

# How self-regulation, the storage effect and their interaction contribute to coexistence in stochastic and seasonal environments

Coralie Picoche <sup>1,\*</sup>, Frédéric Barraquand <sup>1,2</sup>

January 15, 2019

<sup>1</sup> University of Bordeaux, Integrative and Theoretical Ecology, LabEx COTE,  
Bât. B2 - Allée Geoffroy St-Hilaire, 33615 Pessac, France

<sup>2</sup> CNRS, Institute of Mathematics of Bordeaux, 351 Cours de la Libération,  
33405 Talence, France

\* Corresponding author. Email: coralie.picoche@u-bordeaux.fr

## Abstract

Explaining coexistence in species-rich communities of primary producers remains a challenge for ecologists because of the likely competition for shared resources. Following Hutchinson's seminal suggestion, many theoreticians have tried to create diversity through a fluctuating environment, which impairs or slows down competitive exclusion. There are now several fluctuating-environment models allowing coexistence, but they often produce only a dozen of coexisting species at best. Here, we investigate how to create even richer communities in fluctuating environments, using an empirically parameterized model. Building on the forced Lotka-Volterra model of Scranton and Vasseur (2016) inspired by phytoplankton communities, we have investigated the effect of two coexistence mechanisms, namely the storage effect and higher intra- than interspecific competition strengths (i.e., strong self-regulation). We tuned the competition ratio based on empirical analyses, in which self-regulation usually dominates interspecific interactions. Although a strong self-regulation maintained more species (50%) than the storage effect (25%), we show that none of the two coexistence mechanisms considered could, by itself, ensure the coexistence of all species present at the beginning of our simulations. Realistic seasonal environments only aggravated that picture, as they decreased persistence relative to a random environment. Our results suggest that combining different mechanisms for biodiversity maintenance into community models might be more fruitful than trying to find which mechanism explains best the observed diversity levels. We additionally highlight that while trait-biomass distributions provide some clues regarding coexistence mechanisms, they cannot indicate by themselves which coexistence mechanisms are at play.

**Number of words: 242**

**Keywords:** coexistence; seasonality; competition; phytoplankton; Lotka-Volterra; storage effect

# 1 Introduction

There has been a rich debate in theoretical ecology on how to reconcile niche and neutral perspectives on species coexistence (Gravel et al, 2006; Carmel et al, 2017). Under the neutral perspective, all species have equal birth and death rates and compete equally (since space is limited) whilst under the niche perspective, birth and death rates can vary between species and various mechanisms contribute to increasing intraspecific over interspecific competition (Hubbell, 2001). However, as it has been pointed out repeatedly, niche and neutral processes are not mutually exclusive: they may actually act together to produce observed species coexistence (Gravel et al, 2006; Mutshinda et al, 2009; Götzenberger et al, 2012).

An intriguing offshoot of the niche vs neutrality debate is the concept of ‘clumpy coexistence’ (Scheffer and van Nes, 2006), whereby simultaneous influences of both niche and neutral processes create several clumps of similar species along a single trait axis. Classical stabilizing niche differences (SNDs), such as a net intraspecific competition stronger than interspecific competition, enable coexistence of multiple clumps (Chesson, 2000), while within-clump coexistence occurs through neutral processes (Hubbell, 2001; Munoz and Huneman, 2016), as species that differ too little in their fitnesses cannot exclude themselves out on reasonable timeframes. Indeed, clumps on the trait axis eventually thin out in absence of immigration, but transient coexistence can last for extended periods of time. This ‘emergent neutrality’ within groups (Holt, 2006) has been proposed as a unifying concept for the niche and neutral theories. The findings of Scheffer and van Nes (2006) have been disputed due to hidden niches in the original model (Barabás et al, 2013). Hidden niches emerge through stronger intraspecific competition mediated by an additional predation-like term (Barabás et al, 2013). This makes coexistence in the Scheffer and van Nes model more similar to that of the classical Lotka-Volterra model (Barabás et al, 2016), so that coexistence within clumps is not exactly neutral. Still, the idea that niche and neutral assembly can mould communities stays potent (Haegeman and Loreau, 2011; Vergnon et al, 2013). Since then, several studies have suggested that ‘clumpy coexistence’ can occur in theoretical models, most notably models incorporating temporal variation (Scranton and Vasseur, 2016; Sakavara et al, 2018). In these temporal-variation models, equal competitive strengths are combined with other

mechanisms like the storage effect (or temporal niche partitioning, that is an equivalent concept for forced Lotka-Volterra models, Barabás et al, 2012; Scranton and Vasseur, 2016). The storage effect increases the possibility of coexistence by making the interaction strength covary positively with a fluctuating environmental quality (see also Barabás et al, 2012).

Here, we build on the work of Scranton and Vasseur (2016) to investigate the possibility of coexistence through species response to fluctuating environments. Our enthusiasm for the Scranton and Vasseur (2016) model stems from our interest in phytoplankton communities, that inspired their thermal preference curves modeling intrinsic growth rates. However, Scranton and Vasseur (2016) described daily temperature as a random noise, i.e., independent and identically distributed Gaussian random variates over time. This appeared to us a key assumption to relax. Under most latitudes, temperature is indeed a seasonal signal, and seasonal forcing can strongly affect the dynamics of the community considered (Vesipa and Ridolfi, 2017). Hence, over short timescales, random temporal variations often only add noise to a largely deterministic seasonal trend. Our present work can therefore be seen as an attempt to blend Scranton and Vasseur (2016)’s stochastic framework with the periodic environments of Barabás et al (2012), to better represent the mixture of stochastic and deterministic environmental forces affecting phytoplankton community dynamics.

Because many phytoplankton species or genera respond in similar ways to temperature despite having different optimas (Moisan et al, 2002), we hypothesized that a large seasonal variation might not necessarily foster species coexistence. In fact, similar responses to seasonal fluctuations should lead to an increased synchrony of species abundances which, in turn, should theoretically mitigate the expected temporal partitioning. How seasonality affects coexistence (as opposed to a purely randomly fluctuating environment) is therefore a key feature of this paper. In particular, we contrast cases where the storage effect is present vs absent, which conveniently maps to two different parameterizations of the forced Lotka-Volterra model. Moreover, the overall diversity obtained at the end of the simulations with Scranton and Vasseur (2016)’s model was relatively low compared to what we usually observe in phytoplankton communities (several dozens to hundreds of species). We have therefore sought out which mechanisms would foster a truly species-rich community for extended periods of time.

