

# 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>

February 27, 2019

<sup>1</sup> University of Bordeaux, Integrative and Theoretical Ecology, LabEx COTE, Bat. 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 their 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. However, fluctuating-environment models often only produce a dozen of coexisting species at best. Here, we investigate how to create 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 intra/inter competition ratio based on empirical analyses, in which self-regulation 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 ensure the coexistence of all species alone. Realistic seasonal environments only aggravated that picture, as they decreased persistence relative to a random environment. However, strong self-regulation and the storage effect combined superadditively so that all species could persist with both mechanisms at work. Our results suggest that combining different coexistence mechanisms into community models might be more fruitful than trying to find which mechanism best explains diversity. We additionally highlight that while biomass-trait distributions provide some clues regarding coexistence mechanisms, they cannot indicate unequivocally which mechanisms are at play.

**Number of words: 239**

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

# 1 Introduction

The continued maintenance of diversity in spite of widespread competition has long bewildered ecologists, especially for primary producers such as phytoplankton that share the same basic resources (Hutchinson, 1961). A solution for the ‘paradox of the plankton’ was proposed by Hutchinson: temporal variation of the environment. By making the identity of the fittest species change over time, temporal variation could render competitive exclusion less likely, which was confirmed by early experiments (Sommer, 1984). However, it has been shown later that inclusion of temporal variability *per se* in competition models is not sufficient for maintaining a realistic diversity (Chesson and Huntly, 1997; Fox, 2013). Additional mechanisms such as the storage effect (Chesson, 1994; Ellner et al, 2016) or a relative nonlinearity of competition (Armstrong and McGehee, 1980; Chesson, 2000; Descamps-Julien and Gonzalez, 2005; Jiang and Morin, 2007; Fox, 2013) need to be introduced for diversity to maintain. Moreover, richness rarely exceeds a handful to a dozen of species in modeled competitive communities in fluctuating environments, except when external inputs from immigration sustain diversity (e.g., Huisman et al, 2001; Jabot and Lohier, 2016). To our knowledge, the effect of temporal variability on persistence in competition models has mostly been examined in theoretical communities of 2 to 3 species (e.g., Chesson and Huntly, 1997; Litchman and Klausmeier, 2001; Li and Chesson, 2016; Miller and Klausmeier, 2017).

One of the richest modeled communities that we identified can be found in Scranton and Vasseur (2016), which is based on temperature variation and different thermal optima for each species (Moisan et al, 2002). In this model, the synchronizing effect of the environment and the storage effect can maintain 12 phytoplankton-like species on average. Scranton and Vasseur (2016) described daily temperature as a random noise, i.e., independent and identically distributed Gaussian random variates over time. However, under most latitudes, seasonality drives part of the environmental variation: over short timescales, random temporal variations often only add noise to a largely deterministic seasonal trend (Scheffer et al, 1997; Boyce et al, 2017; Barraquand et al, 2018).

Seasonal forcing of parameters can strongly affect the dynamics of model communities by synchronizing species to the seasonal signal or even promoting oscillations with lower frequency (Rinaldi et al, 1993; Barabás et al, 2012; Miller and Klausmeier, 2017; Vesipa and Ridolfi,

2017). How seasonality affects coexistence, as opposed to a randomly fluctuating environment, is therefore a key feature of this paper. Our present work can 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.

What other key features of field communities should be considered when modeling phytoplankton? Strong self-regulation, with intraspecific competition much stronger than interspecific interactions, has been found to be widespread in terrestrial plant communities (Adler et al, 2018), animal communities (Mutshinda et al, 2009), and phytoplanktonic communities (Barraquand et al, 2018). We will therefore insert those niche differences, manifesting as strong self-regulation, into our models of phytoplankton competition. The interaction between environment variability and niche overlap was investigated by Abrams (1976) but his results did not extend to communities more diverse than 4 species; our objective is therefore to see how those mechanisms interact for species-rich communities.

Niche models have often been opposed to the neutral theory (Hubbell, 2001), where dispersal and drift can ensure a transient coexistence of many species, but several authors have attempted to blend niche and neutral processes (Gravel et al, 2006; Scheffer and van Nes, 2006; Carmel et al, 2017). An intriguing offshoot of these attempts 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. Niche differences enable coexistence of multiple clumps (Chesson, 2000) while within-clump coexistence occurs through neutral processes. This ‘emergent neutrality’ within groups (Holt, 2006) has been proposed as a unifying concept for niche and neutral theories (even though the neutrality of the original model has been disputed due to hidden niches, Barabás et al, 2013). Since then, clumpy coexistence has been shown to occur in theoretical models incorporating a temporally variable environment interacting with a thermal preference trait axis (Scranton and Vasseur, 2016; Sakavara et al, 2018). The relationship (or absence thereof) between biomass-trait distributions and coexistence mechanisms is currently debated (D’Andrea and Ostling, 2016), although there are suggestions that clustering on trait axes under competition may be a robust find (D’Andrea et al, 2018, 2019).

