Research

Meta-ecosystem dynamics drive the spatial distribution of functional groups in river networks

Claire Jacquet, Luca Carraro and Florian Altermatt

C. Jacquet (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7913-0689) ⊠ (claire-jacquet@wanadoo.fr), L. Carraro (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3933-1144) and F. Altermatt (https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4831-6958), Dept of Aquatic Ecology, Swiss Federal Inst. of Aquatic Science and Technology, Eawag, Dübendorf, Switzerland and Dept of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, Univ. of Zurich, Zürich, Switzerland.

Oikos

2022: e09372 doi: 10.1111/oik.09372

Subject Editor: Christopher Swan Editor-in-Chief: Dries Bonte Accepted 15 July 2022

The meta-ecosystem concept provides a theoretical framework to study the effect of local and regional flows of resources on ecosystem dynamics. Meta-ecosystem theory has hitherto been applied to highly abstract landscapes, and meta-ecosystem dynamics in real-world landscapes remain largely unexplored. River networks constitute a prime example of meta-ecosystems, being characterized by directional resource flows from upstream to downstream communities and between the terrestrial and the aquatic realm. These flows have been thoroughly described by the River continuum concept (RCC), a seminal concept in freshwater ecology, stating that observed spatial variations in the relative abundances of invertebrate functional groups reflect systematic shifts in types and locations of food resources, which are in turn determined by the physical attributes of river reaches. Hence, the RCC represents a solid conceptual basis for determining how changes in landscape structure and resource flows will translate into local and regional changes in community composition. Here, we develop and analyse a riverine meta-ecosystem model inspired by the RCC, which builds upon a physically-based landscape model of dendritic river networks. We show that the spatial distributions and regional biomass of invertebrate functional groups observed in stream communities are determined by the spatial structure and scaling attributes of dendritic river networks, as well as by specific rates of resource flows. Neglecting any of these aspects in modelling river meta-ecosystems would result in different community patterns. Moreover, we observed that high rates of resource flow, for example due to river anthropization, have a negative effect on the regional biomass of all functional groups studied, and can lead to cascading extinctions at the meta-ecosystem scale. Our work paves the way for the development of physically-based meta-ecosystem models to understand the structure and functioning of real-world ecosystems.

Keywords: dendritic network, macroinvertebrates, metaecosystem, resource transportation, river continuum concept, riverine ecosystem, optimal channel network



www.oikosjournal.org

^{© 2022} Nordic Society Oikos. Published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd

Introduction

Ecosystems are open to flows of materials, organisms and energy, and understanding the effects of these flows on ecosystem structure and functioning is a central goal of ecological research (Polis et al. 2004). By integrating the local production and movement of resources into metacommunity theory, the meta-ecosystem framework allows investigating feedback processes between community and resource dynamics across spatial scales (Loreau et al. 2003, Massol et al. 2011, Gounand et al. 2018a, Guichard and Marleau 2021). Seminal work on meta-ecosystems has been developed on simplified landscapes (Loreau et al. 2003, Loreau and Holt 2004), often represented by two-patch ecosystems (Gravel et al. 2010a, b, Marleau et al. 2010). This simple representation allowed an analytical investigation of the interplay between local and regional flows of matter and their implications for community dynamics (Loreau et al. 2003, Gravel et al. 2010a, Massol et al. 2011, Leroux and Loreau 2012). More recent studies focusing on larger spatial networks outlined the importance of spatial structure and movement rates of organisms and materials to promote meta-ecosystem stability (Marleau et al. 2014, Gravel et al. 2016). However, one enduring limitation of current meta-ecosystem models is the abstract representation of the landscape (Gounand et al. 2018a), which is often described by random or Cartesian spatial networks (Marleau et al. 2014, Gravel et al. 2016). In contrast, the physical structure of real-world landscapes constrains organisms' movement and resource flows and is likely to influence the spatial distributions of resources and the organisms that feed upon them (Leroux and Loreau 2008, Harvey et al. 2017a, 2020, Montagano et al. 2018, Schmitz et al. 2018).

River networks constitute a prime example of meta-ecosystems, as documented by a large body of literature in freshwater ecology assessing the critical influence of directional resource flows, both from the surrounding terrestrial environment and from upstream river reaches, on the composition of local stream communities (Bartels et al. 2012, Soininen et al. 2015, Abelho and Descals 2019). Evidence that composition of local riverine communities is linked with the river ecosystem in its entirety was prominently pointed out in the River continuum concept (RCC) (Vannote et al. 1980), a cornerstone concept in freshwater ecology. The RCC proposes that commonly observed spatial variations in the relative abundances of major functional groups of organisms along a longitudinal river gradient reflect systematic shifts in types and locations of food resources, which are in turn determined by the hydrological attributes of river reaches (e.g. stream width, depth and velocity) and by the energetic constraints of upstream communities. The organismal groups considered are freshwater invertebrates that are generally clustered in five functional groups (grazers, shredders, collectors, filterers and predators), which are of high relevance with respect to the biodiversity and functioning of riverine ecosystems (Anderson and Sedell 1979, Wallace et al. 2015, Harvey and Altermatt 2019). The RCC specifically predicts that shredders

should be the most abundant functional group in small river reaches, which are strongly shaded by the surrounding vegetation and receive a large input of dead organic matter from falling leaves. The abundance of grazers is expected to peak at mid-sized streams, where light penetration into the stream is highest, stimulating the development of primary producers. Light penetration, and therefore primary production, is limited by water depth and turbidity in large rivers, reducing the abundance of grazers. Finally, filterers and collectors should be the most abundant groups in large rivers where the most abundant resources is fine particulate organic matter, which is a by-product of leaf consumption by shredders and is delivered into the water column from upstream communities.

