1 **Extending the CWM approach to intraspecific trait variation: how to deal** 2 **with overly optimistic standard tests?**

3

4 Running title: CWM-environment test extended for ITV

5

6 Authors: David Zelený^{1*}, Kenny Helsen² & Yi-Nuo Lee³

7 Institute of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

8 *Corresponding author

9

10 36 pages; 9176 words, 1 table, 5 figures, 1 appendix

11 R-code and the real world dataset is on GitHub (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5497773>)

12 **Keywords:**

13 trait-environment relationships

14 community level traits

15 Type I error rate

16 intraspecific trait variation

17 site-specific trait values

18 permutation test

19 response traits

20 environmental filtering

21

¹ zeleny@ntu.edu.tw

² helsenkenny@gmail.com

³ poiuytrewq976431@gmail.com

22 **Abstract**

23 Community weighted means (CWMs) are widely used to study the relationship between
 24 community-level functional traits and environment variation. When relationships between
 25 CWM traits and environmental variables are directly assessed using linear regression or
 26 ANOVA and tested by standard parametric tests, results are prone to inflated Type I error
 27 rates, thus producing overly optimistic results. Previous research has found that this problem
 28 can be solved by permutation tests (i.e. the max test). A recent extension of this CWM
 29 approach, that allows the inclusion of intraspecific trait variation (ITV) by partitioning
 30 information in fixed, site-specific and intraspecific CWMs, has proven popular. However,
 31 this raises the question whether the same kind of Type I error rate inflation also exists for
 32 site-specific CWM or intraspecific CWM-environment relationships. Using simulated
 33 community datasets and a real-world dataset from a subtropical montane cloud forest in
 34 Taiwan, we show that site-specific CWM-environment relationships also suffer from Type I
 35 error rate inflation, and that the severity of this inflation is negatively related to the relative
 36 ITV magnitude. In contrast, for intraspecific CWM-environment relationships, standard
 37 parametric tests have the correct Type I error rate, while being somewhat conservative, with
 38 reduced statistical power. We introduce an ITV-extended version of the max test for the ITV-
 39 extended CWM approach, which can solve the inflation problem for site-specific CWM-
 40 environment relationships, and which, without considering ITV, becomes equivalent to the
 41 “original” max test used for the CWM approach. On both simulated and real-world data, we
 42 show that this new ITV-extended max test works well across the full possible magnitude of
 43 ITV. We also provide guidelines and R codes of max test solutions for each CWM type and
 44 situation. Finally, we suggest recommendations on how to handle the results of previously
 45 published studies using the CWM approach without controlling for Type I error rate inflation.

46 **Introduction**

47 According to community assembly theory, which species will occur in a local community
 48 partly depends on the result of environmental filtering by the prevailing local abiotic
 49 conditions (Keddy 1992, Zobel et al. 1998). More recently, this environmental filtering is
 50 believed to act directly upon species' functional response traits (Lavorel & Garnier 2002).
 51 These traits consist of measurable properties of an individual organism that directly influence
 52 its fitness under the prevailing environmental conditions (Violle et al. 2007). The realization
 53 of this link between functional traits and the environment has opened up avenues to uncover
 54 the mechanisms behind community assembly, and to predict community responses to
 55 environmental change. This has resulted in an ever-increasing number of studies exploring
 56 functional trait-environment relationships (e.g. Miller et al. 2019).

57 At the community level, trait-environment relationships are regularly assessed
 58 through the calculation of community weighted mean trait values (CWMs) (Garnier et al.
 59 2004, Diaz et al. 2007). The resulting CWMs are then usually directly related to different
 60 environmental variables using correlation, regression, ANOVA or other general(ized) linear
 61 mixed model techniques. We call this the *CWM approach* in this study. A number of
 62 alternative methods are also available for assessing trait-environment relationships however,
 63 including the fourth corner (Legendre et al. 1997, Dray & Legendre 2008, Peres-Neto et al.
 64 2017), species' niche centroids (SNC; Peres-Neto et al. 2017, ter Braak et al. 2018) and
 65 multilevel models (Brown et al. 2014, Jamil et al. 2013, Warton et al. 2015, Miller et al.
 66 2019).

67 Traditionally, the CWM approach used fixed species-level trait values (a given
 68 species has the same trait value in all occupied sites), and thus ignored intraspecific trait
 69 variation (ITV), i.e. variation in trait values among individuals of the same species. This was
 70 justified by the assumption that, in most datasets, the amount of ITV is negligible compared

71 to the amount of interspecific trait variation, i.e. variation among species (McGill et al. 2006).
 72 However, this assumption has recently been challenged by several studies that found that
 73 both within- and among-community ITV is often substantial, at least for plants (Albert et al.
 74 2010, Messier et al. 2010, Siefert et al. 2015, Westerband et al. 2021). For other taxa, the
 75 extent of ITV remains less well understood, however (e.g. Gaudard et al. 2019 for ants, Behm
 76 and Kiers 2014 for arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi, or Dawson and Jönsson 2020 for
 77 basidiomycetes). Consequently, researchers are now actively advocating the inclusion of ITV
 78 in most community ecological trait research, including in trait-environment relationship tests
 79 (Albert et al. 2011).

80 Specifically for CWM trait-environment relationships, studies have clearly illustrated
 81 that results can be biased when using fixed species-level trait values instead of incorporating
 82 ITV (Albert et al. 2012, Borgy et al. 2017). This has resulted in an increasing number of
 83 studies where authors calculate CWMs using site- or habitat-specific trait values, measured
 84 separately for each species in each site or habitat, respectively. Lepš et al. (2011) introduced
 85 an extension of the CWM approach that allows the partitioning of the relative contribution of
 86 ITV and interspecific trait variation to community-level trait-environment relationships. This
 87 approach is based on the realization that CWMs calculated from fixed species-level trait
 88 values (“fixed” CWM, excluding ITV) can vary among communities only if their species
 89 composition differs (species turnover). On the contrary, differences in CWMs calculated
 90 from site-specific trait values (“site-specific” CWM) can be caused by both species turnover
 91 and ITV. The difference between the site-specific CWMs and fixed CWMs then only
 92 encompasses the effect of ITV (“intraspecific variability effect” CWM, or “intraspecific”
 93 CWM in short). These fixed, site-specific and intraspecific CWMs are subsequently related to
 94 environmental variables using either regression or ANOVA and their explained variation is

95 partitioned between species turnover and ITV. This method has proven popular, and to date,
96 we have identified over 60 published case-studies using it.

97 Several studies recently found that the standard parametric tests in the CWM
98 approach using fixed trait values are prone to Type I error inflation, resulting in the situation
99 that even CWMs calculated from randomly generated species-level trait values often show
100 significant correlations to environmental variables (Peres-Neto et al. 2017, ter Braak et al.
101 2018, Zelený 2018). Peres-Neto et al. (2017) have shown that the correlation of CWMs and
102 environmental variables is in fact numerically tightly related to the fourth corner method
103 (introduced by Legendre et al. 1997), and that the same solution as used for controlling the
104 Type I error rate in the fourth corner (Dray et al. 2008, ter Braak et al. 2012), can be used to
105 control the inflated Type I error rate in the CWM approach. This solution is based on a
106 combination of two permutation tests, one permuting the sample attribute (i.e. the
107 environmental variable) and the other permuting the species attribute (i.e. the trait), into the
108 “max test”, by taking the higher (more conservative) P-value of the two permutations
109 (Cormont et al. 2011, ter Braak et al. 2012).

