Quality matters: stoichiometry of resources modulates spatial feedbacks in aquatic-terrestrial meta-ecosystems

Benoît Pichon[1,*] (https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6206-5482)

Elisa Thébault[2] (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9669-5227)

Gérard Lacroix[1,3]

Isabelle Gounand[*] (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0675-3973)

1. Institut d'écologie et des sciences de l'environnement (iEES Paris), Sorbonne Université, CNRS, UPEC, CNRS, IRD, INRA, 75005 Paris, France;

2. ISEM, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, F-34095 Montpellier, France;

3. CNRS, UAR 3194 (ENS, CNRS), CEREEP – Ecotron IleDeFrance, Ecole Normale Supérieure, 11 Chemin de Busseau, 77140 St-Pierre-lès-Nemours, France.

∗ Corresponding author; benoit.pichon0@gmail.com, isabelle.gounand@sorbonne-universite.fr

Running title: Stoichiometry at terrestrial-aquatic ecotone

Keywords: Meta-ecosystem, cross-ecosystem subsidy, stoichiometry, spatial feedbacks, terrestrial-aquatic ecotone, landscape scale

Type of article: Letter

Number of words: 148 in Abstract, 4976 in Main text

Number of references: 92

Figures: 6 (including one box)

Supplementary Figures: 19

Supplementary Tables: 3

Data: The code is available on Github via Zenodo: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7733880

Abstract

Species dispersal and resource spatial flows can greatly affect connected ecosystems functioning and their response to environmental changes. So far, research on meta-ecosystems has mainly focused on the quantitative effect of subsidy flows. Yet, resource exchanges at the terrestrial-aquatic ecotones display a stoichiometric asymmetry that likely matters for production. Here, we joined ecological stoichiometry and the meta-ecosystem framework to understand how subsidy stoichiometry mediates the response of meta-ecosystem to subsidy flows. Our results demonstrate that resource flows between ecosystems can induce a positive spatial feedback loop, leading to higher production at meta-ecosystem scale by relaxing local ecosystem limitations ("spatial complementarity"). Furthermore, we show that spatial flows can also have an unexpected negative impact on production when accentuating the stoichiometric mismatch between local resources and basal species needs. This study paves the way for new studies on the quality dimension of connectedness at the landscape extent.

Introduction

Flows of organisms, resources and energy connect communities and ecosystems at the landscape scale. These spatial connections among ecosystems are key to consider if we are to understand ecosystem functioning and their response to global changes. As habitats are increasingly fragmented, species indeed often disperse to track more favorable abiotic conditions (Haddad et al., 2015; Thompson & Fronhofer, 2019). In addition, ongoing changes in resource flows between different ecosystems are greatly affecting ecosystem functioning, as exemplified by the consequences of increasing inputs of terrestrial organic matter on aquatic ecosystems (Solomon et al., 2015). In this context, the meta-ecosystem framework (*sensu* Loreau et al., 2003) unveils the strong links between local processes and landscape dynamics (Polis et al., 2004; Massol et al., 2011). Meta-ecosystem theory has shown that at the landscape scale, spatial flows can affect source-sink dynamics (Gravel et al., 2010), the local coexistence of communities (Leibold et al., 2004; Marleau & Guichard, 2019; Peller et al., 2021), and both the stability and functioning of ecosystems (Marleau et al., 2014; Gounand et al., 2014). However, this theory has so far been restricted to flows between identical ecosystems mediated by species dispersal and it has focused on flow magnitude, ignoring the importance of flow quality (but see Marleau et al., 2015).

Yet, resource flows (*i.e.*, detritus or nutrients) of varying quality cross ecotones and connect dissimilar ecosystems (*e.g.*, forest and streams), with strong impacts on recipient ecosystems (Bartels et al., 2012). For instance, plant litter fuels stream communities with carbon-rich subsidies (*i.e.*, resource flows ; Wallace et al., 1997; Nakano & Murakami, 2001; Bartels et al., 2012) while fish caught from streams by terrestrial predators feed riparian communities with nutrient-rich carcasses, providing as much as 25% of the nitrogen budget in riparian forests (Baxter et al., 2005; Helfield & Naiman, 2006). A recent meta-analysis (Montagano et al., 2018) suggested that these bidirectional flows of both carbon and nutrients increase local population abundance, but inflows strongly vary in magnitude

among systems: while similar to local fluxes (decomposition, production, respiration) in freshwater ecosystems, subsidies are relatively smaller in terrestrial systems. This asymmetry in the quantity of resources transferred between ecosystems suggests that these flows should be more important for aquatic than for terrestrial ecosystem functioning (Bartels et al., 2012; Gounand et al., 2018b). However, such asymmetry of resource flows at aquatic-terrestrial ecotones is reverse in terms of quality of resources. Indeed, organisms produce detritus of different qualities, depending on their stoichiometric composition. The composition in nutrients and carbon (N:C ratio) of detritus depends on the trophic level (producer versus consumer) and on the ecosystem, with generally lower N:C ratios for primary producers of terrestrial ecosystems (Elser et al., 2000; Sitters et al., 2015). By complementing previous studies on cross-ecosystem carbon flows with nitrogen flows, we show that nitrogen spatial flows to aquatic and to terrestrial systems could be of the same order of magnitude despite a strong asymmetry in terms of dry mass due to the N:C differences (Fig. 1, Box 1). Therefore, subsidy stoichiometry likely strongly affects the functioning of aquatic-terrestrial meta-ecosystems.

Until now, theoretical meta-ecosystem models mostly described identical ecosystems connected through diffusion of resources and species dispersal (Gounand et al., 2018a, but see Leroux & Loreau, 2008; Harvey et al., 2021). These studies have shown that spatial flows of subsidies can destabilize connected ecosystems (Gounand et al., 2014; Marleau et al., 2014; McCann et al., 2021) but promote ecosystem production (Marleau et al., 2014). While adapted to describe spatial networks of connected forest patches or of lakes, these models do not capture the diversity of resource flows crossing ecotones such as at terrestrial-marine or freshwater ecotones. In addition, to our knowledge, only quantitative impacts of spatial flows have been investigated in models (but see Marleau et al., 2015). Yet, differences in stoichiometry between organisms in local communities are known to strongly impact local ecosystem processes ranging from nutrient recycling by consumers to species coexistence (Daufresne & Loreau, 2001; Cherif & Loreau, 2013;

Daufresne, 2021). The stoichiometry of spatial flows exported is thus expected to affect the functioning of connected ecosystems, depending on the limitation of their basal species. Primary producers are mainly limited by nutrients (*i.e.,* phosphorous or nitrogen) in autotrophic systems, while in heterotrophic systems where primary production is low, species at the basis of the food web are decomposers that can also be limited by carbon (Elser et al., 2007; Daufresne et al., 2008; Harpole et al., 2011). Changing the limitation of organisms within an ecosystem can drastically change the interactions and the feedbacks between trophic levels (Zou et al., 2016; Buchkowski et al., 2019). Together, this suggests that the impact of subsidy flows on ecosystem and meta-ecosystem scale productions may depend on both *(i)* the stoichiometry of subsidies and *(ii)* the local needs of communities.

Recent experimental and theoretical works suggest a complementarity of ecosystems at the landscape scale for performing different functions (Gounand et al., 2017; Harvey et al., 2021). Some aquatic ecosystems such as rivers with high riparian cover or benthic ecosystems are net heterotrophic ecosystems (Gounand et al., 2018b) while terrestrial ecosystems generally drive autotrophic primary production at the landscape extent. In addition, aquatic ecosystems tend to have higher trophic efficiency (*i.e.,* ratio of consumer to prey production ; Shurin et al., 2006). Thus, resource flows may optimize different functions in the meta-ecosystem (Harvey et al., 2021). Studies on aquatic-terrestrial meta-ecosystems have so far considered differences in trophic efficiency and primary production (Evans-White & Halvorson, 2017). We hypothesize that similar mechanisms can be expected with stoichiometry. If spatial flows fuel local ecosystem with resources that are limiting producer growth (*e.g.,* nitrogen-rich subsidies from streams relaxing nitrogen forest limitation or carbon-rich subsidies from terrestrial ecosystems relaxing carbon limitation of decomposers in streams), we expect higher production and positive feedbacks to emerge at the meta-ecosystem scale. However, to our knowledge, no theoretical and empirical studies investigated such hypothesis.