The RCC is likely the most influencing conceptual framework in freshwater and stream ecology and is among the most commonly cited works in this field (totalling > 6000 citations in the Scopus database), prompting empirical and theoretical works assessing its strengths and limitations (reviewed by Doretto et al. 2020). Although the parallel between meta-ecosystem theory and the mechanisms formulated in the RCC has been acknowledged in several recent studies (Massol et al. 2011, Gounand et al. 2018a, Doretto et al. 2020, Harvey et al. 2020), a formal integration of the RCC within a meta-ecosystem model is still lacking. Next to the explicit predictions mentioned above, the RCC further implicitly predicts that changes in the hydrological attributes of a river network should translate into local and regional changes in the composition of invertebrate communities. However, this prediction has never been investigated formally and it remains unclear how changes in resource input and transport will affect the spatial distribution of invertebrate functional groups in a river network. Furthermore, the RCC essentially describes ecological patterns along the main stem of a river, hence disregarding the contribution of river dendritic structure on the spatial patterns observed in river metaecosystems (Doretto et al. 2020).

In this study, we develop a spatially explicit meta-ecosystem model for river systems inspired by the RCC to investigate the effect of meta-ecosystem dynamics on the functional composition of stream communities. We specifically address the following research questions: 1) what is the contribution of the dendritic structure of river networks on the spatial distribution of functional groups described in the RCC? 2) How do changes in resource flow rate influence the spatial distribution and regional biomass of functional groups in river networks? To do so, we make use of a physically-based model of dendritic river networks, which expresses how stream characteristics (e.g. water discharge, stream width) vary across a river system as a function of drainage area (i.e. the portion of land over which precipitation is drained towards a given river cross-section).

We compare the spatial distributions of functional groups between a complex dendritic river network (Carraro and Altermatt 2022) and three alternative landscapes based on different assumptions with respect to dendritic structure and scaling of hydrological variables. We demonstrate that the spatial patterns described in the RCC can only emerge from a meta-ecosystem model that accounts for the dendritic structure of river networks, as well as for changes of its hydrological attributes in the downstream direction. We then analyse different scenarios of resource spatial dynamics and show that increased rates of resource flows have a negative impact on the regional biomass of all the functional groups studied and can lead to extinctions at the meta-ecosystem scale.

Methods

Meta-ecosystem structure and dynamics

We considered a riverine meta-ecosystem composed of a set of local ecosystems, each of them defined by a river reach and its surrounding terrestrial area, which are spatially connected via resource flow across the river network. A river reach corresponds to an uninterrupted stretch of river in which abiotic conditions can be assumed as constant, and hence constitutes the fundamental unit of a river network. In our model, each local ecosystem is composed of four non-living resources, a group of primary producers and five groups of consumers, corresponding to the trophic groups and resource types commonly found in freshwater ecosystems (Vannote et al. 1980, Wallace and Webster 1996, Larsen et al. 2019, Doretto et al. 2020).

First, grazers *G* feed on primary producers *P* (algae or aquatic rooted vascular plants), which are supported by nutrients *N* (e.g. nitrogen) and light (Fig. 1). Second, three independent functional groups feed on different forms of particulate organic matter derived from decomposed terrestrial leaf litter: shredders *S*, collectors *C* and filterers *F* feed on coarse (*CPOM*, > 1 mm in size), fine (*FPOM*, 50 µm–1 mm)

and ultra-fine (UPOM, $< 50 \mu m$) particulate organic matter, respectively. Finally, predators R feed on other groups of consumers, that is G, S, C and F (Fig. 1). The resources present in a local ecosystem originate both from local terrestrial inputs of N, CPOM and UPOM and from upstream reaches via hydrological transport of N, CPOM, FPOM and UPOM. Consequently, local ecosystems are connected through hydrological transport of resources, and the composition of functional groups in upstream ecosystems determines not only the local resource consumption, but also the amount of resources available for the ecosystems situated downstream. Note that Vannote et al. (1980) originally included both filterers and collectors in the same functional group (i.e. collectors), while a distinction between collectors (feeding on FPOM) and filterers (feeding on UPOM) has been operated in more recent literature (Larsen et al. 2019, Doretto et al. 2020). Hence, the densities of collectors described in Vannote et al. (1980) should be compared with the sum of collector and filterer densities in our model.

We focused our analysis on an equilibrium state for the meta-ecosystem, and did not consider the temporal fluctuation of resource inputs, such as seasonality in resource availability or stream flow. We further hypothesized that living organisms only move within river reaches and do not disperse across local ecosystems. Our meta-ecosystem model is expressed by the following set of ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}R_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \varepsilon_R \alpha_R R_i \left(G_i + S_i + C_i + F_i \right) - \mu_R R_i - \beta_R R_i^2; \qquad (1a)$$



Figure 1. Conceptual illustration of the meta-ecosystem model for river networks. A local stream community (grey box) is composed of a primary producer P and five functional groups of consumers (predators R, grazers G, shredders S, collectors C and filter feeders F). The black arrows illustrate the feeding links between consumers and resources (blue box). The resources available for a given local community originate both from local terrestrial inputs (yellow ellipse on the left) and from the ecosystems situated upstream via hydrological transport (blue arrow). Dissolved nutrients (N) and light are the basal resources for primary producers P, while coarse (CPOM), fine (FPOM) and ultra-fine (UPOM) particulate organic matter are the basal resources for S, C and F, respectively. Predators can feed on all primary consumers, that is G, S, C and F. By feeding on CPOM, shredders produce FPOM that constitutes the main resource for collectors.

