Title

Context-dependency in biodiversity-multifunctionality relationships is driven by nitrogen availability and plant functional composition

Summary

The ability of an ecosystem to deliver multiple functions at high levels (multifunctionality) typically increases with biodiversity but there is substantial variation in the strength and direction of biodiversity effects, suggesting context-dependency. However, the drivers of this context dependency have not been identified and understood in comparative meta-analyses or experimental studies. To determine how different factors modulate the effect of diversity on multifunctionality, we conducted a large grassland experiment with 216 communities, crossing a manipulation of plant species richness (1-20 species) with manipulations of resource availability (nitrogen enrichment), plant functional composition (gradient in mean specific leaf area [SLA] to manipulate abundances of fast vs. slow species), plant functional diversity (variance in SLA) and enemy abundance (fungal pathogen removal). We measured ten functions, above and belowground, related to productivity, nutrient cycling and energy transfer between trophic levels, and calculated multifunctionality. Plant species richness and functional diversity both increased multifunctionality, but their effects were context dependent. Species richness increased multifunctionality, but only when communities were assembled with fast growing (high SLA) species. This was because slow species were more redundant in their functional effects, whereas fast species tended to promote different functions. Functional diversity also increased multifunctionality but this effect was dampened by nitrogen enrichment, however, unfertilised, functionally diverse communities still delivered more functions than low diversity, fertilised communities. Our study suggests that a shift towards exploitative communities will not only

25   alter ecosystem functioning but also the strength of biodiversity-functioning relationships, which

26   highlights the potentially complex effects of global change on multifunctionality.

Introduction

The ability of an ecosystem to deliver many functions at high levels simultaneously (multifunctionality) generally increases with diversity [1–6]. Although positive biodiversity-ecosystem multifunctionality relationships are common, studies have found substantial variation in the direction and strength of this relationship [6–8]. Only a few studies have addressed the drivers of context-dependency in biodiversity-multifunctionality relationships and these have been either observational [6,9] or have focussed on one of the multiple potential drivers [10] (but see refs [11,12]). It is therefore not clear how important different environmental or biotic drivers (resource levels, enemy pressure or community composition) are in determining context-dependency in biodiversity-multifunctionality relationships. Experimental approaches are needed to rigorously test this but very few experiments cross diversity gradients with manipulations of resources, enemies or composition.

The main drivers of context dependency are likely to be those that alter the mechanisms by which biodiversity affects function. Two of the main mechanisms behind the positive effects of species diversity on ecosystem functioning are: i) complementary resource use amongst species, and ii) increased enemy attack in species-poor communities [13–15]. If species vary in their resource uptake strategies, then diverse communities should use resources more efficiently [16] while increasing resource levels should remove opportunities for nutrient use complementarity between species and therefore equalise functioning between low and high diversity [17]. We can therefore expect a decrease in the effect of diversity on ecosystem functioning with nitrogen (N) enrichment. However, some experimental studies have shown neutral [18,19] or even positive effects of increased resource levels on the diversity-functioning relationship [20–22]. These results suggest that niche complementarity for nitrogen does not always underlie diversity-functioning relationships. Natural enemy attack is also an important mechanism driving effects of diversity on function: for example, soil pathogens can enhance biodiversity-productivity relationships by reducing biomass production in monocultures [23,24], while

aboveground insects and pathogens can dampen diversity-functioning relationships by removing

more biomass at high diversity [25]. There is therefore little consensus on how plant enemies, or

resource availability, affect diversity-functioning relationships.

In addition to the environment, the composition of the species pool (from which local plant

communities are drawn) could modify biodiversity-multifunctionality relationships. A key element of

composition could be the resource use strategies of the species as those with different resource use

strategies might vary in their degree of resource use complementarity. The leaf economics spectrum

[26,27] distinguishes slow growing, conservative species from fast growing, acquisitive ones and is

indicated by several traits, such as specific leaf area (SLA) and leaf nitrogen content. Slow growing

species, with low SLA, are more competitive in the low nutrient environments they tend to dominate

[28,29] and might therefore differ more in their competitive abilities for different nutrients, leading to

nutrient use complementarity between slow growing species. In contrast, faster growing species, with

high SLA, are abundant in high resource environments, where asymmetric light competition is

prevalent [30,31]. Nutrient use complementarity between fast growing species might therefore be low.

However, fast growing species are also likely to be more sensitive to both resource addition and

enemies, due to a growth defence trade-off [32], and enemies might therefore drive stronger diversity-

functioning relationships in fast-dominated communities. Such effects of the functional composition

of the species pool on diversity-function relationships would lead to different effects of diversity

depending on which species are combined and therefore to interactions between changes in

composition and diversity. At the community level, functional composition and functional diversity

are key drivers of multifunctionality on their own [6,9,33]. A high functional diversity can increase

multifunctionality if species with different resource use strategies (fast vs slow) have complementary

interactions [34,35]. However, functional diversity can also reduce multifunctionality in harsh conditions

where environmental filtering is strong and functionally distinct species are poorly adapted to the

local conditions [36]. Community wide changes in functional composition and diversity both have large

effects on multifunctionality [9,17] and on individual functions [36–38]. Global changes can simultaneously

affect the diversity, and composition of functional traits linked to resource-use strategy, making it

hard to separate effects of functional diversity and composition in observational studies. Experimental

approaches are necessary to disentangle the relative important of composition and diversity and to

test for interactions between them but have not yet been attempted.

To understand how composition, enemy presence, and resource availability modulate the effect of

diversity on multifunctionality, we manipulated plant species richness, N enrichment, fungal pathogen

removal (fungicide spraying), plant functional composition (as a gradient of abundance weighted

specific leaf area [SLA]) and plant functional diversity in a full-factorial experiment with 216 plots. We

therefore manipulated two diversity dimensions, species richness and functional diversity (mean

pairwise distance of SLA), to be as orthogonal as possible to each other (see methods). We measured

ten functions on each plot, related to biotic interactions and biogeochemical cycling: above and

belowground plant biomass, insect herbivore damage (hereafter herbivory) and foliar fungal pathogen

infection, plant nitrogen and phosphorus uptake (quantified as ratios between available nitrogen and

phosphorus content in the soil and nitrogen and phosphorus content in aboveground plant biomass),

two enzymatic activities related to carbon (β-glucosidase) and phosphorus (phosphatase) cycling, soil

respiration and soil carbon storage. We used a novel approach to analysing effects on equal weight

ecosystem function multifunctionality [39], in which we calculated multifunctionality at several

thresholds between 50 and 80%. We then combined all these multifunctionality measures in a single

model (for details see methods), which allowed us to estimate the average effect of our treatments

on multifunctionality, across thresholds. As any particular threshold is arbitrary, this allowed us to

robustly quantify overall effects on multifunctionality. We hypothesised that: (1) species richness and

functional diversity will both increase multifunctionality, (2) the diversity effect will depend on the

functional traits of the species which are combined (i.e. the functional composition of the species

pool), and (3) increased resource levels will reduce and fungal presence will increase the diversity

effect on multifunctionality.