Here, we try to establish what are the relative contributions to coexistence of the storage effect vs strong self-regulation, in a phytoplankton-like theoretical community model with a large number of species. This led us to cross combinations of seasonality vs randomness in the forcing signal, presence of the storage effect or not, and intra- vs interspecific competition intensity, in order to disentangle the contributions of these factors to biodiversity maintenance and their potential interactions. Alongside the resulting species richness, we also report which biomass-trait distribution can be expected under a given combination of processes leading to coexistence.

## 2 Methods

### Models

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

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

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

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

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

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

The original environmental forcing is a normally distributed variable centered on 293 K

Table 1: Parameter definitions and values for the model described in Eqs. 1-4. Parameter values are not specified when they vary over time and/or with 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	$(\frac{\text{kg}}{\text{kg} \times \text{year}})$
$\alpha$	Baseline strength of competition	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)

107 (20 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), with a 5 K dispersion. Temperature varies from one day to the next, but is kept constant  
 108 throughout the day. At and above the daily scale, temperature could therefore be considered  
 109 as a white noise (Vasseur and Yodzis, 2004). However, from a mathematical viewpoint, the  
 110 noise is slightly autocorrelated as the integration process goes below the daily time step. We  
 111 therefore use the expression ‘random noise’ to describe this forcing, as opposed to the ‘seasonal  
 112 noise’ described hereafter. To construct the seasonal noise, we add to the random forcing signal  
 113 a lower-frequency component, using a sinusoidal function with a period of 365 days (Eq. 5).  
 114 We tune the ratio of low-to-high frequency with the variable  $\theta$  so as to keep the same energy  
 115 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  
 117 we do not explore here (but see Zhao (1991) proving bounded coexistence). We choose to  
 118 keep the stochasticity in the signal and to model a plausible temperature signal with  $\theta = 1.3$

(illustrated in Fig. 1b) when considering a seasonal forcing of the dynamics.

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

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

Following Eq. 6, net competition remains unaffected by the environmental conditions, in contrast to intrinsic growth rates, while preserving the same average magnitude of competition as in Eq. 1.

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

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

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

In addition to two types of environmental forcings (random noise with  $\theta = 0$ , and seasonal noise with  $\theta = 1.3$ ), we compare the results for four versions of the original model: with and

---

<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 sets to zero some intergroup competition coefficients; using a model where all  $\alpha_{ij}$  are non-zero leads in contrast to  $\kappa = 10$ ).

without an explicit storage effect (Eq. 1 and Eq. 6, respectively); with strong self-regulation or equal intra- 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 models

146

## 147 Set-up

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

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

## 158 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

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/CoraliePicoche/Seasonality>



165 in the range of their biomasses. A third of the species kept a biomass above 10 kg/area (setting  
 166 area = 1 ha, with a depth of a few meters, produces a realistic standing biomasses; Reynolds,  
 167 2006) while 6 out of the 14 species biomasses remained below the unit. All persisting species  
 168 in the random noise simulation were clustered within a 3.2°C-range of thermal optima (see  
 169 the biomass distribution as a function of the thermal optimum in Electronic Supplementary  
 170 Material, Fig. A1). No obvious temporal patterns (e.g., cycles) could be seen in the community  
 171 forced by random noise. On the contrary, seasonal cycles were clear in the seasonally-forced  
 172 case of Fig. 1d. Only 4 species coexisted at the end of the simulation with seasonal noise,  
 173 gathered in two groups with large thermal optimum differences (5.7°C between the maximum  
 174 thermal optimum of the first group and the minimum thermal optimum of the second group).  
 175 When temperatures were high, the group with higher thermal optima reached its maximum  
 176 biomass, then as temperature decreases through the season, these species leave room for the  
 177 growth of the low-temperature group.

178 The decrease in persistence due to seasonality observed in Fig. 1 was confirmed in all our  
 179 simulations (Fig. 2). In cases where final species richness varied from one simulation to another  
 180 (namely, the two middle cases in Fig. 2: with storage effect but without strong self-regulation,  
 181 or without storage effect but with strong self-regulation), seasonality reduced the number of  
 182 extant species to, on average, 27% and 48% of their original values, respectively (Fig. 2). A  
 183 seasonal signal therefore led to a much smaller average persistence. There was also less variance  
 184 in persistence between seasonally forced simulations compared to random noise simulations.

