Abandonment and restoration of Mediterranean meadows: long-term effects on a butterfly-plant network

Pau Colom¹, Anna Traveset¹, Constantí Stefanescu^{2,3}

¹Institut Mediterrani d'Estudis Avançats (IMEDEA-CSIC-UIB), Global Change Research Group. Miquel Marqués 21, 07190 (Esporles, Illes Balears), Spain.

²Granollers Natural Sciences Museum, Francesc Macià 51, 08402 (Granollers, Barcelona), Spain.

³Centre de Recerca Ecològica i Aplicacions Forestals (CREAF-CSIC-UAB), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193, (Cerdanyola de Vallès, Barcelona), Spain.

pau.colom.montojo@gmail.com, +34662219748

ORCID: 0000-0001-8952-7869

Abstract

Both the intensification and abandonment of traditional agricultural practices are known to be major threats to biodiversity worldwide, above all in industrialized countries. Although land abandonment in particular has a negative effect on the diversity of both plant and insect communities, few studies have ever analysed these two groups together and none has yet examined the effect on plant-insect interactions using a network approach. In view of the notable decline of pollinator insects reported in past decades, it is essential to understand how the structure of a plant-pollinator network changes during the ecological succession that occurs as traditionally managed habitats are abandoned, and to what extent this network is re-established when habitats are restored. We monitored a butterfly-plant network for 22 years in habitats where land abandonment and restoration have taken place and were able to compare restoration by grazing with restoration combining mowing and grazing. Abandonment leads to significant reductions in the cover of typical grasslands plants and, in turn, rapidly provokes changes in butterfly assemblages and plant interactions. Specifically, it caused a replacement of multivoltine by monovoltine species, increasing network specialization due to the great specificity in the interactions that monovoltine species established with plants. Changes in butterfly communities were also recorded in a nearby unaltered

30 habitat due to the metapopulation structure of some species. A highly dynamic source-sink system was
 31 established between managed and unmanaged habitat patches, which ultimately allowed the
 32 metapopulations to persist. Restoration combining mowing and grazing promoted a quick return to the
 33 pre-abandonment situation in the butterfly community, and also increased generality and nestedness, two
 34 network descriptors that are known to enhance community stability.

35

36

37 **Keywords** semi-natural habitats; plant-pollinator network; grassland management;
 38 Lepidoptera; life-history traits; network stability; Mediterranean basin.

39

40 Introduction

41

42 Many of the most biodiverse systems of high ecological value in industrialized areas are the product
43 of the development of traditional human agricultural practices (Di Giulio et al., 2001; Tscharntke et al.,
44 2005; Kleijn et al., 2009, 2011; Blondel et al., 2010). However, many are now threatened by two
45 contrasting phenomena, namely, agricultural intensification and abandonment (Donald et al., 2001;
46 Briggs et al., 2005; Cramer et al., 2008; Kehoe et al., 2017; Zabel et al., 2019).

47 Numerous studies have found that grasslands managed by either mowing or grazing maintain a greater
48 diversity of plant species than those that are abandoned or, by contrast, are subject to intense management
49 (Poschlod & WallisDeVries, 2002; Pykälä et al., 2005). Disturbance caused by mowing or grazing causes
50 an intermediate scenario that allows the least competitive species to survive, thereby favouring greater
51 plant co-existence (Zobel et al., 1996). The literature describes an increase in insect species diversity at
52 the beginning of the succession when meadows are abandoned or management intensity is reduced (Pöyry
53 et al., 2006; Öckinger et al., 2006). The reason for this seems to be that taller but also structurally more
54 diverse vegetation (i.e. increased diversity of turf heights) initially allows more diverse insect
55 communities to thrive (Kruess & Tscharntke, 2002). Then, as ecological succession advances and shrub
56 vegetation and trees encroach, diversity generally decreases, as has clearly been demonstrated in several
57 butterfly studies (e.g. Balmer & Erhardt, 2000; Öckinger et al., 2006). In the Mediterranean region, where
58 most species of butterflies show a strong preference for open habitats, afforestation resulting from the
59 abandonment of traditional agricultural practices (Feranec et al., 2010) has been identified as one of the
60 main factors driving population declines (Slancarova et al., 2016; Herrando et al., 2016; Ubach et al.,
61 2019).

62 In conjunction, these studies have led to a broad consensus that, at least in Europe, a significant loss of
63 biodiversity can be attributed to the abandonment of semi-natural meadows. This, in turn, has encouraged
64 the recovery of such habitats via the restoration of traditional practices (Pykälä, 2003; Pöyry et al., 2005;
65 Öckinger et al., 2006). However, restoring former management practices does not necessarily lead to an
66 immediate return to the semi-natural state of the habitat prior to abandonment (Dover et al., 2011).
67 Depending on the duration of the abandonment, it may take a long time for meadows to return to their
68 former states (Rook et al., 2004). Moreover, the effects of the restoration on both plant and butterfly
69 communities will depend on the type and the frequency of the management. Some studies suggest that the

best results are obtained via grazing rather than mowing (Tälle et al., 2015, 2016), while others advocate an intermediate frequency (Bakker & Berendse, 1999; Watkinson & Ormerod, 2001). In addition, habitat recovery may depend on the type of grazer, since grazing by cows and horses in some cases has positive effects on plant and insect species richness, while grazing by sheep has been reported to have negative effects (Carvell, 2002; Öckinger et al., 2006).

In view of the notable decline in populations of insect pollinators in recent decades (Potts et al., 2010) and the valuable services they offer agriculture (Klein et al, 2007), important efforts are being made to understand how abandonment could affect this group. Specifically, the effects of abandonment and the restoration of grasslands have been studied in vascular plants (Meiners et al., 2001; Pruchniewicz, 2017; Uchida et al., 2018), insects (Erhardt, 1985; Marini et al., 2009; Dover et al., 2011) and in both groups simultaneously (Steffan-Dewenter & Leschke, 2003; Pöyry et al., 2006; Uchida & Ushimaru, 2015), although in the latter case, as far as we know, no network approach has been used. This approach is important because the presence of members of two interacting groups does not necessarily mean that their interactions are also restored. Given the importance of interactions between species in the functioning of ecosystems (Kremen, 2005), it is essential to understand not only the changes that occur in plant and insect communities independently of one another, but also the changes in the interactions occurring between these two groups. Also of importance are trends in network structures in the long term during periods of abandonment and restoration of semi-natural habitats (e.g. Olesen et al., 2008, 2011).

This work aimed to analyse the long-term effects of abandonment and the subsequent restoration of plant and butterfly communities in the same semi-natural meadows over a period of two decades. Specifically, we investigated how butterflies and their nectar plants respond to changes provoked by abandonment and, subsequently, to two different types of restoration. This study of both processes embraces analyses of habitat changes and their effects on species composition and population dynamics. Moreover, for the first time, we employed network analyses to understand the effects of abandonment and restoration on butterfly-plant interactions at community level.

95 **Material and methods**

96

97 *Study site*

98 Data were obtained from a system of traditionally managed meadows prone to flooding, where some
99 of the effects of abandonment on both butterfly and plant communities have been reported in a previous
100 study (Stefanescu et al., 2009). In the study area, a 1.1-km transect was established and divided into six
101 sections (117–286-m long), each in a different meadow; sections were separated from each other by
102 ditches or trees (see appendix A; Fig. 1).