82 In an empirical study combining phytoplankton community-level time series and multivariate  
83 autoregressive models (Barraquand et al, 2018), we found that despite a large influence of the  
84 environment (including temperature, irradiance, and other factors), a strong intraspecific (or in-  
85 tragenus) competition, when compared to interspecific interaction coefficients, was most likely the  
86 key driver of species coexistence. In other words, strong self-regulation had a large role to play  
87 in maintaining species diversity in coastal phytoplankton (Barraquand et al, 2018). These high  
88 intraspecific interaction strengths mirror those found in a number of terrestrial plant communities  
89 (Adler et al, 2018) and in animal communities (Mutshinda et al, 2009).

90 Here, we therefore try to establish what are the relative contributions to coexistence of the stor-  
91 age effect vs strong self-regulation, in a phytoplankton-like theoretical community model. This led  
92 us to cross different combinations of seasonality in the forcing signal, presence of the storage effect  
93 or not, and intra- vs interspecific competition intensity, in order to disentangle the contributions  
94 of all these factors to biodiversity maintenance.

## 95 **2 Methods**

### 96 *Models description*

97 The model described in Scranton and Vasseur (2016) is based on the Lotka-Volterra competition  
98 model. Fluctuations in the environment are introduced in the model by temperature-dependent  
99 intrinsic growth rates (see Eq. 1-2, all coefficients are defined in Table 1) so that species growth  
100 rates can be expressed as:

$$\frac{dN_i}{dt} = r_i(\tau)N_i \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^S \alpha_{ij}N_j\right) - mN_i \quad (1)$$

$$r_i(\tau) = a_r(\tau_0)e^{E_r \frac{(\tau - \tau_0)}{k\tau\tau_0}} f_i(\tau) \quad (2)$$

$$\text{where } f_i(\tau) = \begin{cases} e^{-|\tau - \tau_i^{opt}|^3/b_i}, & \tau \leq \tau_i^{opt} \\ e^{-5|\tau - \tau_i^{opt}|^3/b_i}, & \tau > \tau_i^{opt} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{and } b_i \text{ is defined by numerically solving } \int r_i(\tau)d\tau = A \quad (4)$$

101 Model parameters are detailed in Table 1, and we set their values to match the features of  
 102 phytoplankton communities as in Scranton and Vasseur's work (2016). The niche of each species is  
 103 defined by its thermal optimum  $\tau_i^{opt}$ . Thermal performance curves defined in Eq. 3 are parameter-  
 104 ized so that all species share the same niche area (Eq. 4), which sets a trade-off between maximum  
 105 growth rates and niche width.

Table 1: Parameter definitions and values for the model described in Eqs. 1-4. Parameter values are not specified when they vary with time and/or the species considered.

Name	Definition	Value (unit)
$S$	Initial number of species	60 (NA)
$N_i$	Biomass density of the $i^{th}$ species	(kg/area)
$\tau$	Temperature	(K)
$r_i(\tau)$	Growth rate of species $i$ as a function of temperature	$(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{kg} \times \text{year}})$
$\alpha_{ij}$	Strength of competition of species $j \rightarrow i$	0.001 (area/kg)
$b_i$	Normalization constant for the thermal decay rate	$(K^3)$
$m$	Mortality rate	$15(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{kg} \times \text{year}})$
$\tau_0$	Reference temperature	293 (K) / 20 ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )
$a_r(\tau_0)$	Growth rate at reference temperature	$386(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{kg} \times \text{year}})$
$E_r$	Activation energy	0.467 (eV)
$k$	Boltzmann's constant	$8.6173324 \cdot 10^{-5} (\text{eV} \cdot \text{K}^{-1})$
$f_i(\tau)$	Fraction of the maximum rate achieved for the $i^{th}$ species	(NA)
$\mu_\tau$	Mean temperature	293 (K)
$\sigma_\tau$	Standard deviation for temperature	5 (K)
$\tau_{\min}$	Minimum thermal optimum	288 (K)
$\tau_{\max}$	Maximum thermal optimum	298 (K)
$A$	Niche breadth	$10^{3.1}(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{kg} \times \text{year}})$
$\tau_i^{\text{opt}}$	Thermal optimum for growth of the $i^{th}$ species	(K)
$\theta$	Scaling between random and seasonal noise	(0;1.3) (NA)
$\kappa$	Ratio of intra-to-interspecific competition strength	(1;10) (NA)

The original environmental forcing is a normally distributed variable centered on 293 K (20°C), with a 5 K dispersion. Temperature varies from one day to the next, but is kept constant throughout the day. At the monthly or annual temporal scale usually used in ecological studies, temperature could therefore be considered as a white noise (Vasseur and Yodzis, 2004). However, from a mathematical viewpoint, the noise is slightly autocorrelated as the integration process goes below the daily time step. We therefore use the expression ‘random noise’ to describe this forcing, as opposed to the ‘seasonal noise’ described hereafter. To construct the seasonal noise, we add to the random forcing signal a lower-frequency component, using a sinusoidal function with a period of 365 days (Eq. 5). We tune the ratio of low-to-high frequency with the variable  $\theta$  so as to keep the same energy content - i.e., equal total variance - in the forcing signal.

$$\tau(t) = \mu_\tau + \theta \sigma_\tau \sin(2\pi t) + \epsilon_t, \text{ where } \epsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma_\tau \sqrt{1 - \frac{\theta^2}{2}}\right) \quad (5)$$

116 Note that the upper limit for  $\theta$ ,  $\sqrt{2}$ , corresponds to a completely deterministic model which we  
 117 do not explore here (but see Zhao (1991) proving bounded coexistence). We choose to keep the  
 118 stochasticity in the signal and to model a plausible temperature signal with  $\theta = 1.3$  (illustrated in  
 119 Fig. 1b) when considering a seasonal forcing of the dynamics.

120 The formulation of the forced Lotka-Volterra model of Scranton and Vasseur (2016) implies  
 121 a storage effect, as the net effect of competition exerted by species  $j$  on  $i$  is the product of the  
 122 temperature-related growth rate  $r_i(\tau)$  and the competitive strength  $\alpha_{ij}$  exerted by species  $j$  multi-  
 123 plied by its abundance  $N_j$ . Therefore, total net competition ( $\sum_{j=1}^S r_i(\tau)\alpha_{ij}N_j$ ) covaries positively  
 124 with the growth rate values  $r_i(\tau)$ , which defines the storage effect (Chesson, 1994; Fox, 2013; Ellner  
 125 et al, 2016). To remove the assumption of an explicit storage effect, we created another version of  
 126 the model using the mean value of a species' growth rate ( $\bar{r}_i$ ) to weight the interaction coefficients  
 127 (see Eq. 6). The mean growth rate value was computed by first generating the temperature time  
 128 series and then averaging all  $r_i$  over the corresponding sequences of  $\tau$  values.

$$\frac{dN_i}{dt} = N_i \left( r_i(\tau) - \sum_{j=1}^S \bar{r}_i \alpha_{ij} N_j \right) - mN_i \quad (6)$$

129 Following Eq. 6, net competition remains unaffected by the environmental conditions, in con-  
 130 trast to intrinsic growth rates, while preserving the same average magnitude as in Eq. 1.