110 However, it is unclear if this Type I error inflation persists when introducing ITV in
111 the CWM approach following the method of Lepš et al. (2011). Up to date, none of the
112 papers using this method have tested, or tried to correct, for this potential Type I error
113 inflation. Note however, that Candeias and Fraterrigo (2020) and Sandel and Low (2019)
114 partly acknowledge, and try to address, related Type-I error inflation issues in their studies.
115 Part of the type I error problem for fixed CWMs arises because the CWMs of different sites
116 in a dataset are not independent, since sites usually share a least some species, and the trait
117 values of these shared species are identical. This lack of independence between fixed CWMs
118 reduces the effective degrees of freedom in the analysis of their relationship with
119 environmental variables. We expect that for site-specific CWMs this problem will be relaxed,

because the inclusion of ITV allows species to have different trait values in different sites, thus reducing the dependence among sites. However, although ITV can be substantial, at least for plants, it is often smaller than interspecific trait variation (cf. Messier et al. 2010, Siefert et al. 2015, Westerband et al. 2021). We consequently expect that the use of site-specific trait values will not completely remove the dependency issue, but that the severity of inflation will depend on the magnitude of ITV. Moreover, the currently available max test solution cannot be applied, because the vector-based trait permutation for fixed CWMs cannot readily be extended to the site-by-species matrix for site-specific CWMs. For intraspecific CWMs, we do not have enough clues to forecast whether they are or they are not affected by inflated Type I error rate.

In this study, we explore 1) whether the CWM approach suffers from inflated Type I error rates when including ITV, by calculating site-specific and intraspecific CWMs, 2) whether this potential inflation depends on the magnitude of ITV, and 3) whether our newly proposed modification of the max test can overcome this potential inflation problem. To explore these questions, we quantified Type-I error rates for 1) simulated community data with varying levels of intra- and interspecific trait variation, and 2) a real-world dataset consisting of four functional leaf traits measured along a wind gradient for cloud forest vegetation in northern Taiwan.

Methods

Community weighted mean approach and extension for intraspecific trait variation

When individual trait-environment relationships are analysed at the community level, three objects are usually involved: a species composition matrix, an environmental variable (vector) and a species trait (vector). Species composition is represented by a n -by- S matrix $\mathbf{L} = [l_{ij}]$, where n is the number of sites (rows), S is the number of species (columns) and l_{ij} is the

contribution of species j to site i (where contribution can be expressed as abundance, biomass, cover or another quantitative measure, or as presence-absence). The environmental variable is represented by a n -elements-long vector $\mathbf{e} = [e_i]$, where e_i is the value of the environmental variable for site i . The trait is represented by a S -elements-long vector $\mathbf{t} = [t_j]$, where t_j is the trait value of species j . Naming conventions follow Peres-Neto et al. (2017), with a few exceptions (explicitly mentioned further in the text) and several extensions.

The CWM approach first translates the species-level vector $\mathbf{t}$ to a site-level vector $\mathbf{c} = [c_i]$, by calculating the average trait value for a site across all present species, weighted by each species contribution, as expressed in the matrix $\mathbf{L}$. The community weighted mean for site i is calculated as

$$c_i = \sum_{j=1}^S p_{ij} t_j$$

where p_{ij} is the relative contribution of species j in site i , and t_j is fixed trait value of species j (Garnier et al. 2004, Díaz et al. 2007). Relative contribution p_{ij} is calculated by dividing l_{ij} by the sum of species contributions in site i for which trait values are available, i.e. as $p_{ij} = l_{ij} / \sum_{j=1}^S l_{ij}$. Species with missing trait values should not be included in the calculation of p_{ij} , so as the sum of relative species contributions in site i is always equal to one (Zelený 2018). Next, vector $\mathbf{c}$ is directly related to the environmental vector $\mathbf{e}$ by correlation, regression, ANOVA or another method, and the significance of this relationship is often tested.

Extension of CWM approach to allow the inclusion of ITV is done by distinguishing site-specific and fixed trait values (Lepš et al. 2011). Site-specific trait values for species j in site i thus become a n -by- S matrix $\mathbf{T} = [t_{ij}]$, where t_{ij} represents the mean trait value calculated from individuals of species j collected within site i (the value is missing if the species does not occur at the site or none of its individuals have been measured). The fixed trait values are

denoted as a n -elements-long vector $\bar{\mathbf{t}} = [\bar{t}_j]$, where $\bar{t}_j$ is calculated as the mean of all site-specific trait values (t_{ij}) of species j across all n sites in the dataset where that species occurs.

Using the site-specific ($\mathbf{T}$) and fixed ($\bar{\mathbf{t}}$) trait values, Lepš et al. (2011) calculated site-specific CWMs, which include ITV as

$$c_i^{SS} = \sum_{j=1}^S p_{ij} t_{ij}$$

resulting in a n -elements-long vector $\mathbf{c}^{SS} = [c_i^{SS}]$, while fixed CWMs, which do not consider ITV, were calculated as

$$c_i^F = \sum_{j=1}^S p_{ij} \bar{t}_j$$

resulting in a n -elements-long vector $\mathbf{c}^F = [c_i^F]$, that is essentially c_i as calculated in the absence of ITV measurements (if we assume that $\bar{t}_j = t_j$). Finally, the intraspecific variability effect (called intraspecific CWM here) is defined as the difference between the site-specific CWM and the fixed CWM and calculated as $c_i^{ITV} = c_i^{SS} - c_i^F$, stored in a n -elements-long vector $\mathbf{c}^{ITV} = [c_i^{ITV}]$. Using the above formulas, calculation of $\mathbf{c}^{ITV}$ can be rewritten to

$$c_i^{ITV} = \sum_{j=1}^S p_{ij} (t_{ij} - \bar{t}_j) = \sum_{j=1}^S p_{ij} \Delta t_{ij}$$

where $\Delta t_{ij} = t_{ij} - \bar{t}_j$ are site-specific trait values centred by species, represented by a n -by- S intraspecific trait matrix $\Delta \mathbf{T} = [\Delta t_{ij}]$. Thus, unlike $\mathbf{c}^{SS}$, which quantifies the absolute CWM trait values observed at different sites, $\mathbf{c}^{ITV}$ only quantifies the contribution of ITV to site-specific CWMs.