103 Over a period of 22 years (1997–2018) these meadows underwent important changes in management
104 practices. In the first two years, all six sections were managed traditionally, either by mowing (sections 1,
105 2, 5) or by a combination of grazing and mowing (sections 3, 4, 6). In 1999, sections 1–5 were abandoned
106 (i.e. they were no longer grazed or mown), while section 6, which was managed as before (i.e. by mowing
107 and grazing) throughout the whole study period, acted as a control (see appendix A: Fig. 2). Traditional
108 management using grazing and mowing was restored in 2005 in all abandoned meadows (except section
109 1, which was only grazed). This type of management has continued up to the present day.

110

111 *Data sampling*

112 The butterfly populations of this area have been monitored since 1997 within the framework of the
113 Catalan Butterfly Monitoring Scheme (<www.catalanbms.org>). Butterfly individuals were counted
114 following a standardized methodology: from the first week of March to the last week of September
115 weekly samplings along a walked transect were taken at distances of 2.5 m on both the sides and 5 m
116 ahead of the recorder (Pollard & Yates, 1993). Based on these counts, annual indices of relative
117 abundances per species were calculated to evaluate population trends during the study period. Abundance
118 values were standardized per 100 m of section length. The interactions and their frequency (i.e. number of
119 floral visits) between butterflies and their nectar plants were also recorded. These records only include
120 butterflies that were actually seen to feed on nectar with their proboscis clearly extended. All interaction
121 data were arranged in annual bipartite matrices.

122 In 2000 for the first time, plant communities were characterized following the CORINE Land Cover
123 manual and then repeated every six years. This vegetation monitoring thus provides information
124 regarding which plant communities were dominant in the meadows in the first year after the abandonment

(2000), in the year after management recovery (2006), and in two subsequent monitoring periods (2012 and 2018).

127

128 *Data analysis*

129 Ecological descriptors

130 The combination of data on butterflies and flowering plants was used to characterize ecological
131 changes during the study period. The following five ecological descriptors (hereafter EDs) were
132 calculated annually for each section: (1) Butterfly abundance; (2) Butterfly species richness; (3) Butterfly
133 diversity (calculated using the Shannon-Wiener index); (4) Flower visits (i.e. total number of flower
134 visits); and (5) Plant species richness (i.e. number of species of flowering plants visited by butterflies).
135 Trends over time in the EDs in the different sections and periods were analysed using linear models.
136 Differences in the ED trends between managed (control section #6) and abandoned (#1–5) sections during
137 the abandonment period, and between the two types of restoration (only-grazed section 1 vs.
138 mown/grazed sections 2–5) were analysed using Generalised Linear Models (GLM).

139

140 Butterfly and nectar-plant species composition

141 For the analysis of plant species composition (i.e. flowering plants visited by butterflies), all sections
142 were pooled due to the limited number of recorded flower-butterfly interactions in some years at section
143 level. Bray-Curtis dissimilarity indices were used to measure changes in composition between
144 abandonment and management periods. The same indices were used to analyse changes in the
145 composition of butterfly communities by comparing each section and year with the initial community (i.e.
146 in 1997, the first year). Temporal trends in dissimilarity values were then calculated using linear models
147 for the three different periods of the study, including as a reference value the year previous to the change
148 of management type: (1) abandonment of sections 1–5 (1998–2004); (2) recovery of traditional
149 management in sections 1–5 (2004–2018); and (3) the whole study period (1997–2018). PERMANOVA
150 analysis and NMDS plots were also conducted to test for possible differences in species composition
151 between periods and sections. SIMPER analysis (Clarke, 1993) was additionally used to identify the
152 species that contributed most to the total dissimilarity between abandonment and restoration periods.

153

154 Butterfly population trends related to ecological and life history traits

155 We tested whether butterfly population trends (measured as changes in the annual indices of relative
156 abundance) could be explained by species traits during the two study periods (abandonment and
157 management). The selected ecological and life-history traits of the butterflies were: (a) wing length (wing
158 span, from García-Barros et al., 2013); (b) mobility according to a categorical index with five classes (0 =
159 populations showing very little dispersal; 1 = closed populations and more frequent dispersal; 2 = closed
160 populations and very frequent dispersal; 3 = open populations and non-directional dispersal; and 4 = open
161 populations and directional migration; see Stefanescu et al., 2005, 2009); (c) overwintering stage (egg,
162 larva, pupa, adult, or no overwintering stage); (d) host-plant specialization as a larva (i.e. monophagous,
163 oligophagous or polyphagous); (e) voltinism (i.e. number of generations per year: monovoltine, bivoltine
164 or multivoltine). Life-history data were extracted from García-Barros et al. (2013), Vila et al. (2018) and
165 personal observations by one of the authors (CS).

166

167 Network analysis

168 To evaluate the temporal dynamics of the butterfly-plant interactions over the study period, we
169 calculated different network-level indices commonly used in network analysis with the *bipartite* package
170 in R version 3.6.3 (Dormann et al., 2009). Specifically, specialization index (H_2'), modularity and the
171 nestedness (WNOF) of the network were obtained annually for the whole set of abandoned meadows (i.e.
172 excluding the control section); sections were pooled due to the low number of visits per section per year.
173 Generalized Additive Models (GAM) were used to analyse the trends of indices during the abandonment-
174 restoration succession.

175

176 Results

177

178 *Habitat changes related to meadow management*

179 Despite the lack of data on plant community composition prior to abandonment, important changes
 180 were observed between 2000 and 2006 as a result of the cessation of grazing and mowing. By 2000 (i.e.
 181 one year after abandonment), Mediterranean grasslands with *Gaudinia fragilis* and *Brachypodium*
 182 *phoenicoides* dominated the entire transect. Other species such as *Euphorbia serrata* and *Galium lucidum*,
 183 and typical wetland species such as *Scirpus holoschoenus*, were also abundant. In the period 2000–2006,
 184 however, Mediterranean grassland cover fell by $36 \pm 18\%$ in the abandoned sections. Once the traditional
 185 management was restored, this habitat type increased again ($24 \pm 26\%$) in those sections where mowing
 186 and grazing were combined. By contrast, the grassland community continued to decline (12% fall in
 187 2006–2012) in the only-grazed section until it had completely disappeared by 2018 (see appendix A: Fig.
 188 3). In this section, the grassland community was almost completely replaced by riparian woodland
 189 (mainly *Fraxinus angustifolia* and *Ulmus minor*; 50% of the coverage in 2018). Such notable increase in
 190 the riparian woodland coverage only occurred in one meadow restored by both mowing and grazing (#4),
 191 where a stand of *Populus alba* established itself (40% of coverage after abandonment and 60% after
 192 restoration). Although management never ceased in the control section (#6), this meadow became
 193 severely ruderalized (11% in 2000 vs. 90% in 2018 of ruderal habitat coverage), probably due to
 194 overgrazing by horses (see appendix A; Fig. 3). Indeed, the annual number of episodes of grazing and
 195 mowing in the control section was greater than in any other section (3.36 vs. 2.2 ± 0.3) (see appendix A:
 196 Fig. 2).