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}G_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \varepsilon_G \alpha_G G_i P_i - \alpha_R R_i G_i - \mu_G G_i - \beta_G G_i^2; \tag{1b}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \varepsilon_S \alpha_S S_i CPOM_i - \alpha_R R_i S_i - \mu_S S_i - \beta_S S_i^2; \qquad (1c)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}C_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \varepsilon_C \alpha_C C_i FPOM_i - \alpha_R R_i C_i - \mu_C C_i - \beta_C C_i^2; \qquad (1\mathrm{d})$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}F_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \varepsilon_F \alpha_F F_i UPOM_i - \alpha_R R_i F_i - \mu_F F_i - \beta_F F_i^2; \qquad (1e)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \varepsilon_P \alpha_P l_i P_i N_i - \alpha_G G_i P_i - \mu_P P_i - \beta_P P_i^2; \qquad (1f)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}N_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\delta_N}{V_i} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ji} N_j Q_j - N_i Q_i \right) + \frac{\phi_{N,i}}{V_i} - \alpha_p l_i P_i N_i - \lambda_N N_i; \quad (1g)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}CPOM_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\delta_{CPOM}}{V_i} \left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ji} CPOM_j Q_j - CPOM_i Q_i \right)$$
(1h)
$$\Phi_{CPOM,i} = 0.5POM_i = 0$$

$$+ \frac{\varphi_{CPOM,i}}{V_i} - \alpha_s S_i CPOM_i - \lambda_{CPOM} CPOM_i;$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}FPOM_{i}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\delta_{FPOM}}{V_{i}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ji} FPOM_{j}Q_{j} - FPOM_{i}Q_{i} \right) + (1 - \varepsilon_{S})\alpha_{S}S_{i}CPOM_{i} - \alpha_{C}C_{i}FPOM_{i}$$
(1i)
+ $-\lambda_{FPOM}FPOM_{i}$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}UPOM_{i}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\delta_{UPOM}}{V_{i}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{ji} UPOM_{j}Q_{j} - UPOM_{i}Q_{i} \right) + \frac{\phi_{UPOM,i}}{V_{i}} - \alpha_{F}F_{i}UPOM_{i} - \lambda_{UPOM}UPOM_{i},$$
(1j)

where subscript *i* identifies a river reach. System Eq. 1 is based on a Lotka–Volterra formulation of trophic interactions (including self regulation terms, following Barbier and Loreau 2019), and on mass balance equations (Eq. 1g–1j) for the dynamics of resources in river networks. For the living compartments $X=\{R, G, S, C, F, P\}$ (Eq. 1a–1f), the rate of change in biomass density X depends on biomass gain owing to feeding (assuming direct dependence of feeding rate on biomass production) and biomass loss due to metabolism, predation and intra-group competition for resources (density dependence). The parameters related to the living compartments X are feeding rate α_{χ} , efficiency of resource assimilation ε_{χ} , strength of intra-group competition β_X and mortality rate μ_{χ} .

To include the effect of light availability on nutrient uptake of producers, we expressed the realized assimilation rate of producers as $\alpha_p l_p$, where l_i is a site-specific light limitation factor derived from physical principles and by following the downwelling irradiance concept (Fasham et al. 1990, Davies-Colley and Nagels 2008). To derive l_p , we assumed that the irradiance of photosynthetically active radiation above the canopy is constant across the river system, while spatial variations in l_i are solely determined by variations in river geometry (i.e. width and depth – see the Supporting information for details). Where available, parameters were chosen in agreement with established evidence on feeding behaviour for the various functional groups. Detailed information on parameter values is available in the Supporting information.

For the resource compartments $Y = \{N, CPOM, FPOM, N, V\}$ *UPOM*} (Eq. 1g–1j), the rate of change of resource density Y depends on mass gain from local terrestrial inputs and inputs from upstream reaches via hydrological transport; and mass loss due to consumption by living organisms, downstream hydrological transport and resource degradation and deposition. The parameters related to resources Yare the flux of local terrestrial inputs $\phi_{Y,i}$, the relative downstream velocity of resource Y with respect to water δ_{y} (i.e. if $\delta_{y} = 0.5$, resource Y travels downstream half as fast as water), and the rate of resource loss due to processes other than consumption λ_{V} (i.e. degradation or deposition). Q_{i} and V_i represent the water discharge and the water volume of reach *i*, respectively; w_{ii} is the generic entry of the adjacency matrix ($w_{ii} = 1$ if river reach j drains into i and 0 otherwise); n is the total number of reaches constituting the river network.

Following Vannote et al. (1980) and Marks (2019), we assumed that *FPOM* is a by-product of *CPOM* consumption by shredders (Fig. 1), therefore, as a first approximation, inputs of *FPOM* originate from the aquatic environment only. Importantly, Eq. 1g–1j outline how the hydrological attributes of river networks, that is water discharge Q_i and volume V_i , influence the density of resources available locally for the functional groups. In particular, both water discharge and volume determine the velocity at which resources are transported across a given reach, while water volume also influences the concentration of local terrestrial inputs.

Resource spatial dynamics in river networks

We generated a large, virtual river network (so-called optimal channel network, OCN) with the R-package OCNet (Carraro et al. 2020, 2021) in order to study changes in the abundance density of functional groups along a gradient of physical conditions specific to river networks. OCNs are structures that reproduce the topological connectivity and scaling features of real river networks (Rinaldo et al. 2014) and are well suited to study riverine ecological processes (Carraro et al. 2020, Carraro and Altermatt 2022). We built the OCN (Fig. 2a) on a square lattice spanning an area of 5625 km² partitioned into 3688 reaches in order to obtain a gradient of physical conditions sufficiently large to reproduce the predictions of the RCC, which apply to river systems spanning a wide range of stream sizes. For instance, this roughly corresponds to the size of river Rhone before entering Lake Geneva (5238 km²) or river Rhine before entering Lake Constance (6299 km²). By using a threshold area of 1 km², the resulting total river length is 3854 km (see details in the Supporting information).