Lepš et al. (2011) pointed out that changes in site-specific CWMs ($\mathbf{c}^{SS}$) are caused either by species composition turnover (quantified by $\mathbf{c}^F$), changes in species-level trait values, i.e. ITV (quantified by $\mathbf{c}^{ITV}$), or by both. They proposed a method to partition the effect of these two sources, in which $\mathbf{c}^{SS}$, $\mathbf{c}^F$ and $\mathbf{c}^{ITV}$ are separately related to the vector $\mathbf{e}$ using a

general linear model approach. The sum of squares (SS) are then extracted from each model, where SS_{specific} represents the total among-site trait variation explained by the environmental variable ($\mathbf{c}^{\text{SS}} \sim \mathbf{e}$), while SS_{fixed} and SS_{intra} represent the contribution of species turnover ($\mathbf{c}^{\text{F}} \sim \mathbf{e}$) and ITV ($\mathbf{c}^{\text{ITV}} \sim \mathbf{e}$), respectively. If the effects of species turnover and ITV vary independently, $SS_{\text{specific}} = SS_{\text{fixed}} + SS_{\text{intra}}$. Usually, however, the effects of species turnover and ITV covary, either positively (i.e. when $\mathbf{c}^{\text{F}}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{\text{ITV}}$ both have either a positive or a negative response to the environmental variable) or negatively (i.e. when $\mathbf{c}^{\text{F}}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{\text{ITV}}$ respond oppositely to the environmental variable). Lepš et al. (2011) therefore suggested to add a covariation component, calculated as $SS_{\text{cov}} = SS_{\text{specific}} - SS_{\text{fixed}} - SS_{\text{intra}}$. This approach has been implemented in the R package *cati* (Taudiere & Violle 2015).

Type I error inflation for trait-environment relationships in the CWM approach

Previous studies have shown that using the CWM approach without considering ITV (thus using the fixed CWM vector $\mathbf{c}^{\text{F}}$) to assess the link between environment and traits often results in Type I error inflation. This is explained by the fact that a true link between traits and environment ($\mathbf{t} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{e}$) can only occur if both the link between environment and species composition, and the link between traits and species composition are present ($\mathbf{e} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{t} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{L}$, respectively). Type I error inflation then occurs when the environment, but not traits, are related to the species composition (i.e. $\mathbf{e} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{t} \nleftrightarrow \mathbf{L}$, Peres-Neto et al. 2017). The solution to this inflation problem was adopted for the CWM approach by Peres-Neto et al. (2017) from an analogous solution applied in the fourth-corner approach (Legendre et al. 1997; Dray & Legendre 2008). It consists of calculating two permutation tests, one permuting the rows in $\mathbf{L}$ to test the $\mathbf{e} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{L}$ link, and one permuting the columns in $\mathbf{L}$, to test the $\mathbf{t} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{L}$ link. Both tests are then combined together into the “max test” by only taking the largest P-value (least significant result) as the test of the $\mathbf{t} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{e}$ link (Cormont et al. 2011, ter Braak et al. 2012). An

equivalent result is achieved by replacing the row-based permutation of the $\mathbf{L}$ matrix by permuting vector $\mathbf{e}$ and relating it to vector $\mathbf{c}^F$ (calculated from not-permuted trait values $\mathbf{t}$), and replacing the column-based permutation test of $\mathbf{L}$ by permuted trait values $\mathbf{t}$, and relating the newly resulting vector ${}^P\mathbf{c}^F$ (where P stands for permuted) to the not-permuted vector $\mathbf{e}$ (Fig. 1; Zelený 2018). For convenience, we still refer to these permutation schemes as row- and column-based permutations, respectively.

Simulated community data with ITV

To assess whether the CWM approach extended for ITV inclusion has a correct Type I error rate, we simulated community data that included intra- and interspecific trait variation that was directly structured by a hypothetical environmental gradient. More specifically, we evaluated the potential type I error inflation for the linear regressions between vectors $\mathbf{c}^F$, $\mathbf{c}^{SS}$ or $\mathbf{c}^{ITV}$, on the one hand and vector $\mathbf{e}$, on the other hand.

To generate simulated compositional data structured by an environmental variable ($\mathbf{e}$) we used the COMPAS model proposed by Minchin (1987) and extended by Fridley et al. (2007). The extended model allows the creation of a simulated community by generating S unimodal species response curves along a vector $\mathbf{e}$ of fixed length, where each species response curve (represented by a Beta function, Minchin 1987) quantifies the probability with which a random individual found at a given gradient location is assigned to that given species. The species composition of individual sites is then generated by randomly selecting n locations along the environmental gradient, and assigning a predefined number of individuals to different species at each site, according to the species (response-curve-defined) occurrence probability at that site. In our simulation, we set the number of species $S = 50$, number of sites $n = 25$, and 100 individuals sampled in each site. The width of each species response curve (one of the parameters of the Beta function) is generated as a random number from a

uniform distribution between 0 and the total length of the environmental gradient. This length was set at 5000 units, but sites were only allowed to be sampled between 500 and 4500 units to avoid gradient edges with a lower density of species response curves. The simulation model returns two objects: a vector $\mathbf{e}$ (positions of sites along the gradient), and a n -by- S composition matrix $\mathbf{L}$ (with numbers in cells representing the counts of individuals of a given species in a given site). This simulation was performed 50 times with the same number of species and sites, resulting in 50 independent sets of $\mathbf{e}$ and $\mathbf{L}$.

For each simulation, we generated a matrix of simulated site-specific trait values $\mathbf{T}$, in which both interspecific and intraspecific trait variation was completely, positively linked to vector $\mathbf{e}$. The n -by- S matrix $\mathbf{T}$ was generated by replacing each non-zero value of l_{ij} in a site i of matrix $\mathbf{L}$ by the value e_i (zero values of l_{ij} became missing values in $\mathbf{T}$). In $\mathbf{T} = [t_{ij}]$, different species occurring in the same site will have the same t_{ij} value, and the same species occurring in different sites can have different t_{ij} values. Finally, we rescaled all values in $\mathbf{T}$ into the range between 0 and 1, and added a small value (generated as a random number from a uniform distribution between -0.1 and 0.1) as a random noise to each t_{ij} .

We included an extra step that allowed modifying the magnitude of ITV in the simulated matrix $\mathbf{T}$. For this, we first calculated the vector of fixed trait values $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ as the means of individual columns of matrix $\mathbf{T}$, and calculated the matrix $\Delta\mathbf{T} = [\Delta t_{ij}] = [t_{ij} - \bar{t}_j]$. Then we introduced coefficient m to control the magnitude of simulated ITV in a matrix of site-specific trait values $\mathbf{T}^m = [t_{ij}^m] = [m\Delta t_{ij} + \bar{t}_j]$. For each simulated vector $\mathbf{e}$ and matrix $\mathbf{L}$ we generated a set of site-specific trait matrices $\mathbf{T}^m$ for m ranging from 0 to 5 with 0.5 intervals. If $m = 0$ (no ITV) all values of t_{ij} in column j are identical, and equal to $\bar{t}_j$; this matrix was reduced into the vector $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ and used as fixed trait values. Increasing m increases the magnitude of ITV (for $m = 1$, the values in t_{ij} are identical to those calculated from $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{e}$, as described earlier). Additionally, we also constructed a simulated $\mathbf{T}^m$ matrix in which the trait

values were random values drawn from a standard normal distribution, $N(0, 1)$; no random noise was added to t_{ij} value in this scenario. The latter scenario (with notation $m = \infty$ used in the following text) represents a situation in which the site-specific trait value of a given species is a random sample from the full pool of potential trait values across all species, unconstrained by any species-specific ITV range. Thus, in total we have one vector of fixed trait values $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ and 11 site-specific trait matrices $\mathbf{T}^m$ for each simulation.