197

198 *Trends in ecological descriptors*

199 During the whole of the study period the only-grazed section (#1) was the only meadow that showed
 200 significant temporal trends in all EDs (Table 1; see appendix A: Fig. 4). Butterfly diversity declined
 201 significantly during the abandonment period in this section, and butterfly abundance, butterfly species
 202 richness, total number of flower visits and plant species richness showed negative but non-significant
 203 trends. After management was restored in 2005, differences between the two types of restoration became
 204 patent since the richness and diversity of butterflies and the number of flower visits decreased in the only-
 205 grazed section (#1) but increased or remained stable in the mown-grazed sections (#2-5). Differences

between managed and abandoned sections were observed only in the number of visited plants, for which only the control showed a great increase in the richness of visited plants during abandonment. Despite being constantly managed over all the years of the study, the control section showed significant negative trends in butterfly richness and diversity for the whole period. During the abandonment of the other sections butterfly and plant abundance and richness of visited plants increased in the control section, although the same EDs decreased significantly once management was restored.

Changes in butterfly and flowering plant community structures

During the 22 study years significant changes occurred in butterfly communities with respect to the control year (1997). Such changes were observed not only in the only-grazed section (#1) but also in the control section (#6), although the trend was much more marked in the former ($R^2 = 0.73$ vs. $R^2 = 0.18$, respectively) (Fig. 1). During the abandonment period, butterfly communities changed significantly in all sections (Fig. 1, appendix A: Table 1). However, after management was restored, the only-grazed section (#1) was the only one in which butterfly communities became increasingly more dissimilar relative to the control year. By contrast, in the mowing-grazing sections the dissimilarity values decreased after management was restored, indicating a return to the initial state of the communities prior to abandonment.

The temporal trends in butterfly and flowering plant composition were confirmed by PERMANOVA and NMDS analyses (Fig. 2, appendix A: Table 2). Butterfly communities during the abandonment period differed significantly from those during the restoration period (Fig. 2). These analyses further showed differences between the two types of restoration, as only the grazing-restored section (#1) showed significant differences between the prior to abandonment, abandonment and restoration periods. By contrast, the mowing-grazing sections (#2-5) did not show any significant differences between the restoration period and prior to abandonment, indicating that this type of combined management was an effective restoration technique.

The analyses also revealed significant differences in flowering plant composition between the abandonment and management periods at transect level ($F = 11.5$; $P = 0.009$). The species most visited by butterflies in the abandonment period were *Cirsium* spp., *Rubus* spp. and *Mentha suaveolens*, which dominated the whole of the butterfly-plant interactions recorded during that period (see appendix A; Fig. 5). Once management was restored, however, the number of visits to these plants fell dramatically (except for *Rubus* spp., which maintained a large number of visits throughout the whole study period), while the

number of visits to *Lotus corniculatus* and several species of *Trifolium* increased, despite the severe fall in number of visits during the abandonment period.

Butterfly ecological traits related to management

Voltinism was the only ecological trait that predicted butterfly population trends in the abandoned sections. This trait explained the observed population trends during both the abandonment and the management periods, albeit with opposing effects (Fig. 3). All monovoltine species experienced positive trends when the meadows were abandoned but negative trends once management was restored. Bivoltine and multivoltine species, on the other hand, showed fairly variable trends in both periods, although multivoltine species tended to benefit from grazing and mowing as indicated by mostly positive trends during the restoration period (Fig. 3).

Butterfly-plant interaction trends

A total of 45 species of butterflies and 65 species of nectar plants were recorded and 17% of all possible interactions between these groups were detected. The species present in each annual network were highly variable and showed low persistence (i.e. number of years present) in many cases. Persistence was lower in plants (7.6 ± 6.7 years) than in butterflies (13 ± 8.8 years) (Wilcoxon rank test: $W = 2439.5$; $P < 0.001$). The high turnover of species indicates great variability in the interactions occurring between butterflies and plants from year to year, which translates into a variable network structure over time. Despite the great annual fluctuation in network parameters, results were consistent with a temporal trend of linear decrease in network specialization (H_2') (R^2 adjusted = 0.34) (Fig. 4). However, when the only-grazed section (#1) was excluded, this trend fitted a polynomial function better (adjusted $R^2 = 0.57$), which showed how network specialization increased during the abandonment period and diminished again after management was restored. Modularity significantly decreased over time across all sections, although this relationship was not significant if the only-grazed section was excluded. The mowing-grazing restoration showed an overall increase in nestedness, although its trend was only marginally significant.

264 Discussion

265

266 A vast amount of literature shows how rapidly butterfly populations respond to habitat changes of
267 different kinds (e.g. Thomas, 1991; Dennis, 2010). Evidence for such responses has rapidly accumulated
268 over past decades in many European countries thanks to the establishment of butterfly monitoring
269 schemes and the recognition of butterflies as a good bioindicator group (Thomas, 2005). The present
270 work illustrates not only how butterfly populations respond to changes in habitats but also that notable
271 changes occur in the interactions established between plants and adult butterflies.

272

273 Impact of abandonment and restoration on butterflies and plant interactions

274 The decline in some butterfly species and their interactions with many plants was probably linked to
275 the loss of nearly half of the grassland coverage after the meadows were abandoned. Restoration enabled
276 these plant communities to recover significantly when mowing and grazing were combined (see appendix
277 A: Fig. 3). Otherwise, pasturing alone proved to be insufficient in one of the meadows (#1), where
278 grassland communities continued to decline until they completely disappeared by 2018. Therefore,
279 mowing may be necessary for the conservation of typical Mediterranean meadows, which in this
280 protected area have been identified as the most valuable habitat for butterflies (Stefanescu et al., 2005).

281 Butterfly community analysis over time confirms that changes in habitat lead to rapid modifications in
282 butterfly assemblages. Thus, once the meadows were abandoned, butterfly communities underwent
283 dramatic rearrangements, with a few monovoltine grass-feeder species experiencing population
284 explosions (e.g. *Melanagia lachesis*, *Pyronia cecilia* and *Pyronia tithonus*, see appendix A: Fig. 6). By
285 contrast, the populations of some multivoltine legume-feeders collapsed (e.g. *Plebejus argus* and
286 *Polyommatus icarus*). Interestingly, changes in the populations of these species were also noticed in the
287 control section (#6) that was managed throughout the whole study period, although these trends were in
288 the opposite direction. As the meadows were abandoned, both butterfly abundances and visits to
289 flowering plants substantially increased in the control section. Because the habitat remained essentially
290 the same in the control section during this period, population increases of multivoltine species were
291 probably related to the forced dispersal of populations from the nearby abandoned meadows. This is
292 exemplified by *Plebejus argus*, whose numbers increased dramatically in the control section (up to an
293 extraordinary density of five individuals/m in 2005) coinciding with the collapse of its populations in the

294 abandoned sections. Therefore, population fluctuations are not only related to changes in the habitat
 295 where they are recorded but are also likely to be affected by a wider range of habitats where they are
 296 connected to other subpopulations (Keymer et al., 2000; Johst et al., 2002) in a metapopulation structure
 297 (Thomas & Harrison, 1992; Hanski & Thomas, 1994; Leweis et al., 1997). The temporal trends show how
 298 a meadow representing a sink habitat for *P. argus* at the beginning of the study became the only
 299 stronghold for its vanishing populations among the abandoned and deteriorating meadows. Moreover,
 300 once the habitat in the meadows improved following the restoration of management, the single meadow
 301 harbouring a population (i.e. the former sink) of this butterfly became a source (Pulliam, 1988) from
 302 which new habitats were re-colonized. This pattern highlights the importance of conserving networks of
 303 well-connected patches for habitat specialists, as has been highlighted by many theoretical and empirical
 304 studies (e.g. Hanski, 1999). This highly dynamic system allowed for a rapid recovery of collapsing
 305 populations when mowing and grazing restarted in the abandoned meadows harbouring the original
 306 populations.