Here we integrate ecological stoichiometry and the meta-ecosystem framework to understand *(i)* how stoichiometry mediates the response of meta-ecosystems to subsidy flows and *(ii)* whether subsidy flows increase meta-ecosystem production by inducing a positive spatial feedbacks through the relaxation of local production limitation in carbon or nutrients. To test our hypothesis, we develop a stoichiometric explicit meta-ecosystem model, which connects the dynamics of aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems by carbon and nitrogen fluxes. We explore how these flows of subsidies interact with local community dynamics to determine meta-ecosystem functioning under different scenarios of resource limitations. Our results reveal non-linear positive feedbacks between ecosystems under carbon limitation of the aquatic ecosystem, but negative feedbacks under nitrogen limitation. Spatial flows of resources increase or decrease overall production depending on whether they accentuate the stoichiometric complementarity or the mismatch, respectively, between the needs of local communities and the composition of available resources.

Material and methods

Model description

Meta-ecosystem model - We built a meta-ecosystem model with explicit stoichiometry that couples carbon and nitrogen dynamics between two dissimilar ecosystems (Fig. 2): one terrestrial (indexed by $\mathcal{T}$, *e.g.,* forest or grassland) and one aquatic (indexed by $\mathcal{A}$, *e.g.,* stream or lake). While terrestrial ecosystems have autotrophic plants (P) as basal species, we assumed a heterotrophic functioning of the aquatic ecosystem with decomposers only (B) as basal species (e.g., small streams with high riparian cover). Each ecosystem consists of two trophic levels (see Appendix S5 for different food-web structures). Therefore, grazers (G) and consumers of decomposers (C) consume basal species in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems respectively. Each ecosystem has its own detritus (D) and inorganic nitrogen pool (N). We followed the carbon for the biotic and detritus pools (*e.g.,* B_C for

decomposers), and we derived the nitrogen content of organisms (*e.g.*, P_N for plants) by assuming a fixed stoichiometry (homeostasis) corresponding to their nitrogen to carbon ratio, N:C (r_X, where $X \in \{G, P, C, B\}$; Fig. 2A). This homeostasis involves different mechanisms across trophic levels: contrary to plants that maintain a constant N:C ratio through the control of their uptake (Tilman, 1982), grazers and consumers of decomposers hold their homeostasis through differential assimilation (Grover & Holt, 1998; Sterner & Elser, 2002).

Basal species limitation - Plants are exclusively limited by nitrogen for growth and maintain their stoichiometric homeostasis by adjusting their carbon intake, such that net photosynthesis equals f_P (Eq 1). While, decomposers can either be limited by carbon or nitrogen (Fig. 2B, or by both in Appendix S3). Decomposers feed primarily on detritus. Yet, as the detritus N:C ratio does not always match the decomposer stoichiometry due to variable stoichiometry of detritus produced by organisms, decomposers take-up or excrete nitrogen to maintain their homeostasis (Daufresne & Loreau, 2001). Decomposers limitation determines whether decomposition (ϕ_D, *i.e.*, consumption of detritus flux) is constrained by nitrogen immobilization (ϕ_I; N-limitation) or whether decomposition determines nitrogen dynamics (C-limitation). This link between decomposition and immobilization fluxes, which allows decomposers to maintain their homeostasis is detailed in Appendix S2.

Consumer dynamics - Grazers and consumers of decomposers feed on the basal species in their respective ecosystem at a rate a_G, a_C respectively, which follows the law of mass action (*i.e.*, type I functional response): $f_G = a_G P_C G_C$ and $f_C = a_C B_C C_C$ (Appendix S4 details a donor-controlled version of our model). Due to inefficiencies of assimilation, only fractions e_G and e_C of consumption support consumer growth, while the rest is lost from the system. In addition, to maintain their homeostasis, consumers excrete the excess of nitrogen due to the stoichiometric imbalance between their food and their needs (*e.g.*, $\beta_G f_G$

where $\beta_G = (r_P - e_G r_G)$ for grazers) (Grover & Holt, 1998; Marleau & Guichard, 2019).

Nutrient and resource flows - Recycling occurs through the production of detritus of each biotic compartment at rate $d_X \in \{G, P, C, B\}$, fueling the detritus pool, and the mineralization of detritus into nitrogen at a rate $m_{\mathcal{A}}$, in the aquatic system, which corresponds to decomposer's nitrogen mineralization (Daufresne & Loreau, 2001), and a rate $m_{\mathcal{T}}$ in the terrestrial ecosystem, where the action of decomposers is implicit.
Both ecosystems are supplied with autochthonous nitrogen and detritus flows $I_{N_{\mathcal{Z}}}$ and $I_{D_{\mathcal{Z}}}$ respectively, and detritus and nitrogen are lost at rates $l_{N_{\mathcal{Z}}}$ and $l_{D_{\mathcal{Z}}}$ ($\mathcal{Z} \in [\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}]$). We assumed such inputs of autochthonous detritus did not vary the N:C ratio of detritus.

Meta-ecosystem flows - Ecosystems are coupled by spatial flows of subsidies, with a fraction Δ of the produced detritus and excreted nitrogen being directly transferred from each biotic compartment in one ecosystem to the detritus and nitrogen pools in the other ecosystem (regional flow) while the remaining fraction being locally recycled ($1 - \Delta$, local flow).

Therefore, we obtain the following set of equations for terrestrial ecosystem (Fig. 2):

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{dP_C}{dt} = f_P - f_G - d_P P_C \\ \dfrac{dG_C}{dt} = e_G f_G - d_G G_C \\ \dfrac{dD_{N_{\mathcal{T}}}}{dt} = I_{D_{\mathcal{T}}} \dfrac{D_{N_{\mathcal{T}}}}{D_{C_{\mathcal{T}}}} - l_{D_{\mathcal{T}}} D_{N_{\mathcal{T}}} + r_G d_G G_C (1-\Delta) + r_P d_P P_C (1-\Delta) + r_C d_C C_C \Delta \\ \qquad + r_B d_B B_C \Delta - m_{\mathcal{T}} D_{N_{\mathcal{T}}} \\ \dfrac{dD_{C_{\mathcal{T}}}}{dt} = I_{D_{\mathcal{T}}} - l_{D_{\mathcal{T}}} D_{C_{\mathcal{T}}} + d_G G_C (1-\Delta) + d_P P_C (1-\Delta) + d_C C_C \Delta + d_B B_C \Delta_B - m_{\mathcal{T}} D_{C_{\mathcal{T}}} \\ \dfrac{dN_{\mathcal{T}}}{dt} = I_{N_{\mathcal{T}}} - l_{N_{\mathcal{T}}} N_{\mathcal{T}} + \beta_G f_G (1-\Delta) + \beta_C f_C \Delta \\ \qquad - r_P f_P + m_{\mathcal{T}} D_{N_{\mathcal{T}}} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Similarly, we get the following equations for the aquatic ecosystem dynamics:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dB_C}{dt} = \phi_D - d_B B_C - f_C - m_{\mathcal{A}} B_C \\ \frac{dB_N}{dt} = \phi_I r_B + \phi_D \frac{D_{N_{\mathcal{A}}}}{D_{C_{\mathcal{A}}}} - f_C r_B - d_B B_C r_B - r_B m_{\mathcal{A}} B_C \\ \frac{dC_C}{dt} = e_C\, f_C - d_C C_C \\ \frac{dD_{N_{\mathcal{A}}}}{dt} = I_{D_{\mathcal{A}}} \frac{D_{N_{\mathcal{A}}}}{D_{C_{\mathcal{A}}}} - l_{D_{\mathcal{A}}} D_{N_{\mathcal{A}}} + r_C d_C C_C (1-\Delta) + r_B d_B B_C (1-\Delta) + r_G d_G G_C \Delta + \\ \qquad r_P d_P P_C \Delta - \phi_D \frac{D_{N_{\mathcal{A}}}}{D_{C_{\mathcal{A}}}} \\ \frac{dD_{C_{\mathcal{A}}}}{dt} = I_{D_{\mathcal{A}}} - l_{D_{\mathcal{A}}} D_{C_{\mathcal{A}}} + d_C C_C (1-\Delta) + d_B B_C (1-\Delta) + d_G G_C \Delta + d_P P_C \Delta - \phi_D \\ \frac{dN_{\mathcal{A}}}{dt} = I_{N_{\mathcal{A}}} - l_{N_{\mathcal{A}}} N_{\mathcal{A}} + \beta_C f_C (1-\Delta) + \beta_G f_G \Delta \\ \qquad - \phi_I r_B + m_{\mathcal{A}} B_C r_B \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Ecosystem & meta-ecosystem metrics

To test our hypotheses on the effect of subsidy stoichiometry on meta-ecosystem functioning, we compared the following ecosystem and meta-ecosystem metrics for two different scenarios of heterotrophic decomposer limitation: nitrogen versus carbon limitation (see parameters in Appendix S2). Under each scenario, we made sure decomposer limitation remained unchanged by the studied variations in decomposer and plant stoichiometry.