Dependence of the Type I error rate on the magnitude of ITV

To assess the Type I error rates of the linear regressions of $\mathbf{c}^F$, $\mathbf{c}^{SS}$ or $\mathbf{c}^{ITV}$ to vector $\mathbf{e}$, tested by parametric F -tests using our simulated community data, we first cancelled the link between the traits and the species composition by permuting the trait matrices for each separate simulation (Fig. S1). For the fixed trait values, we permuted values within vector $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ to get ${}^P\bar{\mathbf{t}} = [{}^P\bar{t}_j]$ (Fig. S1). For the intraspecific trait values, we calculated the intraspecific trait matrix $\Delta\mathbf{T}^m$ for each $\mathbf{T}^m$ and permuted the values within each column (species) of $\Delta\mathbf{T}^m$ to get ${}^P\Delta\mathbf{T}^m = [{}^P\Delta t_{ij}]$. Note that these column permutations are only performed across cells where the species is present. Finally, vector ${}^P\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ and matrix ${}^P\Delta\mathbf{T}^m$ were combined into a matrix of permuted site-specific trait values ${}^P\mathbf{T}^m = [{}^Pt_{ij}] = {}^P\Delta t_{ij} + {}^P\bar{t}_j$. Subsequently, ${}^P\bar{\mathbf{t}}$, and all ${}^P\mathbf{T}^m$ and ${}^P\Delta\mathbf{T}^m$ matrices were combined with the $\mathbf{L}$ matrix to calculate one ${}^P\mathbf{c}^{SS}$, 11 ${}^P\mathbf{c}^F$ and 11 ${}^P\mathbf{c}^{ITV}$ vectors, respectively. Each of these 23 CWM vectors was then regressed against vector $\mathbf{e}$ and significance levels assessed by parametric F -tests. We repeated all trait matrix permutations 1000 times, and for each of the 23 trait- environment regressions we counted the number of significant correlations ($p < 0.05$) (N_{obs}). Since the null hypothesis that the trait is not correlated to the environmental variable is true, because we broke the link between the trait and the species composition by permuting trait values, the expected number of significant correlations (i.e. the Type I error rate) is $\alpha(0.05) \times 1000 = 50$ (N_{exp}). The Type I error rate

inflation was then quantified using the inflation index $I(\alpha) = N_{\text{obs}}/N_{\text{exp}}$ (Lennon 2000); an index value of 1 indicates no inflation.

Finally, the mean $\pm$ SD inflation index across the 50 simulations was plotted against the magnitude of ITV in the simulated data (cf. parameter m), separately for P_{c}^{SS} , and $P_{\text{c}}^{\text{ITV}}$. To allow comparison with real datasets, we transformed parameter m to “relative ITV index”, calculated as the mean variance of ITV (i.e. variance of individual species’ site-specific trait values across all sites, averaged across species) divided by the variance of interspecific trait variation across all species included in the analysis (calculated from the fixed trait values). This ratio is equivalent to the $T_{\text{PC/PR}}$ T-statistic introduced by Violle et al. (2012).

Introducing a max solution for the ITV-extended CWM approach

The previously described row- and column-based permutation tests used for controlling Type I error inflation in the CWM approach (Peres-Neto et al. 2017, ter Braak et al. 2018) cannot be directly used for the ITV-extended CWM approach (Lepš et al. 2011). While the row-based permutation test can still be performed by permuting vector $\mathbf{e}$ (Fig. 2a), it is not clear how the column-based permutation test should permute trait values in the trait matrix $\mathbf{T}$, opposed to vector $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ used in the absence of ITV. Both the species composition matrix ($\mathbf{L}$) and the site-specific trait matrix ($\mathbf{T}$) usually contain some sites i where species j is absent ($p_{ij} = 0$) and thus the site-specific trait value is not available ($t_{ij} = \text{NA}$). Permuting columns in $\mathbf{T}$ (analogously to permuting elements in $\mathbf{t}$) would mismatch values in these two matrices, causing some species with non-zero abundances in $\mathbf{L}$ being newly paired with missing site-specific trait values in $\mathbf{T}$ and vice versa. To avoid this problem, we propose a new max test version containing a column-based permutation test that combines separate interspecific (on vector $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$) and intraspecific (on matrix $\Delta\mathbf{T}$) trait permutations. For vector $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ the fixed trait values are directly permuted to obtain $P\bar{\mathbf{t}}$. The permutation of values in $\Delta\mathbf{T}$, however, is done

separately for each column (ignoring cells with missing values) to get ${}^P\Delta\mathbf{T}$. The permuted mean trait values in vector ${}^P\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ and permuted site-specific trait matrix ${}^P\Delta\mathbf{T}$ are then combined together into a new matrix of permuted site-specific trait values ${}^P\mathbf{T}$. This new matrix is then used to calculate ${}^P\mathbf{c}^{SS}$, which is then related to the non-permuted vector $\mathbf{e}$ (Fig. 2b). The final max test then combines the row-based permutation test (using ${}^P\mathbf{e}$) and the new column-based permutation test (using ${}^P\mathbf{c}^{SS}$) by only taking the largest P-value (least significant result), similarly as the previously described max test for the CWM approach without extension for ITV (Cormont et al. 2011, ter Braak et al. 2012).

We explored whether this newly proposed max test for ITV-extended CWM approach can correctly control for Type I error rate inflation for our 50 simulations, across different magnitudes of ITV. For this, we used the same 50 simulated datasets we used to quantify inflation of Type I error rate. For fixed CWM ($m = 0$), we replaced this newly modified column-based test by a test permuting only the mean trait values in $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ (Fig. 1b). We repeated 1000 times each test for each combination of dataset and ITV magnitude, and plotted the average and standard deviation of the inflation index across the 50 simulations for each test against the ratio of intra- and interspecific trait variation, as described earlier.

Real world dataset: leaf traits of woody species in the cloud forest of Taiwan

To illustrate the effect of ITV on community-level trait-environment relationships in a real-world dataset, we used data from the one-hectare vegetation plot in the cloud zone of northern Taiwan (24°42'25" N, 121° 26'29" E, 1758-1782 m a.s.l.), hereafter termed the Lalashan Forest Dynamics Plot. The plot is located on a wide mountain ridge, with several dry gullies and a windward slope in the eastern part of the plot. The vegetation is defined as *Chamaecyparis* montane mixed cloud forest (Li et al. 2013), with coniferous cypress *Chamaecyparis obtusa* var. *formosana* dominating the canopy, and several evergreen broad-

leaf tree species dominating the subcanopy (e.g., *Neolitsea accuminatissima*, *Quercus sessilifolia*, *Rhododendron formosanum*, *Trochodendron aralioides*). Within the 100 m × 100 m Lalashan Forest Dynamics Plot, established following ForestGeo protocol (Condit 1988), we surveyed woody species in 25 systematically distributed 10 m × 10 m subplots. We recorded diameter at breast height (DBH) and species identity of all woody individuals with a DBH ≥ 1 cm, and used relative number of individuals and relative basal area (derived from DBH) to calculate the importance value index (IVI) per subplot for each species (Curtis 1959). IVI values were then organized in the subplot × species **L** matrix. In total, we surveyed 1110 individuals of 49 species (including 48 broad-leaved and one coniferous species).

