., Oteng-Yeboah, A., Pereira, H.M.,

629   Perrings, C., Reid, W.V., Sarukhan, J., Scholes, R.J., Whyteo, A., 2009.

Science for managing ecosystem services: Beyond the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 106, 1305–1312. doi:10.1073/pnas.0808772106.

Chan, K.M.A., Shaw, M.R., Cameron, D.R., Underwood, E.C., Daily, G.C., 2006. Conservation planning for ecosystem services. PLoS Biology 4, e379. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0040379.

Cimon-Morin, J., Darveau, M., Poulin, M., 2013. Fostering synergies between ecosystem services and biodiversity in conservation planning: A review. Biological Conservation 166, 144–154. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2013.06.023.

Cork, S., Stoneham, G., Lowe, K., 2007. Ecosystem Services and Australian Natural Resource Management (NRM) Futures. Technical Report. the Ecosystem Services Working Group of the Natural Resource Policies and Programs Committee.

Crawford, J.W., Harris, J.A., Ritz, K., Young, I.M., 2005. Towards an evolutionary ecology of life in soil. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 20(2), 81–87. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2004.11.014.

Daniel, T.C., Muhar, A., Arnberger, A., Aznar, O., Boyd, J.W., Chan, K.M.A., Costanza, R., Elmqvist, T., Flint, C.G., Gobster, P.H., Grêt-Regamey, A., Lave, R., Muhar, S., Penker, M., Ribe, R.G., Schauppenlehner, T., Sikor, T., Soloviy, I., Spierenburg, M., Taczanowska,

36

651   K., Tam, J., von der Dunk, A., 2012. Contributions of cultural ser-
652   vices to the ecosystem services agenda. Proceedings of the National
653   Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 109, 8812–8819.
654   doi:10.1073/pnas.1114773109.

655 Dickie, I.A., Yeates, G.W., St. John, M.G., Stevenson, B.A., Scott, J.T.,
656   Rillig, M.C., Peltzer, D.A., Orwin, K.H., Kirschbaum, M.U.F., Hunt, J.E.,
657   Burrows, L.E., Barbour, M.M., Aislabie, J., 2011. Ecosystem service and
658   biodiversity trade-offs in two woody successions. Journal of Applied Ecol-
659   ogy 48, 926–934. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2011.01980.x.

660 Dormann, C.F., McPherson, J.M., Araújo, M.B., Bivand, R., Bolliger, J.,
661   Carl, G., Davies, R.G., Hirzel, A., Jetz, W., Kissling, W.D., Kʹuhn, I.,
662   Ohlemʹuller, R., Peres-Neto, P.R., Reineking, B., Schrʹoder, B., Schurr,
663   F.M., Wilson, R., 2007. Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation
664   in the analysis of species distributional data: a review. Ecography 30,
665   609–628. doi:10.1111/j.2007.0906-7590.05171.x.

666 Efron, B., Tibshirani, R., 1994. An introduction to the bootstrap. CRC
667   Press.

668 Faraway, J.J., 2005. Extending the linear model with R: generalized linear,
669   mixed effects and nonparametric regression models. Taylor & Francis Inc.

670 Garibaldi, L.A., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Winfree, R., Aizen, M.A., Bommarco,
671   R., Cunningham, S.A., Kremen, C., Carvalheiro, L.G., Harder, L.D., Afik,

37

672   O., Bartomeus, I., Benjamin, F., Boreux, V., Cariveau, D., Chacoff, N.P.,

673   Dudenhöffer, J.H., Freitas, B.M., Ghazoul, J., Greenleaf, S., Hipólito, J.,

674   Holzschuh, A., Howlett, B., Isaacs, R., Javorek, S.K., Kennedy, C.M.,

675   Krewenka, K.M., Krishnan, S., Mandelik, Y., Mayfield, M.M., Motzke, I.,

676   Munyuli, T., Nault, B.A., Otieno, M., Petersen, J., Pisanty, G., Potts,

677   S.G., Rader, R., Ricketts, T.H., Rundlöf, M., Seymour, C.L., Schüepp, C.,

678   Szentgyörgyi, H., Taki, H., Tscharntke, T., Vergara, C.H., Viana, B.F.,

679   Wanger, T.C., Westphal, C., Williams, N., Klein, A.M., 2013. Wild polli-

680   nators enhance fruit set of crops regardless of honey bee abundance. Sci-

681   ence 29, 1608–1611.