185 Both a strong self-regulation and the storage effect markedly increased persistence. Without  
 186 any of these coexistence mechanisms, only one species persisted at the end of the simulations.  
 187 When only the storage effect was present, the number of extant species varied between 8  
 188 and 20 ( $14.8 \pm 2.4$ ) with random noise, or 2 and 6 ( $4.1 \pm 0.7$ ) with a seasonal signal. On  
 189 the other hand, when only a strong self-regulation was present, the number of extant species  
 190 nearly doubled, varying between 20 and 32 ( $27.5 \pm 2.4$ ), or 12 and 15 ( $13.3 \pm 0.6$ ), with a  
 191 random or a seasonal noise, respectively. Remarkably, when the storage effect and a strong  
 192 self-regulation both affected the community dynamics, all species persisted in the community:  
 193 the number of species coexisting with both mechanisms present is greater than the sum of  
 194 the species coexisting with either mechanism alone. The two mechanisms therefore combine




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).

superadditively, as their interaction has a positive effect on the richness of the community.

The trait-biomass distribution of the community was affected by the type of forcing even when the richness of the community was stable (Fig. 3). Without storage effect nor strong self-regulation, there was only one species left at the end of the simulations. A random noise favored species with intermediate thermal optima: the final species had a thermal optimum between 18.9°C and 21.4°C (only a fourth of the initial range of thermal optima) for two simulations out of three and the maximum final biomasses over 100 simulations was reached in this range (Fig. 3a). This distribution may indicate a selection for the highest long-term growth rates, averaged




Figure 2: Number of species still present at the end of 100 simulations (5000 years each), initialized with 60 species, with a random (blue) or a seasonal forcing signal (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.

over time (see scaled growth rates in Fig. 3). Seasonality with no coexistence mechanisms also led to a single final species but, in this case, the species always had a higher maximum growth rate (thermal optimum above 22°C). Species with a higher thermal optimum were more likely to persist and to reach a higher biomass at the end of the simulation. 38% of the simulations therefore ended with the species having the highest temperature optimum, 25°C. The shift in trait distribution towards higher maximum growth rates with a seasonal noise vs higher average growth rates with a random noise was consistent for all model types considered.

When both the storage effect and strong self-regulation were present, the 60 initial species coexist with almost no variation in their respective biomasses from one simulation to the next (mean CV across simulations is 0.008, averaged across species, Fig. 3b and d). The forcing signal modified only the distribution of biomasses, resulting in contrasted community structures despite equal richness. With a random noise, the distribution was unimodal. On the contrary, a seasonal signal led to a bimodal distribution (centered on 17.0°C and 24.4°C), each

216 corresponding to one season, with highest biomasses for higher thermal optima (Fig. 3d). The  
 217 minimum biomass was reached for the highest long-term average growth rate at an intermediate  
 218 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.

219 In cases where the richness of the community varied, the overall shape (multimodal vs  
 220 unimodal) of the marginal distribution of extant species with respect to the trait axis were  
 221 similar for both 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 Electronic 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 c,d), 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.

## 4 Discussion

We have simulated competitive Lotka-Volterra dynamics forced by a fluctuating temperature 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 signal 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; Boyce et al, 2017) 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,




Figure 4: Mean biomass distribution over the last 200 years for 100 simulations, as a function of thermal optima, (a) with storage effect and equal competitive strengths and (b) without storage effect, with strong self-regulation. 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 and maximum growth rates are shown as filled and open circles, respectively, and indexed on the right y-axis. The maximum average growth rate is indicated by the dashed line.

1994). Strong self-regulation seems 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). While short- and medium-term transients (a few years to hundreds of years) are completely negligible at the end of the time series, very long transients can remain in this class of models (Scheffer and van Nes, 2006; Hastings et al, 2018): these are not mere artefacts but instead traduce the fact that some processes (e.g., exclusion of a species) can be really slow. We realized that convergence was 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.

262 We could have considered longer time intervals, but comparison with the values reported by  
263 Scranton and Vasseur (2016) would then have been compromised. Another way to shorten  
264 the transients, suggested by a referee (GB), is to vary the mortality parameter. This did not  
265 alter the conclusions (see Appendix B in Electronic Supplementary Material). Unfortunately,  
266 added variability also shifts the model further away from neutral dynamics (when intra and  
267 interspecific competition strengths are equal), which renders comparisons difficult. All things  
268 considered, we therefore kept the 5000-year time window for integration.