For 1–3 individuals of each broad-leaved species within each subplot, we collected three mature leaves for trait measurements. For each leaf, we measured leaf area (LA, mm²), specific leaf area (SLA, mm²/mg), leaf dry matter content (LDMC, mg/g) and leaf thickness (Lth, mm), following the protocols of Pérez-Harguindeguy et al. (2013). Leaf-level trait values were first averaged per individual and subsequently per species in each subplot, to obtain a species × site-specific trait values **T** matrix. Since the distribution of site-specific trait values of LA and SLA was strongly right-skewed, we log₁₀-transformed them before further analysis. We measured leaf traits for 665 individuals of all 48 broad-leaf species.

For each subplot, we also calculated a set of topographical parameters, including mean elevation (m), convexity (m) and windwardness. Mean elevation of the subplot and convexity were calculated from the elevation of corner piles, following Valencia et al. (2004). Windwardness is a combination of aspect and slope, expressed as ‘easterness’ × slope, where ‘easterness’ is the aspect folded along the east-west axis, rescaled into +90° for the E and -90° for the W direction. Windwardness is expected to be related to the effect of the chronic north-eastern (winter) monsoon winds. We additionally calculated a hypothetical

‘environmental’ factor that was directly calculated from the **L** matrix. This variable, the subplot scores on the first ordination axis of a correspondence analysis calculated on the **L** matrix (hereafter named CA1), presents the strongest possible predictor of subplot-level species composition, since it is directly derived from it.

We used data from this case study for two subsequent analyses. In the first one, we evaluated the relationship between Type I error inflation and the magnitude of ITV, for the four measured leaf traits and the two environmental factors, windwardness and CA1. We calculated Type I error rates for the relationships (linear regression, *F*-test) between the four site-specific and intraspecific CWMs, on the one hand, and windwardness and CA1, on the other hand (we did not consider the fixed CWMs in this analysis). Species for which no trait measurements were performed were removed from **L** matrix. The two CWM vectors, $\mathbf{c}^{SS}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{ITV}$, were calculated as defined earlier. To break the relationship between traits and environment in this data, we permuted site-specific and intraspecific trait data and performed 10,000 independent permutations to quantify the inflation index, as described earlier. For each trait, we also calculated the relative ITV index and plotted the inflation index for each tested community-level trait–environment relationship against the relative ITV index. For site-specific CWMs, we additionally assessed if applying our newly introduced ITV-extended max test (with 999 permutations) could remove Type I error inflation.

In the second analysis, we used the variation partitioning method introduced by Lepš et al. (2011) and modified by Fajardo & Siefert (2018) for linear regression, to explore the specific community-level trait–environment relationships in our dataset and to quantify the effects of ITV, species turnover and their interaction on these relationships. We used all four measured leaf traits and the three measured topographical variables (but not CA1). For each trait and topographical variable combination, we calculated three linear regression models and tested them using the appropriate method: (i) $\mathbf{c}^F \sim \mathbf{e}$, tested by the “original” max test, (ii)

$\mathbf{c}^{SS} \sim \mathbf{e}$, tested by the newly introduced ITV-extended max test, and (iii) $\mathbf{c}^{ITV} \sim \mathbf{e}$, tested by the standard parametric F -test. For (i) and (ii), we also included standard parametric F -tests to allow comparison of the results with the correct test method (max test). We decided not to correct for multiple testing issue in this analysis, as we mainly compare differences between P -values calculated by standard parametric test and max permutation tests for individual trait-environment combinations. For each regression, we then calculated the sum of squares, where SS_{fixed} represents the effect of species turnover, SS_{specific} the total trait variation, and SS_{ITV} the effect of ITV, respectively. We subsequently partitioned those variations by the formula $SS_{\text{specific}} = SS_{\text{fixed}} + SS_{\text{ITV}} + \text{covariation}$. All sum of square values were then rescaled to percentage scale, where SS_{specific} was set to 100%.

All calculations with the simulated and real world datasets were performed in R 4.0.4. (R Core Team 2021). The R code and the real world data set are provided at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5497773>. The simulated datasets were generated using the *simcom* package (Zelený, version 0.1.0, <https://github.com/zdeolveindy/simcom>), max permutation tests for the fixed CWM-environment relationships were performed with the *weimea* package (Zelený, version 0.1.18, <https://github.com/zdeolveindy/weimea>), correspondence analysis with the *vegan* package (Oksanen et al., version 2.5-7) and the partitioning of among-plot trait variation with functions modified from the *cati* package (Taudiere & Violle, 2015, version 0.99.3).

Results

Simulated community data

The relationships between site-specific CWMs and environment, tested using standard parametric tests, have an inflated Type I error rate, where the inflation is negatively related to the magnitude of ITV (Fig. 3a). Type I error inflation is highest at the smallest relative ITV

index, approaching the inflation for fixed CWM. The inflation seems to be almost absent if the relative ITV index is higher than 3, and there is no obvious inflation ITV is unconstrained ($m = \infty$). The relationship between intraspecific CWMs and environment, tested using standard parametric tests, does not have an inflated Type I error rate (Fig. 3b), and consequently shows no relationship with the relative ITV index. This test actually seems rather conservative, with all inflation index values below one.

Our newly introduced ITV-extended max test successfully controls for Type I error rate inflation of site-specific CWMs for all magnitudes of ITV (Fig. 3c). For fixed CWMs (ITV = 0), this test reverts to the “original” max test, which also controls for Type I error rate inflation (Fig. 3c). The relationship of intraspecific CWMs and environment was not inflated when tested by standard parametric *F*-tests, so no permutation-based correction was necessary.

Leaf traits of woody species in the cloud forest

Regression of site-specific CWMs against the two environmental variables (the measured windwardness and generated CA1) showed an inflated Type I error rate for all four measured traits (Fig. 4a). The inflation index values were, overall, higher for regressions against CA1 compared to windwardness. While the inflation index showed a somewhat decreasing trend with increasing relative ITV for CA1, no relationship was observed for windwardness. All regressions of intraspecific CWMs against CA1 and windwardness had an inflation index close to 1, with no apparent trend along the increasing relative ITV index (Fig. 4b). The newly introduced ITV-extended max test also successfully addressed the type I error inflation in this dataset (inflation index close to or lower than 1).

From the CWM-environment relationships in our dataset which were significant ($P < 0.05$) when tested by *F*-test, several became insignificant following max test correction (Tab.

1). For site-specific CWMs, Lth was positively and SLA negatively related to windwardness (Fig. 5b and c, respectively) based on both the parametric and max tests (Table 1). For fixed CWMs, LA was positively related to elevation and SLA negatively related to convexity when tested with parametric tests, but based on the max test, both relationships are only marginally significant ($P < 0.1$) (Table 1). Finally, for the intraspecific CWMs (tested only by parametric test), we found a negative relationship with windwardness for both LA and SLA (Fig. 5a&c) and a positive relationship between Lth and windwardness (Fig. 5b). None of the three CWMs for LDMC were significantly related to any measured environmental variable. Variance partitioning of the trait – environment relationship into the effect of species turnover, ITV and their covariation showed that there is a considerable positive covariation fraction for the SLA and Lth relationships with windwardness (Fig. S2).