We made several assumptions regarding the rate of hydrological transport of resources in order to incorporate the verbal arguments of the RCC into our meta-ecosystem model. In particular, we assumed *CPOM* to be transported downstream at a low rate ($\delta_{CPOM} = 0.01$) compared to water because of the large size of its constituents, which likely induces clogging (Vannote et al. 1980, Wallace and Webster 1996). Conversely, we assumed *FPOM* to travel downstream at an intermediate rate ($\delta_{FPOM} = 0.5$), while *UPOM* and *N* are transported at a high rate (i.e. same velocity as water: $\delta_{UPOM} = 1$ and $\delta_N = 1$) (Cushing et al. 1993, Wallace and Webster 1996).

We derived water discharge Q_i and water volume V_i (Fig. 2c) across all river reaches of the network based on drainage area values (Fig. 2b) via the scaling relationships of Leopold and Maddock (1953). Drainage area corresponds to the portion of land over which precipitation is drained towards a given location (Fig. 2a). As a universal geomorphological feature, drainage area is the master variable controlling the physical and hydrological characteristics of a given reach (Leopold et al. 1964, Rodriguez-Iturbe and Rinaldo 2001). We therefore used drainage area to describe the positioning of a reach within the river network and illustrated how water volume (Fig. 2c), concentration of terrestrial inputs (Fig. 2d) and light availability (Fig. 2e) change along a gradient of drainage area (details on how these variables are calculated are reported in the Supporting information). Specifically, the input concentration of all resources decreases as drainage area increases (Fig. 2d) because of the corresponding increase in water volume along the downstream direction (Fig. 2c). Note that local inputs of CPOM depend on river width and not on drainage area, therefore CPOM follows a slightly different pattern than other resources in Fig. 2d (see the Supporting information for more details). Light availability l_i peaks at intermediate values of drainage area (Fig. 2e) and is lower both in upstream (due to increased shading effect of canopy in narrower reaches) and downstream reaches (due to increased water depth and subsequent limited light penetration).



Figure 2. (a) The dendritic river network used in the model simulation, spanning a square of area 5625 km². The river network is partitioned into 3688 reaches. Three example reaches are highlighted in black, and their corresponding drainage areas (i.e. the portion of land over which water drains into a given reach) are shown in orange; a zoom-in for the smallest of these reaches is provided at the bottom-right corner. (b) Distribution of drainage area values across the 3688 reaches constituting the river network, ranging from 1 to 5625 km² (grouped into 16 bins). Orange solid lines display the drainage area values corresponding to the three orange areas illustrated in panel a. (c-e) Variation of physical attributes of the river network along a gradient of drainage area: (c) water volume increases with drainage area, (d) concentration of terrestrial inputs decreases with drainage area and (e) light availability is maximum for intermediate values of drainage area (around 100 km²). In panels c–e, solid lines represent median values calculated over reaches corresponding to each bin of panel b, while shaded areas correspond to the 2.5th–97.5th percentile intervals evaluated across the bins of panel b.

We determined the equilibrium densities of each compartment of the meta-ecosystem in all reaches of the river network by finding a feasible equilibrium state (i.e. non-negative densities for all state variables (including resources) at all reaches) for system Eq. 1 by using a linearization method (see the Supporting information for details). In a default simulation, we investigated how the densities of functional groups change along a gradient of drainage area and compared the model predictions with the empirical patterns described in the River continuum concept (Vannote et al. 1980). Here, we did not aim at testing and validating the predictions of the RCC. Rather, we aimed at building a mechanistic framework that accurately reproduces the spatial patterns described in the RCC, which we then used to explore alternative scenarios of landscape structure and resource dynamics. We also performed a sensitivity analysis (methodology and results are reported in the Supporting information), where we varied two key hyperparameters shaping food chains, namely predator feedback and pyramid top-heaviness (following Barbier and Loreau 2019). Predator feedback expresses the ratio between consumption rates and self-regulation terms, while top-heaviness expresses the ratio between assimilation efficiency and metabolic costs.

Alternative scenarios of landscape structure and resource dynamics

We assessed the influence of assuming a complex, dendritic landscape on the spatial distribution of functional groups by running the meta-ecosystem model (Eq. 1) on three alternative landscapes based on different assumptions with respect to dendritic structure and scaling of hydrological variables. In particular, we introduced a linear river channel (without branches) where hydrological variables do not scale with drainage area; a linear channel where hydrological variables scale with drainage area; and a dendritic river network where hydrological variables do not scale with drainage area. We maintained the following quantities equal in the four landscapes: number of reaches, total drainage area, water discharge at the outlet, total river length, total water volume and total resource inputs from the terrestrial realm. Details on the construction of the alternative landscapes are provided in the Supporting information. We then compared the spatial distributions of functional groups between the default dendritic network and the three alternative landscapes.

For the dendritic landscape, we further compared the spatial distributions and regional biomass of each functional group between the default case and two alternative scenarios of resource spatial dynamics: a 'no flow' scenario, where hydrological transport of resources is neglected, and a 'fast' scenario where all resources are transported at a high rate (i.e. same velocity as water). All the scenarios were based on the same set of parameters specified in the Supporting information.

Results

The meta-ecosystem model for dendritic river networks accurately reproduces the distributions of functional groups described in the River continuum concept (Fig. 3). Specifically, the density of grazers peaks at intermediate values of drainage area (Fig. 3a, f), which is mirrored by the analogous pattern for primary producers (Fig. 3g). Both of these patterns essentially follow the spatial distribution of light availability (Fig. 2e). The density of shredders is maximum in headwaters and decreases as drainage area increases (Fig. 3b, f), while filterers tend to be more homogeneously distributed across the river network (Fig. 3d, f). Conversely, the density of collectors monotonically increases with drainage area (Fig. 3c, f). Consequently, collectors and filterers are the most abundant groups in largest river reaches. In 468 reaches (12.7% of all reaches), all located at the headwaters, collectors are predicted to go extinct. Finally, the density of predators (Fig. 3e), which is proportional to the sum of their preys' densities (Fig. 3f), is relatively constant along a gradient of drainage area. The corresponding spatial patterns of resource densities predicted by the model are shown in the Supporting information. Our sensitivity analysis (Supporting information) shows that the spatial patterns of consumers' density present the same shape with respect to the default case, while regional abundances vary substantially.