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

282 Finally, our study is limited to communities whose species have fast population dynamics  
283 relative to the yearly timescale, like phytoplankton and likely other fast-living organisms, so  
284 that many generations can occur in a year. Persistence in community with slower dynamics may  
285 be affected differently by seasonality (Miller and Klausmeier, 2017). This especially true for  
286 species with generations that extend over multiple years. In models where trophic interactions  
287 are implemented, seasonality has been shown to promote multiyear cycles and the existence of  
288 chaotic attractors (Rinaldi et al, 1993; Taylor et al, 2013; Tyson and Lutscher, 2016). These rich  
289 dynamics of consumers may feed back into the lower trophic levels: Dakos et al (2009) present  
290 a planktonic community with seasonally-entrained chaotic dynamics which may be partly due  
291 to zooplanktonic predation. Predation probably entails additional niche differences, possibly

292 with an emerging self-regulation created by predation processes (Chesson, 2018), but it seems  
293 unlikely that we would be able to generate such dynamics with the models presented in this  
294 article. Additional nonlinearities would be needed to create intrinsically variable and chaotic  
295 dynamics.

296 With these assumptions in mind, we have found that first, temporally forced Lotka-Volterra  
297 dynamics cannot sustain any diversity with our phytoplankton-based set of parameters, unless  
298 the structure is geared to include either a storage effect or a strong self-regulation. Although  
299 this absence of diversity-enhancing effect of “pure” environmental variation has already been  
300 stated by other authors (Chesson and Huntly, 1997; Barabás et al, 2012; Fox, 2013; Scranton  
301 and Vasseur, 2016), this is not always intuitive (Fox, 2013), so we feel compelled to stress it  
302 once more: temporal variation in growth rate alone cannot help coexistence within competitive  
303 communities. A nice point made by Scranton and Vasseur (2016) was that a built-in storage  
304 effect in a forced Lotka-Volterra model, parameterized for phytoplankton communities, could  
305 lead to a reasonable degree of coexistence. Our investigation reproduced these results, using the  
306 random noise considered by Scranton and Vasseur (2016). However, an arguably more lifelike  
307 noisy and seasonal temperature forcing considerably lessened the richness of the community  
308 after 5000 years, decreasing from 15 to 4 species on average. Even imagining that groups  
309 represented here are genera or classes rather than species, this is a fairly low diversity for a  
310 phytoplankton-like community (see e.g., Chapter 1 in Reynolds, 2006). This suggests that  
311 the storage effect may not, on its own, be sufficient to maintain species-rich communities  
312 (e.g., dozens to hundreds of species). We have therefore sought out whether a stronger self-  
313 regulation could maintain a higher diversity, using field-based intra- vs intergroup (species or  
314 genera) competition strength ratio (Barraquand et al, 2018), where the intragroup density-  
315 dependence was estimated 10 times stronger. Implementing such strong self-regulation, in the  
316 forced Lotka-Volterra models that we considered, produced a higher level of diversity than the  
317 storage effect (almost double). Of course, the result is somehow contingent upon the strength  
318 of self-regulation. Our estimates are a little stronger than what was found in perennial plants  
319 (Adler et al, 2010), where interspecific competition was suggested 4 or 5 times stronger than  
320 intraspecific. Still, the widespread effects of natural enemies in phytoplankton (zooplankton,  
321 parasites) may contribute to an increase in the self-regulation strength (Barraquand et al, 2018;



Chesson, 2018) relative to other systems, hence we believe that 10 times stronger intraspecific competition constitutes a reasonable order of magnitude.

However, such strong self-regulation was still insufficient to maintain the whole community diversity (60 species) by itself, especially when the seasonal forcing was considered (always decreasing species richness). The diversity within clumps of similar values of thermal optima was considerably decreased once seasonality was implemented. This diversity reduction occurs because within a season, the signal autocorrelation gives long, contiguous time intervals to the best competitor to exclude its less adapted competitors. This makes the results likely to hold not only for seasonal environments, but more generally for autocorrelated ones above the daily scale, i.e., “red” noise. In contrast, the random noise scenario – which can be considered white noise above the daily temporal scale – generates large temperature shifts more frequently, and thereby forbids such competitive exclusion. In a seasonal setting, a species with the highest long-term (arithmetically) averaged growth rate may not be the best competitor, and can disappear as a result of a strong competition from both low- and high-temperature tolerant species. This holds with or without a storage effect.