Production and spatial subsidy flows - We measured the primary and secondary production (in carbon units) at both scales, defined as the flow to basal species and consumers at equilibrium, respectively. When decomposer growth is limited by nitrogen, primary production corresponds to immobilization flux of nitrogen (ϕ_I), while it is the decomposition flux (ϕ_D) under carbon limitation. We compared the production of the meta-ecosystem when ecosystems are connected versus isolated (*i.e.,* local recycling of detritus) while varying the stoichiometry of plants and decomposers, using a log ratio response (LRR)

defined as:

$$log(\frac{\mathcal{P}rod_{j,\ \Delta=1}}{\mathcal{P}rod_{j,\ \Delta=0}}) \tag{3}$$

, where $\mathcal{P}rod_j$ is the production of the trophic level j from both ecosystems (meta-ecosystem scale). A positive LRR value means that production benefits from subsidy flows relatively to a scenario where all subsidies are locally recycled (no spatial flows).

Measuring the feedback between ecosystems - In addition, we measured the spatial effects (hereafter feedbacks) of subsidy flows as the difference in production between scenarios where ecosystems are bidirectionally versus unidirectionally connected by subsidy flows. In the latter, the focal ecosystem receives subsidies from the connected ecosystem but its own exported flows are lost from the meta-ecosystem. For instance, for the case of terrestrial ecosystem, we aim to quantify how resources exported by terrestrial ecosystem impact its own production through the effect of spatial flows exported to the aquatic ecosystem and the quantity of aquatic subsidies exported back (see Fig. S7.1). We interpret this measure as the strength of the spatial feedback $\mathcal{F}$ induced by the subsidy flow:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{T}_j} &= \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_j,\Delta_X\neq 0} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{T}_j,\text{terrestrial subsidies lost}} \\ \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{A}_j} &= \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_j,\Delta_X\neq 0} - \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}_j,\text{aquatic subsidies lost}} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

, where $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{Z}_j}$ is the production of the trophic level $j, j \in [1,2]$ in ecosystem $\mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{Z} \in [\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{A}]$. In addition, because this metric evaluate the long term impact of spatial flows on each ecosystem production, we also measured the short term response of each trophic level density to a transient increase in the fraction of subsidies received by the other ecosystem (Appendix S7).

Parameters and sensitivity analysis - We parametrized the model to account for differences of functioning between aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems and stoichiometry between plants and decomposers (see Appendix S2, and Table S2.1). We performed sensitivity

analysis on the shape of the functional responses, the number of trophic levels and the parameter values (Appendices S4-S6).

As the model is not analytically tractable, we performed simulations using *DifferentialEquation* package in Julia (version 1.7.3), and analyzed them in R (version 4.1.0).

Results

The following results hold qualitatively when changing the type of functional response, adding a trophic level and varying the parameter values (Appendices S4-6).

Spatial complementarity under carbon limitation

Under the scenario of carbon limitation for aquatic decomposers, resource spatial flows maximize both primary and secondary productions in each local ecosystem when decomposers have high nitrogen content (r_B) and plants have low nitrogen content (r_P) (Fig. 3A). In addition, spatial flows also increase the densities of grazers and aquatic consumers (Fig. S7.2).

As decomposers need more nitrogen to maintain their homeostasis (r_B increases), both the nitrogen content of decomposer-produced detritus and the quantity of nitrogen excreted by aquatic consumers through stoichiometric imbalance ($\beta_C = r_B - e_C r_C$) increase. When ecosystems are connected, this flow of nitrogen fuels the terrestrial nitrogen pool, and supports higher plant production (Fig 3A-*(iii) to (i)*) and higher density of grazers (Fig. S7.2). These mechanisms contribute to higher carbon and nitrogen flows exported back to the aquatic ecosystem. In addition, we observe that aquatic ecosystem is a net source for nitrogen and a net sink for carbon at the meta-ecosystem scale (Fig. 3A *(i)-(iii)*). Productions in both ecosystems are maximized for plants with a low N:C ratio (low r_P, Fig. 3A). When plant N:C decreases (*e.g.*, from Fig. 3A-*(ii) to (i)*), basal plant production increases due to lower needs of nitrogen for the same growth, and consequently leads

to a higher grazer density (Figs S7.2, 3A-*(ii)*). Thus, the quantity of detritus produced by plants and grazers, and then exported, increases (Fig. S7.3). Consequently, it supports higher production in the aquatic ecosystem (Fig. S7.2). Additionally, because resources exported from the terrestrial ecosystem have on average a lower N:C ratio compared to the ones produced by the aquatic ecosystem, the N:C ratio of aquatic detritus decreases (Fig. S7.4B), which relaxes the decomposer limitation for carbon (Fig. S7.4C) and could, in specific conditions, induce a change in the limitation of decomposers (from carbon to nitrogen, Fig. S7.5).

Besides, at the meta-ecosystem scale, spatial coupling between ecosystems mainly lead to higher primary and secondary productions than the sum of the productions of isolated systems (Fig. 4A). Positive effects result from a stoichiometric matching between the local community needs and the spatial flows (*e.g*, plants need nitrogen that is brought by nitrogen-rich aquatic subsidies), suggesting a spatial complementarity of ecosystems.

Ecosystem spatial competition under nitrogen limitation

Conversely, under nitrogen limitation of decomposers, we observe opposite patterns between ecosystems: spatial flows maximize production in one ecosystem when minimizing it in the other. Basal production in the aquatic ecosystem peaks for high r_P, when plants produce nitrogen-rich detritus, while it peaks for low r_P in the terrestrial ecosystem, when plant demand for nitrogen is low (Fig. 3B). When r_B increases, it exacerbates the stoichiometric mismatches between decomposers and both their consumers and their detrital resources (*i.e.*, $r_B - \frac{D_{N_\mathcal{A}}}{D_{C_\mathcal{A}}}$ increases; Fig. S7.4). The stoichiometric mismatch with consumers reduces secondary production (Fig S7.5B). The stoichiometric mismatch with detritus reduces the nitrogen pool in the aquatic ecosystem (because decomposers need more nitrogen to maintain their homeostasis) and limits the decomposition of detritus (Fig. 3B). In these conditions (high r_B), the aquatic ecosystem acts as a net sink receiving on average more carbon and nitrogen flows than it exports (Fig. 3B). We find the same

pattern of aquatic ecosystem acting as a sink for carbon and nitrogen in empirical data on terrestrial-freshwater exchanges (Fig. 1C; Box 1). Additionally, we observed that meta-ecosystem primary and secondary productions generally decrease when both ecosystems are connected (Fig. 4B), which denotes a spatial competition rather than complementarity effect between ecosystems: the resources exported by the terrestrial ecosystem do not match the aquatic community needs.