307 The complexity of the management techniques required to reach ideal conditions for plant and
 308 butterfly communities is a recurrent theme in butterfly conservation (Settele et al., 2009). In this context,
 309 the control meadow where management continued throughout the study period showed some of the worst
 310 trends. This is likely due to the great disturbance (i.e. large number of grazing and mowing episodes),
 311 which ultimately affected butterfly populations and interactions with plants. The ruderalization of plant
 312 communities was linked to a reduction in the number and diversity of flower resources, which led to
 313 lower abundances in butterfly and probably other pollinator communities (Scheper et al., 2014). The
 314 absence of negative trends in butterfly richness and diversity suggests that the loss of available nectar
 315 resources led to a reduction in butterfly abundance and not *vice versa*.

316

317 Butterfly life-history traits predict species' responses to environmental succession

318 Certain previous studies have attempted to explain trends in butterfly populations in abandoned
 319 grasslands by examining species traits (Steffan-Dewenter & Tschamtkke, 1997; Sanford, 2002; Stefanescu
 320 et al., 2009). Kithara et al. (2000) reported that species richness declined more in specialists than in
 321 generalists along a gradient of increasing disturbance when specialization was measured in terms of
 322 voltinism and host-plant specialization. Likewise, Pöyry et al. (2006) observed that the abandonment of
 323 grasslands benefitted generalist herbivores, while low-intensity management was more beneficial to

specialists. In our study system, Stefanescu et al. (2009) failed to observe differences in host-plant specialization but did detect an increase in seasonal specialization (i.e. decrease in voltinism) of the communities in accordance to the r/k species concept (Pianka, 1970). In a habitat with recurrent disturbance (i.e. mowing and/or grazing) the species that will dominate the community will be those with high reproductive rates (Brown & Southwood, 1983; Brown, 1985). By contrast, species with longer developmental times and, therefore, with fewer annual generations will benefit from the abandonment of management practices (i.e. absence of disturbance). Our results, added to the previous study by Stefanescu et al. (2009) using data from another 14 years of management restoration, confirm that voltinism is indeed the best life-history trait for predicting population trends affected by managing practices in Mediterranean meadows.

334

335 How does network structure change as a result of meadow management?

Our work also revealed interesting changes in the butterfly-plant network structure as a consequence of habitat management. The non-linearity of long-term trends in network parameters makes sense if we consider that management practices changed twice during the study period (Fig. 4). The increase in network specialization (H_2') when there was a lack of management suggests greater feeding selectivity by butterflies in this period. Butterflies are commonly regarded as generalist nectar-feeders, the level of specialization of species being more related to the length of the flight period than to their evolutionary history (Stefanescu & Traveset, 2009; Olesen et al., 2011). Monovoltine species will only be able to interact with those plants that are in bloom during their short flight period, whereas species with multiple generations can potentially interact with a greater number of plants. Therefore, the turnover of species that occurred during meadow abandonment (i.e. the substitution of multivoltine by monovoltine species) could explain the increasing specialization of the network. In other words, the greater specialization of the network was probably not due to a change in species' behaviour but to population changes and species turnover. Moreover, although neither the total number of visits nor the diversity of the plants visited significantly changed in this period (Table 1), the number of butterfly visits some opportunistic plants (e.g. *Cirsium* spp., *Rubus* spp. and *Mentha suaveolens*) received increased markedly (see appendix A: Fig. 5). The dominance of these species could have reduced the likelihood that butterflies would interact with other species. Previous studies have reported a relative constancy in the nestedness pattern in plant-pollinator networks subject to notable annual fluctuations in the identity of the species in the network

(Alarcón et al., 2008; Petanidou et al., 2008). Nevertheless, we found a slight tendency for nestedness to increase in the meadows that were restored ($P = 0.091$, $R^2 = 0.21$). This pattern could be amplified given the increasing complexity of the network (i.e. number of interactions) as more abundant butterfly populations will predictably visit more nectar plant species (Bascompte et al., 2003). Both an increase in generality (i.e. reducing network specialization) and network nestedness could enhance the stability and functional redundancy of communities (Okuyama & Holland, 2008; Kaiser-Bunbury et al., 2017). This could be especially important in a context of global change, where episodes of extreme aridity are likely to threaten Mediterranean butterfly populations (Herrando et al., 2019). Therefore, the restoration of traditional management in meadows could increase ecosystem resilience in the face of future climate disturbance (Walker, 1995). In this context, we consider that restoration efforts in semi-natural habitats should be focused not only on species but also on their interactions (Tylianakis et al., 2010; Valiente Banuet et al., 2015; Kaiser-Bunbury and Blütghen, 2015).

Conclusions

The abandonment of Mediterranean meadows led to significant reductions in the cover of typical grassland plants and, in turn, caused rapid changes to occur in butterfly assemblages. Such changes were recorded not only in meadows undergoing vegetation encroachment but also in nearby unaltered habitats due to the metapopulation structure of some butterfly species. A highly dynamic source-sink system was then established between managed and unmanaged habitat patches, ultimately allowing for metapopulation persistence. In addition, our data show that management restoration combining mowing and grazing can promote a quick return in the butterfly community to the pre-abandonment situation. However, insufficient management pressure (only-grazed section 1) or, conversely, excessive grazing and mowing pressure (control section 6) did not permit a proper recovery and led, instead, to a progressive decline in diversity. Interesting temporal trends in the butterfly-plant network structure paralleling habitat changes were also detected. Both interaction generalisation and nestedness decreased when meadows were abandoned but increased again once habitat was restored by combining mowing and grazing. These results suggest that effective meadow management not only helps maintain a richer butterfly community but also increases functional redundancy and network stability. Our work highlights the importance of

383 maintaining traditional management practices in these semi-natural meadows as an effective way of
384 preserving their highly diverse communities and the stability of the whole butterfly-plant network.
385

386 **Acknowledgements**

387

388 We wish to thank the staff of the Aiguamolls de l'Empordà Natural Park for their support during these
 389 years. Thanks too are due to Ferran Páramo and Andreu Ubach for their technical support, Amparo
 390 Lázaro for her assistance in some of the statistical analyses and Pedro Bergamo for his useful comments
 391 and suggestions in an advanced version of the manuscript. The Butterfly Monitoring Scheme in Catalonia
 392 is funded by the Departament de Territori i Sostenibilitat de la Generalitat de Catalunya. PC was funded
 393 by a PhD fellowship from the Govern de les Illes Balears (FPI-CAIB-2018). This work is part of project
 394 GLC2017-88122-P financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation to AT.

395 **Tables**

396

397 **Table 1.** Temporal trends in all the ecological descriptors in the analysed periods. Beta coefficients and *P*
 398 values are given. *P* values for the Generalised Linear Model comparisons between the trends in the
 399 different treatments (abandoned vs. managed and grazing vs. grazing + mowing) are shown in the GLM *
 400 rows.