131 Strong self-regulation is ensured by the addition of the coefficient  $\kappa$ , which is the ratio of intra-  
 132 to-interspecific competition strength. We can therefore re-write the interaction coefficients  $\alpha_{ij}$  in  
 133 Eq. 7

$$\alpha_{ij} = \alpha (1 + (\kappa - 1)\delta_{ij}) \quad (7)$$

134 where  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker symbol, equal to 1 if  $i = j$  and to 0 otherwise. The value of the  
 135 parameter  $\kappa = 10$  was chosen from analyses of phytoplanktonic data (Barraquand et al, 2018)<sup>1</sup>.  
 136 Hereafter, the expression “strong self-regulation” characterizes dynamics where the intraspecific  
 137 competition strength is 10 times higher than the interspecific competition strength, as opposed to

---

<sup>1</sup>The values of non-zero interspecific competition coefficients reported in Fig. 5 of Barraquand et al (2018) are somewhat higher than here (and  $\kappa$  lower, closer to 4) because the best-fitting model actually set to zero some intergroup competition coefficients; using a model where all  $\alpha_{ij}$  are non-zero leads in contrast to  $\kappa = 10$ .



138 “equal competitive strengths” where intra- and interspecific competition strengths are equal.

139 In addition to two types of environmental forcings (random noise with  $\theta = 0$ , and seasonal  
140 noise with  $\theta = 1.3$ ), we compare the results for four formulations of the model: with and without  
141 an explicit storage effect (Eq. 1 and Eq. 6, respectively); with strong self-regulation or equal intra-  
142 and inter-competition strength ( $\kappa = 10$  or  $\kappa = 1$ , respectively). These are summed up in Table 2.

$\frac{1}{N_i} \frac{dN_i}{dt} + m_i$	Storage effect	No storage effect
Strong self-regulation ( $\kappa = 10$ )	$r_i(\tau) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^S \alpha (1 + 9\delta_{ij}) N_j\right)$	$r_i(\tau) - \sum_{j=1}^S \bar{r}_i \alpha (1 + 9\delta_{ij}) N_j$
Equal competitive strengths ( $\kappa = 1$ )	$r_i(\tau) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^S \alpha N_j\right)$	$r_i(\tau) - \sum_{j=1}^S \bar{r}_i \alpha N_j$

Table 2: Growth rate of species  $i$  in the four formulations of the model we present

143

## 144 Set-up

145 We replicate the ‘Species sorting’ experiment of Scranton and Vasseur (2016) so as to investigate  
146 how the structure of synthetic phytoplankton communities varies under the different scenarios we  
147 described above. We focused on the dynamics of a community initialized with 60 species with  
148 thermal optima uniformly spaced along the interval  $[15^\circ\text{C}, 25^\circ\text{C}]$ , and with the same initial density  
149  $\left(\frac{1}{\alpha S}\right)$ . Each simulation was run for 5000 years in 1-day intervals. When the density of a species  
150 dropped below  $10^{-6}$ , it was considered extinct. For each combination of parameters (type of  
151 environmental signal, storage effect and stabilizing niche differences), we ran 100 simulations.

152 All simulations were run with Matlab’s ode45 algorithm, an explicit Runge-Kutta (4,5) inte-  
153 gration scheme with an absolute error tolerance of  $10^{-8}$ , and relative error tolerance of  $10^{-3}$ . The  
154 code is available in a GitHub repository<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/CoraliePicoche/Seasonality>, will be made public upon acceptance or at the reviewer’s request and stored in Zenodo

### 3 Results

Typical dynamics of the community following Eq. 1 (the model of Scranton and Vasseur, 2016), with both a purely Gaussian noise (original choice of Scranton and Vasseur, 2016; Fig. 1a) and a seasonal noise described in Eq. 5 (our variant, Fig. 1b), are shown in Fig. 1c and d, respectively. A sinusoidal forcing produces the strongly seasonally structured dynamics that are typical of phytoplankton. Even though only 5 species can be seen in Fig. 1c, there were 14 species still present at the end of the simulation forced by a random noise, with large disparities in the range of their biomasses. A third of the species kept a biomass above 10 kg/area (setting area = 1 ha, with a depth of a few meters, produces a realistic standing biomasses; Reynolds, 2006) while 6 out of the 14 species biomasses remained below the unit. All persisting species in the random noise simulation were clustered within a 3.2°C-range of thermal optima (see the biomass distribution as a function of the thermal optimum in Supplementary Material, Fig. A1). No obvious temporal patterns (e.g., cycles) could be seen in the community forced by random noise. On the contrary, seasonal cycles were clear in the seasonally-forced case of Fig. 1d. Only 4 species coexisted at the end of the simulation with seasonal noise, gathered in two groups with large thermal optimum differences (5.7°C between the maximum thermal optimum of the first group and the minimum thermal optimum of the second group). When temperatures were high, the group with higher thermal optima reached its maximum biomass, then as temperature decreases through the season, these species leave room for the growth of the low-temperature group.




Figure 1: Time series of temperature (top; a-b) and extant species (bottom; c-d) for the 2 last years of a 5000-year simulation, with storage effect but no differences between intraspecific and interspecific competition strengths. The forcing temperature is either a random noise (a) or a seasonal noise (b), leading to community dynamics with more erratic fluctuations (c) vs seasonally structured fluctuations (d). Line colors of species biomasses correspond to their thermal optimum (from blue, corresponding to low thermal optimum, to red, corresponding to high thermal optimum).

174 The decrease in persistence due to seasonality observed in Fig. 1 was confirmed in all our  
 175 simulations (Fig. 2). In cases where final species richness varied from one simulation to another  
 176 (namely, the two middle cases in Fig. 2: with storage effect but without strong self-regulation, or  
 177 without storage effect but with strong self-regulation), seasonality reduced the number of extant  
 178 species to, on average, 27% and 48% of their original values, respectively (Fig. 2). A seasonal signal

179 therefore led to a much smaller average persistence. There was also less variance in persistence  
180 between seasonally forced simulations compared to random noise simulations.