Results

Richness-multifunctionality relationships depend on functional composition

Diversity effects on multifunctionality were highly context-dependent in our experiment. The effect of sown species richness on multifunctionality was modified by plant functional composition (community weighted mean SLA). Species richness (SR) decreased multifunctionality slightly in communities with low mean SLA but increased multifunctionality at high mean SLA (Figure 1a and b and Table S1). Species richness therefore had a positive effect on multifunctionality in communities assembled from fast-growing, acquisitive species, but a neutral to negative effect when the species pool contained only slow-growing, conservative species. We also analysed each function individually and found that the SLA x SR interaction was significant for only one function, soil phosphatase activity, and the interaction was negative (Figure 2), meaning that it did not drive the overall SLA x SR effect on multifunctionality. SLA as a main effect had contrasting effects on individual functions, with a positive effect on functions measured aboveground (pathogen presence, herbivory), and a negative effect belowground (belowground biomass, phosphatase activity, soil respiration).

High resource levels dampen effects of functional diversity on multifunctionality

Sown functional diversity, calculated as the mean pairwise distance between species in their SLA, increased multifunctionality in control plots (Figure 1a and c). However, nitrogen enrichment dampened this positive effect of functional diversity by increasing multifunctionality most in the low

functional diversity plots. Nitrogen enrichment increased several individual functions (above and

belowground biomass, soil β-glucosidase activity, plant P uptake) but the interaction with functional

diversity was significant only for soil respiration (Figure 2). Interestingly, N enrichment also interacted

with species richness to affect belowground biomass and C storage (Figure 2), but this interaction

further depended on SLA and foliar pathogen removal (fungicide treatment) and did not affect

multifunctionality.

Foliar pathogen removal reduced overall fungal damage to leaves and herbivory, in species rich

communities, and increased total soil respiration in high SLA communities and belowground biomass

in species rich fertilised communities. Foliar pathogen removal was also involved in some other

complex interactions for C storage and phosphatase. These contrasting effects translated into a non-

significant effect of pathogen removal on multifunctionality and no interactions between pathogens

and diversity (Figure 2).

Effect of change in species abundances on functional diversity

The sown functional diversity of the plots increased multifunctionality, see above. However, species

have shifted their relative abundances since the start of the experiment and to test the effect of these

abundance changes on functional diversity, we calculated MPDw, weighted by realised species

abundances. As weighted and unweighted MPD were correlated, because both were 0 in

monocultures (see Figure S1), we fitted a second model in which we replaced the unweighted, sown

MPD by MPDw. Abundance weighted functional diversity had an opposite effect and decreased

multifunctionality (Figure 3). These contradictory effects indicate that the communities with the

highest multifunctionality were those which had been sown with functionally distinct species (high

unweighted MPD), but in which functional redundancy increased because they became dominated by

functionally similar species (lower abundance weighted MPDw). Such high multifunctionality

communities are therefore dominated by functionally similar species but contain functionally distinct

rare species.

Effects of individual species on functions

Our results show that combining multiple fast-growing species in a community leads to high

multifunctionality, whereas combining slow growing species does not increase multifunctionality.

There are two main factors that could cause this: 1) fast species tend to drive different functions,

whereas slow species all drive the same function: if slow species are more redundant in their

functional effects, then adding slow species to a community (increasing diversity) would not add

functions. 2) Slow species tend to trade-off in their functional effects, while fast species have more

synergies (positive effects on multiple functions): trade-offs mean that some species increase a given

function, while others tend to reduce the same function, and this would mean that increasing diversity

would not enhance multifunctionality because adding species to a community would tend to reduce

as many functions as it enhanced.

To test these ideas, we calculated the effect of each of our 20 species on each function, by fitting

regression models for each function with the presence or abundance of each species as predictors

(similar to refs [1,3]). We extracted the significant positive and negative effects of each species and

calculated the dissimilarity in functional effects between sets of four species (see methods for more

details). This showed that fast species were more dissimilar in the functions they drove (Table S2,

Table S3 and Table S4), as an increase in mean SLA between species increased the dissimilarity in the

set of functions they affected. The results were similar for presence-based or abundance weighted

effects, and for both positive and negative effects, showing that slow species tend to all affect similar

functions, while fast species have different effects on different functions.

In order to test whether there are also more trade-offs in functional effects between slow species, we

calculated the proportion of functional effects that were trade-offs, for each pair of species (see

methods). The effects were non-significant, both when analysed based on species presence or on

species abundance (Table S2). It therefore seems that trade-offs in functional effects are not more

common for low SLA species and that instead low SLA species are more redundant in their functional

effects because they tend to drive similar functions.

Figure 1: Context-dependent diversity-multifunctionality relationships. Standardised effect (+/- confidence intervals) of each significant variable and their significant interaction on multifunctionality across seven thresholds: a) scaled centred estimates, b) interaction between sown species richness and specific leaf area (SLA, m² kg⁻¹), and c) interaction between functional diversity (MPD, mean pairwise distance) and nitrogen enrichment. N = 216 plots. Details of the model output can be found in the Table S1.

Figure 2: Drivers of individual functions. Mean standardised effect (+/- confidence intervals) of each significant variable and their interaction on functions after model simplification. SR: sown plant species richness, MPD: mean pairwise distance in SLA equally weighted, N: nitrogen enrichment, SLA: abundance weighted community specific leaf area, Fng: fungicide treatment. Each function was measured on 216 plots. See Table S5 and Figure S2 for details.

Figure 3: Effect of sown vs. realised functional diversity on multifunctionality. Effect on multifunctionality of a) unweighted, sown, functional diversity (MPD) and b) abundance weighted, realised, functional diversity (MPDw). Effect (+/- confidence intervals) from individual models. c) MPDw plotted against MPD. The green lines represent the model predicted multifunctionality values at a 0.65 threshold. The high multifunctionality plots are those with both a relatively high MPD and a relatively low MPDw (bottom right corner). Monocultures were included but are not shown in c) as they are all coded as 0 MPD and MPDw. See Table S6 for details on the model output.

Discussion

Our results show that there is substantial context dependency in biodiversity-multifunctionality relationships. This context-dependency is mostly explained by the functional composition of the species pool, and also to some extent by resource availability. Previous diversity experiments have generally isolated diversity effects from compositional variation, and when experimental [40,41] or observational (e.g. [9]) studies have considered compositional and diversity effects, they have compared their relative importance but have never tested whether they might interact. In general, biodiversity experiments have focused on diversity as a driver of functioning (e.g. ref [42]), while many observational studies have considered mean trait values and mass ratio effects (e.g. refs [43,44]). By experimentally crossing functional composition and diversity treatments, we were able to show that composition and diversity are not always independent drivers of multifunctionality, and that they can enhance each other's effects. Our results also support recent observational evidence [36,41] that multiple biodiversity dimensions (including species richness, functional diversity and functional redundancy) need to be considered together. Taken together our findings emphasise that a better understanding of multifunctionality requires approaches that can disentangle the influence of multiple, interacting drivers.