Cross-ecosystem feedbacks

Lastly, we measured how the subsidies exported by a donor ecosystem, feedback on its own production through the subsidies exported by the recipient (Figs. 5, S7.1). Under carbon limitation of decomposers, feedbacks on basal and secondary productions in both ecosystems are always positive and scale non-linearly with the fraction of subsidies regionally exported (Figs. 5A, S7.7a). This means that exports of resources from the donor ecosystem compared to losses always increase production of the recipient ecosystem, which further increases the fraction of subsidies exported back. The strength of this positive feedback is highly and positively modulated by the stoichiometry of decomposers, while plant stoichiometry only slightly changes the feedback (Fig. 5A). Conversely, feedbacks reach negative values under nitrogen limitation of decomposers, meaning that production is lower with bidirectional flows than with a unidirectional flow leaving the meta-ecosystem (Figs 5B, S7.7b). Indeed, we found a U-shape relationship crossing 0 between the fraction of subsidies being transferred regionally and the strength of the feedback in the terrestrial ecosystem.

At first, the feedback decreases with increasing connectedness of ecosystems (for $\Delta \in [0, 0.25]$ (resp. $[0, 0.9]$) in aquatic (resp. terrestrial) ecosystems) due to an amplification of the stoichiometric mismatch between decomposers and their detritus following carbon-rich terrestrial subsidies inputs. However, at higher regional flows, the terrestrial ecosystem exports more detritus regionally due to higher levels of nitrogen-rich subsidies from

the aquatic ecosystem. The mass effect of abundant terrestrial subsidies overcomes the negative saturating effect of stoichiometric mismatch between detritus and decomposers (Fig. S7.7c), thus allowing the terrestrial system to sustain higher aquatic production compared to a scenario where subsidies from the aquatic ecosystem are lost.

Discussion

By analyzing a stoichiometrically explicit meta-ecosystem model, we reveal how local ecosystem limitations and basal species stoichiometry drive meta-ecosystem functioning, by leading either to stoichiometric complementarity or competition between spatial flows and local demand. Our results highlight the potential for complementarity in resource use among ecosystems at the landscape scale, but also show that resource flows can induce a negative spatial feedback between terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems, depending on local nutrient limitations. We therefore discuss the implications of these findings and provide perspectives for spatial ecology.

Spatial complementarity vs competition through subsidy flows

Under carbon limitation of aquatic decomposers, spatial flows maximize production in both ecosystems for basal species with complementary needs (low-N plants and high-N decomposers). Terrestrial subsidies alleviate carbon limitation and sustain production in the aquatic ecosystem, while nitrogen-rich subsidies from the aquatic ecosystem allow plants of the terrestrial ecosystem to fix more carbon (Box 1), together leading to higher meta- ecosystem production. Both a recent experimental work and a review have stressed the importance of spatial flow quality for local ecosystem functioning (Sitters et al., 2015; Gounand et al., 2017). In addition, using two-patch microcosms, Gounand et al. showed that detritus exchange between autotrophic and heterotrophic communities can maximize densities in both communities compared to communities being isolated (Gounand et al.,

2017). In a recent meta-ecosystem modeling work, Harvey et al., 2021 proposed the cross-ecosystem efficiency hypothesis to describe how spatial flows might foster higher functions at the landscape scale by redistributing resources among ecosystems differing in the functions they optimize (primary production in terrestrial ecosystems versus higher trophic efficiency in aquatic ecosystems). We further propose that complementarity between ecosystems can arise from the match between the stoichiometry of spatial flows and local community needs, leading to higher production when ecosystems are connected. Indeed, complementarity of ecosystems create a spatial positive feedback loop: on the one hand, autotrophic ecosystems, which drive primary production at the landscape extent, export organic matter that fuels heterotrophic ecosystems and fosters the local production. In return, more nutrient-rich subsidies are exported back, promoting primary production and closing the meta-ecosystem loop. Therefore, we propose that cross-ecosystem flows bound ecosystems into a spatial auto-catalytic loop (*sensu* Veldhuis et al., 2018), maximizing production of the whole. Further research using experimental microcosm or theory could investigates such hypothesis.

However, cross-ecosystem effects are highly modulated by local ecosystem limitation. While we find connectedness between ecosystems leads to complementarity when the aquatic ecosystem is limited by carbon, a mismatch arises between aquatic community needs and resources exported by the terrestrial ecosystem under nitrogen limitation. In this case, plants and decomposers indirectly compete at the meta-ecosystem scale for nitrogen: high nitrogen demand and low-quality terrestrial subsidies lower decomposition and production in the aquatic ecosystem, with negative spatial feedback on terrestrial primary production through reduced detritus export. Then, both consumers of decomposers and grazers shrink in densities due to reduced basal production. In non-spatial experiments, decomposers often evolve toward co-limitation as a mechanism to avoid competitive exclusion when competing for nutrients with autotrophs (Daufresne & Loreau, 2001; Danger et al., 2008; Daufresne et al., 2008). In our meta-ecosystem model, N-C co-limitations in

decomposers always trigger positive spatial feedbacks (see Appendix. S3), suggesting that if such evolution was to occur in a spatial context, it would maximize production at the meta-ecosystem scale.

Understanding cross-ecosystem interactions through resource feedbacks

Cross-ecosystem facilitation (*i.e.,* complementarity mechanism) and competition (*i.e.,* mismatch mechanism) occur through spatial feedback, which sign is modulated by the limitation of decomposers and the stoichiometry of basal species. In particular, we emphasize that feedbacks on terrestrial production could reach negative values under nitrogen limitation of the aquatic ecosystem while they are always positive and scale non-linearly with the connectedness of ecosystems under carbon limitation. Under carbon limitation, positive feedbacks on the productions of both ecosystems increase with the N:C ratio of decomposers. While our model is spatial, recent models connecting brown and green food chains in non-spatial contexts also emphasized the importance of microbial stoichiometry in determining the interaction between decomposers and plants (Zou et al., 2016; Buchkowski et al., 2019). Zou et al. (2016) showed how the impact of the green food web on the brown one was highly determined by their resource limitation of decomposers: the effect was positive (resp. negative) when decomposers were C- (resp. N-) limited. The negative effect was emerging from plant and decomposer competition for a common nitrogen pool. In a meta-ecosystem perspective, we found these feedbacks between autotrophic and heterotrophic food-webs to reach negative values under nitrogen limitation: spatial flows of terrestrial subsidies negatively impact aquatic ecosystem production through a direct stoichiometric mismatch effect, and may indirectly decrease terrestrial ecosystem production compared to a scenario where terrestrial resources exported are lost from the system. This finding puts into perspective the term ”subsidies” (sensu Polis et al., 1997; but see Subalusky & Post, 2019), defined in relation to their positive effect on production in the recipient ecosystem. This stoichiometric mechanism contrasts with previous theoretical

works, which suggested that cross-ecosystem flows always increase landscape production (*e.g.,* Marleau et al., 2014). In fact, stoichiometric mismatch is an important constraint upon consumer growth (Hillebrand et al., 2009). In an experimental context, several authors stressed that lower food quality can decrease consumer assimilation efficiency and population growth rates, and further lead to population abundance decrease in aquatic systems (*e.g.,* Anderson et al., 2005; Brett et al., 2009; Hillebrand et al., 2009). For instance, Kelly et al. (2014) showed a negative association between zooplankton production and inputs of terrestrial organic carbon in lakes caused by shading and low quality of terrestrial inflows that did not support zooplankton production (Kelly et al., 2014).

Besides, empirical studies support our results that cross-ecosystem material flows can shape the functioning within recipient ecosystems by modulating nutrient limitations (see Sitters et al., 2015 for a review). For instance, pacific salmons that annually migrate to freshwater ecosystems can relax nitrogen limitation of heterotrophic bacteria communities, leading to higher levels of production (Rüegg et al., 2011). These salmons can further be eaten by bears, increasing both their excretion rates and the carcass deposition and contributing to a nitrogen flow positively affecting riparian forests (Helfield & Naiman, 2006 ; Box 1). We observed such cross-ecosystem effects in both ecosystems in the model since resources exported by the terrestrial ecosystem relaxed carbon limitation, or exacerbated nitrogen limitation in the aquatic ecosystem, depending on resource limitation of decomposers.