181 Both a strong self-regulation and the storage effect markedly increased persistence. Without  
182 any of these coexistence mechanisms, only one species persisted at the end of the simulations.  
183 When only the storage effect was present, the number of extant species varied between 8 and 20  
184 ( $14.8 \pm 2.4$ ) with random noise, or 2 and 6 ( $4.1 \pm 0.7$ ) with a seasonal signal. On the other  
185 hand, when only a strong self-regulation was present, the number of extant species nearly doubled,  
186 varying between 20 and 32 ( $27.5 \pm 2.4$ ), or 12 and 15 ( $13.3 \pm 0.6$ ), with a random or a seasonal  
187 noise, respectively. Remarkably, when the storage effect and a strong self-regulation both affected  
188 the community dynamics, all species persisted in the community: the number of species coexisting  
189 with both mechanisms present is therefore greater than the sum of the species coexisting with either  
190 mechanism alone. The two mechanisms therefore combine superadditively, as their interaction has  
191 a positive effect on the richness of the community. ; while neither of these mechanisms was able  
192 to produce that result alone, for either random and seasonal noise.




Figure 2: Number of species still present at the end of 100 simulations (5000 years each), initialized with 60 species, with a random forcing signal (blue) or a seasonal noise (red). The signs + or - storage refer to presence or absence of the storage effect, respectively; + / - SSR, presence or absence of Strong Self-Regulation, respectively. Community compositions are stable in the cases -storage-SSR and +storage+SSR, for which 1 or 60 species are still present at the end of all simulations, respectively. Due to low variance, the whiskers here represent min and max rather than 1.5 interquartile range.

193 The trait-biomass distribution of the community was affected by the type of forcing even  
194 when the richness of the community was stable (Fig. 3). Without storage effect nor strong self-  
195 regulation, there was only one species left at the end of the simulations. A random noise favored  
196 species with intermediate thermal optima: the final species had a thermal optimum between 18.9°C  
197 and 21.4°C (only a fourth of the initial range of thermal optima) for two simulations out of three  
198 and the maximum final biomasses over 100 simulations was reached in this range (Fig. 3a). This  
199 distribution may indicate a selection for the highest long-term growth rates, averaged over time (see  
200 scaled growth rates in Fig. 3). Seasonality with no coexistence mechanisms also led to a single  
201 final species but, in this case, the species always had a higher maximum growth rate (thermal  
202 optimum above 22°C). Species with a higher thermal optimum were more likely to persist and to

203 reach a higher biomass at the end of the simulation. 38% of the simulations therefore ended with  
204 the species having the highest temperature optimum, 25°C. The shift in trait distribution towards  
205 higher maximum growth rates with a seasonal noise vs higher average growth rates with a random  
206 noise was consistent for all model types considered.

207 When both storage effect and strong self-regulation were present, the 60 initial species coexisted  
208 with small variations in biomasses for each species over the 100 simulations (mean CV=0.008  
209 across simulations with either a random or a seasonal noise, Fig. 3b and d). The forcing signal  
210 modified only the distribution of biomasses resulting in contrasted community structures despite  
211 equal richness in both simulation types. With a random noise, the distribution was unimodal with  
212 a maximum biomass reached for the second highest long-term average growth rate (corresponding  
213 to a thermal optimum of 20.2°C). On the contrary, a seasonal signal led to a bimodal distribution  
214 (centered on 17.0°C and 24.4°C), each corresponding to one season, with highest biomasses for  
215 higher thermal optima (Fig. 3d). The minimum biomass was reached for the highest long-term  
216 average growth rate at an intermediate temperature (20.4°C).




Figure 3: Mean biomass distribution over the last 200 years for 100 simulations, as a function of the species thermal optima. Here we consider the two stable-composition cases and two types of forcing signal. On the left column, simulations without storage effect nor strong self-regulation are presented. Only one species is present at the end of the simulations and its mean value is represented by one large colored circle per simulation. There can be several circles for the same species, corresponding to multiple simulations ending with this species alone. On the right column, simulations with storage effect and strong self-regulation are represented. All species are present at the end of the simulations and small boxplots present the variation in the temporal average of biomass with a given trait, for 100 simulations. The forcing signal is either a random (top) or a seasonal noise (bottom). Each species is identified by its thermal optimum through its color code. Scaled (divided by maximum) average and maximum growth rates are shown as small filled and open circles, respectively, and are indexed on the right y-axis.

217 In cases where the richness of the community varied, the overall shape (multimodal vs unimodal)  
 218 of the marginal distribution of extant species with respect to the trait axis were similar for both  
 219 types of environmental forcings (Fig. 4). By contrast, the type of coexistence mechanism generated

different shapes. Indeed, the storage effect (when acting alone) led to a multimodal biomass distribution with respect to thermal optima. We always observed 3 modes with a random noise and 3 modes in 95% of the seasonal simulations (Fig. 4a). With a random noise, extant species were grouped in rather similar clumps regarding species thermal optima (between 18.8°C and 22.2°C) whereas species tended to be further apart in the seasonal case, covering a total range of 7.7°C, with species grouping in the higher part of the thermal range, above 22°C. On the other hand, strong self-regulation led to a quasi-uniform biomass distribution (Fig. 4 b). Species in communities forced by a random noise stayed in the lower range of thermal optima (in 96% of the simulations, the highest thermal optimum was 22.4°C, see Fig. A2 in the Supplementary Material) while they were filtered out in communities subjected to a seasonal fluctuation of their environment, for which species with thermal optima above 20.5°C persisted. As before (Fig. 3), seasonality promoted species with a higher maximum growth rate since the autocorrelated temperatures enabled them to achieve this highest growth rate for a longer period of time than a random noise would have.






Figure 4: Mean biomass distribution over the last 200 years for 100 simulations, as a function of thermal optima, with storage effect and equal competitive strengths (a) and without storage effect, with strong self-regulation (b). The forcing signal is either a random (in blue) or a seasonal noise (in red). Shades of the same color correspond to the 50th, 90th and 100th percentiles of the distributions while colored lines correspond to one representative simulation. Scaled (divided by maximum) average (whose maximum is indicated by the dashed line) and maximum growth rates are shown as filled and open and circles, respectively, and indexed on the right y-axis.

## 4 Discussion

We have simulated competitive Lotka-Volterra dynamics forced by a fluctuating environment (e.g., temperature fluctuations) under a range of scenarios allowing more or less coexistence. Two coexistence mechanisms, the storage effect and strong self-regulation (i.e., intraspecific competition much stronger than interspecific competition), could be either present or absent, which led to four scenarios. These four scenarios were crossed with two possibilities for the forcing signal, a random noise (mostly white) and a stochastic yet seasonal signal, both with equal temporal variance.