Functional composition modulates richness effects on ecosystem functioning

Species richness increased multifunctionality, but only when plant communities were assembled with fast growing species. Some studies have considered how the functional *diversity* of the species pool impacts species richness-functioning relationships [17,45] but our results show that the functional *composition* of the species pool may be a stronger driver. Our analysis of individual species effects on

functions showed that slow species were more redundant in their functional effects, this was because

some slow species drove multiple functions (*Achillea millefolium, Centaurea jacea, Festuca rubra* and

Salvia pratensis), while fast species affected just one function each. Therefore, combining multiple

fast species together increased multifunctionality because each species increased a different function.

However, slow species were also more variable in their functional effects with several having only

negative effects on functions, meaning that monocultures of slow species did not have high

multifunctionality, on average. This suggests that amongst slow species there might be a

"multifunctional selection effect" with high multifunctionality driven by the presence of particular

species that promote several functions, while amongst fast species there is "multifunctional

complementarity" with different species driving different functions. This idea is further supported by

the fact that a similar diversity x composition interaction was not present for individual functions.

Instead, species richness increased belowground biomass and carbon storage regardless of

community SLA, and increased phosphatase activity the most in plots dominated by slow growing

species. Diversity therefore did increase several individual functions within slow species communities,

presumably because the slow species were complementary in their effects on these functions.

However, this did not translate into higher multifunctionality when slow species were combined, as

the slow species were not complementary in their effects on multifunctionality. While species richness

and composition have usually been seen as alternative or opposing drivers of functioning (i.e. mass

ratio vs. diversity effects [46–49]), we show here that they are dependent and modify each other's effects.

Resource level modulates functional diversity effects on ecosystem functioning

In addition to sown species richness, sown functional diversity was an important driver of

multifunctionality but its positive effect was dampened by N enrichment. N enrichment increased

functioning in low diversity communities, but not in high diversity ones. However, high diversity,

unfilised communities still delivered higher multifunctionality than low diversity, fertilised

communities (0.624 and 0.588 respectively), suggesting low input, high diversity grasslands could

deliver high functioning relative to intensive systems. Previous studies have found mixed effects of

increased resource supply on diversity-functioning relationships. One study in the Jena Experiment

showed that the strength of the diversity-productivity relationship increased under nutrient

enrichment [20]. However, the Jena Experiment added multiple nutrients, which increased total

resource levels, whereas we added nitrogen alone which may have led to an unbalanced nutrient

stoichiometry and therefore a reduction in complementarity [50]. Results from a meta-analysis showed

that the effect of diversity on productivity was independent of nutrient levels, although

complementarity was reduced in fertilised communities due to higher productivity in monocultures [21].

Consistent with this, our study also found that the effect of diversity on aboveground productivity was

independent of fertilisation (Figure 2), and that the interaction between N and either species richness

or functional diversity was inconsistent across individual functions. However, we do find a clear,

negative, effect of N enrichment on the diversity-multifunctionality relationship. This result is partially

supported by a study on soil multifunctionality [22], who showed that the positive diversity effect on

multifunctionality was weaker under N enrichment, but only at higher thresholds. Therefore, adding

N to functionally diverse communities would not further increase multifunctionality.

Foliar fungal pathogen removal had no significant effect on multifunctionality or on diversity-

multifunctionality relationships, although it did modulate the diversity effect on individual functions.

Previous studies have shown that specialist soil pathogens can drive diversity-productivity

relationships by reducing biomass particularly at low diversity [23,24]. In our experiment, foliar pathogen

impact was not reduced in (untreated) high diversity communities, perhaps due to a shift towards

generalist pathogens [51] or because increased spillovers of pathogens (between species) counteracted

resource concentration effects in diverse mixtures [52]. The absence of an effect of foliar fungal removal

on biodiversity-multifunctionality relationships suggests that resources are more important context

drivers than foliar enemies, but changes in other enemy groups or in foliar fungal species composition

still need to be investigated further.

Contrasting effects of weighted and unweighted functional diversity

Multifunctionality was maximised at high levels of sown functional diversity but was reduced by high

levels of abundance weighted functional diversity. These contrasting effects of functional diversity

depending on whether it was weighted by abundance or not, mean that multifunctionality was highest

when communities became dominated by functionally similar species but retained some distinct rare

species (relatively low abundance weighted functional diversity combined with high sown functional

diversity). The increase in multifunctionality with non-abundance weighted functional diversity

emphasises the importance of species identity effects in affecting multifunctionality [53,54]. These

findings are also in accordance with a body of literature on the importance of locally rare species for

the provision of multiple ecosystem functions [55–57]. The negative effects of abundance weighted

functional diversity mean that multifunctionality was maximised when the dominants in a community

were functionally similar, which suggests that, alongside the effects of rare species, mass ratio effects

were also important for increasing multifunctionality. Evenness has been shown to reduce

multifunctionality in species-rich biocrust systems [58], and a recent study showed that

multifunctionality in dryland ecosystems was maximised when communities were dominated by

functionally similar species that were well adapted to the environmental conditions [36]. In our

experiment, a high functional evenness (functionally different dominants) could reduce the levels of

certain functions if more even communities contained a higher proportion of low functioning species,

for instance a higher proportion of low SLA species would reduce functions related to fast

biogeochemical cycling (herbivory, pathogen infection, see Figure 2). On the other hand, the presence

of low SLA species led to an increase in belowground biomass (Figure 2) and soil respiration (on plots

without fungicide), perhaps indicating increased microbial activity in slow growing communities [59].

The addition of a few rare slow growing species could therefore have increased levels of certain soil

functions and could have boosted multifunctionality in fast dominated communities. In our

experiment, the highly functioning communities contained a large proportion of species linked to

acquisitive strategies, as well as a few functionally distinct species supplying a complementary set of

functions, further highlighting the complex interplay between diversity and mass ratio effects in

driving multifunctionality.

Conclusions

Our results shed light on the context dependence of diversity effects on multifunctionality. The most

important driver of context dependency was the functional composition of the species pool, a novel

context driver not considered in previous biodiversity-functioning experiments. Our findings show

that shifts in functional composition due to global change will not just alter ecosystem functioning

themselves but will also alter the strength of diversity-functioning relationships. This could result in

complex interactions between global change drivers, for instance, if some drivers alter functional

composition and others change diversity. For the functions considered here, the optimal community

for multifunctionality contained several different fast growing species at high abundance and some

functionally distinct slow growing species at low abundance. However, the optimal community is likely

to differ for other sets of functions and considering which functions should be maximised will be

important to define optimal functional composition and diversity. Overall, these findings underline

the need to consider multiple diversity dimensions and interactions between them and abiotic

conditions to optimise multifunctionality in the context of multiple simultaneous global changes.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Pete Manning and Jasper van Ruijven for very helpful comments on earlier drafts of the manuscript. We would also like to thank Mervi Laitinen and Marlise Zimmermann, the technicians working with us on the PaNDiv Experiment, as well as the large team of helpers on the field and in the lab. This study was supported by funding of the Swiss National Science Foundation (31003A_160212). SS was supported by the Spanish Government under a Ramón y Cajal contract (RYC-2016- 20604).