We found that all of the alternative landscapes that neglected either the dendritic structure of the river network or the scaling of hydrological variables with drainage area vielded patterns of consumer and resource densities that differ substantially with respect to the default OCN case (Fig. 4, Supporting information). The linear setting without scaling of hydrological variables leads to constant patterns of consumer and resource density (a formal proof for this fact is provided in the Supporting information). In the case of the linear channel with scaling of hydrological variables, densities of all functional groups (excluding filter feeders) tend to be much lower than in the default case. In particular, shredders' density (Fig. 4c) tends to peak for intermediate values of drainage area, and moderately decline further downstream. Collectors' density (Fig. 4d) is null in the 2% most upstream reaches, and increases downstream (with values much lower than those predicted for the default case, except towards the outlet, where values tend to be more similar). Peak densities of grazers (Fig. 4b) and producers (Fig. 4f) are localized closer to the outlet than it was the case for the default setting. As a result, in this setting predators' density (Fig. 4a) is predicted to increase in the downstream direction. The dendritic landscape without scaling of hydrological variables leads to patterns of consumers that, in most cases, tend to decrease in the downstream direction (especially for predators, shredders, grazers and producers), while collectors' density appears highly variable in the upstream part of the network and tends to the density observed in the default case towards the outlet. In all three settings, filter feeders' density (Fig. 4e) is spatially constant and very similar to that of the default case; indeed, both the input of UPOM in the river and the consumption



Figure 3. Spatial distributions of functional groups emerging from the meta-ecosystem model. (a–d) Map representations of the distributions of the four main functional groups discussed in the RCC. (e–g) Variation in density of functional group densities over drainage area. Solid lines represent median values calculated over reaches corresponding to each bin of Fig. 2b, while shaded areas correspond to the 2.5th– 97.5th percentile intervals evaluated across the bins of Fig. 2b. The numbers within boxes correspond to the regional biomasses of the respective functional groups (total biomass density across the whole river catchment). Note that trends in (f) correspond to the patterns shown in (a–d).

process by this functional group were assumed to be independent of any reach-specific variable (such as river width, which is key for *CPOM* input and thus shredder density, and depth, which influences producers' assimilation rate via the light limitation factor). Additional comments on these results are reported in the Supporting information.

Concerning the effect of variations in resource flow dynamics on riverine community patterns, the absence of hydrological transport of resources has a major effect on the spatial distribution of all functional groups in the 'no flow' scenario (Fig. 5). Indeed, in this scenario, the densities of all groups decrease in the downstream direction. Given that all organisms need to rely on local terrestrial inputs in this scenario, the resulting consumer patterns essentially mirror those of input resource concentration (Fig. 2d), which tend to decrease downstream due to the dilution effect (i.e. increasing water volume downstream (Fig. 2c)). This effect is particularly strong for grazers, filterers and producers (Fig. 5b, e, f), while shredders are the least impacted. Hence, functional groups feeding on fast-flowing resources (i.e. nutrients and UPOM) are more impacted than the ones feeding on slow-flowing resources (i.e. CPOM) in this scenario. For the

parameter set chosen, the regional biomasses of grazers, producers and filterers are 4.8, 6.7 and 89.1% higher in the 'no flow' scenario, respectively. For these groups, the increase in density observed in upstream reaches exceeds the decrease observed downstream. Note that this result is sensitive to the type of functional response (i.e. the relationship between a consumer's intake rate and resource density (Holling 1959)) used in the model (see Supporting information for additional analyses with a type II functional response). Conversely, the regional biomass of shredders is 9.4% lower, suggesting that the decrease in CPOM in the most downstream reaches has a significant effect on the regional biomass of this group. The group of collectors exhibits a totally different spatial distribution in the 'no flow' scenario, with very high densities in headwaters and a decreasing density in the downstream direction (Fig. 5d). The regional biomass of collectors is more than doubled, which mirrors the amount of FPOM available in this scenario (Supporting information). As a result of changes in prey patterns, the spatial distribution of predator density changes as well (Fig. 5a), with higher densities in upstream reaches and a regional biomass that is 54.5% higher without hydrological transport of resources.



Figure 4. Effect of network structure on the spatial distribution and regional biomass of functional groups in stream communities. Comparison between the spatial distribution of functional groups in a dendritic river network where river width and depth scale with drainage area (black, same as in Fig. 3) and three alternative landscapes (linear without scaling, orange; linear with scaling, violet; network without scaling, green). Solid lines represent median values calculated over reaches corresponding to each bin of Fig. 2b, while shaded areas correspond to the 2.5th–97.5th percentile intervals evaluated across the bins of Fig. 2b. The numbers within boxes correspond to the regional biomasses of the respective groups; percentage values within the boxes indicate the variation in total biomass relative to the default simulation. Corresponding resource patterns are shown in the Supporting information.

In the 'fast' scenario, increasing the rates of hydrological transport of CPOM and FPOM has major effects on the spatial distributions and overall quantity of resources available for shredders and collectors at the regional scale (Fig. 6). The amounts of CPOM and FPOM available in the whole river network are 90.8% and 99.9% lower in this scenario, respectively (Supporting information). These changes have dramatic negative effects on the density of shredders, which is 93.6% lower at the regional scale, but shows an increasing trend in the downstream direction (Fig. 6c). We also find that shredders go extinct in 28.7% of the reaches (1058 reaches). Because *FPOM* is a by-product of shredders activity (Fig. 1), the sharp decrease in shredder density cascades to collectors, which go extinct in all reaches in this scenario (Fig. 6d). Consequently, the regional biomass of predators shrinks by more than half (Fig. 6a), with a spatial distribution following those of grazers (Fig. 6b) and filterers (Fig. 6e), which are unaffected by increases in the rates of hydrological transport of CPOM and FPOM.