Our results may appear at odds with recent proposals that seasonal forcing in itself would help maintain diversity (Sakavara et al, 2018). However, we compared the effect of seasonal forcing to that of other forcing signals while controlling for total variance. Thus, the contrast between our results and those of Sakavara et al (2018) may be due to the role of forcing variance over time: we compare scenarios under a constant total variance, much like what is done when examining the effect of noise color on population and community dynamics (Jiang and Morin, 2007; Ruokolainen et al, 2009). Thinking in terms of signal spectrum, while seasonality may maintain slightly more diversity than no forcing at all if a storage effect is present, the reddening of the environmental noise due to such seasonality reduces coexistence. This result may be contingent upon the correlated positive responses of the species growth rate to increases in the environmental variable (Ruokolainen et al, 2009, and references therein).

The biomass-trait relationship was affected more marginally by the type of forcing signal. The storage effect alone begot several clumps along the trait space (as observed by Scranton and Vasseur, 2016). The seasonality that we added to the temperature signal led to more distant clumps on the trait axis, with less species per clump. Conversely, strong self-regulatory

mechanisms alone led to relatively uniform biomass distributions, with species forming a single large cluster, which covered a fraction of the initial trait space. Therefore, the shape of the distribution was mostly affected by the coexistence mechanism at work while the average trait value was modified by the type of environmental forcing, even though the mean value of the environmental signal did not change. However, when both strong-self regulation and the storage effect were at play, the biomass-trait distribution could either be unimodal or multimodal depending on the type of noise driving the community dynamics (random or seasonal, respectively). This implies that the mere observation of multimodality in a thermal preference trait-biomass distribution is not a proof of a storage effect, or conversely, the proof of the influence of a seasonal environment.

The identification of multiple modes in biomass-trait distributions is relatively recent (Segura et al, 2013; Loranger et al, 2018; D’Andrea et al, 2018, 2019), so we recommend to interpret them with caution to avoid over-generalization. Barabás et al (2013) convincingly argued that multimodality could arise from the demographic stochasticity of a single model run. However, with several locations - or in a theoretical context as done here - one could average across locations. There are additional reasons to be cautious: the occurrence of clustering is very sensitive to the shape of the competition kernel; small differences in shape can shift the distribution towards either clustered or uniform (Pigolotti et al, 2010). We therefore view clustering on the thermal preference trait axis as an interesting clue suggesting to look for a storage effect, rather than any definite proof that the storage effect is at work. Finally, we recall that we focus on a trait (thermal optimum) which clearly interacts with the environment: clustering may emerge on another trait axis, such as size, which typically affects the competition coefficient, without having any relationship to the storage effect (Segura et al, 2011, 2013; D’Andrea et al, 2018, 2019).

In our previous empirical study of phytoplankton dynamics (Barraquand et al, 2018), we did not find any storage effect. This does not mean that it could not be observed in other planktonic systems: we studied a coastal ecosystem and focused a specific fraction of phytoplankton: relatively large diatoms and dinoflagellates. However, given the consequences of the storage effect for species richness and composition presented here, we are skeptical that the storage effect could, by itself, fully explain phytoplankton diversity at any location. Our results suggest that

382 in phytoplankton-like seasonal environments, empirically-tuned self-regulation produces much  
383 more diversity than the storage effect, when both are considered in isolation. The storage effect  
384 may therefore help phytoplankton diversity maintenance, but only when combined to other  
385 mechanisms. This is all the more likely that in our models, the combination storage effect  
386 + strong self-regulation is non-additive: the cases where both self-regulation and the storage  
387 effect were present showed more diversity than generated by any mechanism on its own.