Relaxing some model assumptions

As for any modelling studies, we derived mechanisms and predictions at the cost of simplifying hypotheses on processes. First, we assumed that each organism was held at a constant stoichiometry. While a reasonable assumption for decomposers and their consumers (Cross et al., 2003; Andersen et al., 2004; Persson et al., 2010), plant stoichiometry often changes depending on the dominance of species and their traits (*e.g.* Yu et al.,

2010) and on nutrient inputs into terrestrial ecosystems. We may expect this plant plasticity mechanism to reduce the stoichiometric mismatch between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems as the nitrogen content of plants would increase in response to nitrogen-rich aquatic subsidies. In the example of salmons, nitrogen actively transferred to terrestrial ecosystems by bears increases the N:C ratio of plant foliage (Hilderbrand et al., 1999). Additionally, we ignored compensatory feeding mechanisms that consumers can develop when facing low-quality food (Cebrian & Lartigue, 2004; Hillebrand et al., 2009). Yet, these mechanisms can modify community dynamics. For instance, they can promote extinction of producers through consumer overfeeding (Marx et al., 2021) and decrease trophic efficiency of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems (Frost et al., 2006; Hillebrand et al., 2009). Accounting for both top-down (compensatory feeding) and bottom-up (deviation from strict homeostasis) mechanisms may help to better predict community response to spatial subsidies.

Secondly, at the landscape level, we only focused on nitrogen as the main nutrient exchanged between aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem. While nitrogen appears to be the most limiting element in terrestrial ecosystems (Sterner & Elser, 2002; Fagan & Denno, 2004), many aquatic ecosystems are considered to be limited by phosphorous (Elser et al., 2007). Moreover, it also matters in a meta-ecosystem perspective as primary producers in freshwater, terrestrial and marine ecosystems can be co-limited by phosphorous and nitrogen (Elser et al., 2007; Harpole et al., 2011; Rosemond et al., 2015). This co-limitation for phosphorous and nitrogen can switch to a phosphorous limitation by cross-ecosystem subsidies (Rüegg et al., 2011). Inversely, the movement of consumers across the landscape has also been shown to induce co-limitation (Marleau et al., 2015). Hence, taking into account phosphorous along with nitrogen in stoichiometric models could reveal emergent stoichiometric processes induced by cross-ecosystem flows.

Perspectives at the landscape scale

Here, we built a spatially implicit model merging meta-ecosystem theory and ecological stoichiometry and showed how spatial feedbacks between dissimilar ecosystems modulate local and regional productions. We argue that future models should go beyond spatially implicit models to account for landscape structure and its heterogeneity. Harvey et al provided a flexible model to predict ecosystem function at the landscape extent (Harvey et al., 2021). A promising future path would be to link the spatial distribution of resources and the foraging behavior of consumers. Consumers often avoid areas with low-quality resources (*e.g.,* Duparc et al., 2020; Rizzuto et al., 2021). By doing so, they limit important stoichiometric mismatch with their food and avoid nutrient limitations. Yet, no theoretical studies investigated the consequences of such mechanisms on the spatial distribution of resources, or on the coexistence between multiple consumers. Modelling studies on these active flows remain scarce despite their strong potential for understanding how herbivore movements and traits interact with predation (including non-consumptive effects, Schmitz et al., 2010) to determine the distribution of nutrients at the landscape scale (Anderson et al., 2010; Schmitz et al., 2018; Ferraro et al., 2022). This may provide emergent patterns, such as nutrient co-limitation induced by spatial processes (Marleau et al., 2015) or patchy distribution of resources (Johnson-Bice et al., 2022). In addition, we currently lack a clear understanding of the relative contribution of passive flows, which are associated to the entropy of a system (a current, an upwelling), and active vectors that can transport resources against entropy (*e.g.,* salmon swimming back up the river) across many ecotones (Schmitz et al., 2018; McInturf et al., 2019; Ellis-Soto et al., 2021). While we found few data regarding resource flows mediated by organisms (*e.g.,* faeces, carcasses), this data showed that such flows could be large in magnitude, suggesting that the impact of organism-mediated resource flows might be higher compared to passive flows in some ecosystems. Integrating these new perspectives to understand the interplay between foraging and spatial flows of resources, and better characterizing meta-ecosystem

functioning will help to build a more integrative spatial ecology and better understand the feedbacks at the landscape extent.

Figure 1: Empirical data on stoichiometry and magnitude differences between resources exchanged at freshwater-terrestrial ecotone.

(A): Distribution of the number of observations of cross-ecosystem flows at terrestrial-freshwater ecotone according to their magnitude (in $gDW.m^{-2}.yr^{1}$). The surface (in m^{-2}) corresponds to the area of the ecosystem receiving the resource flow. (B): Nitrogen to carbon ratio of materials exported by terrestrial (forests and grasslands in green) and freshwater (streams and lakes in blue) ecosystems. The shape of the points indicates the type of materials being exported by ecosystems. Fresh. = Freshwater, Terr. = Terrestrial, amphib. = amphibians and inverteb. = invertebrates. Terrestrial or aquatic labels indicate the donor ecosystem. (C): Cross-ecosystem flows of resources (carbon (left) and nitrogen (right)) crossing freshwater-terrestrial ecotone. The units of flows are $gC.m^{-2}.yr^{1}$ and $gN.m^{-2}.yr^{1}$ for carbon and nitrogen respectively. Fresh. = Freshwater, Terr. = Terrestrial. Boxplots present the median surrounded by the first and third quartiles, and whiskers are not shown. Mean flows are indicated on the top of each boxplot. Note that, panel (B) show the stoichiometry of material **exported** by each type of ecosystem, while panel (C) represent the quantity of C and N fluxes fueling each type of ecosystem. The number of observations, n, is indicated in each panel.


A
Number of observations
Fresh. amphib. (n = 26)
Fresh. insects (n = 156)
Fresh. carcass (n = 28)
Terr. amphib. (n = 24)
Terr. carcass (n = 2)
Terr. DOC (n = 1)
Terr. mammal faeces (n = 4)
Terr. POC (n = 3)
Terr. inverteb. (n = 123)
Terr. plants (n = 161)
[0,1[
[1,5[
[20,100[
[5,20[
>100
Class of flow magnitude, in gDW.m−2.yr−1
B
N:C
n = 125
n = 48
n = 15
n = 39
Forest
Grassland
Lake
Stream
C
Cross−ecosystem flows of resources (g.m−2.yr−1)
20.72
128.14
3.33
6.36
Carbon
Nitrogen
n = 110
n = 214
n = 109
n = 95
Fresh. to terr.
Terr. to fresh.
Fresh. to terr.
Terr. to fresh.
Aqu. insects
Zooplankton
Macroalgae
Carcass
Mammal faeces
Small amphib.
Terr. plants
Terr. inverteb.
Phytoplankton
POC
DOC
Forest
Grassland
Lake
Stream

Figure 1

Figure 2: Stoichiometric meta-ecosystem model - hierarchy of processes and scales. Basal species and consumers are held at a fixed stoichiometry (homeostasis). (A): Stoichiometric imbalance (β_G) results from the differences between producer stoichiometry and consumer needs and lead to nitrogen excretion. A similar mechanism occurs for the interaction between decomposers and their consumers. (B): Decomposers from the freshwater heterotrophic ecosystem have two possible limitations: nitrogen or carbon. Their limitation sets which flow (decomposition of detritus (ϕ_D) or immobilization of nitrogen (ϕ_I)) constrains the other so that decomposers maintain a constant stoichiometry. (C): Two ecosystems, one heterotrophic (freshwater) with decomposers as basal species and the other autotrophic (terrestrial) with plants as primary producers, are linked at the landscape level by subsidy flows (dead organic matter and nitrogen flows due to stoichiometric imbalance). Symbols are used in the model equations: mineralization rates in ecosystems ($m_{\mathcal{T}}, m_{\mathcal{A}}$), immobilization flow ($\phi_I$), decomposition flow ($\phi_D$), plant net photosynthesis (f_P) and nitrogen uptake ($r_P f_P$), attack rates of consumers of decomposers and grazers (f_C, f_G respectively), decay rates of organisms (d_G, d_P, d_B, d_C), stoichiometric imbalance between producers and consumers (β_G, β_C), fraction of subsidies recycled regionally ($\Delta_P, \Delta_G, \Delta_C, \Delta_B$) and nitrogen to carbon ratio of organisms (r_G, r_C, r_P, r_B) Black thick arrows describe trophic interactions while grey dashed arrows correspond to recycling paths.