	Study period (1997–2018)		Abandonment (1998–2004)		Restoration (2004–2018)	
			Abandoned	Managed	Grazing	Graz. + mown
Butterfly abundance (Number of individuals/100m)	S1	$\beta = -7.759$ $P < 0.001$	$\beta = -5.85$ $P = 0.528$		$\beta = -4.013$ $P = 0.229$	
	S2	$\beta = -0.322$ $P = 0.906$	$\beta = 29.73$ $P = 0.087$			$\beta = -3.944$ $P = 0.382$
	S3	$\beta = -0.689$ $P = 0.753$	$\beta = 29.42$ $P = 0.051$			$\beta = -2.424$ $P = 0.459$
	S4	$\beta = -4.686$ $P = 0.037$	$\beta = 21.63$ $P = 0.125$			$\beta = -0.209$ $P = 0.923$
	S5	$\beta = 1.272$ $P = 0.643$	$\beta = -6.67$ $P = 0.415$			$\beta = 3.434$ $P = 0.552$
	S6	$\beta = -3.272$ $P = 0.302$		$\beta = 33.65$ $P = 0.004$		$\beta = -13.88$ $P = 0.019$
	GLM*		$F = 3.982; P = 0.074$		$F = 1.18; P = 0.287$	
Butterfly richness (Number of butterfly species)	S1	$\beta = -0.579$ $P < 0.001$	$\beta = -0.571$ $P = 0.263$		$\beta = -0.489$ $P = 0.022$	
	S2	$\beta = 0.183$ $P = 0.092$	$\beta = 0.285$ $P = 0.715$			$\beta = 0.111$ $P = 0.539$
	S3	$\beta = 0.046$ $P = 0.711$	$\beta = 1.643$ $P = 0.074$			$\beta = -0.075$ $P = 0.72$
	S4	$\beta = -0.327$ $P = 0.008$	$\beta = -0.286$ $P = 0.740$			$\beta = 0.096$ $P = 0.518$
	S5	$\beta = -0.208$ $P = 0.047$	$\beta = 0.285$ $P = 0.363$			$\beta = 0.079$ $P = 0.669$
	S6	$\beta = -0.254$ $P = 0.031$		$\beta = 0.893$ $P = 0.153$		$\beta = -0.371$ $P = 0.055$
	GLM*		$F = 0.844; P = 0.38$		$F = 6.446; P = 0.017$	
Butterfly diversity (Shannon diversity index of butterflies)	S1	$\beta = -0.043$ $P < 0.001$	$\beta = -0.077$ $P = 0.004$		$\beta = -0.048$ $P = 0.003$	
	S2	$\beta = 0.018$ $P = 0.005$	$\beta = -0.047$ $P = 0.132$			$\beta = 0.031$ $P = 0.021$
	S3	$\beta = 0.019$ $P = 0.008$	$\beta = 0.069$ $P = 0.126$			$\beta = 0.012$ $P = 0.303$
	S4	$\beta = -0.021$	$\beta = -0.047$			$\beta = 0.013$

		$P = 0.032$	$P = 0.294$			$P = 0.391$
	S5	$\beta = -0.034$ $P = 0.028$	$\beta = 0.047$ $P = 0.465$			$\beta = -0.019$ $P = 0.459$
	S6	$\beta = -0.031$ $P = 0.002$		$\beta = -0.009$ $P = 0.616$		$\beta = -0.022$ $P = 0.244$
	GLM*		$F = 0.002; P = 0.963$		$F = 12.54; P = 0.003$	
Flower visits (Total number of plants visited by butterflies)	S1	-7.47 $P < 0.001$	$\beta = -3.25$ $P = 0.344$		$\beta = -4.854$ $P = 0.014$	
	S2	$\beta = -0.016$ $P = 0.992$	$\beta = 20.21$ $P = 0.109$			$\beta = 0.221$ $P = 0.924$
	S3	$\beta = 0.638$ $P = 0.416$	$\beta = 8.786$ $P = 0.123$			$\beta = 1.989$ $P = 0.076$
	S4	$\beta = 0.189$ $P = 0.424$	$\beta = 1.857$ $P = 0.035$			$\beta = 0.901$ $P = 0.044$
	S5	$\beta = 0.998$ $P = 0.433$	$\beta = 4.714$ $P = 0.356$			$\beta = 1.296$ $P = 0.62$
	S6	$\beta = -0.937$ $P = 0.278$		$\beta = 10.39$ $P = 0.006$		$\beta = -3.914$ $P = 0.015$
	GLM*		$F = 1.094; P = 0.32$		$F = 7.727; P = 0.01$	
Plant richness (Number of plant species visited by butterflies)	S1	$\beta = -0.028$ $P = 0.011$	$\beta = -0.714$ $P = 0.13$		$\beta = -0.278$ $P = 0.16$	
	S2	$\beta = 0.199$ $P = 0.017$	$\beta = 0.286$ $P = 0.535$			$\beta = 0.203$ $P = 0.194$
	S3	$\beta = 0.117$ $P = 0.274$	$\beta = 0.643$ $P = 0.153$			$\beta = -0.157$ $P = 0.449$
	S4	$\beta = -0.053$ $P = 0.424$	$\beta = 0.25$ $P = 0.392$			$\beta = 0.05$ $P = 0.701$
	S5	$\beta = 0.111$ $P = 0.07$	$\beta = -0.25$ $P = 0.548$			$\beta = 0.304$ $P = 0.001$
	S6	$\beta = -0.076$ $P = 0.401$		$\beta = 1.143$ $P = 0.032$		$\beta = -0.425$ $P = 0.008$
	GLM*		$F = 5.109; P = 0.047$		$F = 3.203; P = 0.085$	

401

402 Figures

403

404 **Figure 1.** Trends in dissimilarity values with respect to the first year of monitoring (1997) for the
 405 butterfly communities. In green: section 1; in blue: sections 2–5 (with standard deviation represented by
 406 bars); in red: section 6.

407

Figure 2. Non-Metric Multidimensional Scaling (NMDS) plots for each section of the transect. The different periods of analysis are represented in colours: green: before abandonment; blue: abandonment period; red: after management was restored. Dotted lines and asterisks represent significant differences ($P < 0.05$ in PERMANOVA analysis) between periods. * 1999 was included in the period before abandonment as butterfly communities were still very similar to the initial situation due to the inertia in changes in plant composition in the first year after abandonment.

416 **Figure 3.** Population trends in the butterfly species in the abandoned sections (1–5) in relation to
417 voltinism (number of generations per year). Population trends in the different species are represented as
418 the slope values of the linear regression models.

419

420 **Figure 4.** Network structure dynamics in the abandoned meadows. Network indices trends for
421 (a) all abandoned meadows – i.e. sections 1–5 of the transect - and (b) abandoned sections that
422 were restored by mowing and grazing – i.e. sections 2–5 of the transect. P-values and adjusted
423 R-squared of the GAM models are shown.