Discussion

By performing the first formal integration of the verbal arguments of the River continuum concept – a milestone that

has been shaping the scientific thinking in freshwater ecology over the last four decades (Vannote et al. 1980, Doretto et al. 2020) – within a meta-ecosystem model, we showed that spatial distributions and regional biomasses of major functional groups observed in stream communities are jointly shaped by the dendritic structure and scaling attributes of river networks as well as specific rates of resource flows. Neglecting any of these aspects in modelling riverine meta-ecosystems would result in very different community patterns. More generally, we showed that spatially explicit meta-ecosystem models allow understanding the interactive effects of landscape structure and resource spatial dynamics on the composition of local communities.

Model predictions did not reproduce the spatial distribution of functional groups observed in stream communities when only local ecosystem dynamics were implemented (i.e. the 'no flow' scenario), which highlights the central role exerted by hydrological transport of resources in riverine ecosystems. Furthermore, the spatial distributions of functional groups were obtained without making specific assumptions on the spatial distribution of terrestrial resources (e.g. forests being more abundant at higher or intermediate elevation). For instance, in our model the spatial variation of *CPOM* concentration only results from the scaling of river width and water volume with drainage area in the absence of shredders,



Figure 5. Effect of hydrological transport of resources on the spatial distribution and regional biomass of functional groups in stream communities. Comparison between the spatial distributions of functional groups with (black, same as in Fig. 3) and without (purple) hydrological transport of resources in the river network. Solid lines represent median values calculated over reaches corresponding to each bin of Fig. 2b, while shaded areas correspond to the 2.5th–97.5th percentile intervals evaluated across the bins of Fig. 2b. The numbers within boxes correspond to the regional biomasses of the respective groups; percentage values within the boxes indicate the variation in total biomass relative to the default simulation. The corresponding resource patterns are shown in the Supporting information.

while it is modulated by shredders' assimilation and downstream transportation rates when shredders are present. Hence, we found that dendritic connectivity, hydrologymediated resource flow and scaling of physical variables along a river network are sufficient to explain the widely observed community patterns postulated by the RCC. Moreover, a sensitivity analysis showed that the overall shape of these patterns is independent of the predator feedback and topheaviness levels implemented in the food-web (Supporting information). Note that our work focuses on the spatial variations of functional group densities, not on the comparison of densities between functional groups in a given river reach, which would require a precise estimation of group-specific food-web parameters from empirical data, which is beyond the scope of our work.

We showed how the spatial distribution of functional groups crucially depends on the ratio between the feeding rate of each group and the rate at which their resources are transported across the river network. In particular, shredders are adapted to feed on *CPOM*, which is a slow-flowing resource. During their feeding activity, shredders produce *FPOM*, which is the resource on which collectors feed. We showed that, when the transport of *CPOM* is accelerated, which could be for instance due to the anthropogenic elimination of low-current areas or regularization of the river

bed, populations of shredders are heavily depleted and this, in turn, leads to the extinction of collectors across the whole river network via a massive decrease in FPOM concentration. Note that, in nature, part of the in-stream FPOM is likely to enter the river network directly from the terrestrial environment (through soil erosion, for instance). In this case, the resulting pattern of collectors would appear as a combination of the patterns of collectors and filter feeders. Overall, these results support the use of metacommunity and meta-ecosystem theory for ecosystem management and restoration, as suggested by Harvey et al. (2017b), by outlining the negative effect of high rates of resource transportation in river networks on several functional groups of macroinvertebrates. The meta-ecosystem approach also formalizes the relationship between the size of the particles constituting a given resource and the rate at which it is transported via hydrological flow. This relationship is based on general physical laws and could be applied to other types of resources and other freshwater organisms, such as fishes or microbes.

Our meta-ecosystem model for river networks depends on a number of technical assumptions inherited from the RCC. First, the model does not include the dispersal of living organisms, hence making the implicit assumptions that the time scale of resource transport (which is controlled



Figure 6. Effect of high rates of hydrological transport of resources on the spatial distribution and regional biomass of functional groups. Comparison between the spatial distributions of functional groups for the default scenario (black, same as in Fig. 3), and the scenario with high rates of hydrological transport for all resources (blue). Solid lines represent median values calculated over reaches corresponding to each bin of Fig. 2b, while shaded areas correspond to the 2.5th–97.5th percentile intervals evaluated across the bins of Fig. 2b. The numbers within boxes correspond to the regional biomass of the respective groups; percentage values within the boxes indicate the variation in total biomass for the relative resource as compared with the default simulation. The corresponding resource patterns are shown in the Supporting information.

by water velocity) is much shorter than that of organismal movement across reaches, and that dispersal is unbiased, with mean distances travelled that are much smaller than the extent of the river network. In particular, these assumptions allowed us to highlight the crucial effect of resource flows on the spatial patterns of riverine communities. All these hypotheses are reasonable first approximations, yet we acknowledge that more complex dispersal dynamics can have an important role in shaping riverine metacommunities (Altermatt 2013, Lowe and McPeek 2014, Tonkin et al. 2018) and that other freshwater organisms, such as fish, can constitute important flows of energy and nutrients, both within a river network (e.g. stream-resident fishes) and across ecosystems (e.g. potamodromous or diadromous fishes).