Our investigation therefore built on the model of Scranton and Vasseur (2016), which included a random forcing and a storage effect, but considered seven additional combinations of mechanisms. This was motivated by our wish to include two observed features of phytoplankton dynamics: seasonal cycles (Winder and Cloern, 2010) and strong self-regulation (Chesson, 2000; Adler et al, 2010; Barraquand et al, 2018). Many mechanisms can lead to intraspecific competition being stronger than interspecific competition: nonlinearities in the functional forms of competition or mutualism that contribute to increasing self-regulation (Kawatsu and Kondoh, 2018), or predation as well as parasitism (see e.g., the generalist predators in Haydon, 1994). Strong self-regulation seems nonetheless an ubiquitous feature in competition networks of primary producers (Adler et al, 2018), and perhaps even more general networks (Barabás et al, 2017).

Before discussing the ecological interpretation of our results, we first recall some technical assumptions made in this study. All our simulations lasted for a fixed duration (5000 timesteps) as in Scranton and Vasseur (2016). This means that short- and medium-term transients (a few years to hundreds of years) are completely negligible at the end of the time series, but very long transients can remain [and can reveal as much on the community functioning as asymptotic dynamics Hastings et al \(2018\)](#). We realized that convergence could be incomplete after 5000 years in some cases (e.g., random noise + storage effect + equal competitive strength). Such simulations would take up to 15 000 years to converge and the rate of convergence would slow over time, as can also be observed for similar models (Scheffer and van Nes, 2006). We kept a fixed time integration window rather than waiting for convergence for both technical and ecological reasons. From a technical standpoint, adding 10 000 years of numerical integration (or more) for the sake of reaching equilibrium would have been very challenging computationally, and comparison with the values reported by Scranton and Vasseur (2016) would have been compromised. [Another way to shorten the transients in the case developped by Scranton and Vasseur \(2016\) would be to vary the mortality parameter, shifting the model further away from neutral dynamics but this also made comparison with their initial paper more difficult while not altering the conclusions \(see Appendix B in Supplementary Material\).](#) ~~From an ecological standpoint, waiting for full convergence when there are extremely long transients (Hastings et al, 2018) is also quite artificial: there is no reason to believe that very~~

268 long transients (i.e., transients that maintains for thousands of years) have any less ecological  
269 reality than an attractor that is deemed stable. Speed of convergence is therefore an issue to judge  
270 whether transients should be considered or excluded, and a very long yet fixed time window for  
271 integration allows advantageously to compare all mechanisms.—

272 Another assumption pertains to competition coefficients. To allow for comparison with Scranton  
273 and Vasseur (2016), we did not introduce variability in intraspecific competition strength  
274 or interspecific competition strength. By contrast, data-based coefficients vary between species  
275 (Barraquand et al, 2018), with a majority of weak interactions (as suggested in Wootton and Emerson,  
276 2005) and more variance in intraspecific coefficients. Stump (2017) recently considered the  
277 potential effects of competition coefficient variability (also called non-diffuse competition), as did  
278 Kokkoris et al (2002); more variance in interspecific competition strength is usually detrimental to  
279 coexistence (see Stump (2017) for a classification of the various effects). Setting the competition  
280 coefficients using a multidimensional trait-based framework, like that of Ashby et al (2017), would  
281 provide a natural development to the work presented here; it is in our opinion difficult to speculate  
282 on those variance effects because both intra- and interspecific competition coefficient variances may  
283 matter to community persistence.

284 Finally, our study is limited to communities whose species have fast population dynamics  
285 relative to the yearly timescale, like phytoplankton and likely other fast-living organisms, so that  
286 many generations can occur in a year. Different effects of seasonality may occur in species that  
287 have slower life histories or with generations that extend over multiple years (e.g., multiyear cycles  
288 and chaotic attractors, Rinaldi et al 1993; Taylor et al 2013; Tyson and Lutscher 2016). Persistence  
289 may be affected differently by seasonality in such cases with slower community dynamics.

290 With these assumptions in mind, we have found that first, temporally forced Lotka-Volterra  
291 dynamics cannot sustain any diversity with our phytoplankton-based set of parameters, unless the  
292 structure is geared to include either a storage effect or a strong self-regulation. Although this  
293 absence of diversity-enhancing effect of “pure” environmental variation has already been stated by  
294 other authors (Chesson and Huntly, 1997; Barabás et al, 2012; Fox, 2013; Scranton and Vasseur,  
295 2016), this is not always intuitive (Fox, 2013), so we feel compelled to stress it once more: tem-

296 poral variation in growth rate alone cannot help coexistence within competitive communities. A  
 297 nice point made by Scranton and Vasseur (2016) was that a built-in storage effect in a forced  
 298 Lotka-Volterra model, parameterized for phytoplankton communities, could lead to some degree  
 299 of coexistence. Our investigation reproduced these results, using the random noise considered by  
 300 Scranton and Vasseur (2016). However, an arguably more lifelike noisy and seasonal temperature  
 301 forcing considerably lessened the richness of the community after 5000 years, decreasing from 15  
 302 to 4 species on average. Even imagining that groups represented here are genera or classes rather  
 303 than species, this is a fairly low diversity for a phytoplankton-like community (see e.g., Chapter  
 304 1 in Reynolds, 2006). This suggests that the storage effect may not, on its own, be sufficient  
 305 to maintain species-rich communities (e.g., dozens to hundreds of species). We have therefore  
 306 sought out whether a stronger self-regulation could maintain a higher diversity, using field-based  
 307 intra- vs intergroup (species or genera) competition strength ratio (Barraquand et al, 2018), where  
 308 the intragroup density-dependence was estimated 10 times stronger. Implementing such strong  
 309 self-regulation, in the forced Lotka-Volterra models that we considered, produced a higher level of  
 310 diversity than the storage effect (almost double). Of course, the result is somehow contingent upon  
 311 the strength of self-regulation. Our estimates are a little stronger than what was found in perennial  
 312 plants (Adler et al, 2010), where interspecific competition was suggested 4 or 5 times stronger than  
 313 intraspecific. Still, the widespread effects of natural enemies in phytoplankton (zooplankton, para-  
 314 sites) may contribute to increase the strength of self-regulation (Barraquand et al, 2018; Chesson,  
 315 2018) relative to other systems, hence we believe that 10 times stronger intraspecific competition  
 316 constitutes a reasonable order of magnitude.

317 However, such strong self-regulation was still insufficient to maintain the whole community  
 318 diversity (60 species) by itself, especially when the seasonal forcing (always decreasing species  
 319 richness) was considered. The diversity within clumps of similar values of thermal optima was  
 320 considerably decreased once seasonality was implemented. This diversity reduction occurs because  
 321 within a season, the signal autocorrelation gives long, contiguous time intervals to the best com-  
 322 petitor to exclude its less adapted competitors. This makes the results likely to hold not only for  
 323 seasonal environments, but more generally for autocorrelated ones above the daily scale, i.e., “red”

324 noise. In contrast, the random noise scenario – which can be considered white noise above the  
325 daily temporal scales – generates large temperature shifts more frequently, and thereby forbids such  
326 competitive exclusion. In a seasonal setting, a species with the highest long-term (arithmetically)  
327 averaged growth rate may not be the best competitor, and can disappear as a result of a strong  
328 competition from both low- and high-temperature tolerant species. This holds with or without a  
329 storage effect.