Authors contribution

N.A.P., S.L.C. and E.A. designed and set up the PaNDiv Experiment; N.A.P., S.L.C., T.M., TZ.N., H.V. collected the data; N.A.P., T.M., N.H., V.H.K. and T.K. processed and analysed the NIRS samples; N.A.P. analysed the data and wrote the first manuscript with substantial input from E.A., S.S. and S.L.C. All authors contributed to revisions of the manuscript.

Material and methods

The PaNDiv Experiment

We set up a field experiment in October 2015 in Münchenbuchsee (Switzerland, 47°03'N, 7°46'E, 564 m a.s.l.) with factorial manipulations of plant species richness, plant functional composition, N enrichment and foliar fungal pathogens [60]. The site had been unfertilised for at least 10 years before the start of the experiment. The soil is characterized as 0.7 to 1m deep brown earth (Cambisol), according to the Geoportal of the Canton Bern (http://www.geo.apps.be.ch). We measured total soil N and carbon (C) concentrations and pH in the top 20 cm of soil at the start of the experiment and found concentrations of 2.3-4.2% C, 0.26-0.43% N and a pH of 7.4. The grassland was an Arrhenaterion, with some characteristic plant species of Mesobromion and Polygono-Trisetion communities (classification based on Delarze 2015 [61]). The area was cleared from vegetation and ploughed before the establishment of experimental plots.

The whole experiment consisted of 216 plots of 2 x 2m separated from one another by a 1m path and arranged in four blocks. We sowed the different communities with enough seeds to obtain a density of 1000 seedlings per m^2, equally divided between the species and corrected for species germination rates. The species pool consisted of 20 herbs and grasses typical of mesic, Central European grasslands (see list of species Table **S7**). We divided the species into two pools corresponding to different resource economic strategies [26], using literature values of leaf N content and specific leaf area (SLA) to classify the species. We created a pool of 10 species with high SLA and leaf N, which have a fast-growing, acquisitive resource use strategy, with short leaf lifespans and high photosynthetic rates, and a pool of 10 species with a more slow-growing, conservative strategy, long leaf lifespans and low photosynthetic rates. For simplicity we refer to these species as "fast" and "slow" throughout. We

excluded legumes from the species pool as they are expected to decline with N enrichment and

including them in the slow growing pool only would add an additional difference between the pools.

We therefore might have underestimated the diversity effects by excluding legumes from the species

pool.

All 20 monocultures were established, together with 60 four species, 60 eight species and 16 twenty

species plots. Plots with four and eight species could contain either only fast or only slow species, or

a mix of the two strategies. This allowed us to create a large gradient in functional composition (mean

SLA) and functional diversity (variance in SLA), independent of species richness. Species compositions

for each plot were randomly selected from the respective species pool, with the constraint that all

plots (except monocultures) had to contain both grasses and herbs. Each particular species

composition received the four combinations of N enrichment and fungicide application. Fertilised

plots received N in the form of urea twice a year in April and late June, for an annual addition of 100

kg N ha^{-1}y^{-1}, which corresponds to intermediately intensive grassland management[62]. Urea addition

had no significant effect on soil pH measured in autumn 2017 (data not shown). In order to manipulate

multitrophic interactions we removed foliar fungal pathogens using fungicide. The plots were sprayed

with two fungicides to try to achieve broad suppression of the fungal community ("Score Profi", 24.8

% Difenoconazol 250 g.L^{-1} and "Ortiva", 32.8% Chlorothalonil 400 g.L^{-1} 6.56% Azoxystrobin 80 g.L^{-1})

four times during the growing season (beginning of April and June, late July and September) and the

same amount of water was applied to the untreated plots. The fungicides were very effective in

suppressing rusts and mildews but less effective in reducing infection by leaf spots, and had very few

non target effects[51]. The experiment was weeded three times a year to maintain the diversity levels.

All plots were mown twice a year, in mid-June and mid-August, which corresponds to intermediate to

extensive grassland management.

Further details about the site characteristics and experimental setup of the PaNDiv Experiment can be

found under ref [60].

Measurements on the plant community

Plant traits

We measured specific leaf area (SLA = surface/dry weight, $m^2\,kg^{-1}$) in August 2017 and in June and

August 2018, one leaf from each of five individuals in all monocultures. We rehydrated the leaves and

measured leaf surface, and dry weight according to the protocol of Garnier et al. [63]. The SLA per species

is the average of the trait values across the five samples and across the three sampling dates. We used

only SLA to calculate functional diversity and composition as our experimental design involved

manipulating the mean and variation in SLA within communities (species were defined as fast and

slow based on SLA).

Functional composition (CWM SLA)

388 We visually estimated the cover of each plant species (target species and all weeds together) before

389 mowing. We calculated the community weighted mean (CWM) SLA per plot using the relative cover

390 estimates: CWM = $\sum p_i * x_i$; with p_i the relative abundance of the species i and x_i the trait value of i in

391 each monoculture of the same treatment (i.e. nitrogen and fungicide added or not).

Functional diversity (MPD and MPDw)

As a measure of functional diversity, we calculated a community mean pairwise distance, as the mean

distance in SLA between the species sown in the plot [64]. The SLA values used were the control

monoculture traits, and all monocultures had an MPD value of 0 by definition.

To assess how changes in species relative abundances affected the realised MPD of the experimental

communities, we calculated an abundance weighted index, MPDw. The two indices were highly

correlated (see Figure S1), partly due to coding the monocultures as 0. We therefore analysed the

effect of MPD and MPDw in two separate models (Table S6). Model output calculated with equally-

weighted species MPD excluding the species that were not recorded at least once between 2017 and

2018 did not differ from the main model output (see Table S8).

Ecosystem functions

The functions described in this study were measured between June 2017 and autumn 2018. We

excluded June 2016 aboveground measurements as the experiment had just started to establish and

the weed and bare ground cover were still large [60]. For each function measured more than once, we

used the mean value per plot over the whole period (see Table S5 and Figure S3).

Aboveground biomass

We collected aboveground biomass twice per year, before the mowing. The samples were taken by

clipping plant material to 5cm above ground level, in two quadrats of 20x50 cm located in the centre

of each plot. We weighed the biomass after 2 days of drying at 65°C. The plot target biomass

production (i.e. of the sown species without weeds) was calculated by multiplying the percentage

cover of weeds by the total biomass and subtracting this estimated weed biomass from the total

weight. To control if the estimation was accurate, we sorted the biomass per species in June 2017 for

all plots of one block. The sorted target biomass (without the weeds) was highly correlated with the

estimated target biomass (R^2 = 0.994, data not shown). The mean weed percentage was around five

percent and therefore removing the weeds made little difference to the total biomass [60].