References

- Alarcón, R., Waser, N. M., & Ollerton, J. (2008). Year-to-year variation in the topology of a plant–pollinator interaction network. *Oikos*, 117(12), 1796–1807. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2008.16987.x>
- Bakker, J. P., & Berendse, F. (1999). Constraints in the restoration of ecological diversity in grassland and heathland communities. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 14(2), 63–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(98\)01544-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(98)01544-4)
- Balmer, O., & Erhardt, A. (2000). Consequences of succession on extensively grazed grasslands for central European butterfly communities: rethinking conservation practices. *Conservation biology*, 14(3), 746–757. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.2000.98612.x>
- Bascompte, J., Jordano, P., Melián, C. J., & Olesen, J. M. a.(2003). The nested assembly of plant–animal mutualistic networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100(16), 9383–9387. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1633576100>
- Blondel, J., J. Aronson, J. Y. Bodiou, & Boeuf, G. (2010). The Mediterranean region: biological diversity in space and time. *Oxford University Press*.
- Briggs, J. M., A. K. Knapp, J. M. Blair, J.L. Heisler, G. A. Hoch, M. S. Lett & McCarron, J.K. (2005). An ecosystem in transition: causes and consequences of the conversion of mesic grassland to shrubland. *BioScience*, 55(3), 243–254. [https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568\(2005\)055\[0243:AEITCA\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1641/0006-3568(2005)055[0243:AEITCA]2.0.CO;2)
- Brown, V. K. (1985). Insect herbivores and plant succession. *Oikos*, 17–22. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3544037>
- Brown, V. K., & Southwood, T.R.E. (1983). Trophic diversity, niche breadth and generation times of exopterygote insects in a secondary succession. *Oecologia*, 56(2–3), 220–225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00379693>
- Carvell, C. (2002). Habitat use and conservation of bumblebees (*Bombus* spp.) under different grassland management regimes. *Biological conservation*, 103(1), 33–49. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(01\)00114-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00114-8)
- Clarke, K.R. (1993). Non-parametric multivariate analyses of changes in community structure. *Australian Journal of Ecology*, 18, 117–143. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.1993.tb00438.x>
- Cramer, V. A., R.J. Hobbs, & Standish, R.J. (2008). What's new about old fields? Land abandonment and ecosystem assembly. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 23(2), 104–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.10.005>
- Dennis, R.L.H. (2010). A resource-based habitat view for conservation. *Butterflies in the British landscape*. Wiley-Blackwell. 406 pp.
- Di Giulio, M., P. J. Edwards, & Meister, E. (2001). Enhancing insect diversity in agricultural grasslands: the roles of management and landscape structure. *Journal of applied Ecology*, 38(2), 310–319. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.2001.00605.x>
- Donald, P. F., R.E. Green, & Heath, M.F. (2001). Agricultural intensification and the collapse of Europe's farmland bird populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 268(1462), 25–29. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2000.1325>
- Dormann, C. F., Fründ, J., Blüthgen, N., & Gruber, B. (2009). Indices, graphs and null models: analyzing bipartite ecological networks. *The Open Ecology Journal*, 2(1). DOI: 10.2174/1874213000902010007
- Dover, J. W., S. Spencer, S. Collins, I. Hadjigeorgiou, & A. Rescia, (2011). Grassland butterflies and low intensity farming in Europe. *Journal of Insect Conservation*, 15(1–2), 129–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10841-010-9332-0>

474 Erhardt, A. (1985). Diurnal Lepidoptera: sensitive indicators of cultivated and abandoned
475 grassland. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 849-861. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2403234>

476 Feranec, J., G. Jaffrain, T. Soukup, & Hazeu, G. (2010). Determining changes and flows in European
477 landscapes 1990–2000 using CORINE land cover data. *Applied geography*, 30(1), 19-35.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2009.07.003>

479 García-Barros, E., M.L. Munguira, C. Stefanescu, & Vives-Moreno, A. (2013). Lepidoptera:
480 Papilionoidea. Fauna Ibérica, 37. Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales-CSIC, Madrid. 1213 pp.

481 Gesti, J.G. Mercadal & Vilar, L. (2003). La Biodiversidad de los Prados de Siega de los Aiguamolls
482 de L 'Alt Empordà (Girona). XIX Jornadas de Fitosociología – Congreso de la Federación Internacional
483 de Fitosociología, Biodiversidad y Gestión del Territorio. La Laguna, Tenerife.

484 Hanski, I. & Thomas, C.D. (1994). Metapopulation dynamics and conservation: a spatially explicit
485 model applied to butterflies. *Biological Conservation*, 68(2), 167-180. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(94)90348-4)
486 [3207\(94\)90348-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(94)90348-4)

487 Hanski, I. (1999). Habitat connectivity, habitat continuity, and metapopulations in dynamic
488 landscapes. *Oikos*, 209-219. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3546736>

489 Herrando, S., L. Brotons, M. Anton, F. Paramo, D. Villero., N. Titeux, J. Quesada & Stefanescu, C.
490 (2016). Assessing impacts of land abandonment on Mediterranean biodiversity using indicators based on
491 bird and butterfly monitoring data. *Environmental Conservation*, 43(1), 69-78.
492 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892915000260>

493 Herrando, S., Titeux, N., Brotons, L., Anton, M., Ubach, A., Villero, D., García-Barros, E., Munguira,
494 M., Godinho, C. & Stefanescu, C. (2019). Contrasting impacts of precipitation on Mediterranean birds
495 and butterflies. *Scientific reports*, 9(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.ch8dd57>.

496 Johst, K., R. Brandl, & Eber, S. (2002). Metapopulation persistence in dynamic landscapes: the role of
497 dispersal distance. *Oikos*, 98(2), 263-270. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.980208.x>

498 Kaiser-Bunbury, C. N., & Blüthgen, N. (2015). Integrating network ecology with applied
499 conservation: a synthesis and guide to implementation. *AoB Plants*, 7.
500 <https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plv076>

501 Kaiser-Bunbury, C. N., Mougai, J., Whittington, A. E., Valentin, T., Gabriel, R., Olesen, J. M., &
502 Blüthgen, N. (2017). Ecosystem restoration strengthens pollination network resilience and
503 function. *Nature*, 542(7640), 223-227. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21071>

504 Kehoe, L., A. Romero-Muñoz, E. Polaina, L., Estes, H. Kreft, & Kuemmerle, T. (2017). Biodiversity
505 at risk under future cropland expansion and intensification. *Nature ecology & evolution*, 1(8), 1129-1135.
506 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0234-3>

507 Keymer, J. E., P.A. Marquet, J.X. Velasco-Hernández, Levin, S.A. (2000). Extinction thresholds and
508 metapopulation persistence in dynamic landscapes. *The American Naturalist*, 156(5), 478-494.
509 <https://doi.org/10.1086/303407>

510 Kitahara, M., K. Sei & Fujii, K. (2000). Patterns in the structure of grassland butterfly communities
511 along a gradient of human disturbance: further analysis based on the generalist/specialist
512 concept. *Population Ecology*, 42(2), 135-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00011992>

513 Kleijn, D., F. Kohler, A. Báldi, P. Batáry, E.D. Concepción, Y. Clough, M. Diaz, D. Gabriel, A.
514 Holzschuh, E. Knop, & A. Kovács, E.J.P. Marshall, T. Tscharntke & Verhulst, J. (2009). On the
515 relationship between farmland biodiversity and land-use intensity in Europe. *Proceedings of the royal*
516 *society B: biological sciences*, 276(1658), 903-909. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1509>

517 Kleijn, D., M. Rundlöf, J. Scheper, H.G. Smith, & Tscharntke, T. (2011). Does conservation on
518 farmland contribute to halting the biodiversity decline?. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 26(9), 474-481.
519 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2011.05.009>

520 Klein, A. M., Vaissiere, B. E., Cane, J. H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S. A., Kremen, C., &
521 Tscharntke, T. (2007). Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. *Proceedings of*
522 *the royal society B: biological sciences*, 274(1608), 303-313. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3721>

523 Kremen, C. (2005). Managing ecosystem services: what do we need to know about their ecology?.

524 *Ecology letters*, 8(5), 468-479. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00751.x>

525 Kruess, A., & Tscharntke, T. (2002). Contrasting responses of plant and insect diversity to variation in

526 grazing intensity. *Biological conservation*, 106(3), 293-302. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00255-5)

527 3207(01)00255-5

528 Lewis, O., C. Thomas, J. Hill, M. Brookes, T. P. Crane, Y. Graneau, J. Mallet, Rose, O. (1997). Three

529 ways of assessing metapopulation structure in the butterfly *Plebejus argus*. *Ecological Entomology*, 22(3),

530 283-293. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2311.1997.00074.x>

531 Marini, L., P. Fontana, A. Battisti, & Gaston, K.J. (2009). Response of orthopteran diversity to

532 abandonment of semi-natural meadows. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, 132(3-4), 232-236.