330 Our results may appear at odds with recent proposals that seasonal forcing in itself would help  
331 maintain diversity (Sakavara et al, 2018). However, we compared the effect of seasonal forcing to  
332 that of other forcing signals while controlling for total variance. Thus, the contrast between our  
333 results and those of Sakavara et al (2018) may be due to the role of forcing variance over time  
334 (we compare scenarios under a constant total variance). Overall, while seasonality may be slightly  
335 better than no forcing at all in maintaining diversity if a storage effect is present, seasonal forcing  
336 of parameters does not improve coexistence when compared to white noise.

337 In addition to community diversity, the biomass-trait relationship also varied from one sim-  
338 ulation to another. Some regularities did emerge across simulations though. The storage effect  
339 ~~alone~~ begot several clumps along the trait space (as observed by Scranton and Vasseur, 2016). The  
340 seasonality that we added to the temperature signal led to more distant clumps on the trait axis,  
341 with less species per clump. Conversely, strong self-regulatory mechanisms alone led to relatively  
342 uniform biomass distributions, with species forming a single large cluster, which covers a fraction  
343 of the initial trait space. –Therefore, the shape of the distribution was ~~mostly~~ affected by the  
344 coexistence mechanism at work while the average trait value was modified by the type of environ-  
345 mental forcing, even though the mean value of the environmental signal did not change. ~~However,~~  
346 ~~when both mechanisms were at play, the biomass-trait could either be unimodal or multimodal~~  
347 ~~depending on the type of noise, random or seasonal, driving the community dynamics. This im-~~  
348 ~~plies that the mere observation multimodality is not a proof of the storage effect acting on its own,~~  
349 ~~or conversely, the proof of the influence of a seasonal environment.~~ The biomass-trait distribu-  
350 tions ~~therefore~~ ~~indeed~~ constitute clues to interpret community dynamics (D’Andrea and Ostling,  
351 2016; Loranger et al, 2018), although we certainly recommend to interpret them with caution to

avoid over-generalization. The identification of multiple modes in biomass-trait relationships and  
 SADs is relatively recent (Dornelas and Connolly, 2008; Matthews et al, 2014) and is a rare pat-  
 tern in theoretical models (McGill et al, 2007). Barabás et al (2013) convincingly argued that  
 multimodality could arise from the demographic stochasticity of a single model run (with either  
 self-regulation or neutrality, but without the clumpy coexistence emerging from a storage effect).  
 However, our results are based on many model runs, for which either the storage effect alone or  
 a storage effect + strong self-regulation in a seasonal context consistently produced multimodal  
 distributions, while simulations without the storage effect always led to a single cluster along the  
 trait axis. Our suggestion for empirical studies is as follows: if only one spatial location is observed,  
 caution in interpreting multiple clumps on the trait axis is of course required, as Barabás et al  
 (2013) highlighted. However, with several locations - or in a theoretical context - one could average  
 across locations to reproduce similar graphs to the ones produced here. Clumps in the trait axis  
 when averaged across model runs/locations are therefore a signature of a coexistence induced by  
 the storage effect, for the cases that we considered in the article. Of course, other mechanisms  
 that we did not include in our models may produce similar patterns (Rael et al, 2018) or obfus-  
 cate these patterns – typically strong self-regulation weakens the clustering on the trait axis. We  
 therefore view clustering on the trait axis (when averaged over several samples) as an interesting  
 clue suggesting to look for a storage effect, rather than any definite proof that the storage effect is  
 at work.

In our previous empirical study of coastal phytoplankton dynamics (Barraquand et al, 2018),  
 we did not find any storage effect. This, however, does not mean that it could not be observed  
 in other planktonic systems. Given the consequences of the storage effect for species richness and  
 composition presented here, we are skeptical that the storage effect could by itself help explaining  
 phytoplankton diversity. However, our results suggest that in phytoplankton-like seasonal envi-  
 ronments, even though empirically-based self-regulation produce much more diversity than the  
 storage effect when considered in isolation, the storage effect can help diversity maintenance when  
 combined to other mechanisms. Indeed, the combination storage effect + strong self-regulation is  
 non-additive: the cases where both self-regulation and the storage effect were present showed more

380 diversity than generated by any mechanism on its own.

381 The above results suggest the very exciting idea that multiple coexistence mechanisms might  
382 combine superadditively [to affect the richness of the community](#), thus helping us to better under-  
383 stand the astounding diversity of primary producers. This logic could, in principle, be extended  
384 to mechanisms that we have not considered here (e.g., spatial structure, specialized natural ene-  
385 mies, that could be as important here for plankton as they are for tropical trees, see Bagchi et al,  
386 2014; Comita et al, 2014; Barraquand et al, 2018). [The effect of interacting mechanism can be](#)  
387 [measured either on community diversity, as we did here, or on other processes of the commu-](#)  
388 [nity such as the growth rates of species when rare.](#) ~~Using the latter metric, P~~previous research  
389 has however demonstrated that generalist seed predation could weaken the storage effect ~~-(Kuang~~  
390 and Chesson, 2009, 2010) thus different mechanisms might not always combine superadditively  
391 as we found here. ~~That said, superadditivity has been found in some cases, i.e., pathogens could~~  
392 ~~enhance the storage effect~~ [and broaden the conditions in which species could coexist](#) ~~-(Mordecai,~~  
393 2015). Better explaining plant or microbial diversity would then not be about selecting the best  
394 unique mechanism susceptible to explain the observed diversity, but rather better combining those  
395 mechanisms together. This may obviously be an annoyance for those who like to sharpen Occam's  
396 razor, but it clearly holds opportunities for theoreticians wishing to investigate synergies between  
397 coexistence mechanisms in highly diverse communities. Aside from the synergies between preda-  
398 tor diversity-enhancing effects, strong self-regulation through various means and storage effects  
399 (on the temporal axis), one obvious follow-up of this research would be interactions with spatial  
400 structure. Spatial structure occurs both endogeneously, through spatially restricted movements  
401 and interactions, and exogeneously, through spatial variation in environmental covariates (Bolker,  
402 2003). Numerous studies (e.g., Bolker and Pacala, 1999; Murrell and Law, 2002) have shown that  
403 spatially restricted movements and interactions - very small-scale spatial structure - can help co-  
404 existence, which we believe would be especially important for phytoplankton since many species  
405 form colonies (Reynolds, 2006; see discussion in Barraquand et al, 2018). Moreover, although  
406 temperature is usually relatively spatially homogeneous over space, other drivers (e.g., rainfall, pH  
407 in terrestrial ecosystems; salinity in aquatic ones) may exhibit spatial variation which is a main