682 de Groot, R., Alkemade, R., Braat, L., Hein, L., Willemen, L., 2010. Chal-

683   lenges in integrating the concept of ecosystem services and values in land-

684   scape planning, management and decision making. Ecological Complexity

685   7(3), 260–272. doi:10.1016/j.ecocom.2009.10.006.

686 de Groot, R.S., Wilson, M.A., Boumans, R.M., 2002. A typology for the

687   classification, description and valuation of ecosystem functions, goods and

688   services. ecological economics,. Ecological Economics 41, 393–408.

689 Haase, D., Schwarz, N., Strohbach, M., Kroll, F., Seppelt, R., 2012. Syn-

690   ergies, trade-offs, and losses of ecosystem services in urban regions: an

691   integrated multiscale framework applied to the Leipzig-Halle region, Ger-

692   many. Ecology and Society 17(3), 22. doi:10.5751/es-04853-170322.

693 Haines-Young, R., Potschin, M., 2013. Common International Classi-

694 fication of Ecosystem Services (CICES): Consultation on Version 4,
695 August-December 2012. Technical Report. EEA Framework Contract No
696 EEA/IEA/09/003.

697 Harrison, P., Berry, P., Simpson, G., Haslett, J., Blicharska, M., Bucur, M.,
698 Dunford, R., Egoh, B., Garcia-Llorente, M., Geamănă, N., Geertsema,
699 W., Lommelen, E., Meiresonne, L., Turkelboom, F., 2014. Linkages be-
700 tween biodiversity attributes and ecosystem services: A systematic review.
701 Ecosystem Services 9, 191–203. doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2014.05.006.

702 Hein, L., van Koppen, K., de Groot, R.S., van Ierland, E.C., 2006. Spatial
703 scales, stakeholders and the valuation of ecosystem services. Ecological
704 Economics 57, 209–228. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.04.005.

705 Hillebrand, H., Matthiessen, B., 2009. Biodiversity in a complex world:
706 consolidation and progress in functional biodiversity research. Ecology 12,
707 1405–1419. doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01388.x.

708 Hinkel, D., Wiersma, W., Jurs, S., 2003. Applied Statistics for the Behavioral
709 Sciences 5th ed. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.

710 Hobbs, P.R., Sayre, K., Gupta, R., 2008. The role of conservation agriculture
711 in sustainable agriculture. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society
712 B 363, 543–555. doi:10.1098/rstb.2007.2169.

713 Holling, C.S., 1996. Engineering resilience versus ecological resilience, in:

39

714 Schulze, P. (Ed.), Engineering Within Ecological Constraints. National
715 Academy of Engineering, pp. 31–44.

716 Howe, C., Suich, H., Vira, B., Mace, G.M., 2014. Creating win-wins from
717 trade-offs? ecosystem services for human well-being: A meta-analysis of
718 ecosystem service trade-offs and synergies in the real world. Global Envi-
719 ronmental Change 28, 263–275. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.07.005.

720 Jacobs, M., 1997. Environmental valuation, deliberative democracy and pub-
721 lic decision-making institutions, in: Foster, J. (Ed.), Valuing Nature? Eco-
722 nomics, Ethics and Environment.. Routledge, London, pp. 211–231.

723 Jopke, C., Kreyling, J., Maes, J., Koellner, T., 2014. Interactions among
724 ecosystem services across europe: Bagplots and cumulative correlation co-
725 efficients reveal synergies, trade-offs, and regional patterns. Ecological
726 Indicators 49, 46–52. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2014.09.037.

727 Kandziora, M., Burkhard, B., Felix, M., 2013. Interactions of ecosystem
728 properties, ecosystem integrity and ecosystem service indicatorsa theo-
729 retical matrix exercis. Ecological Indicators 28, 54–78. doi:10.1016/j.
730 ecolind.2012.09.006.

731 Klein, A.M., Vaissiére, B.E., Cane, J.H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham,
732 S.A., Kremen, C., Tscharntke, T., 2007. Importance of pollinators in
733 changing landscapes for world crops. Proceedings of the Royal Society B:
734 Biological Sciences 274, 303–313. doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3721.

735 Kremen, C., 2005. Managing ecosystem services: what do we need to know
736   about their ecology? Ecology Letters 8, 468–479.

737 Landers, D.H., Nahlik, A.M., 2013. Final Ecosystem Goods and Ser-
738   vices Classification System (FEGS-CS). Technical Report EPA/600/R-
739   13/ORD-004914. United States Environmental Protection Agency.

740 Landis, D.A., Wratten, S.D., Gurr, G.M., 2000. Habitat management to
741   conserve natural enemies of arthropod pests in agricultrue. Annual Review
742   of Entomology 45, 175–201. doi:10.1146/annurev.ento.45.1.175.