388 The above results suggest the very exciting idea that multiple coexistence mechanisms might  
389 combine superadditively to determine the richness of the community, thus helping us to better  
390 understand the astounding diversity of primary producers. This logic could, in principle, be  
391 extended to mechanisms that we have not considered here (e.g., spatial structure, specialized  
392 natural enemies, that could be as important here for plankton as they are for tropical trees, see  
393 Bagchi et al, 2014; Comita et al, 2014; Barraquand et al, 2018). Superadditivity, i.e. the posi-  
394 tive effect of interactions between mechanisms can be measured either on community diversity,  
395 as we did here, or on the invasion growth rates (Ellner et al, 2019). Using the latter metric,  
396 previous research has however demonstrated that generalist seed predation could weaken the  
397 storage effect (Kuang and Chesson, 2009, 2010) thus different mechanisms might not always  
398 combine superadditively as we found here. That said, superadditivity has been found in some  
399 cases, i.e., pathogens could enhance the storage effect and broaden the conditions in which  
400 species could coexist (Mordecai, 2015). Better explaining plant or microbial diversity would  
401 then not be about selecting the best unique mechanism susceptible to explain the observed  
402 diversity, but rather better combining those mechanisms together. This may obviously be  
403 an annoyance for those who like to sharpen Occam’s razor, but it clearly holds opportunities  
404 for theoreticians wishing to investigate synergies between coexistence mechanisms in highly  
405 diverse communities. Aside from the synergies between predator diversity-enhancing effects,  
406 strong self-regulation through various means and the storage effect (on the temporal axis), one  
407 obvious follow-up of this research would be interactions with spatial structure. Spatial struc-  
408 ture occurs both endogeneously, through spatially restricted movements and interactions, and  
409 exogeneously, through spatial variation in environmental covariates (Bolker, 2003). Numer-  
410 ous studies (e.g., Bolker and Pacala, 1999; Murrell and Law, 2002) have shown that spatially  
411 restricted movements and interactions - very small-scale spatial structure - can help coexis-

tence, which we believe would be especially important for phytoplankton since many species form colonies (Reynolds, 2006; see discussion in Barraquand et al, 2018). Moreover, although temperature is usually relatively spatially homogeneous over space, other drivers (e.g., rainfall, pH in terrestrial ecosystems; salinity in aquatic ones) may exhibit spatial variation which is a main factor for coexistence (Snyder, 2008). The odds that different (resource) niches, natural enemies, spatial limits to competition and temporal niche partitioning all interact to promote the very high-dimensional coexistence observed in the field seem much higher than for any of those mechanisms alone. Whether the diversity-enhancing effects of these mechanisms combine subadditively (as in Kuang and Chesson, 2010) or superadditively like here is therefore worthy of further research.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Alix Sauve for thoughtful comments and some bibliographic references. We are very grateful to György Barabás and an anonymous referee for their constructive feedback. This study was supported by the French ANR through LabEx COTE (ANR-10-LABX-45).

## References

- Abrams PA (1976) Niche overlap and environmental variability. *Mathematical Biosciences* 28(3):357–372, doi:10.1016/0025-5564(76)90133-4
- Adler PB, Ellner SP, Levine JM (2010) Coexistence of perennial plants: an embarrassment of niches. *Ecology letters* 13(8):1019–1029, doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01496.x
- Adler PB, Smull D, Beard KH, Choi RT, Furniss T, Kulmatiski A, Meiners JM, Tredennick AT, Veblen KE (2018) Competition and coexistence in plant communities: intraspecific competition is stronger than interspecific competition. *Ecology Letters* 21(9):1319–1329, doi:10.1111/ele.13098
- Armstrong R, McGehee R (1980) Competitive Exclusion. *American Naturalist* 115(2):151–170, doi:10.1086/283553

437 Ashby B, Watkins E, Lourenço J, Gupta S, Foster KR (2017) Competing species leave many  
438 potential niches unfilled. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1(10):1495–1501, doi:10.1038/s41559-  
439 017-0295-3

440 Bagchi R, Gallery RE, Gripenberg S, Gurr SJ, Narayan L, Addis CE, Freckleton RP, Lewis  
441 OT (2014) Pathogens and insect herbivores drive rainforest plant diversity and composition.  
442 *Nature* 506(7486):85–88, doi:10.1038/nature12911

443 Barabás G, Meszéna G, Ostling A (2012) Community robustness and limiting similarity in  
444 periodic environments. *Theoretical Ecology* 5(2):265–282, doi:10.1007/s12080-011-0127-z

445 Barabás G, D’Andrea R, Rael R, Meszéna G, Ostling A (2013) Emergent neutrality or hidden  
446 niches? *Oikos* 122(11):1565–1572, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2013.00298.x

447 Barabás G, Michalska-Smith MJ, Allesina S (2017) Self-regulation and the stability of large  
448 ecological networks. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1(12):1870–1875, doi:10.1038/s41559-017-  
449 0357-6

450 Barraquand F, Picoche C, Maurer D, Carassou L, Auby I (2018) Coastal phytoplankton com-  
451 munity dynamics and coexistence driven by intragroup density-dependence, light and hydro-  
452 dynamics. *Oikos* 127(12):1834–1852, doi:10.1111/oik.05361

453 Bolker B, Pacala S (1999) Spatial moment equations for plant competition: understanding  
454 spatial strategies and the advantages of short dispersal. *The American Naturalist* 153(6):575–  
455 602, doi:10.1086/303199