408 factor for coexistence (Snyder, 2008). The odds that different (resource) niches, natural enemies,  
409 spatial limits to competition and temporal niche partitioning all interact to promote the very high-  
410 dimensional coexistence observed in the field seem much higher than for any of those mechanisms  
411 alone. Whether the diversity-enhancing effects of these mechanisms combine subadditively (as in  
412 Kuang and Chesson, 2010) or superadditively like here is therefore worthy of further research.-

## 413 Acknowledgements

414 We thank Alix Sauve for thoughtful comments and some bibliographic references, as well as György  
415 Barabás and an anonymous referee for constructive feedback. This study was supported by the  
416 French ANR through LabEx COTE (ANR-10-LABX-45).

## 417 References

- 418 Adler PB, Ellner SP, Levine JM (2010) Coexistence of perennial plants: an embarrassment of  
419 niches. *Ecology letters* 13(8):1019–1029, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01496.x
- 420 Adler PB, Smull D, Beard KH, Choi RT, Furniss T, Kulmatiski A, Meiners JM, Tredennick AT, Ve-  
421 blen KE (2018) Competition and coexistence in plant communities: intraspecific competition is  
422 stronger than interspecific competition. *Ecology Letters* 21(9):1319–1329, doi:10.1111/ele.13098
- 423 Ashby B, Watkins E, Lourenço J, Gupta S, Foster KR (2017) Competing species leave many  
424 potential niches unfilled. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1(10):1495–1501, doi:10.1038/s41559-017-  
425 0295-3
- 426 Bagchi R, Gallery RE, Gripenberg S, Gurr SJ, Narayan L, Addis CE, Freckleton RP, Lewis OT  
427 (2014) Pathogens and insect herbivores drive rainforest plant diversity and composition. *Nature*  
428 506(7486):85–88, doi:10.1038/nature12911
- 429 Barabás G, Mészéna G, Ostling A (2012) Community robustness and limiting similarity in periodic  
430 environments. *Theoretical Ecology* 5(2):265–282, doi:10.1007/s12080-011-0127-z



- 431 Barabás G, D’Andrea R, Rael R, Meszéna G, Ostling A (2013) Emergent neutrality or hidden  
432 niches? *Oikos* 122(11):1565–1572, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00298.x
- 433 Barabás G, Michalska-Smith MJ, Allesina S (2016) The Effect of Intra- and Interspecific Compe-  
434 tition on Coexistence in Multispecies Communities. *The American Naturalist* 188(1):E1–E12,  
435 doi:10.1086/686901
- 436 Barabás G, Michalska-Smith MJ, Allesina S (2017) Self-regulation and the stability of large eco-  
437 logical networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1(12):1870–1875, doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0357-6
- 438 Barraquand F, Picoche C, Maurer D, Carassou L, Auby I (2018) Coastal phytoplankton community  
439 dynamics and coexistence driven by intragroup density-dependence, light and hydrodynamics.  
440 *Oikos* In press, doi:10.1101/171264
- 441 Bolker B, Pacala S (1999) Spatial Moment Equations for Plant Competition: Understanding Spa-  
442 tial Strategies and the Advantages of Short Dispersal. *The American Naturalist* 153(6):575–602,  
443 doi:10.1086/303199
- 444 Bolker BM (2003) Combining endogenous and exogenous spatial variability in analytical population  
445 models. *Theoretical Population Biology* 64(3):255–270, doi:10.1016/S0040-5809(03)00090-X
- 446 Carmel Y, Suprunenko YF, Kunin WE, Kent R, Belmaker J, Bar-Massada A, Cornell SJ (2017)  
447 Using exclusion rate to unify niche and neutral perspectives on coexistence. *Oikos* 126(10):1451–  
448 1458, doi:10.1111/oik.04380
- 449 Chesson P (1994) Multispecies Competition in Variable Environments. *Theoretical Population*  
450 *Biology* 45:227–276, doi:10.1006/tpbi.1994.1013
- 451 Chesson P (2000) Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual review of Ecology and*  
452 *Systematics* 31:343–366, doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.343
- 453 Chesson P (2018) Updates on mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Journal of Ecology*  
454 106(5):1773–1794, doi:10.1111/1365-2745.13035

455 Chesson P, Huntly N (1997) The roles of harsh and fluctuating conditions in the dynamics of  
456 ecological communities. *The American Naturalist* 150(5):519–553, doi:10.1086/286080

457 Comita LS, Queenborough SA, Murphy SJ, Eck JL, Xu K, Krishnadas M, Beckman N, Zhu Y  
458 (2014) Testing predictions of the Janzen-Connell hypothesis: a meta-analysis of experimental  
459 evidence for distance- and density-dependent seed and seedling survival. *Journal of Ecology*  
460 102(4):845–856, doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12232

461 D’Andrea R, Ostling A (2016) Challenges in linking trait patterns to niche differentiation. *Oikos*  
462 125(10):1369–1385, doi:10.1111/oik.02979

463 Dornelas M, Connolly SR (2008) Multiple modes in a coral species abundance distribution. *Ecology*  
464 *Letters* 11(10):1008–1016, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01208.x

465 Ellner SP, Snyder RE, Adler PB (2016) How to quantify the temporal storage effect using simula-  
466 tions instead of math. *Ecology Letters* 19(11):1333–1342, doi:10.1111/ele.12672

467 Fox JW (2013) The intermediate disturbance hypothesis should be abandoned. *Trends in Ecology*  
468 *& Evolution* 28(2):86–92, doi:10.1016/j.tree.2012.08.014

469 Götzenberger L, de Bello F, Bråthen KA, Davison J, Dubuis A, Guisan A, Lepš J, Lindborg  
470 R, Moora M, Pärtel M, Pellissier L, Pottier J, Vittoz P, Zobel K, Zobel M (2012) Ecological  
471 assembly rules in plant communities-approaches, patterns and prospects. *Biological Reviews*  
472 87(1):111–127, doi:10.1111/j.1469-185X.2011.00187.x

473 Gravel D, Canham CD, Beaudet M, Messier C (2006) Reconciling niche and neutrality:  
474 the continuum hypothesis: Reconciling niche and neutrality. *Ecology Letters* 9(4):399–409,  
475 doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00884.x