Discussion

We illustrate with both simulated and real community data that testing community-level trait-environment relationships suffer from inflated Type I error rate when CWMs include (among-site) ITV in a similar way as when CWMs are calculated from fixed species-level trait values. We also showed that the extent of this inflation decreases with increasing amounts of ITV; for very low ITV magnitudes it approaches the inflation of trait – environment relationships using fixed CWMs, while for high ITV magnitudes it is almost non-existent (Fig. 3a). At the range of ITV magnitude observed in our real world dataset (0.35-0.60), inflation remains strong. The newly introduced max test extended for ITV proved to control Type I error rate for the full range of simulated ITV magnitude, and we suggest to use it whenever exploring site-specific CWM -environment relationships. Indeed, our simulation dataset suggests that levels of ITV need to be more than 3 times the amount of

interspecific trait variation before inflation becomes neglectable, so the test is likely to be needed in most real data studies.

Our real world dataset is rather small concerning both the number of species (48) and sites (25), and is also quite homogeneous in terms of environmental conditions (due to the small spatial extent). Consequently, we would expect the magnitude of ITV in our study (0.3-0.6, or 30-60%, respectively) to be less extensive than for more species-rich communities across strong environmental gradients at large spatial scales. Surprisingly, other studies have nonetheless found lower ITV magnitudes, both at local (15-33%, Jung et al. 2010) and global scales for plant communities (32%, Siefert et al. 2015). It therefore seems unlikely that the extent of ITV in a real datasets would be sufficiently high (>300%) to overcome type I error inflation for site-specific CWM-environment relationships, without the use of a max test correction, at least for plant communities. A detailed review of community-level studies including ITV might be useful, however, to quantify the range of ITV magnitudes for different taxa, environmental strengths and spatial scales. Also note that the comparison of ITV magnitude with other studies is slightly hampered by the use of several alternative measures for ITV magnitude (cf. Lepš et al. 2006, Albert et al. 2010, de Bello et al. 2011, Siefert et al. 2015). We nonetheless expect ITV magnitude values to differ only slightly among these different methods.

The use of trait values measured on the level of individual sites (“site-specific ITV”), as in this study, is just one example of how ITV can be incorporated in CWM-based trait – environment relationships. ITV covers any type of intraspecific trait variation, from variation among leaves of a single tree to variation among individuals of a species occurring on different continents. Specifically for CWM-based trait – environment relationships, the amount of included ITV can gradually range from the inclusion of only ‘habitat-specific’ or ‘region-specific’ ITV, where sites of one habitat or region are characterized by fixed species-

level trait values (e.g. Lepš et al. 2011, Helsen et al. 2018), to the inclusion of fine-scale intra-site ITV (trait variation among individuals in a site) (e.g. Carlucci et al. 2015). The severity of type I error inflation is expected to decrease along this gradient, since the more detailed ITV information is included, the more likely ITV magnitude will be considerable. Our study nonetheless suggests that Type I error corrections will remain necessary for any study where the magnitude of ITV is lower than 3.

The actual level of Type I error inflation in real world datasets is also influenced by several other parameters, next to the amount of ITV. As shown using a similar simulation model as used in our study, inflation increases with decreasing beta diversity of the species compositional data, increasing number of community samples used in the analysis and increasing strength of the link between the environmental variable and the species composition data (Zelený 2018). The strength of the **e-L** link in particular likely explains why the inflation is high for site-specific CWM related to CA1 (which is intrinsically strongly linked to the **L** matrix) and low when related to the real measured environmental variable, windwardness (with has a much weaker link to matrix **L**). The newly introduced ITV-extended max test nonetheless solved the inflated Type I error rate problem in both the simulated and real data.

Surprisingly, the relationships between the intraspecific CWMs and environment showed no Type I error inflation when tested with standard parametric tests. Even more, this test appears to be conservative, with inflation rates being consistently lower than 1, in both simulated data and real world data. We hypothesise that the lack of power is caused by the way intraspecific CWMs are calculated: the matrix of site-specific trait values is converted into the matrix of intraspecific trait values by centering the species' traits, resulting in intraspecific trait values and CWM's which tend to have values close to zero, and thus very low variance. In the case of our less noisy simulated dataset, this behaviour is quite

pronounced, resulting in low inflation index values (<0.4), while for the noisier real world data this behaviour is less pronounced, with inflation index values only slightly below 1. Detailed analyses should be performed in the future to uncover whether this is the real reason for the apparent conservatism of the test.

Our study demonstrates the problem of Type I error inflation for site-specific CWMs – environment relationships assessed specifically using linear regression. We assume, however, that the same problem applies to other methods that can be used to assess trait-environment relationships with the CWM approach, including correlation (parametric or non-parametric), weighted regression (ter Braak et al. 2017) or ANOVA. Although not specifically assessed in this study, we assume that our new ITV-extended max test can solve this inflation in all of these methods, since they belong (or are closely related) to the same statistical family of general linear models. As shown by ter Braak et al. (2017) for fixed CWMs, the “original” max test is also applicable to this whole range of methods. It nonetheless remains useful to formally evaluate the sensitivity of these different methods to the Type I error rate inflation and their respective power.

In our analysis of trait-environment relationship on real cloud forest data, we deliberately ignored the Type I error inflation problem associated with multiple testing, which arises when conclusions are based on results of several (non-independent) tests carried out on the same dataset. Note that this issue is independent of the Type I error rate inflation explored in this study. When the CWM approach is used to identify multiple trait-environment relationships, an additional correction of significance levels for this multiple testing issue is necessary to avoid inflated family-wise Type I error rates (see Wright 1992). We suggest to base this correction on the number of trait-environment pairs, not on the overall number of tests performed; i.e. no matter whether the study focuses on only a single CWM type (e.g. the site-specific one) or all three CWMs, each P-value should be adjusted by

the value calculated as the number of traits $\times$ the number of environmental variables. The correction for multiple testing will also require a higher number of permutations for each individual test, as to allow the adjusted P -values to reach values lower than the selected significance threshold (e.g. $\alpha = 0.05$).

Practical considerations

For researchers using the CWM approach extended for ITV, we suggest the following workflow. From the three CWMs calculated within this extension, namely fixed, site-specific and intraspecific CWM, only the first two are prone to Type I error inflation. For fixed CWMs, we suggest using the original max (permutation) test, as introduced by Peres-Neto et al. (2017), which is currently available in the *weimea* R package (Zelený, unpublished; <https://github.com/zdealveindy/weimea>). For site-specific CWMs, the max test extended for ITV as introduced in this study can be used, by applying the custom-made functions provided in the R code accompanying this manuscript (https://github.com/zdealveindy/ITV_CWM). For intraspecific CWMs, standard parametric tests do not suffer from Type I error rate inflation and no correction is needed.