456 Bolker BM (2003) Combining endogenous and exogenous spatial variability in analyti-  
457 cal population models. *Theoretical Population Biology* 64(3):255–270, doi:10.1016/S0040-  
458 5809(03)00090-X

459 Boyce DG, Petrie B, Frank KT, Worm B, Leggett WC (2017) Environmental structuring of  
460 marine plankton phenology. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 1:1484–1494, doi:10.1038/s41559-  
461 017-0287-3

462 Carmel Y, Suprunenko YF, Kunin WE, Kent R, Belmaker J, Bar-Massada A, Cornell SJ

463 (2017) Using exclusion rate to unify niche and neutral perspectives on coexistence. *Oikos*  
 464 126(10):1451–1458, doi:10.1111/oik.04380

465 Chesson P (1994) Multispecies Competition in Variable Environments. *Theoretical Population*  
 466 *Biology* 45:227–276, doi:10.1006/tpbi.1994.1013

467 Chesson P (2000) Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual review of Ecology*  
 468 *and Systematics* 31:343–366, doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.343

469 Chesson P (2018) Updates on mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Journal of Ecol-*  
 470 *ogy* 106(5):1773–1794, doi:10.1111/1365-2745.13035

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

473 Comita LS, Queenborough SA, Murphy SJ, Eck JL, Xu K, Krishnadas M, Beckman N, Zhu Y  
 474 (2014) Testing predictions of the Janzen-Connell hypothesis: a meta-analysis of experimental  
 475 evidence for distance- and density-dependent seed and seedling survival. *Journal of Ecology*  
 476 102(4):845–856, doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12232

477 Dakos V, Benincà E, van Nes EH, Philippart CJM, Scheffer M, Huisman J (2009) Interannual  
 478 variability in species composition explained as seasonally entrained chaos. *Proceedings of the*  
 479 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 276(1669):2871–2880, doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.0584

480 D’Andrea R, Ostling A (2016) Challenges in linking trait patterns to niche differentiation. *Oikos*  
 481 125(10):1369–1385, doi:10.1111/oik.02979

482 D’Andrea R, Ostling A, O’Dwyer J (2018) Translucent windows: how uncertainty in competi-  
 483 tive interactions impacts detection of community pattern. *Ecology Letters* 21(6):826–835,  
 484 doi:10.1111/ele.12946

485 D’Andrea R, Riolo M, Ostling A (2019) Generalizing clusters of similar species as a sig-  
 486 nature of coexistence under competition. *PLOS Computational Biology* 15(1):e1006688,  
 487 doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006688

488 Descamps-Julien B, Gonzalez A (2005) Stable coexistence in a fluctuating environment: an  
 489 experimental demonstration. *Ecology* 86(10):2815–2824, doi:10.1890/04-1700

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

492 Ellner SP, Snyder RE, Adler PB, Hooker G (2019) An expanded modern coexistence theory for  
493 empirical applications. *Ecology Letters* 22(1):3–18, doi:10.1111/ele.13159

494 Fox JW (2013) The intermediate disturbance hypothesis should be abandoned. *Trends in Ecol-  
495 ogy & Evolution* 28(2):86–92, doi:10.1016/j.tree.2012.08.014

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

499 Hastings A, Abbott KC, Cuddington K, Francis T, Gellner G, Lai YC, Morozov A, Petrovskii S,  
500 Scranton K, Zeeman ML (2018) Transient phenomena in ecology. *Science* 361(6406):eaat6412,  
501 doi:10.1126/science.aat6412

502 Haydon D (1994) Pivotal assumptions determining the relationship between stability and com-  
503 plexity: an analytical synthesis of the stability-complexity debate. *The American Naturalist*  
504 144(1):14–29, doi:10.1086/285658

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

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

509 Huisman J, Johansson AM, Folmer EO, Weissing FJ (2001) Towards a solution of the plank-  
510 ton paradox: the importance of physiology and life history. *Ecology Letters* 4(5):408–411,  
511 doi:10.1046/j.1461-0248.2001.00256.x

512 Hutchinson GE (1961) The paradox of the plankton. *The American Naturalist* 95(882):137–145,  
513 doi:10.1086/282171

514 Jabot F, Lohier T (2016) Non-random correlation of species dynamics in tropical tree commu-  
515 nities. *Oikos* 125(12):1733–1742, doi:10.1111/oik.03103

516 Jiang L, Morin PJ (2007) Temperature fluctuation facilitates coexistence of competing  
517 species in experimental microbial communities. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 76(4):660–668,  
518 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2007.01252.x