A
Stoichiometric imbalance
C
N
$\beta_G = r_P - e_G r_G$
$r_G = \frac{N}{C}$
r_P
B
$\varphi_I = f(\varphi_D)$
Nitrogen
C-limited
φ_D
Detritus
φ_I
Nitrogen
N-limited
Detritus
$\varphi_D = f(\varphi_I)$
C
β_G
G_C
G_N
r_G
d_G
f_G
f_P
P_C
P_N
r_P
d_P
$r_P f_P$
m_T
N_T
D_{C_T}
D_{N_T}
Δ_G
Δ_C
Δ_P
Δ_B
d_C
C_C
C_N
r_C
β_C
f_C
d_B
B_C
B_N
r_B
m_A
Φ_D
Φ_I
D_{C_A}
D_{N_A}
N_A

Figure 2

Figure 3: Effects of basal species limitation and stoichiometry on ecosystem production

We show the basal production in terrestrial (left) and freshwater (right) ecosystems with spatial coupling ($\Delta = 1$, see Fig. S6.4 in appendix S5 for varying values) according to the N:C ratio of basal species. In (A), decomposers are carbon limited, while they are limited by nitrogen in (B). Production in both ecosystems is expressed in carbon units. We also represent the meta-ecosystem compartments at equilibrium when ecosystems are connected $\Delta = 1$ (terrestrial ecosystem in green and freshwater one in blue) for the four corners of the heat map (*(i)*: $r_B = 0.25, r_P = 0.025$, *(ii)*: $r_B = 0.25, r_P = 0.1$, *(iii)*: $r_B = 0.12, r_P = 0.025$, *(iv)*: $r_B = 0.12, r_P = 0.1$). Black arrows correspond to trophic interaction while gray arrows correspond to recycling paths. The two trophic levels are represented in pink for primary consumers and green for basal species. Nitrogen and detritus pools are respectively in blue and brown. For detritus, we only represent the carbon content. The size of each compartment is set relatively to the other same compartments to allow direct size comparison of each compartment (*e.g.,* detritus) across the stoichiometric conditions. We also represent the net flow of carbon (orange arrow) and nitrogen (purple arrow) at the meta-ecosystem scale. Their width is proportional to the flow.


A
Terrestrial basal production
Aquatic basal production
N:C decomposers (r_B)
N:C plants (r_P)
0.25
0.20
0.15
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
0.10
(i)
(ii)
(iii)
(iv)
4.6 4.7 4.8 4.9 5.0
2.44 2.46
C
N
B
4.6 4.7
0.50 0.52 0.54 0.56

Figure 3

Figure 4: Effect of spatial flows on meta-ecosystem production. We compare the log ratio-response of basal production (plants + decomposers) in left panels, and secondary production (grazers + consumers of decomposers) in right panels, at the meta-ecosystem scale when ecosystems are connected versus isolated. (A): Decomposers are carbon limited. (B) Decomposers are nitrogen limited. The black line indicates the isocline delimiting positive and negative effects of spatial subsidies.


A
Basal prod. meta−ecosystem
Secondary prod. meta−ecosystem
N:C decomposers (rB)
0.25
0.20
0.15
0.02
0.04
0.06
0.08
0.10
N:C plants (rP)
0.01
0.03
0.05
B
−0.015
−0.005
0.005
−0.3
−0.2
−0.1

Figure 4

Figure 5: Feedback between ecosystems depends both on decomposer limitation and basal species stoichiometry.

In order to understand how resources exported by an ecosystem feedback on its own production through the effect on the recipient ecosystem, we compared for each trophic level and both ecosystems the production of the recipient ecosystem for scenarios of bidirectional and unidirectional flows of subsidies along a gradient of connectivity between ecosystems (Δ; see methods and Fig. S7.1 for formulas). Shapes correspond to the four extreme scenarios of basal species stoichiometry defined in Fig. 3. of plants and decomposers (see Fig. 3). (A): C-limited decomposers and (B): N-limited decomposers. Some inserts are displayed for some curves



Figure 5

Box 1: Empirical cross-ecosystem subsidy flows between freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems

We gathered data from the literature on cross-ecosystem flows between freshwater (streams, lakes) and terrestrial (forests, grasslands) ecosystems and provide here orders of magnitudes and stoichiometric characteristics of these fluxes (see Appendix S1 for details on data extraction). First, at the freshwater-terrestrial ecotone, subsidies are mostly represented by plant litter exported by terrestrial ecosystem and invertebrates exported by both ecosystems (Fig. 1A). Interestingly, exported materials by terrestrial *versus* freshwater ecosystems vary in quantity (Fig. 1C) and quality (carbon and nitrogen content; (Fig. 1B). While the exports of terrestrial ecosystems, mainly characterized by plant litter, are of poor quality (*i.e.*, carbon-rich), resources from freshwater ecosystems are richer in nitrogen. Aside from quality these cross-ecosystem flows also vary in quantity. When comparing the carbon and nitrogen flows at terrestrial-freshwater ecotone, we observe a strong asymmetry of carbon flows crossing ecotones (20 $gC.m^{-2}.yr^{1}$ exported in average by freshwater ecosystems *versus* 128 $gC.m^{-2}.yr^{1}$ from terrestrial ones; Fig. 1C). However, this quantitative asymmetry of exported resources is partially compensated by their stoichiometric asymmetry. Consequently, while there is one order of magnitude of difference for carbon flows, we only observe a slight difference for nitrogen flows.

Thus, we observe two types of asymmetries in resource flows at freshwater-terrestrial ecotone. First, there is an asymmetry in flow quantity that may originate from differences in convexity of ecosystem profiles (*e.g.* forest *versus* stream ; see Polis et al., 1997; Shurin et al., 2006; Leroux & Loreau, 2008). Second, there is an asymmetry in quality, which originate from stoichiometric differences of organisms (Elser et al., 2000) and can impact local ecosystem functioning. In fact, high quantity but low quality of terrestrial subsidies can limit freshwater ecosystem production by various mechanisms ranging from shading of lakes, increase in stoichiometric mismatch or reduction of freshwater production (*e.g.*, (Kelly et al., 2014)). Similarly, high quality subsidies can considerably impact terrestrial plant communities in both richness and production (Helfield & Naiman, 2006; Rüegg et al., 2011; Hocking & Reynolds, 2011; Bultman et al., 2014). Together, it emphasizes the need to move toward a stoichiometric theory at the landscape extent (Leroux et al., 2017).

Conflict of interest disclosure: The authors of this article declare that they have no financial conflict of interest with the content of this article.

Author contribution: All authors conceived the study. B.P perform research and wrote the first draft, which was substantially revised by E.T, G.L and I.G.

All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding: This work was supported by the French National program EC2CO (Ecosphère Continentale et Côtière). E.T acknowledges support from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-18-CE02-0010).

Acknowledgement: The authors thanks Frédéric Guichard for interesting discussions and feedbacks on a previous version.

References

Andersen, T., Elser, J. J. & Hessen, D. O. (2004). Stoichiometry and population dynamics: Stoichiometry and population dynamics. Ecology Letters, 7, 884–900.

Anderson, T., Hessen, D., Elser, J. & Urabe, J. (2005). Metabolic stoichiometry and the fate of excess carbon and nutrients in consumers. The American Naturalist, 165, 1–15.

Anderson, T. M., Hopcraft, J. G. C., Eby, S., Ritchie, M., Grace, J. B. & Olff, H. (2010). Landscape-scale analyses suggest both nutrient and antipredator advantages to Serengeti herbivore hotspots. Ecology, 91, 1519–1529.

Bartels, P., Cucherousset, J., Steger, K., Eklöv, P., Tranvik, L. J. & Hillebrand, H. (2012). Reciprocal subsidies between freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems structure consumer resource dynamics. Ecology, 93, 1173–1182.