Second, the RCC is inspired from natural, temperateclimate rivers and the predictions of the model thus apply to natural river networks that are not subject to disconnections between river reaches due to physical barriers (e.g. dams and reservoirs) or major drying events. However, a significant fraction of river networks worldwide are fragmented (Grill et al. 2019, Belletti et al. 2020) and/or experience flow intermittence (Allen et al. 2020, Messager et al. 2021), which is likely to disrupt the longitudinal transport of resources through the network. The effect of network fragmentation on the predictions of the RCC will depend on the location of the physical barriers or dry streams; in this respect, the use of a physically-based river landscape model as done here would enable an adequate assessment of the effects of physical barriers (González-Ferreras et al. 2019) and expansions/ contractions of the river network (Giezendanner et al. 2021) on stream communities.

Recent studies outlined the need for meta-ecosystem ecology to move from a very simplified and abstract representation of ecosystems to a more realistic one (Gounand et al. 2018a, Guichard 2019). Previous theoretical studies on meta-ecosystems demonstrated that high rates of resource flow destabilize simple producer–consumer dynamics (Marleau et al. 2014). However, most studies on meta-ecosystem dynamics have focused on the effect of recycling or organism movement on ecosystem stability and productivity in small spatial networks. Here, we demonstrated that meta-ecosystem dynamics and community composition are strongly influenced by the nonrandom structure of realworld landscapes. Indeed, the spatial variation of functional groups observed in river systems only emerged from the dendritic structure and scaling of physical variables characteristic of river networks, while none of the alternative landscapes neglecting either of these aspects yielded correct predictions.

While our meta-ecosystem model was designed for river networks, the general approach proposed can be adapted to other ecological systems where meta-ecosystems dynamics are important structuring processes, such as marine shorelines, coral reef systems or estuaries (Menge et al. 2015, Spiecker et al. 2016, Gounand et al. 2018a). The application of meta-ecosystem theory to real-world landscapes crucially depends on an informed knowledge of the specific physical attributes of a landscape that constrain the direction and rates of resource flows among localities (Polis et al. 2004). Hence, the development of theoretical models, such as the one described in the present study, further outlines the need for empirical quantifications of cross-ecosystem flows of resources (Gounand et al. 2018b). Such empirical effort is central for fostering future developments of spatially explicit meta-ecosystem approaches and predicting the large-scale effects of human-induced changes in meta-ecosystem dynamics on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning.

Funding – Funding is from the Swiss National Science Foundation grants no. PP00P3_179089 and 310030_197410 and the University of Zurich Research Priority Programme 'URPP Global Change and Biodiversity' (to FA) and the University of Zurich Forschungskredit, grant no. K-74335-03-01 (to CJ).

Author contributions

Claire Jacquet and **Luca Carraro** contributed equally to this paper. **Claire Jacquet**: Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Visualization (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review and editing (equal). **Luca Carraro**: Conceptualization (equal); Formal analysis (equal); Investigation (equal); Methodology (equal); Visualization (equal); Writing – original draft (equal); Writing – review and editing (equal). **Florian Altermatt**: Conceptualization (equal); Funding acquisition (lead); Investigation (equal); Supervision (lead); Writing – original draft (supporting); Writing – review and editing (equal).

Data availability statement

The paper contains no data. The code of the meta-ecosystem model for river networks is archived in the Zenodo repository: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7018337 (Jacquet et al. 2022).

Supporting information

The Supporting information associated with this article is available with the online version.

References

- Abelho, M. and Descals, E. 2019. Litter movement pathways across terrestrial–aquatic ecosystem boundaries affect litter colonization and decomposition in streams. – Funct. Ecol. 33: 1785–1797.
- Allen, D. C. et al. 2020. River ecosystem conceptual models and non-perennial rivers: a critical review. WIREs Water 7: e1473.
- Altermatt, F. 2013. Diversity in riverine metacommunities: a network perspective. – Aquat. Ecol. 47: 365–377.
- Anderson, N. and Sedell, J. 1979. Detritus processing by macroinvertebrates in stream ecosystems. – Annu. Rev. Entomol. 24: 351–377.
- Barbier, M. and Loreau, M. 2019. Pyramids and cascades: a synthesis of food chain functioning and stability. – Ecol. Lett. 22: 405–419.
- Bartels, P. et al. 2012. Reciprocal subsidies between freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems structure consumer resource dynamics. – Ecology 93: 1173–1182.
- Belletti, B. et al. 2020. More than one million barriers fragment Europe's rivers. – Nature 588: 436–441.
- Carraro, L. and Altermatt, F. 2022. Optimal Channel Networks accurately model ecologically-relevant geomorphological features of branching river networks. – Commun. Earth Environ. 3: 125.
- Carraro, L. et al. 2020. Generation and application of river network analogues for use in ecology and evolution. Ecol. Evol. 10: 7537–7550.
- Carraro, L. et al. 2021. OCNet: Optimal Channel Networks. R package ver. 0.5.0, <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/ OCNet/index.html>.
- Cushing, C. E. et al. 1993. Transport dynamics of fine particulate organic matter in two Idaho streams. Limnol. Oceanogr. 38: 1101–1115.
- Davies-Colley, R. J. and Nagels, J. W. 2008. Predicting light penetration into river waters. – J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci. 113 https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JG000722>.
- Doretto, A. et al. 2020. The river continuum concept: lessons from the past and perspectives for the future. – Can. J. Fish. Aquatic Sci. 77: 1853–1864.
- Fasham, M. J. R. et al. 1990. A nitrogen-based model of plankton dynamics in the oceanic mixed layer. – J. Mar. Res. 48: 591–639.
- Giezendanner, J. et al. 2021. A note on the role of seasonal expansions and contractions of the flowing fluvial network on metapopulation persistence. – Water Resour. Res. 57: e2021WR029813.
- González-Ferreras, A. M. et al. 2019. Effects of altered river network connectivity on the distribution of *Salmo trutta*: Insights from a metapopulation model. – Freshwater Biol. 64: 1877–1895.
- Gounand, I. et al. 2018a. Meta-ecosystems 2.0: rooting the theory into the field. Trends Ecol. Evol. 33: 36–46.
- Gounand, I. et al. 2018b. Cross-ecosystem carbon flows connecting ecosystems worldwide. – Nat. Commun. 9: 4825.
- Gravel, D. et al. 2016. Stability and complexity in model metaecosystems. – Nat. Commun. 7: 12457.
- Gravel, D. et al. 2010a. Source and sink dynamics in meta-ecosystems. – Ecology 91: 2172–2184.
- Gravel, D. et al. 2010b. Patch dynamics, persistence, and species coexistence in metaecosystems. Am. Nat. 176: 289–302.
- Grill, G. et al. 2019. Mapping the world's free-flowing rivers. Nature 569: 215–221.