743 Larvelle, P., 2012. Soil as habitat, in: Wall, D.H. (Ed.), Soil Ecology and
744   Ecosystem Services. Oxford University Press, pp. 7–27.

745 Lautenbach, S., Seppelt, R., Liebscher, J., Dormann, C.F., 2012. Spatial and
746   temporal trends of global pollination benefit. PLoS ONE 7(4), e35954.
747   doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035954.

748 Lautenbach, S., Volk, M., Strauch, M., Whittaker, G., Seppelt, R., 2013.
749   Optimization-based trade-off analysis of biodiesel crop production for man-
750   aging an agricultural catchment. Environmental Modelling & Software 48,
751   98–112. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2013.06.006.

752 Lavorel, S., Grigulis, K., Lamarque, P., Colace, M.P., Garden, D., Girel,
753   J., Pellet, G., Douzet, R., 2011. Using plant functional traits to under-
754   stand the landscape distribution of multiple ecosystem services. Journal
755   of Ecology 99(1), 135–147. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2011.01914.x.

41

756 Legendre, P., Legendre, L., 2003. Numerical ecology. Elsevier.

757 Lichtfouse, E., Navarrete, M., Debaeke, P., Souchère, V., Alberola, C.,
758 Ménassieu, J., 2009. Agronomy for sustainable agriculture: A review.
759 Sustainable Agriculture , 1–7doi:10.1007/978-90-481-2666-8_1.

760 Liu, J., Hull, V., Batistella, M., DeFries, R., Dietz, T., Fu, F., Hertel, T.W.,
761 Izaurralde, R.C., Lambin, E.F., Li, S. F.and Li, S., Martinelli, L.A., Mc-
762 Connell, W.J., Moran, E.F., Naylor, R., Ouyang, Z., Polenske, K.R., Reen-
763 berg, A., Rocha, G.d.M., Simmons, C.S., Verburg, P.H., Vitousek, P.M.,
764 Zhang, F., Zhu, C., 2013. Framing sustainability in a telecoupled world.
765 Ecology and Society 18(2), 26. doi:10.5751/ES-05873-180226.

766 Liu, J., Mooney, H., Hull, V., Davis, S.J., Gaskell, J., Hertel, T., Lubchenco,
767 J., Seto, K.C., Gleick, P., Kremen, C., Li, S., 2015. Systems integration
768 for global sustainability. Science 347. doi:10.1126/science.1258832.

769 MA, 2005. Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis. Millennium
770 Ecosystem Assessment, Island Press, Washington, DC.

771 Mace, G.M., Norris, K., Fitter, A.H., 2012. Biodiversity and ecosystem
772 services: a multilayered relationship. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 27(1),
773 19–26. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.08.006.

774 Maes, J., Paracchini, M., Zulian, G., Dunbar, M., Alkemade, R., 2012. Syn-
775 ergies and trade-offs between ecosystem service supply, biodiversity, and

42

776   habitat conservation status in europe. Biological Conservation 155, 1–12.

777   doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2012.06.016.

778   Martín-López, B., Gómez-Baggethun, E., García-Llorente, M., Montes, C.,

779   2013. Trade-offs across value-domains in ecosystem services assessment.

780   Ecological Indicators 37, 220–228. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.03.003.

781   Martín-López, B., Montes, C., Benayas, J., 2007. Influence of user char-

782   acteristics on valuation of ecosystem services in doñana natural pro-

783   tected area (south-west spain). Environmental Conservation 34, 215–224.

784   doi:10.1017/S0376892907004067.

785   Martínez-Harms, M.J., Balvanera, P., 2012. Methods for mapping ecosystem

786   service supply: a review. International Journal of Biodiversity Science,

787   Ecosystem Services & Management 8, 17–25. doi:10.1080/21513732.

788   2012.663792.

789   Mason, R.D., Lind, D.A., 1983. Statistics: An introduction. Houghton Mifflin

790   Harcourt P.

791   Mastrangelo, M.E., Weyland, F., Villarino, S.H., Barral, M.P., Nahuelhual,

792   L., Laterra, P., 2014. Concepts and methods for landscape multifunction-

793   ality and a unifying framework based on ecosystem services. Landscape

794   Ecology 29, 345–358. doi:10.1007/s10980-013-9959-9.

795   Mattison, E.H., Norris, K., 2005. Bridging the gaps between agricultural

43

796   policy, land-use and biodiversity. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 20, 610–

797   616.