Baxter, C. V., Fausch, K. D. & Carl Saunders, W. (2005). Tangled webs: reciprocal flows of invertebrate prey link streams and riparian zones: Prey subsidies link stream and riparian food webs. Freshwater Biology, 50, 201–220.

Brett, M. T., Kainz, M. J., Taipale, S. J. & Seshan, H. (2009). Phytoplankton, not allochthonous carbon, sustains herbivorous zooplankton production. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106, 21197–21201.

Buchkowski, R. W., Leroux, S. J. & Schmitz, O. J. (2019). Microbial and animal nutrient limitation change the distribution of nitrogen within coupled green and brown food chains. Ecology, 100, e02674.

Bultman, H., Hoekman, D., Dreyer, J. & Gratton, C. (2014). Terrestrial deposition of aquatic insects increases plant quality for insect herbivores and herbivore density: Terrestrial effects of midge deposition. Ecological Entomology, 39, 419–426.

Cebrian, J. & Lartigue, J. (2004). Patterns of herbivory and decomposition in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Ecological Monographs, 74, 237–259.

Cherif, M. & Loreau, M. (2013). Plant–herbivore–decomposer stoichiometric mismatches and nutrient cycling in ecosystems. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 280, 20122453.

Cleveland, C. C. & Liptzin, D. (2007). C:N:P stoichiometry in soil: is there a "Redfield ratio" for the microbial biomass? Biogeochemistry, 85, 235–252.

Cross, W. F., Benstead, J. P., Rosemond, A. D. & Bruce Wallace, J. (2003). Consumer-resource stoichiometry in detritus-based streams. Ecology Letters, 6, 721–732.

Danger, M., Daufresne, T., Lucas, F., Pissard, S. & Lacroix, G. (2008). Does Liebig's law of the minimum scale up from species to communities? Oikos, 117, 1741–1751.

Daufresne, T. (2021). A consumer-driven recycling theory for the impact of large herbivores on terrestrial ecosystem stoichiometry. Ecology Letters, ele.13876.

Daufresne, T., Lacroix, G., Benhaim, D. & Loreau, M. (2008). Coexistence of algae and bacteria: a test of the carbon hypothesis. Aquatic Microbial Ecology, 53, 323–332.

Daufresne, T. & Loreau, M. (2001). Ecological stoichiometry, primary producer-decomposer interactions, and ecosystem persistence. Ecology, 82, 3069–3082.

Duparc, A., Garel, M., Marchand, P., Dubray, D., Maillard, D. & Loison, A. (2020). Through the taste buds of a large herbivore: foodscape modeling contributes to an understanding of forage selection processes. Oikos, 129, 170–183.

Ellis-Soto, D., Ferraro, K., Rizzuto, M., Briggs, E., Monk, J. & Schmitz, O. (2021). A methodological roadmap to quantify animal-vectored spatial ecosystem subsidies. The Journal of animal ecology, 90.

Elser, J. J., Bracken, M. E., Cleland, E. E., Gruner, D. S., Harpole, W. S., Hillebrand, H., Ngai, J. T., Seabloom, E. W., Shurin, J. B. & Smith, J. E. (2007). Global analysis of nitrogen and phosphorus limitation of primary producers in freshwater, marine and terrestrial ecosystems. Ecology Letters, 10, 1135–1142.

Elser, J. J., Fagan, W. F., Denno, R. F., Dobberfuhl, D. R., Folarin, A., Huberty, A., Interlandi, S., Kilham, S. S., McCauley, E., Schulz, K. L., Siemann, E. H. & Sterner, R. W. (2000). Nutritional constraints in terrestrial and freshwater food webs. Nature, 408, 578–580.

Evans-White, M. A. & Halvorson, H. M. (2017). Comparing the ecological stoichiometry in green and brown food webs – A Review and meta-analysis of freshwater food webs. Frontiers in Microbiology, 8, 1184.

Fagan, W. & Denno, R. (2004). Stoichiometry of actual vs. potential predator-prey interactions: Insights into nitrogen limitation for arthropod predators. Ecology Letters, 7, 876–883.

Ferraro, K. M., Schmitz, O. J. & McCary, M. A. (2022). Effects of ungulate density and sociality on landscape heterogeneity: a mechanistic modeling approach. Ecography, 2022, ecog.06039.

Frost, P. C., Benstead, J. P., Cross, W. F., Hillebrand, H., Larson, J. H., Xenopoulos, M. A. & Yoshida, T. (2006). Threshold elemental ratios of carbon and phosphorus in aquatic consumers. Ecology Letters, 9, 774–779.

Gounand, I., Harvey, E., Ganesanandamoorthy, P. & Altermatt, F. (2017). Subsidies mediate interactions between communities across space. Oikos, 126, 972–979.

Gounand, I., Harvey, E., Little, C. J. & Altermatt, F. (2018a). Meta-Ecosystems 2.0: Rooting the Theory into the Field. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 33, 36–46.

Gounand, I., Little, C. J., Harvey, E. & Altermatt, F. (2018b). Cross-ecosystem carbon flows connecting ecosystems worldwide. Nature Communications, 9, 4825.

Gounand, I., Little, C. J., Harvey, E. & Altermatt, F. (2020). Global quantitative synthesis of ecosystem functioning across climatic zones and ecosystem types. Global Ecology and Biogeography, 29, 1139–1176.

Gounand, I., Mouquet, N., Canard, E., Guichard, F., Hauzy, C. & Gravel, D. (2014). The paradox of enrichment in metaecosystems. The American Naturalist, 184, 752–763.

Gravel, D., Guichard, F., Loreau, M. & Mouquet, N. (2010). Source and sink dynamics in meta-ecosystems. Ecology, 91, 2172–2184.

Grover, J. P. & Holt, R. D. (1998). Disentangling resource and apparent competition: realistic models for plant-herbivore communities. Journal of Theoretical Biology, 191, 353–376.

Haddad, N. M., Brudvig, L. A., Clobert, J., Davies, K. F., Gonzalez, A., Holt, R. D., Lovejoy, T. E., Sexton, J. O., Austin, M. P., Collins, C. D., Cook, W. M., Damschen, E. I., Ewers, R. M., Foster, B. L., Jenkins, C. N., King, A. J., Laurance, W. F., Levey, D. J., Margules, C. R., Melbourne, B. A., Nicholls, A. O., Orrock, J. L., Song, D.-X. & Townshend, J. R. (2015). Habitat fragmentation and its lasting impact on Earth's ecosystems. Science Advances, 1, e1500052.

Harpole, W. S., Ngai, J. T., Cleland, E. E., Seabloom, E. W., Borer, E. T., Bracken, M. E., Elser, J. J., Gruner, D. S., Hillebrand, H., Shurin, J. B. & Smith, J. E. (2011). Nutrient co-limitation of primary producer communities: Community co-limitation. Ecology Letters, 14, 852–862.

Harvey, E., Marleau, J., Gounand, I., Leroux, S., Firkowski, C., Altermatt, F., Blanchet, F. G., Cazelles, K., Chu, C., D'Aloia, C., Donelle, L., Gravel, D., Guichard, F., Mccann, K., Ruppert, J., Ward, C. & Fortin, M.-J. (2021). A general meta-ecosystem model to predict ecosystem function at landscape extents. Authorea.

Helfield, J. M. & Naiman, R. J. (2006). Keystone interactions: salmon and bear in riparian forests of Alaska. Ecosystems, 9, 167–180.

Hilderbrand, G. V., Hanley, T. A., Robbins, C. T. & Schwartz, C. C. (1999). Role of brown bears (Ursus arctos) in the flow of marine nitrogen into a terrestrial ecosystem. Oecologia, 121, 546–550.

Hillebrand, H., Borer, E. T., Bracken, M. E. S., Cardinale, B. J., Cebrian, J., Cleland, E. E., Elser, J. J., Gruner, D. S., Stanley Harpole, W., Ngai, J. T., Sandin, S., Seabloom, E. W., Shurin, J. B., Smith, J. E. & Smith, M. D. (2009). Herbivore metabolism and stoichiometry each constrain herbivory at different organizational scales across ecosystems. Ecology Letters, 12, 516–527.