476 Haegeman B, Loreau M (2011) A mathematical synthesis of niche and neutral theories in commu-  
477 nity ecology. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 269(1):150–165, doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2010.10.006

478 Hastings A, Abbott KC, Cuddington K, Francis T, Gellner G, Lai YC, Morozov A, Petrovskii S,

479 Scranton K, Zeeman ML (2018) Transient phenomena in ecology. *Science* 361(6406):eaat6412,  
480 doi:10.1126/science.aat6412

481 Haydon D (1994) Pivotal assumptions determining the relationship between stability and com-  
482 plexity: an analytical synthesis of the stability-complexity debate. *The American Naturalist*  
483 144(1):14–29, doi:10.1086/285658

484 Holt R (2006) Emergent neutrality. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 21(10):531–533,  
485 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2006.08.003

486 Hubbell SP (2001) *The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography* (MPB-32).  
487 Princeton University Press

488 Kawatsu K, Kondoh M (2018) Density-dependent interspecific interactions and the complexity–  
489 stability relationship. *Proc R Soc B* 285(1879):20180698, doi:10.1098/rspb.2018.0698

490 Kokkoris GD, Jansen VAA, Loreau M, Troumbis AY (2002) Variability in interaction strength  
491 and implications for biodiversity. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 71(2):362–371, doi:10.1046/j.1365-  
492 2656.2002.00604.x

493 Kuang JJ, Chesson P (2009) Coexistence of annual plants: generalist seed predation weakens the  
494 storage effect. *Ecology* 90(1):170–182, doi:10.1890/08-0207.1

495 Kuang JJ, Chesson P (2010) Interacting coexistence mechanisms in annual plant communities:  
496 frequency-dependent predation and the storage effect. *Theoretical population biology* 77(1):56–  
497 70, doi:10.1016/j.tpb.2009.11.002

498 Loranger J, Munoz F, Shipley B, Violle C (2018) What makes trait-abundance relationships  
499 when both environmental filtering and stochastic neutral dynamics are at play? *Oikos*  
500 doi:10.1111/oik.05398

501 Matthews TJ, Borges PAV, Whittaker RJ (2014) Multimodal species abundance distributions:  
502 a deconstruction approach reveals the processes behind the pattern. *Oikos* 123(5):533–544,  
503 doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00829.x

504 McGill BJ, Etienne RS, Gray JS, Alonso D, Anderson MJ, Benecha HK, Dornelas M, Enquist  
505 BJ, Green JL, He F, Hurlbert AH, Magurran AE, Marquet PA, Maurer BA, Ostling A, Soykan  
506 CU, Ugland KI, White EP (2007) Species abundance distributions: moving beyond single pre-  
507 diction theories to integration within an ecological framework. *Ecology Letters* 10(10):995–1015,  
508 doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01094.x

509 Moisan JR, Moisan TA, Abbott MR (2002) Modelling the effect of temperature on the  
510 maximum growth rates of phytoplankton populations. *Ecological Modelling* 153(3):197–215,  
511 doi:10.1016/S0304-3800(02)00008-X

512 Mordecai EA (2015) Pathogen impacts on plant diversity in variable environments. *Oikos*  
513 124(4):414–420, doi:10.1111/oik.01328

514 Munoz F, Huneman P (2016) From the neutral theory to a comprehensive and multiscale theory  
515 of ecological equivalence. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 91(3):321–342, doi:10.1086/688098

516 Murrell DJ, Law R (2002) Heteromyopia and the spatial coexistence of similar competitors. *Ecology*  
517 *Letters* 6(1):48–59, doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2003.00397.x

518 Mutshinda CM, O’Hara RB, Woiwod IP (2009) What drives community dynamics? *Proceedings*  
519 *of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 276(1669):2923–2929, doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.0523

520 Rael RC, D’Andrea R, Barabás G, Ostling A (2018) Emergent niche structuring leads to in-  
521 creased differences from neutrality in species abundance distributions. *Ecology* 99(7):1633–1643,  
522 doi:10.1002/ecy.2238

523 Reynolds CS (2006) *The ecology of phytoplankton*. Cambridge University Press

524 Rinaldi S, Murator S, Kuznetsov Y (1993) Multiple attractors, catastrophes and chaos in sea-  
525 sonally perturbed predator-prey communities. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 55(1):15–35,  
526 doi:10.1007/BF02460293

527 Sakavara A, Tsirtsis G, Roelke DL, Mancy R, Spatharis S (2018) Lumpy species coexistence arises

robustly in fluctuating resource environments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(4):738–743, doi:10.1073/pnas.1705944115

Scheffer M, van Nes EH (2006) Self-organized similarity, the evolutionary emergence of groups of similar species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103(16):6230–6235, doi:10.1073/pnas.0508024103

Scranton K, Vasseur DA (2016) Coexistence and emergent neutrality generate synchrony among competitors in fluctuating environments. *Theoretical Ecology* 9(3):353–363, doi:10.1007/s12080-016-0294-z

Snyder RE (2008) When does environmental variation most influence species coexistence? *Theoretical Ecology* 1(3):129–139, doi:10.1007/s12080-008-0015-3

Stump SM (2017) Multispecies Coexistence without Diffuse Competition; or, Why Phylogenetic Signal and Trait Clustering Weaken Coexistence. *The American Naturalist* 190(2):213–228, doi:10.1086/692470

Taylor RA, White A, Sherratt JA (2013) How do variations in seasonality affect population cycles? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 280(1754), doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2714

Tyson R, Lutscher F (2016) Seasonally Varying Predation Behavior and Climate Shifts Are Predicted to Affect Predator-Prey Cycles. *The American Naturalist* 188(5):539–553, doi:10.1086/688665

Vasseur DA, Yodzis P (2004) The Color Of Environmental Noise. *Ecology* 85(4):1146–1152, doi:10.1890/02-3122

Vernon R, van Nes EH, Scheffer M (2013) Interpretation and predictions of the Emergent neutrality model: a reply to Barabás et al. *Oikos* 122(11):1573–1575, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00790.x

Vesipa R, Ridolfi L (2017) Impact of seasonal forcing on reactive ecological systems. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 419:23–35, doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2017.01.036

- 553 Winder M, Cloern JE (2010) The annual cycles of phytoplankton biomass. Philo-  
554 sophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 365(1555):3215–3226,  
555 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0125
- 556 Wootton JT, Emmerson M (2005) Measurement of Interaction Strength in Na-  
557 ture. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 36(1):419–444,  
558 doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.091704.175535
- 559 Zhao XQ (1991) The qualitative analysis of n-species Lotka-Volterra periodic competition systems.  
560 Mathematical and Computer Modelling 15(11):3–8, doi:10.1016/0895-7177(91)90100-L