798   Mononen, L., Auvinen, A.P., Ahokumpu, A.L., Aarras, M.R.N., Tolvanen,

799   H., Kamppinen, M., Viirret, E., Kumpula, T., Vihervaara, P., 2015. Na-

800   tional ecosystem service indicators: Measures of social-ecological sustain-

801   ability. Ecological Indicators x, xx. doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.03.

802   041.

803   Mouchet, M.A., Lamarque, P., Martín-López, B., Crouzat, E., Gos, P., By-

804   czek, C., Lavorel, S., 2014. An interdisciplinary methodological guide for

805   quantifying associations between ecosystem services. Global Environmen-

806   tal Change 28, 298–308. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.07.012.

807   Nemec, K.T., Raudsepp-Hearne, C., 2012. The use of geographic information

808   systems to map and assess ecosystem services. Biodiversity and conserva-

809   tion 22, 1–15. doi:10.1007/s10531-012-0406-z.

810   Nieto-Romero, M., Oteros-Rozas, E., José A. González, B.M.L., 2014. Ex-

811   ploring the knowledge landscape of ecosystem services assessments in

812   mediterranean agroecosystems: Insights for future research. Environmen-

813   tal Science & Policy 37, 121–133. doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2013.09.003.

814   OECD, 2003. Multifunctionality: The policy implementation. Technical

815   Report. OECD.

44

816 O'Farrell, P.J., Reyers, B., Maitre, D.C.L., Milton, S.J., Egoh, B., Maherry,

817 A., Colvin, C., Atkinson, D., Lange, W.D., Blignaut, J.N., Cowling, R.M.,

818 2010. Multi-functional landscapes in semi arid environments: implications

819 for biodiversity and ecosystem services. Landscape Ecology 25, 1231–1246.

820 doi:10.1007/s10980-010-9495-9.

821 Olschewski, R., Klein, A.M., Tscharntke, T., 2010. Economic trade-offs

822 between carbon sequestration, timber production, and crop pollination

823 in tropical forested landscapes. Ecological Complexity 7(3), 314–319.

824 doi:10.1016/j.ecocom.2010.01.002.

825 Paracchini, M.L., Pacini, C., Jones, M.L.M., rez Soba, M.P., 2011. An aggre-

826 gation framework to link indicators associated with multifunctional land

827 use to the stakeholder evaluation of policy options. Ecological Indicators

828 11, 71–80.

829 Phalan, B., Onial, M., Balmford, A., Green, R.E., 2011. Reconciling food

830 production and biodiversity conservation: Land sharing and land sparing

831 compared. Science 333, 1289–1291. doi:10.1126/science.1208742.

832 de Ponti, T., Rijk, B., van Ittersum, M.K., 2012. The crop yield gap be-

833 tween organic and conventional agriculture. Agricultural Systems 108,

834 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2011.12.004.

835 Pullin, A.S., Stewart, G.B., 2006. Guidelines for systematic review in conser-

vation and environmental management. Conservation Biology 20, 1647–1656. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00485.x.

R Core Team, 2015. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. URL: http://www.R-project.org/.

Raudsepp-Hearne, C., Peterson, G.D., Bennett, E.M., 2010. Ecosystem service bundles for analyzing tradeoffs in diverse landscapes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 107, 5242–5247. doi:10.1073/pnas.0907284107.

Reidsma, P., Tekelenburg, T., van den Berg, M., Alkemade, R., 2006. Impacts of land-use change on biodiversity: An assessment of agricultural biodiversity in the european union. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 114, 86–102. doi:10.1016/j.agee.2005.11.026.

Rodríguez, J.P., Beard, T.D., Jr, Bennett, E.M., Cumming, G.S., Cork, S.J., Agard, J., Dobson, A.P., Peterson, G.D., 2006. Trade-offs across space, time, and ecosystem services. Ecology and Society 11(1), 28. URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss1/art28/.

Schindler, S., Sebesvari, Z., Damm, C., Euller, K., Mauerhofer, V., Schneidergruber, A., Biró, M., Essl, F., Kanka, R., Lauwaars, S.G., Schulz-Zunkel, C., van der Sluis, T., Kropik, M., Gasso, V., Krug, A., Pusch, M.T., Zulka, K.P., Lazowski, W., Hainz-Renetzeder, C., Henle, K., Wr-

857 bka, T., 2014. Multifunctionality of floodplain landscapes: relating man-

858 agement options to ecosystem services. Landscape Ecology 29, 229–244.

859 doi:10.1007/s10980-014-9989-y.