Herbivory

Herbivory was assessed in May and August 2018. Five individuals of each target species were randomly

selected from each plot and five leaves per individual were assessed for damage. Leaves were selected

from the middle tier of each individual, and juvenile and senescent leaves were excluded. Damage

was characterised by the type of herbivory; chewing, sucking, leaf mining and rasping damage based

on the methods of Loranger et al. [65]. In this study, we calculated the community weighted mean total

damage using the sum of damage types per leaf, per species, weighted by the cover of the particular

species.

Pathogens

Fungal infection was measured per species per plot once in October 2017 and twice in 2018, in July

and October. Ten randomly chosen individuals in the central square meter of the plots were visually

screened for signs of infection and the percentage of infected individuals was recorded. If there were

less than 10 individuals in the central square meter, individuals in the rest of the plot were screened.

If there were fewer individuals, the percentage of infected individuals was calculated based on all

individuals present. The species level infection and the percentage cover data were used to calculate

a community weighted mean of fungal infection per plot and season.

Plant N and P uptake

We included two ecosystem functions representing the potential N and P flux within a community.

The goal was to compare the resource use efficiency independently of biomass output or nutrient

stock. We calculated plant N and P uptake using total biomass and soil available N and P content. The

biomass collected in June and August 2018 was homogenised per plot and we ground a minimum of

5g per plot with a cyclone mill to obtain a fine powder. We then used near infrared reflectance

spectroscopy (NIRS) analyses to estimate biomass N and P content using calibrations by Kleinebecker

et al. [66]. Soil samples were collected five times in 2018 using two homogenised cores per plot. Soil NO_3^-

, NH_4^+ and PO_4^{3-} were extracted with $CaCl_2$ and analysed using a Continuous Flow Optical-Absorption

Spectrometer (CF-OAP; model Skalar Scan+; Skalar Analytical, Breda, The Netherlands). The plant N

and P uptake are the mean plant N and P content divided by the mean available N (NO_3^- and NH_4^+) and

available P (PO_4^{3-}), respectively.

Enzymatic activity

The activity of two enzymes related to carbon and phosphorus cycling, β-glucosidase and

phosphatase, was measured in autumn 2017 and in April, May, July and August 2018. These functions

give an estimate of soil microbial activity, and β-glucosidase has been shown to be a good soil health

indicator [67]. We took two soil samples per plot of 1.5 cm diameter to 20 cm depth. The fresh samples

were homogenised and sieved through 2mm meshes. In each sample, we measured the β-glucosidase

and phosphatase enzymatic activities, following the protocol of Tabatabai [68]. For the analyses

presented here, we calculated the mean value of each enzymatic activity for all the periods sampled.

Belowground biomass

Root biomass was measured once in autumn 2017. We took two cores per plot to 20 cm depth (440

cm^3 of soil). We homogenised the two samples and used a subset of 40g fresh soil in which we sorted

out the roots. The samples were washed in 200 μm sieves and the roots sorted out with tweezers. We

dried the roots at 65°C for 48 hours. We estimated soil bulk density by weighing 40g of soil from the

same plot before and after drying for 24 hours at 105°C. Bulk density did not differ between the

treatments (data not shown). The final belowground biomass per plot is the weight of roots per g of

dry soil.

Respiration

We measured overall soil respiration five times during 2018. We placed one PVC ring per plot at least

a week before taking the measurements. The vegetation was clipped before starting the measures

without disturbing the soil. We took two measures per plot and repeated the measures in case of large

difference between the respiration rates. We took the measurements using a soil CO_2 flux chamber

(6400-09) attached to a LI-6400XT (Li-Cor Inc.). Soil respiration varies during the day and between

days. To minimise this variation, we took the measurements starting at 10am and finishing the latest

at 2pm, as this time span is expected to provide rates representative of the mean daily respiration

[69,70]. We measured one block per day (54 plots), avoided humid days and kept the measurement days

as close to each other as possible (max 6 days for one sampling session). The final soil respiration

measure is the mean measure per plot.

Carbon storage

We measured soil carbon concentration on soil samples of 440 cm^3, taken to 25 cm depth in autumn

2017. We took two samples per plot, homogenised them and removed stones and living material

(roots, fauna). We weighed the samples before and after drying at 65°C for 48 hours. To calculate

carbon storage, we compared the 2017 samples to soil samples taken in autumn 2015 before the start

of the experiment. In 2015, we took 5 soil samples per plot from a subset of 89 plots distributed across

the field. As the field had just been ploughed and homogenised there was relatively little variation

between adjacent plots and we estimate soil C concentrations for all plots using kriging (package geoR,

estimating sill and range of the data variogram using the variofit function). Analyses of soil total C were

conducted in a CNS Analyser at the Institute of Geography of the University of Bern. The carbon

storage per plot is the difference between the percentage carbon in autumn 2017 and in autumn 2015.

Analyses

Multifunctionality

We calculated multifunctionality from our 10 ecosystem functions using a multiple threshold

approach [71]. We therefore calculated "ecosystem function multifunctionality" [39] using a set of distinct

functions, representing key above and belowground carbon and nutrient fluxes. We first standardised

each function to a common scale (see Table S5 and Figure S4) and then calculated multifunctionality

using thresholds from 0.5 to 0.8 with an interval of 0.05 [36]. We excluded very large (>0.8) or very small

(<0.5) thresholds as multifunctionality values tend to have small ranges at the extremes (i.e. most

plots either have 0 multifunctionality or maximum multifunctionality). The thresholds were defined

relative to the mean of the five highest values of each function, in order to reduce the influence of

outliers [72]. Multifunctionality was the proportion of functions reaching this threshold per plot,

calculated using the multidiv function (available at https://github.com/eric-allan/multidiversity).

We first analysed multifunctionality at each threshold separately, using linear mixed effects models,

testing the effects of N enrichment, fungicide, species richness, SLA (as a continuous measure of

functional composition), MPD, and their interaction on multifunctionality. We included *block* and

species composition (random assemblages within diversity and functional composition levels) as

random terms. Replacing the effect of sown by realised species richness gave similar results (Table

S8). Our data met the model assumptions of homogeneity of variance and normal distribution of

residuals. All explanatory variables were scaled and centred to a mean of 0 and standard deviation of

1, so that their effect sizes are comparable. We included block and combination (specific set of species

per richness and functional composition level) as random terms. We did not test for SLA x MPD

interactions, as the two factors are not fully orthogonal in the experimental design (MPD is inevitably

maximal at intermediate SLA, see Figure S1).

The effects of different factors can vary according to the threshold used to calculate multifunctionality.