Hocking, M. D. & Reynolds, J. D. (2011). Impacts of salmon on riparian plant diversity. Science, 331, 1609–1612.

Johnson-Bice, S., Gable, T., Roth, J. & Bump, J. (2022). Patchy indirect effects: how predators drive landscape heterogeneity and influence ecosystem dynamics via localized pathways. preprint, Preprints. URL `https://www.authorea.com/users/504426/articles/583780-patchy-indirect-effects-how-predators-drive-landscape-heterogeneity-and-influe` `commit=057fda3715996acbd9c606c688dda881ce15438f`.

Kelly, P. T., Solomon, C. T., Weidel, B. C. & Jones, S. E. (2014). Terrestrial carbon is a resource, but not a subsidy, for lake zooplankton. Ecology, 95, 1236–1242.

Leibold, M. A., Holyoak, M., Mouquet, N., Amarasekare, P., Chase, J. M., Hoopes, M. F., Holt, R. D., Shurin, J. B., Law, R., Tilman, D., Loreau, M. & Gonzalez, A. (2004). The metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale community ecology. Ecology Letters, 7, 601–613.

Leroux, S. J. & Loreau, M. (2008). Subsidy hypothesis and strength of trophic cascades across ecosystems. Ecology Letters, 11, 1147–1156.

Leroux, S. J., Wal, E. V., Wiersma, Y. F., Charron, L., Ebel, J. D., Ellis, N. M., Hart, C., Kissler, E., Saunders, P. W., Moudrá, L., Tanner, A. L. & Yalcin, S. (2017). Stoichiometric distribution models: ecological stoichiometry at the landscape extent. Ecology Letters, 20, 1495–1506.

Loreau, M., Mouquet, N. & Holt, R. D. (2003). Meta-ecosystems: a theoretical framework for a spatial ecosystem ecology. Ecology Letters, 6, 673–679.

Marleau, J. N. & Guichard, F. (2019). Meta-ecosystem processes alter ecosystem function and can promote herbivore-mediated coexistence. Ecology, e02699.

Marleau, J. N., Guichard, F. & Loreau, M. (2014). Meta-ecosystem dynamics and functioning on finite spatial networks. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 281, 20132094.

Marleau, J. N., Guichard, F. & Loreau, M. (2015). Emergence of nutrient co-limitation through movement in stoichiometric meta-ecosystems. Ecology Letters, 18, 1163–1173.

Marx, J., Brose, U., Gonzalez, A. & Gauzens, B. (2021). Plant flexible stoichiometry and herbivore compensatory feeding drive population dynamics across temperature and nutrient gradients.

Massol, F., Gravel, D., Mouquet, N., Cadotte, M. W., Fukami, T. & Leibold, M. A. (2011). Linking community and ecosystem dynamics through spatial ecology: An integrative approach to spatial food webs. Ecology Letters, 14, 313–323.

McCann, K. S., Cazelles, K., MacDougall, A. S., Fussmann, G. F., Bieg, C., Cristescu, M., Fryxell, J. M., Gellner, G., Lapointe, B. & Gonzalez, A. (2021). Landscape modification and nutrient-driven instability at a distance. Ecology Letters, 24, 398–414.

McInturf, A. G., Pollack, L., Yang, L. H. & Spiegel, O. (2019). Vectors with autonomy:

what distinguishes animal-mediated nutrient transport from abiotic vectors? Biological Reviews, 94, 1761–1773.

Montagano, L., Leroux, S. J., Giroux, M. & Lecomte, N. (2018). The strength of ecological subsidies across ecosystems: a latitudinal gradient of direct and indirect impacts on food webs. Ecology Letters, ele.13185.

Nakano, S. & Murakami, M. (2001). Reciprocal subsidies: Dynamic interdependence between terrestrial and aquatic food webs. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 98, 166–170.

Peller, T., Marleau, J. N. & Guichard, F. (2021). Traits affecting nutrient recycling by mobile consumers can explain coexistence and spatially heterogeneous trophic regulation across a meta-ecosystem. Ecology Letters, ele.13941.

Persson, J., Fink, P., Goto, A., Hood, J., Jonas, J. & Kato, S. (2010). To be or not to be what you eat: regulation of stoichiometric homeostasis among autotrophs and heterotrophs. Oikos, 119, 741–751.

Polis, G. A., Anderson, W. B. & Holt, R. D. (1997). Toward an integration of landscape and food web ecology : the dynamics of spatially subsidized food webs. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 28, 289–316.

Polis, G. A., Power, M. E. & Huxel, G. R. (2004). Food webs at the landscape level. University of Chicago Press. ISBN 0-226-67327-8.

Rizzuto, M., Leroux, S. J., Vander Wal, E., Richmond, I. C., Heckford, T. R., Balluffi-Fry, J. & Wiersma, Y. F. (2021). Forage stoichiometry predicts the home range size of a small terrestrial herbivore. Oecologia, 197, 327–338.

Rosemond, A. D., Benstead, J. P., Bumpers, P. M., Gulis, V., Kominoski, J. S., Manning, D.

W. P., Suberkropp, K. & Wallace, J. B. (2015). Experimental nutrient additions accelerate terrestrial carbon loss from stream ecosystems. Science, 347, 1142–1145.

Rüegg, J., Tiegs, S. D., Chaloner, D. T., Levi, P. S., Tank, J. L. & Lamberti, G. A. (2011). Salmon subsidies alleviate nutrient limitation of benthic biofilms in southeast Alaska streams. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 68, 277–287.

Schmitz, O. J., Hawlena, D. & Trussell, G. C. (2010). Predator control of ecosystem nutrient dynamics. Ecology Letters, 13, 1199–1209.

Schmitz, O. J., Wilmers, C. C., Leroux, S. J., Doughty, C. E., Atwood, T. B., Galetti, M., Davies, A. B. & Goetz, S. J. (2018). Animals and the zoogeochemistry of the carbon cycle. Science, 362, eaar3213.

Shurin, J. B., Gruner, D. S. & Hillebrand, H. (2006). All wet or dried up? Real differences between aquatic and terrestrial food webs. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 273, 1–9.

Sitters, J., Atkinson, C. L., Guelzow, N., Kelly, P. & Sullivan, L. L. (2015). Spatial stoichiometry: cross-ecosystem material flows and their impact on recipient ecosystems and organisms. Oikos, 124, 920–930.

Solomon, C. T., Jones, S. E., Weidel, B. C., Buffam, I., Fork, M. L., Karlsson, J., Larsen, S., Lennon, J. T., Read, J. S., Sadro, S. & Saros, J. E. (2015). Ecosystem consequences of changing inputs of terrestrial dissolved organic matter to lakes: current knowledge and future challenges. Ecosystems, 18, 376–389.

Sterner, R. W. & Elser, J. J. (2002). Ecological Stoichiometry: The Biology of Elements from Molecules to the Biosphere. Princeton University Press.

Subalusky, A. L. & Post, D. M. (2019). Context dependency of animal resource subsidies. Biological Reviews, 94, 517–538.

Thompson, P. L. & Fronhofer, E. A. (2019). The conflict between adaptation and dispersal for maintaining biodiversity in changing environments. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116, 21061–21067.

Tilman, D. (1982). Resource competition and community structure. Monographs in population biology, 17, 1–296.

Veldhuis, M. P., Berg, M. P., Loreau, M. & Olff, H. (2018). Ecological autocatalysis: a central principle in ecosystem organization? Ecological Monographs, 88, 304–319.

Wallace, J. B., Eggert, S. L., Meyer, J. L. & Webster, J. R. (1997). Multiple trophic levels of a forest stream linked to terrestrial litter inputs. Science, 277, 102–104.

Yu, Q., Chen, Q., Elser, J. J., He, N., Wu, H., Zhang, G., Wu, J., Bai, Y. & Han, X. (2010). Linking stoichiometric homoeostasis with ecosystem structure, functioning and stability: Homoeostasis underpins ecosystem properties. Ecology Letters, 13, 1390–1399.

Zou, K., Thébault, E., Lacroix, G. & Barot, S. (2016). Interactions between the green and brown food web determine ecosystem functioning. Functional Ecology, 30, 1454–1465.