533 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2009.04.003>

534 Meiners, S. J., S. T. Pickett, & Cadenasso, M. L. (2001). Effects of plant invasions on the species

535 richness of abandoned agricultural land. *Ecography*, 24(6), 633-644. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2001.tb00525.x)

536 0587.2001.tb00525.x

537 Öckinger, E., A.K. Eriksson, & Smith, H.G. (2006). Effects of grassland abandonment, restoration

538 and management on butterflies and vascular plants. *Biological conservation*, 133(3), 291-300.

539 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.06.009>

540 Okuyama, T., & Holland, J. N. (2008). Network structural properties mediate the stability of

541 mutualistic communities. *Ecology Letters*, 11(3), 208-216. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01137.x)

542 0248.2007.01137.x

543 Olesen, J. M., Bascompte, J., Elberling, H., & Jordano, P. (2008). Temporal dynamics in a pollination

544 network. *Ecology*, 89(6), 1573-1582. <https://doi.org/10.1890/07-0451.1>

545 Olesen, J. M., Stefanescu, C., & Traveset, A. (2011). Strong, long-term temporal dynamics of an

546 ecological network. *PLoS One*, 6(11). doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0026455

547 Petanidou, T., Kallimanis, A. S., Tzanopoulos, J., Sgardelis, S. P., & Pantis, J. D. (2008). Long-term

548 observation of a pollination network: fluctuation in species and interactions, relative invariance of

549 network structure and implications for estimates of specialization. *Ecology letters*, 11(6), 564-575.

550 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01170.x>

551 Pianka, E. R. (1970). On r-and K-selection. *The american naturalist*, 104(940), 592-597.

552 <https://doi.org/10.1086/282697>

553 Pollard, E. & Yates, T. (1993). Monitoring Butterflies for Ecology and Conservation. Chapman and

554 Hall, London, UK.

555 Potts, S. G., Biesmeijer, J. C., Kremen, C., Neumann, P., Schweiger, O., & Kunin, W. E. (2010).

556 Global pollinator declines: trends, impacts and drivers. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 25(6), 345-353.

557 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2010.01.007>

558 Poschlod, P., & WallisDeVries, M.F. (2002). The historical and socioeconomic perspective of

559 calcareous grasslands—lessons from the distant and recent past. *Biological Conservation*, 104(3), 361-

560 376. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207\(01\)00201-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3207(01)00201-4)

561 Pöyry, J., S. Lindgren, J. Salminen & Kuussaari, M. (2005). Responses of butterfly and moth species

562 to restored cattle grazing in semi-natural grasslands. *Biological Conservation*, 122(3), 465-478.

563 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2004.09.007>

564 Pöyry, J., M. Luoto, J. Paukkunen, J. Pykälä, K. Raatikainen & Kuussaari, M. (2006). Different

565 responses of plants and herbivore insects to a gradient of vegetation height: an indicator of the vertebrate

566 grazing intensity and successional age. *Oikos*, 115(3), 401-412. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2006.0030-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2006.0030-1299.15126.x)

567 1299.15126.x

568 Pruchniewicz, D., (2017). Abandonment of traditionally managed mesic mountain meadows affects

569 plant species composition and diversity. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 20, 10-18.

570 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2017.01.006>

571 Pulliam, H. R., (1988). Sources, sinks, and population regulation. *The American Naturalist*, 132(5),

572 652-661. <https://doi.org/10.1086/284880>

573 Pykälä, J., (2003). Effects of restoration with cattle grazing on plant species composition and richness
574 of semi-natural grasslands. *Biodiversity & Conservation*, 12(11), 2211-2226.
575 <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024558617080>

576 Pykälä, J., M. Luoto, R. K. Heikkinen, & Kontula, T. (2005). Plant species richness and persistence of
577 rare plants in abandoned semi-natural grasslands in northern Europe. *Basic and applied ecology*, 6(1), 25-
578 33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baec.2004.10.002>

579 Rook, A. J., B. Dumont, J. Isselstein, K. Osoro, M.F. WallisDeVries, G. Parente, & Mills, J. (2004).
580 Matching type of livestock to desired biodiversity outcomes in pastures—a review. *Biological*
581 *conservation*, 119(2), 137-150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2003.11.010>

582 Sanford, M. P. (2002). Effects of successional old fields on butterfly richness and abundance in
583 agricultural landscapes. *Great Lakes Ent.*, 35, 193-207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2012.05.006>

584 Scheper, J., Reemer, M., van Kats, R., Ozinga, W. A., van der Linden, G. T., Schaminée, J. H., Siepel,
585 H. & Kleijn, D. (2014). Museum specimens reveal loss of pollen host plants as key factor driving wild
586 bee decline in The Netherlands. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(49), 17552-
587 17557. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1412973111>

588 Settele, J., J. Dover, M. Dolek, & Konvicka, M. (2009). Butterflies of European ecosystems: impact of
589 land use and options for conservation management. *Ecology of Butterflies in Europe*. Cambridge
590 University Press, Cambridge, 353-370.

591 Slancarova, J., A. Bartonova, M. Zapletal, M. Kotilinek, Z.F. Fric, N. Micevski, V. Kati, & Konvicka,
592 M. (2016). Life history traits reflect changes in Mediterranean butterfly communities due to forest
593 encroachment. *PloS one*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0152026>

594 Stefanescu, C., J. Peñuelas, & Filella, I. (2005). Butterflies highlight the conservation value of hay
595 meadows highly threatened by land-use changes in a protected Mediterranean area. *Biological*
596 *Conservation*, 126(2), 234-246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2005.05.010>

597 Stefanescu, C., J. Penuelas, & Filella I. (2009). Rapid changes in butterfly communities following the
598 abandonment of grasslands: a case study. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 2(4), 261-269.
599 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-4598.2009.00063.x>

600 Stefanescu, C., & Traveset, A. (2009). Factors influencing the degree of generalization in flower use
601 by Mediterranean butterflies. *Oikos*, 118(7), 1109-1117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2009.17274.x>

603 Steffan-Dewenter, I. & Tschamtker, T. (1997). Early succession of butterfly and plant communities on
604 set-aside fields. *Oecologia*, 109(2), 294-302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420050087>

605 Steffan-Dewenter, I., & Leschke, K. (2003). Effects of habitat management on vegetation and above-
606 ground nesting bees and wasps of orchard meadows in Central Europe. *Biodiversity &*
607 *Conservation*, 12(9), 1953-1968. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024199513365>

608 Tälle, M., H. Fogelfors, L. Westerberg, & Milberg, P. (2015). The conservation benefit of mowing vs
609 grazing for management of species-rich grasslands: a multi-site, multi-year field experiment. *Nordic*
610 *Journal of Botany*, 33(6), 761-768. <https://doi.org/10.1111/njb.00966>

611 Tälle, M., B. Deák, P. Poschlod, O. Valkó, L. Westerberg, & Milberg, P. (2016). Grazing vs. mowing:
612 A meta-analysis of biodiversity benefits for grassland management. *Agriculture, Ecosystems &*
613 *Environment*, 222, 200-212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.02.008>

614 Thomas, J. A. (1991). Rare species conservation: case studies of European butterflies. In: The
615 scientific management of temperate communities for conservation (I.F. Spellerberg, F.B. Goldsmith &
616 M.G. Morris, eds), pp. 149-197. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford.