Previous approaches have tested how diversity effects vary depending on the threshold [71] but

visualising how multiple factors vary with multifunctionality thresholds is more challenging. We

therefore used a new approach to test which treatment effects were consistent across thresholds and

which depended on the threshold level. To do this, we constructed models with all multifunctionality

measures (calculated using different thresholds) combined. This meant that each plot had seven

measures of multifunctionality (at the 50, 55, 60, 65, 70, 75 and 80% thresholds). We analysed all the

multifunctionality values with linear mixed effects models with the same structure as the individual

thresholds model, but including threshold as a fixed continuous term which could interact with the

treatment variables, and including plot as a random effect to correct for the fact that we had several

measures of multifunctionality per plot. We also included random slopes for the effect of threshold

on multifunctionality in each plot, which corrects for additional autocorrelation between

multifunctionality values measured in the same plot. This is a similar approach to that used in Soliveres

et al. [8] but extended to multifunctionality calculated at different thresholds. Using this method, we

could estimate which effects were significant across all thresholds, and which ones changed

continuously as the threshold was increased. We then estimated the overall effect of each treatment

and interaction across the thresholds and calculated a confidence interval around the effect.

Confidence intervals were calculated using a script from Ben Bolker (available at

https://bbolker.github.io/mixedmodels-misc/glmmFAQ.html#predictions-andor-confidence-or-

prediction-intervals-on-predictions).

In addition, all functions were analysed separately using linear mixed effect models.

Monocultures all get an arbitrary MPD of 0 causing some correlation between MPD and species

richness (Figure S1). To ensure that the effect of diversity is not driven only by the difference between

monocultures and polycultures, we did an additional analysis in which we added a binary variable for

the monoculture/not monoculture contrast. Results using this approach were qualitatively similar to

those presented in the main text (Table S9).

All analyses were conducted in R using the package lme4 [73,74]. We simplified full models by dropping

terms that did not significantly improve the overall model fit using likelihood-ratios.

Effects of individual species on functions

To test the effect of each species on each function we fitted two separate models for each function,

one with the presence and one with the abundance (relative cover) of each of the 20 species. We used

the following model structure:

*Function ~ Nitrogen * Fungicide + Species1 + … + Species20 + (1|Block)*

We extracted the effect of each species presence and abundance on each function, non-significant

effects were set to 0 (Table S3 and Table S4.). We then calculated how similar different sets of species

were in the functions they affected. We calculated the similarity in functional effects for all possible

combinations of four species. We chose four species as this corresponds to one of our diversity

treatments and allows us to explore differences in the functions provided by sets of species differing

in their mean functional traits. We calculated the similarity in both positive and negative functional

effects for all combinations of four species, and for effects of species presence and abundance. We

used the CqN similarity index [75], as this allows a calculation of dissimilarity (beta diversity) among any

number of communities. We used a q value of 2, which means larger functional effects were weighted

as more important. This corresponds to the multicommunity extension of the Morisita-Horn index.

We then calculated the mean and variance in SLA between all sets of four species and regressed them

against the dissimilarity in functional effects between the four species (CqN). We are principally

interested in the effect of mean SLA, to determine if sets of species with higher mean SLA are more

different in the functions they provide, however we included the variance in SLA between the species

to account for the fact that a set of four species with intermediate mean SLA could either be composed

of low and high SLA (slow and fast) species or a set of species all with intermediate SLA. To test if the

effects were significant, we randomly shuffled the SLA values between the species and recalculated

the relationships between mean and variance in SLA and functional dissimilarity 1000 times. We

tested whether the observed slopes between mean SLA and variance in SLA and functional

dissimilarity (CqN) lay outside the 2.5 and 97.5% quantiles of the random slopes. These analyses were

repeated for the positive and negative effects and effects of species presence and abundance. Output

in Table S2.

In a second step, we tested for trade-offs between the functions supplied by different species and

whether this was related to their SLA. We only considered significant effects in this analysis. For each

pair of species, we summed the number of functional effects that were opposing (e.g. one species has

a positive effect on a given function while the other species has a negative effect). We related the

number of trade-offs to the mean and difference in SLA for the species pair, to test if pairs of low SLA

(slow) species tend to have more opposing effects. We again randomly shuffled the SLA values

between the species, recalculated the relationships 1000 times and tested whether the observed

slopes lay outside the 2.5 and 97.5% quantiles of the random slopes. Output in Table S2.

Number of functions

In addition to the threshold chosen, multifunctionality values depend on the number and identity of

functions included, which makes generalisation across studies challenging [5,10,76]. In order to test the

sensitivity of our results to the number and identity of functions, we calculated multifunctionality with

all possible combinations of between two and ten functions (1013 combinations) for four thresholds

from 0.5 to 0.8 (4052 multifunctionality measures). We extracted the effects of our factors and

interactions from a linear mixed effect model for each multifunctionality measure. In order to correct

for the uncertainty of each estimate, we weighted each estimate by the inverse of the standard error.

We then calculated an overall mean and confidence interval for multifunctionality per threshold

depending on the number of functions included. The number of functions included did not significantly

change the mean effect of our variables on multifunctionality, except for the interaction between SLA

and SR at the 50% threshold, which strengthened as more functions were considered. The variation

around the mean got larger with a decreasing number of functions, going from positive to negative

depending on the functions included (Figure S5 and Figure S6). This variation was driven more by

variation in the identity rather than in the number of functions included (Figure S6).

References

References

1. Hector, A. & Bagchi, R. Biodiversity and ecosystem multifunctionality. *Nature* **448,** 188–190;

10.1038/nature05947 (2007).

2. Gamfeldt, L., Hillebrand, H. & Jonsson, P. R. Multiple functions increase the importance of

biodiversity for overall ecosystem functioning. *Ecology* **89,** 1223–1231 (2008).

3. Isbell, F. *et al.* High plant diversity is needed to maintain ecosystem services. *Nature* **477,** 199–

202; 10.1038/nature10282 (2011).

4. Lefcheck, J. S. *et al.* Biodiversity enhances ecosystem multifunctionality across trophic levels and

habitats. *Nature communications* **6,** 6936; 10.1038/ncomms7936 (2015).

5. Meyer, S. T. *et al.* Biodiversity–multifunctionality relationships depend on identity and number of

measured functions. *Nature ecology & evolution* **2,** 44; 10.1038/s41559-017-0391-4 (2018).

6. van der Plas, F. Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning in naturally assembled communities.

Biological reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society **94,** 1220–1245; 10.1111/brv.12499

(2019).

7. Balvanera, P. *et al.* Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning

and services. *Ecology letters* **9,** 1146–1156; 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00963.x (2006).

8. Soliveres, S. *et al.* Biodiversity at multiple trophic levels is needed for ecosystem

multifunctionality. *Nature* **536,** 456–459; 10.1038/nature19092 (2016).

9. Allan, E. *et al.* Land use intensification alters ecosystem multifunctionality via loss of biodiversity

and changes to functional composition. *Ecol Lett* **18,** 834–843; 10.1111/ele.12469 (2015).

10. Giling, D. P. *et al.* A niche for ecosystem multifunctionality in global change research. *Global

Change Biology* **25,** 763–774; 10.1111/gcb.14528 (2019).