When using the results of previously published studies that applied the CWM approach extended for ITV without controlling for Type I error inflation, be aware that some of them may be overly optimistic. As previously shown for the CWM approach without extension for ITV, Type I error inflation in fixed CWM-environment relationships correlate positively with dataset size and strength of the link between species composition and environment, and negatively with the overall species beta diversity (Zelený 2018). We show that for assessing site-specific CWM-environment relationships using the CWM approach extended for ITV, inflation is additionally negatively dependent on the magnitude of ITV.

Acknowledgements

Our thanks goes out to all members of the Vegetation Ecology Lab at the National Taiwan University and several volunteers, who participated in the vegetation data collection campaign of the Lalashan Forest Dynamics Plot, especially Ting Chen and Kun-Sung Wu. This study was supported by a grant from the Taiwanese Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST 109-2621-B-002-002-MY3).

Supporting Information

Appendix S1 with Figure S1 and S2

Literature Cited

- Albert, C. H., W. Thuiller, N. G. Yoccoz, A. Soudant, F. Boucher, P. Saccone, and S. Lavorel. 2010. Intraspecific functional variability: extent, structure and source of variation. *Journal of Ecology* 98:604–613.
- Albert, C. H., F. de Bello, I. Boulangeat, G. Pellet, S. Lavorel, and W. Thuiller. 2012. On the importance of intraspecific variability for the quantification of functional diversity. *Oikos* 121:116–126.
- Albert, C. H., F. Grassein, F. M. Schurr, G. Vieilledent, and C. Violle. 2011. When and how should intraspecific variability be considered in trait-based plant ecology? *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* 13:217–225.
- Albert, C. H., W. Thuiller, N. G. Yoccoz, R. Douzet, S. Aubert, and S. Lavorel. 2010. A multi-trait approach reveals the structure and the relative importance of intra- vs. interspecific variability in plant traits. *Functional Ecology* 24:1192–1201.

572 Behm, J. E., and E. T. Kiers. 2014. A phenotypic plasticity framework for assessing
573 intraspecific variation in arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal traits. *Journal of Ecology*
574 102:315–327.

575 Borgy, B., et al. 2017. Sensitivity of community-level trait–environment relationships to data
576 representativeness: A test for functional biogeography. *Global Ecology and*
577 *Biogeography* 26:729–739.

578 Brown, A. M., D. I. Warton, N. R. Andrew, M. Binns, G. Cassis, and H. Gibb. 2014. The
579 fourth-corner solution –using predictive models to understand how species traits
580 interact with the environment. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 5:344–352.

581 Candeias, M., and J. Fraterrigo. 2020. Trait coordination and environmental filters shape
582 functional trait distributions of forest understory herbs. *Ecology and Evolution*
583 10:14098–14112.

584 Carlucci, M. B., V. J. Debastiani, V. D. Pillar, and L. D. S. Duarte. 2015. Between- and
585 within-species trait variability and the assembly of sapling communities in forest
586 patches. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 26:21–31.

587 Condit, R. 1998. Tropical forest census plots: methods and results from Barro Colorado
588 Island, Panama and a comparison with other plots. Springer, Berlin, Germany.

589 Cormont, A., C. C. Vos, C. A. M. van Turnhout, R. P. B. Foppen, and C. J. F. ter Braak. 2011.
590 Using life-history traits to explain bird population responses to changing weather
591 variability. *Climate Research* 49:59–71.

592 Curtis, J. T. 1959. The vegetation of Wisconsin: an ordination of plant communities.
593 University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI, US.

594 Dawson, S. K., and M. Jönsson. 2020. Just how big is intraspecific trait variation in
595 basidiomycete wood fungal fruit bodies? *Fungal Ecology* 46: 100865.

596 Díaz, S., S. Lavorel, F. de Bello, F. Quétier, K. Grigulis, and T. M. Robson. 2007.
597 Incorporating plant functional diversity effects in ecosystem service assessments.
598 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America
599 104:20684–20689.

600 Dray, S., and P. Legendre. 2008. Testing the species traits-environment relationships: The
601 fourth-corner problem revisited. *Ecology* 89:3400–3412.

602 Fajardo, A., and A. Siefert. 2018. Intraspecific trait variation and the leaf economics
603 spectrum across resource gradients and levels of organization. *Ecology* 99:1024–1030.

604 Fridley, J. D., D. B. Vandermast, D. M. Kuppinger, M. Manthey, and R. K. Peet. 2007. Co-
605 occurrence based assessment of habitat generalists and specialists: A new approach
606 for the measurement of niche width. *Journal of Ecology* 95:707–722.

607 Garnier, E., et al. 2004. Plant functional markers capture ecosystem properties during
608 secondary succession. *Ecology* 85:2630–2637.

609 Gaudard, C. A., M. P. Robertson, and T. R. Bishop. 2019. Low levels of intraspecific trait
610 variation in a keystone invertebrate group. *Oecologia* 190:725–735.

611 Helsen, K., et al. 2018. Impact of an invasive alien plant on litter decomposition along a
612 latitudinal gradient. *Ecosphere* 9:e02097.

613 Jamil, T., W. A. Ozinga, M. Kleyer, and C. J. F. ter Braak. 2013. Selecting traits that explain
614 species-environment relationships: A generalized linear mixed model approach.
615 *Journal of Vegetation Science* 24:988–1000.

616 Jung, V., C. H. Albert, C. Violle, G. Kunstler, G. Loucougaray, and T. Spiegelberger. 2010.
617 Intraspecific trait variability mediates the response of subalpine grassland
618 communities to extreme drought events. *Journal of Ecology* 102:45–53.

619 Keddy, P. A. 1992. Assembly and response rules: two goals for predictive community
620 ecology. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 3:157–164.

621 Lavorel, S., and E. Garnier. 2002. Predicting changes in community composition and
622 ecosystem functioning from plant traits: Revisiting the Holy Grail. *Functional*
623 *Ecology* 16:545–556.

624 Legendre, P., R. Galzin, and M. L. Harmelin-Vivien. 1997. Relating behavior to habitat:
625 Solutions to the fourth-corner problem. *Ecology* 78:547–562.

626 Lennon, J. J. 2000. Red-shifts and red herrings in geographical ecology. *Ecography* 23:101–
627 113.

628 Lepš, J., F. de Bello, P. Šmilauer, and J. Doležal. 2011. Community trait response to
629 environment: Disentangling species turnover vs intraspecific trait variability effects.
630 *Ecography* 34:856–863.

631 Li, C.-F., et al. 2013. Classification of Taiwan forest vegetation. *Applied Vegetation Science*
632 16:698–719.

633 McGill, B. J., B. J. Enquist, E. Weiher, and M. Westoby. 2006. Rebuilding community
634 ecology from functional traits. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 21:178–185.

635 Messier, J., B. J. McGill, and M. J. Lechowicz. 2010. How do traits vary across ecological
636 scales? A case for trait-based ecology. *Ecology Letters* 13:838–848.

637 Miller, J. E. D., E. I. Damschen, and A. R. Ives. 2019. Functional traits and community
638 composition: A comparison among community-weighted means, weighted
639 correlations, and multilevel models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 10:415–425.

640 Minchin, P. 1987. Simulation of multidimensional community patterns: towards a
641 comprehensive model. *Vegetatio* 71:145–156.