860 Seidl, R., Rammer, W., Jäger, D., Currie, W.S., Lexer, M.J., 2007. Assessing

861 trade-offs between carbon sequestration and timber production within a

862 framework of multi-purpose forestry in austria. Forest Ecology and Man-

863 agement 248(1-2), 64–79.

864 Seppelt, R., Dormann, C.F., Eppink, F.V., Lautenbach, S., Schmidt, S.,

865 2011. A quantitative review of ecosystem service studies: approaches,

866 shortcomings and the road ahead. Journal of Applied Ecology 48, 630–

867 636. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01952.x.

868 Seufert, V., Ramankutty, N., Foley, J.A., 2012. Comparing the yields of

869 organic and conventional agriculture. Nature 485, 229–232. doi:10.1038/

870 nature11069.

871 Six, J., Elliott, E., Paustian, K., 2000. Soil macroaggregate turnover and mi-

872 croaggregate formation: a mechanism for c sequestration under no-tillage

873 agriculture. Soil Biology & Biochemistry 32, 2099–2103.

874 Smith, B., Prentice, I., Sykes, M., 2001. Representation of vegetation dynam-

875 ics in the modelling of terrestrial ecosystems: comparing two contrasting

876 approaches within european climate space. Global Ecology & Biogeogra-

877 phy 10, 621–637.

47

878 Tabachnick, B., Fidell, L., 1989. Using Multivariate Statistics. Harper &
879 Row Publishers, New York.

880 Tallis, H., Polasky, S., 2009. Mapping and valuing ecosystem services as
881 an approach for conservation and natural-resource management. Annals
882 of the New York Academy of Sciences 1162, 265–283. doi:10.1111/j.
883 1749-6632.2009.04152.x.

884 Taylor, R., 1990. Interpretation of the correlation coefficient: A basic review.
885 Journal of Diagnostic Medical Sonography 6, 35–39.

886 Naturkapital Deutschland TEEB DE, 2014. Naturkapital und klimapolitik
887 synergien und konflikte. kurzbericht für entscheidungsträger. Technische
888 Universität Berlin and Helmholtz-Zentrum für Umweltforschung UFZ,
889 Leipzig.

890 Turkelboom, F., Raquez, P., Dufrêne, M., Raes, L., Simoens, I., Jacobs, S.,
891 Stevens, M., Vreese, R.D., Panis, J.A., Hermy, M., Thoonen, M., Liekens,
892 I., Fontaine, C., Dendoncker, N., van der Biest, K., Casaer, J., Heyrman,
893 H., Meiresonne, L., Keune, H., 2013. CICES going local: Ecosystem Ser-
894 vices Classification adapted for a highly populated country. Ecosystem
895 Services , 223–247doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-419964-4.00018-4.

896 Turner, K.G., Odgaard, M.V., Bøcher, P.K., Dalgaard, T., Svenning, J.C.,
897 2014. Bundling ecosystem services in denmark: Trade-offs and synergies
898 ina cultural landscape. Landscape and Urban Planning 125, 89–104.

Václavík, T., Lautenbach, S., Kuemmerle, T., Seppelt, R., 2013. Mapping global land system archetypes. Global Environmental Change 23, 1637–1647. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.09.004.

Vatn, A., Bromley, D.W., 1994. Choices without prices without apologies. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management 26, 129–148. doi:10.1006/jeem.1994.1008.

Weber, J.C., Lamb, D.R., 1970. Statistics and Research in Physical Education. Mosby.

Westa, P.C., Gibbs, H.K., Monfreda, C., Wagner, J., Barford, C.C., Carpenter, S.R., Foley, J.A., 2010. Trading carbon for food: Global comparison of carbon stocks vs. crop yields on agricultural land. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 107, 19645–19648.

Wiggering, H., Dalchow, C., Glemnitz, M., Helming, K., Müller, K., Schultz, A., Stachow, U., Zander, P., 2006. Indicators for multifunctional land use linking socio-economic requirements with landscape potentials. Ecological Indicators 6, 238–249.

Willemen, L., Veldkamp, A., Verburg, P., Hein, L., Leemans, R., 2012. A multi-scale modelling approach for analysing landscape service dynamics. Journal of Environmental Management 100, 86–95. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.01.022.

49

920 Young, I., Ritz, K., 2000. Tillage, habitat space and function of soil microbes.

921 Soil and Tillage Research 53, 201–213. doi:`10.1016/S0167-1987(99)`

922 `00106-3`.

923 Zhang, W., Ricketts, T.H., Kremen, C., Carney, K., Swinton, S.M., 2007.

924 Ecosystem services and dis-services to agriculture. Ecological Economics

925 64(2), 253–260. doi:`10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.02.024`.