11. Alsterberg, C., Sundbäck, K. & Gamfeldt, L. Multiple stressors and multifunctionality: limited

effects on an illuminated benthic system. *Biology letters* **10,** 20140640; 10.1098/rsbl.2014.0640

(2014).

12. Liu, Y.-R. *et al.* Identity of biocrust species and microbial communities drive the response of soil

multifunctionality to simulated global change. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **107,** 208–217;

10.1016/j.soilbio.2016.12.003 (2017).

13. Cardinale, B. J. *et al.* Effects of biodiversity on the functioning of trophic groups and ecosystems.

Nature **443,** 989–992; 10.1038/nature05202 (2006).

14. Tilman, D., Reich, P. B. & Isbell, F. Biodiversity impacts ecosystem productivity as much as

resources, disturbance, or herbivory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*

United States of America **109,** 10394–10397; 10.1073/pnas.1208240109 (2012).

15. Barry, K. E. *et al.* The Future of Complementarity: Disentangling Causes from Consequences.

Trends in ecology & evolution **34,** 167–180; 10.1016/j.tree.2018.10.013 (2018).

16. Tilman, D. *Resource competition and community structure* (Princeton University Press, Princeton,

Guildford, 1982).

17. Ratcliffe, S. *et al.* Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning relations in European forests depend on

environmental context. *Ecology letters* **20,** 1414–1426; 10.1111/ele.12849 (2017).

18. Wacker, L., Baudois, O., Eichenberger-Glinz, S. & Schmid, B. Diversity Effects in Early- and Mid-

Successional Species Pools along a Nitrogen Gradient. *Ecology* **90,** 637–648 (2009).

19. Hooper, D. U. *et al.* A global synthesis reveals biodiversity loss as a major driver of ecosystem

change. *Nature* **486,** 105–108; 10.1038/nature11118 (2012).

20. Weigelt, A., Weisser, W. W. & Buchmann, N. and Scherer-Lorenzen, M. Biodiversity for

multifunctional grasslands: equal productivity in high-diversity low-input and low-diversity high-

input systems. *Biogeosciences* **6,** 1695–1706 (2009).

21. Craven, D. *et al.* Plant diversity effects on grassland productivity are robust to both nutrient

enrichment and drought. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B,*

Biological sciences **371**; 10.1098/rstb.2015.0277 (2016).

22. Eisenhauer, N. *et al.* Plant diversity maintains multiple soil functions in future environments.

eLife **7**; 10.7554/eLife.41228 (2018).

23. Maron, J. L., Marler, M., Klironomos, J. N. & Cleveland, C. C. Soil fungal pathogens and the

relationship between plant diversity and productivity. *Ecology letters* **14,** 36–41; 10.1111/j.1461-

0248.2010.01547.x (2011).

24. Schnitzer, S. A. *et al.* Soil microbes drive the classic plant diversity-productivity pattern. *Ecology*

92, 296–303; 10.1890/10-0773.1 (2011).

25. Seabloom, E. W. *et al.* Food webs obscure the strength of plant diversity effects on primary

productivity. *Ecology letters* **20,** 505–512; 10.1111/ele.12754 (2017).

26. Wright, I. J. *et al.* The worldwide leaf economics spectrum. *Nature* **428,** 821–827;

10.1038/nature02403 (2004).

27. Díaz, S. *et al.* The global spectrum of plant form and function. *Nature* **529,** 167–171;

10.1038/nature16489 (2016).

28. Tilman, D. & Wedin, D. Plant Traits and Resource Reduction For Five Grasses Growing on a

Nitrogen Gradient. *Ecology* **72,** 685–700; 10.2307/2937208 (1991).

29. Reich, P. B. The world-wide 'fast-slow' plant economics spectrum. A traits manifesto. *J Ecol* **102,**

275–301; 10.1111/1365-2745.12211 (2014).

30. Hautier, Y., Niklaus, P. A. & Hector, A. Competition for Light Causes Plant Biodiversity Loss After

Eutrophication. *Science* **324,** 636–638; 10.1126/science.1169640 (2009).

31. Busch, V. *et al.* Will I stay or will I go? Plant species-specific response and tolerance to high land-

use intensity in temperate grassland ecosystems. *J Veg Sci* **30,** 674–686; 10.1111/jvs.12749

(2019).

32. Endara, M.-J. & Coley, P. D. The resource availability hypothesis revisited: a meta-analysis.

Functional Ecology **25,** 389–398; 10.1111/j.1365-2435.2010.01803.x (2011).

33. Gross, N. *et al.* Functional trait diversity maximizes ecosystem multifunctionality. *Nat Ecol Evol* **1,**

) 14; 10.1038/s41559-017-0132 (2017).

34. Cadotte, M. W., Carscadden, K. & Mirotchnick, N. Beyond species: functional diversity and the

maintenance of ecological processes and services. *J Appl Ecol* **48,** 1079–1087; 10.1111/j.1365-

2664.2011.02048.x (2011).

35. Handa, I. T. *et al.* Consequences of biodiversity loss for litter decomposition across biomes.

Nature **509,** 218–221; 10.1038/nature13247 (2014).

36. Le Bagousse-Pinguet, Y. *et al.* Phylogenetic, functional, and taxonomic richness have both

positive and negative effects on ecosystem multifunctionality. *Proceedings of the National*

Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **116,** 8419–8424; 10.1073/pnas.1815727116

(2019).

37. Díaz, S. *et al.* Incorporating plant functional diversity effects in ecosystem service assessments.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **104,** 20684–

20689; 10.1073/pnas.0704716104 (2007).

38. Lavorel, S. *et al.* Using plant functional traits to understand the landscape distribution of multiple

ecosystem services. *Journal of Ecology* **99,** 135–147; 10.1111/j.1365-2745.2010.01753.x (2011).

39. Manning, P. *et al.* Redefining ecosystem multifunctionality. *Nature ecology & evolution* **2,** 427–

436; 10.1038/s41559-017-0461-7 (2018).

40. Hector, A. *et al.* BUGS in the analysis of biodiversity experiments: species richness and

composition are of similar importance for grassland productivity. *PloS one* **6,** e17434;

10.1371/journal.pone.0017434 (2011).

41. Craven, D. *et al.* Multiple facets of biodiversity drive the diversity-stability relationship. *Nature*

ecology & evolution **2,** 1579–1587; 10.1038/s41559-018-0647-7 (2018).

42. Cardinale, B. J. *et al.* Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature* **486,** 59–67;

10.1038/nature11148 (2012).

43. Garnier, E. *et al.* Plant functional markers capture ecosystem properties during secondary

succession. *Ecology* **85,** 2630–2637; 10.1890/03-0799 (2004).

44. Lavorel, S. & Grigulis, K. How fundamental plant functional trait relationships scale-up to trade-

offs and synergies in ecosystem services. *Journal of Ecology* **100,** 128–140; 10.1111/j.1365-

2745.2011.01914.x (2012).

45. Wagg, C. *et al.* Functional trait dissimilarity drives both species complementarity and competitive

disparity. *Funct Ecol* **31,** 2320–2329; 10.1111/1365-2435.12945 (2017).