- Guichard, F. 2019. Recent advances in metacommunities and metaecosystem theories. – F1000Research 8: 1279.
- Guichard, F. and Marleau, J. 2021. Meta-ecosystem dynamics. Springer.
- Harvey, E. and Altermatt, F. 2019. Regulation of the functional structure of aquatic communities across spatial scales in a major river network. – Ecology 100: e02633.
- Harvey, E. et al. 2017a. Upstream trophic structure modulates downstream community dynamics via resource subsidies. – Ecol. Evol. 7: 5724–5731.
- Harvey, E. et al. 2017b. Bridging ecology and conservation: from ecological networks to ecosystem function. J. Appl. Ecol. 54: 371–379.
- Harvey, E. et al. 2020. Metaecosystem dynamics drive community composition in experimental, multi-layered spatial networks. – Oikos 129: 402–412.
- Holling, C. S. 1959. Some characteristics of simple types of predation and parasitism. – Can. Entomol. 91: 385–398.
- Jacquet, C. et al. 2022. Data from: Meta-ecosystem dynamics drive the spatial distribution of functional groups in river networks. – Zenodo Repository, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7018337>.
- Larsen, S. et al. 2019. Testing the River continuum concept with geostatistical stream-network models. – Ecol. Complex. 39: 100773.
- Leopold, L. B. and Maddock, T. 1953. The hydraulic geometry of stream channels and some physiographic implications. – Tech. Rep. Geol. Surv. Professional Paper 252.
- Leopold, L. B. et al. 1964. Fluvial processes in geomorphology. Dover Publications Inc.
- Leroux, S. J. and Loreau, M. 2008. Subsidy hypothesis and strength of trophic cascades across ecosystems. – Ecol. Lett. 11: 1147–56.
- Leroux, S. J. and Loreau, M. 2012. Dynamics of reciprocal pulsed subsidies in local and meta-ecosystems. Ecosystems 15: 48–59.
- Loreau, M. and Holt, R. D. 2004. Spatial flows and the regulation of ecosystems. Am. Nat. 163: 606–615.
- Loreau, M. et al. 2003. Meta-ecosystems: a theoretical framework for a spatial ecosystem ecology. – Ecol. Lett. 6: 673–679.
- Lowe, W. H. and McPeek, M. A. 2014. Is dispersal neutral? Trends Ecol. Evol. 29: 444–450.
- Marks, J. C. 2019. Revisiting the fates of dead leaves that fall into streams. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 50: 547–568.

- Marleau, J. N. et al. 2010. Nutrient flows between ecosystems can destabilize simple food chains. J. Theor. Biol. 266: 162–174.
- Marleau, J. N. et al. 2014. Meta-ecosystem dynamics and functioning on finite spatial networks. – Proc. R. Soc. B 281: 20132094.
- Massol, F. et al. 2011. Linking community and ecosystem dynamics through spatial ecology. – Ecol. Lett. 14: 313–23.
- Menge, B. A. et al. 2015. Are meta-ecosystems organized hierarchically? A model and test in rocky intertidal habitats. – Ecol. Monogr. 85: 213–233.
- Messager, M. L. et al. 2021. Global prevalence of non-perennial rivers and streams. Nature 594: 391–397.
- Montagano, L. et al. 2018. The strength of ecological subsidies across ecosystems: a latitudinal gradient of direct and indirect impacts on food webs. – Ecol. Lett. 22: 265–274.
- Polis, G. A. et al. 2004. Food webs at the landscape level. Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Rinaldo, A. et al. 2014. Evolution and selection of river networks: statics, dynamics and complexity. – Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 111: 2417–2424.
- Rodriguez-Iturbe, I. and Rinaldo, A. 2001. Fractal River Basins. Chance and self-organization. – Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Schmitz, O. J. et al. 2018. Animals and the zoogeochemistry of the carbon cycle. Science 362: eaar3213.
- Soininen, J. et al. 2015. Toward more integrated ecosystem research in aquatic and terrestrial environments. – BioScience 65: 174–182.
- Spiecker, B. et al. 2016. Reciprocal feedbacks between spatial subsidies and reserve networks in coral reef meta-ecosystems. – Ecol. Appl. 26: 264–278.
- Tonkin, J. D. et al. 2018. The role of dispersal in river network metacommunities: patterns, processes and pathways. – Freshwater Biol. 63: 141–163.
- Vannote, R. L. et al. 1980. The river continuum concept. Can. J. Fish. Aquatic Sci. 37: 130–137.
- Wallace, J. B. and Webster, J. R. 1996. The role of macroinvertebrates in stream ecosystem function. – Annu. Rev. Entomol. 41: 115–139.
- Wallace, J. B. et al. 2015. Stream invertebrate productivity linked to forest subsidies: 37 stream-years of reference and experimental data. – Ecology 96: 1213–1228.