617 Thomas, C. D., & Harrison, S. (1992). Spatial dynamics of a patchily distributed butterfly
618 species. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 437-446. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/5334>

619 Thomas, J. A. (2005). Monitoring change in the abundance and distribution of insects using butterflies
620 and other indicator groups. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*

621 *Sciences*, 360(1454), 339-357. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1585>

622 Tschamtké, T., A.M. Klein, A. Krüss, I. Steffan-Dewenter, & Thies, C. (2005). Landscape
623 perspectives on agricultural intensification and biodiversity–ecosystem service management. *Ecology*
624 *letters*, 8(8), 857-874. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00782.x>

625 Tylianakis, J. M., Laliberté, E., Nielsen, A., & Bascompte, J. (2010). Conservation of species
626 interaction networks. *Biological conservation*, 143(10), 2270-2279.
627 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.12.004>

628 Ubach, A., F. Páramo, C. Gutiérrez, & Stefanescu, C. (2019). Vegetation encroachment drives
629 changes in the composition of butterfly assemblages and species loss in Mediterranean ecosystems. *Insect*
630 *Conservation and Diversity*, 13(2), 151-161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/icad.12397>

631 Uchida, K., & Ushimaru, A. (2015). Land abandonment and intensification diminish spatial and
632 temporal β -diversity of grassland plants and herbivorous insects within paddy terraces. *Journal of*
633 *Applied Ecology*, 52(4), 1033-1043.

634 Uchida, K., T. F. Koyanagi, T. Matsumura, & Koyama, A. (2018). Patterns of plant diversity loss and
635 species turnover resulting from land abandonment and intensification in semi-natural grasslands. *Journal*
636 *of environmental management*, 218, 622-629. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12443>

637 Valiente-Banuet, A., Aizen, M. A., Alcántara, J. M., Arroyo, J., Cocucci, A., Galetti, M., Garcia,
638 M.B., Garcia, D., Gomez, J. M., Jordano, P., Medel, R., Navarro, L., Obeso, J., Oviedo, R., Ramirez, N.,
639 Rey, P.J., Traveset, A., Verdú, M. & Zamora, R. (2015). Beyond species loss: the extinction of ecological
640 interactions in a changing world. *Functional Ecology*, 29(3), 299-307.

641 Vila, R., Stefanescu C., Sesma J.M. (2018). Guia de les papallones diürnes de Catalunya. Barcelona,
642 Spain: Lynx edicions.

643 Watkinson, A. R., & Ormerod, S. J. (2001). Grasslands, grazing and biodiversity: editors'
644 introduction. *Journal of applied ecology*, 233-237. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2655793>

645 Walker, B. (1995). Conserving biological diversity through ecosystem resilience. *Conservation*
646 *biology*, 9(4), 747-752. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1523-1739.1995.09040747.x>

647 Zabel, F., R. Delzeit, J. M. Schneider, R. Seppel, W. Mauser & Václavík, T. (2019). Global impacts of
648 future cropland expansion and intensification on agricultural markets and biodiversity. *Nature*
649 *communications*, 10(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10775-z>

650 Zobel, M., M. Suurkask, E. Rosén, & Pärtel, M. (1996). The dynamics of species richness in an
651 experimentally restored calcareous grassland. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 7(2), 203-210.
652 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3236320>

653 Appendix A. Supplementary data.

654

655 **Table A1.** Butterfly community dissimilarity trends in the analysed periods. Beta coefficients and *P*
656 values are given.

	Study period (1997–2018)		Abandonment (1998–2004)		Management recovery (2004–2018)	
			Abandoned	Managed	Grazing	Graz. + mown
Butterfly community dissimilarity trend (Bray-Curtis dissimilarity with respect to 1997)	S1	$\beta = 0.008$ $P < 0.001$	$\beta = 0.012$ $P = 0.021$		$\beta = 0.004$ $P = 0.007$	
	S2	$\beta < -0.001$ $P = 0.729$	$\beta = 0.025$ $P = 0.019$			$\beta = -0.004$ $P = 0.173$
	S3	$\beta < -0.001$ $P = 0.836$	$\beta = 0.021$ $P = 0.016$			$\beta = -0.002$ $P = 0.145$
	S4	$\beta = -0.002$ $P = 0.152$	$\beta = 0.007$ $P = 0.31$			$\beta < -0.001$ $P = 0.916$
	S5	$\beta = -0.002$ $P = 0.268$	$\beta = 0.027$ $P = 0.011$			$\beta = -0.006$ $P = 0.012$
	S6	$\beta = 0.003$ $P = 0.047$		$\beta = 0.016$ $P = 0.002$		$\beta = -0.002$ $P = 0.499$
	GLM*		$F = 0.219$; $P = 0.649$		$F = 15.14$; $P < 0.001$	

657

658

659

660

661 **Table A2.** PERMANOVA results for the butterfly community between periods: (A): before
662 abandonment*; (B) abandonment; (C) management recovery. * 1999 was included in this period as
663 butterfly communities were still very similar to the initial situation due to the inertia in changes in plant
664 composition in the first year after abandonment (see Figure 6).
665

Section	Treatment	PERMANOVA analysis	A vs B	A vs C	B vs C
1	Abandoned Only-grazed	$P < 0.001$	$P = 0.045$	$P = 0.005$	$P < 0.001$
2	Abandoned Mowing-grazing	$P = 0.009$	$P = 0.158$	$P = 1$	$P = 0.015$
3	Abandoned Mowing-grazing	$P = 0.001$	$P = 0.096$	$P = 0.334$	$P = 0.001$
4	Abandoned Mowing-grazing	$P < 0.001$	$P = 0.164$	$P = 0.052$	$P = 0.001$
5	Abandoned Mowing-grazing	$P = 0.001$	$P = 0.052$	$P = 1$	$P < 0.001$
6	Managed Mowing-grazing	$P = 0.018$	$P = 0.105$	$P = 0.084$	$P = 0.006$

666

667 **Figure A1.** Study area. Transect sections in Closes de Tec, Aiguamolls de l'Empordà Natural Park.

668

Figure A2. Type of management in the sections during the study period. Circles indicate episodes of grazing and crosses indicate mowing. As of 1999, sections 1–5 were abandoned; section 6 continued to be managed throughout the whole study period. Management was restored in 2005 in the abandoned meadows, although, while sections 2–5 combined grazing and mowing, section 1 was managed exclusively by grazing.

675 **Figure A3.** Habitat cover present along the different sections in 2000, 2006, 2012 and 2018. Habitat types
676 characterized according to the CORINE Land Cover manual.

679 **Figure A4.** Continuous lines indicate trends for the eight ecological descriptors analysed in section 1.
680 Dashed lines indicate trends for the total of all six sections. Significant trends ($P < 0.05$) are represented
681 by small dotted lines.

682

683 **Figure A5.** Population trends of the most sensitive plant species to management changes according to a
684 Simper analysis. Trends for the totals for the five abandoned sections.

685
686

687 **Figure A6.** Population trends of the most sensitive butterfly species to management changes according to
688 a Simper analysis. Blue lines show the trends in species in abandoned sections (1–5) and red lines trends
689 in species in section 6.