642 Peres-Neto, P. R., S. Dray, and C. J. F. ter Braak. 2017. Linking trait variation to the
643 environment: Critical issues with community-weighted mean correlation resolved by
644 the fourth-corner approach. *Ecography* 40:806–816.

645 Pérez-Harguindeguy, et al. 2013. New handbook for standardised measurement of plant
646 functional traits worldwide. *Australian Journal of Botany* 61:167–234.

647 R Core Team. 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
648 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

649 Sandel, B., and R. Low. 2019. Intraspecific trait variation, functional turnover and trait
650 differences among native and exotic grasses along a precipitation gradient. *Journal of*
651 *Vegetation Science* 30:633–643.

652 Siefert, A., et al. 2015. A global meta-analysis of the relative extent of intraspecific trait
653 variation in plant communities. *Ecology Letters* 18:1406–1419.

654 Taudiere, A., and C. Violle. 2015. cati: an R package using functional traits to detect and
655 quantify multi-level community assembly processes. *Ecography* 39:699–708.

656 ter Braak, C. J. F., A. Cormont, and S. Dray. 2012. Improved testing of species traits-
657 environment relationships in the fourth-corner problem. *Ecology* 93:1525–1526.

658 ter Braak, C. J. F., P. Peres-Neto, and S. Dray. 2018. Simple parametric tests for trait-
659 environment association. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 29:801–811.

660 Valencia, R., et al. 2004. Tree species distributions and local habitat variation in the Amazon:
661 large forest plot in eastern Ecuador. *Journal of Ecology* 92:214–229.

662 Violle, C., B. J. Enquist, B. J. McGill, L. Jiang, C. H. Albert, C. Hulshof, V. Jung, and J.
663 Messier. 2012. The return of the variance: intraspecific variability in community
664 ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 27:244–252.

665 Violle, C., M. M.-L. Navas, D. Vile, E. Kazakou, C. Fortunel, I. Hummel, and E. Garnier.
666 2007. Let the concept of trait be functional! *Oikos* 116:882–893.

667 Warton, D. I., B. Shipley, and T. Hastie. 2015. CATS regression -a model-based approach to
668 studying trait-based community assembly. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 6:389–
669 398.

670 Westerband, A. C., J. L. Funk, and K. E. Barton. 2021. Intraspecific trait variation in plants: a
671 renewed focus on its role in ecological processes. *Annals of Botany* 127:397–410.

672 Wright, S. P. 1992. Adjusted *P*-values for simultaneous inference. *Biometrics* 48:1005–1013.

673 Zelený, D. 2018. Which results of the standard test for community weighted mean approach
674 are too optimistic? *Journal of Vegetation Science* 29: 953–966.

675 Zobel, M., E. van der Maarel, and C. Dupré. 1998. Species pool: the concept, its
676 determination and significance for community restoration. *Applied Vegetation*
677 *Science* 1:55–66.

678

679

Tables

Table 1. Leaf traits of woody species in the cloud forest: regression of site-specific (SS), fixed (F) and intraspecific (ITV) CWM on environmental variables, tested by parametric F -test (P_{par}) and max permutation test (P_{max} ; ITV-extended max test was used for site-specific CWM, and “original” max test for fixed CWM). Significant results ($P < 0.05$) are in bold.

Environmental variable	CWM type	LA				Lth				SLA				LDMC			
		r^2	F	P_{par}	P_{max}	r^2	F	P_{par}	P_{max}	r^2	F	P_{par}	P_{max}	r^2	F	P_{par}	P_{max}
elevation	SS	0.101	2.58	0.122	0.179	0.025	0.60	0.448	0.518	0.001	0.01	0.911	0.923	0.018	0.42	0.523	0.628
	F	0.166	4.58	0.043	0.095	0.035	0.85	0.367	0.497	0.002	0.05	0.822	0.881	0.003	0.07	0.799	0.860
	ITV	0.006	0.15	0.704		0.011	0.25	0.624		0.000	0.01	0.940		0.061	1.48	0.236	
convexity	SS	0.031	0.73	0.403	0.442	0.073	1.82	0.190	0.218	0.066	1.63	0.215	0.252	0.008	0.18	0.678	0.691
	SS	0.030	0.70	0.411	0.486	0.024	0.56	0.461	0.549	0.164	4.50	0.045	0.091	0.120	3.14	0.089	0.154
	ITV	0.004	0.08	0.778		0.089	2.25	0.147		0.003	0.06	0.810		0.033	0.79	0.384	
windwardness	SS	0.120	3.13	0.090	0.104	0.285	9.18	0.006	0.007	0.370	13.50	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.02	0.890	0.909
	F	0.035	0.84	0.369	0.488	0.054	1.31	0.265	0.364	0.065	1.60	0.219	0.311	0.018	0.43	0.520	0.609
	ITV	0.172	4.79	0.039		0.412	16.13	0.001		0.431	17.41	0.000		0.006	0.14	0.710	

Figures

Figure 1. The schema of (a) the row-based and (b) the column-based permutation test for fixed trait values CWM. Resulting *P*-values from both tests are combined into the max test. Grey cells represent values of non-zero species abundances (in species composition matrix **L** and **P**) or values of traits and environmental variables that are not missing.

Figure 2. The schema of ITV-extended max test. (a) The row-based permutation test for site-specific trait values. (b) Combined column-based permutation test, with separate permutation of fixed trait values and intraspecific trait values. Max test combines *P*-values from both tests by selecting the higher one. Grey cells represent values of non-zero species abundances (in species composition matrix **L** and **P**) or values of traits and environmental variables which are not missing.

Figure 3. The effect of the magnitude of intraspecific trait variation (relative ITV index) on inflation index (mean + standard deviation) of the linear regression between (a, c) site-specific CWM or (b) intraspecific CWM and the ‘environmental variable’ of the simulated data, tested by (a, b) standard parametric test and (c) “max” permutation test. Black square = fixed CWM (cf. site-specific CWM with no ITV). Relative ITV index equal to infinity (∞) represents situation when site-specific trait matrix with trait values randomly sampled from normal distribution was used. No inflation occurs if the inflation index is equal or lower to 1 (indicated by dashed horizontal line).

Figure 4. The effect of the magnitude of intraspecific trait variation (relative ITV index) on inflation index (mean + standard deviation) of the linear regression between (a, c) site-

specific CWM or (b) intraspecific CWM and windwardness (gray italics) and CA1 (black) of the cloud forest data, tested by (a,b) standard parametric test and (c) “max” permutation test. No inflation occurs if the inflation index is equal or lower to 1 (indicated by dashed horizontal line). LA = leaf area, SLA = specific leaf area, LDMC = leaf dry matter content, Lth = leaf thickness.

Figure 5. Regression between windwardness and the site-specific, fixed and intraspecific CWM of (a) leaf area, (b) leaf thickness, and (c) specific leaf area. All CWMs were z-transformed. Regressions significant at $P < 0.05$ (max test in the case of site-specific and fixed CWM, parametric test in the case of intraspecific CWM) were visualized by a solid regression line, non- significant regressions by a dashed line.

Figure 1

(a) Row-based permutation test

(b) Column-based permutation test

730 Figure 3

731

732

733 Figure 4

734

735

736 Figure 5

737