46. Tilman, D. Distinguishing between the Effects of Species Diversity and Species Composition.

Oikos **80,** 185; 10.2307/3546532 (1997).

47. Grime, J. P. Benefits of plant diversity to ecosystems: immediate, filter and founder effects.

Journal of Ecology **86,** 902–910 (1998).

48. Mokany, K., Ash, J. & Roxburgh, S. Functional identity is more important than diversity in

influencing ecosystem processes in a temperate native grassland. *J Ecol* **96,** 884–893;

10.1111/j.1365-2745.2008.01395.x (2008).

49. Ruiz-Benito, P. *et al.* Diversity increases carbon storage and tree productivity in Spanish forests.

Global Ecology and Biogeography **23,** 311–322; 10.1111/geb.12126 (2014).

50. Cardinale, B. J., Hillebrand, H., Harpole, W. S., Gross, K. & Ptacnik, R. Separating the influence of

resource 'availability' from resource 'imbalance' on productivity-diversity relationships. *Ecology*

letters **12,** 475–487; 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01317.x (2009).

51. Cappelli, S. L., Pichon, N. A., Kempel, A. & Allan, E. Sick plants in grassland communities: a

growth-defense trade-off is the main driver of fungal pathogen abundance. *Ecology letters*;

10.1111/ele.13537 (2020).

52. Power, A. G. & Mitchell, C. E. Pathogen spillover in disease epidemics. *The American Naturalist*

164 Suppl 5, S79-89; 10.1086/424610 (2004).

53. McLaren, J. R. & Turkington, R. Ecosystem properties determined by plant functional group

identity. *Journal of Ecology* **98,** 459–469; 10.1111/j.1365-2745.2009.01630.x (2010).

54. Vogel, A. *et al. in Advances in Ecological Research,* edited by N. Eisenhauer, D. A. Bohan & A. J.

Dumbrell (Academic Press2019), pp. 91–131.

55. Lyons, K. G., Brigham, C. A., Traut, B. H. & Schwartz, M. W. Rare Species and Ecosystem

Functioning. *Conservation Biology* **19,** 1019–1024; 10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00106.x (2005).

56. Mouillot, D. *et al.* Rare species support vulnerable functions in high-diversity ecosystems. *PLoS*

biology **11,** e1001569; 10.1371/journal.pbio.1001569 (2013).

57. Soliveres, S. *et al.* Locally rare species influence grassland ecosystem multifunctionality.

Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences **371**;

10.1098/rstb.2015.0269 (2016).

58. Maestre, F. T., Castillo-Monroy, A. P., Bowker, M. A. & Ochoa-Hueso, R. Species richness effects

on ecosystem multifunctionality depend on evenness, composition and spatial pattern. *Journal*

of Ecology **100,** 317–330; 10.1111/j.1365-2745.2011.01918.x (2012).

59. Delgado-Baquerizo, M. *et al.* A global atlas of the dominant bacteria found in soil. *Science (New*

York, N.Y.) **359,** 320–325; 10.1126/science.aap9516 (2018).

60. Pichon, N. A. *et al.* Decomposition disentangled: A test of the multiple mechanisms by which

nitrogen enrichment alters litter decomposition. *Funct Ecol* **84,** 597; 10.1111/1365-2435.13560

(2020).

61. Delarze, R. *Lebensräume der Schweiz. Ökologie, Gefährdung, Kennarten.* 3rd ed. (Ott, Bern,

2015).

62. Blüthgen, N. *et al.* A quantitative index of land-use intensity in grasslands: Integrating mowing,

grazing and fertilization. *Basic and Applied Ecology* **13,** 207–220; 10.1016/j.baae.2012.04.001

(2012).

63. Garnier, E., Shipley, B., Roumet, C. & Laurent, G. A standardized protocol for the determination

of specific leaf area and leaf dry matter content. *Funct Ecology* **15,** 688–695; 10.1046/j.0269-

8463.2001.00563.x (2001).

64. de Bello, F., Carmona, C. P., Lepš, J., Szava-Kovats, R. & Pärtel, M. Functional diversity through

the mean trait dissimilarity: resolving shortcomings with existing paradigms and algorithms.

Oecologia **180,** 933–940; 10.1007/s00442-016-3546-0 (2016).

65. Loranger, H. *et al.* Invertebrate herbivory increases along an experimental gradient of grassland

plant diversity. *Oecologia* **174,** 183–193; 10.1007/s00442-013-2741-5 (2014).

66. Kleinebecker, T., Klaus, V. & Hölzel, N. Reducing sample quantity and maintaining high-prediction

quality of grassland biomass properties with near infrared reflectance spectroscopy. *J. Near*

Infrared Spectrosc. **19,** 495–505; 10.1255/jnirs.957 (2011).

67. Turner, B. L., Hopkins, D. W., Haygarth, P. M. & Ostle, N. β-Glucosidase activity in pasture soils.

Applied Soil Ecology **20,** 157–162; 10.1016/S0929-1393(02)00020-3 (2002).

68. Tabatabai, M. A. in *Methods of soil analysis. Part 2. Chemical and microbiological properties.,*

edited by A. L. Page, E. M. Miller & D. R. Keeney (American Society of Agronomy, Madison, WI,

1982), pp. 903–947.

69. Mielnick, P. C. & Dugas, W. A. Soil CO2 flux in a tallgrass prairie. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry* **32,**

221–228 (2000).

70. Castillo-Monroy, A. P., Maestre, F. T., Rey, A., Soliveres, S. & García-Palacios, P. Biological Soil

Crust Microsites Are the Main Contributor to Soil Respiration in a Semiarid Ecosystem.

Ecosystems **14,** 835–847; 10.1007/s10021-011-9449-3 (2011).

71. Byrnes, J. E. K. *et al.* Investigating the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem

multifunctionality. Challenges and solutions. *Methods Ecol Evol* **5,** 111–124; 10.1111/2041-

210X.12143 (2014).

72. Zavaleta, E. S., Pasari, J. R., Hulvey, K. B. & Tilman, G. D. Sustaining multiple ecosystem functions

in grassland communities requires higher biodiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*

Sciences of the United States of America **107,** 1443–1446; 10.1073/pnas.0906829107 (2010).

73. Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B. & Walker, S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *J.*

Stat. Soft. **67**; 10.18637/jss.v067.i01 (2015).

74. R Core Team. *R. A language and environment for statistical computing* (R Foundation for

Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2018).

75. Jost, L., Chao, A. & Chazdon, R. L. in *Biological diversity,* edited by A. E. Magurran (Oxford Univ.

Press, Oxford, 2013), pp. 66–84.

76. Bradford, M. A. *et al.* Discontinuity in the responses of ecosystem processes and

multifunctionality to altered soil community composition. *Proceedings of the National Academy*

of Sciences of the United States of America **111,** 14478–14483; 10.1073/pnas.1413707111

(2014).