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

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

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

526 Kuang JJ, Chesson P (2010) Interacting coexistence mechanisms in annual plant communi-  
527 ties: frequency-dependent predation and the storage effect. *Theoretical population biology*  
528 77(1):56–70, doi:10.1016/j.tpb.2009.11.002

529 Li L, Chesson P (2016) The effects of dynamical rates on species coexistence in a variable  
530 environment: the paradox of the plankton revisited. *The American Naturalist* 188(2):E46–  
531 E58, doi:10.1086/687111

532 Litchman E, Klausmeier CA (2001) Competition of phytoplankton under fluctuating light. *The*  
533 *American Naturalist* 157(2):170–187, doi:10.1086/318628

534 Loranger J, Munoz F, Shipley B, Violle C (2018) What makes trait-abundance relationships  
535 when both environmental filtering and stochastic neutral dynamics are at play? *Oikos*  
536 127:1735–1745, doi:10.1111/oik.05398

537 Miller ET, Klausmeier CA (2017) Evolutionary stability of coexistence due to the storage effect  
538 in a two-season model. *Theoretical Ecology* 10(1):91–103, doi:10.1007/s12080-016-0314-z

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



542 Mordecai EA (2015) Pathogen impacts on plant diversity in variable environments. *Oikos*  
543 124(4):414–420, doi:10.1111/oik.01328

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

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

548 Pigolotti S, López C, Hernández-García E, Andersen K (2010) How Gaussian competi-  
549 tion leads to lumpy or uniform species distributions. *Theoretical Ecology* 3(2):89–96,  
550 doi:10.1007/s12080-009-0056-2

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

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

555 Ruokolainen L, Lindén A, Kaitala V, Fowler M (2009) Ecological and evolutionary dynam-  
556 ics under coloured environmental variation. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 24(10):555–563,  
557 doi:10.1016/j.tree.2009.04.009

558 Sakavara A, Tsirtsis G, Roelke DL, Mancy R, Spatharis S (2018) Lumpy species coexistence  
559 arises robustly in fluctuating resource environments. *Proceedings of the National Academy*  
560 *of Sciences* 115(4):738–743, doi:10.1073/pnas.1705944115

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

564 Scheffer M, Rinaldi S, Kuznetsov Y, van Nes E (1997) Seasonal dynamics of *Daph-*  
565 *nia* and algae explained as a periodically forced predator-prey system. *Oikos* 80(3):519,  
566 doi:10.2307/3546625

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

570 Segura AM, Calliari D, Kruk C, Conde D, Bonilla S, Fort H (2011) Emergent neutrality drives  
571 phytoplankton species coexistence. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*  
572 278(1716):2355–2361, doi:10.1098/rspb.2010.2464

573 Segura AM, Kruk C, Calliari D, García-Rodríguez F, Conde D, Widdicombe CE, Fort H (2013)  
574 Competition drives clumpy species coexistence in estuarine phytoplankton. *Scientific Reports*  
575 3:1037, doi:10.1038/srep01037

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

578 Sommer U (1984) The paradox of the plankton: Fluctuations of phosphorus availability  
579 maintain diversity of phytoplankton in flow-through cultures. *Limnology and Oceanography*  
580 29(3):633–636, doi:10.4319/lo.1984.29.3.0633

581 Stump SM (2017) Multispecies coexistence without diffuse competition; or, why phylogenetic  
582 signal and trait clustering weaken coexistence. *The American Naturalist* 190(2):213–228,  
583 doi:10.1086/692470

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

587 Tyson R, Lutscher F (2016) Seasonally varying predation behavior and climate shifts  
588 are predicted to affect predator-prey cycles. *The American Naturalist* 188(5):539–553,  
589 doi:10.1086/688665

590 Vasseur DA, Yodzis P (2004) The color of environmental noise. *Ecology* 85(4):1146–1152,  
591 doi:10.1890/02-3122

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

- 594 Winder M, Cloern JE (2010) The annual cycles of phytoplankton biomass. Philosoph-  
595 ical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 365(1555):3215–3226,  
596 doi:10.1098/rstb.2010.0125
- 597 Wootton JT, Emmerson M (2005) Measurement of interaction strength in na-  
598 ture. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 36(1):419–444,  
599 doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.091704.175535
- 600 Zhao XQ (1991) The qualitative analysis of n-species Lotka-Volterra periodic competition sys-  
601 tems. Mathematical and Computer Modelling 15(11):3–8, doi:10.1016/0895-7177(91)90100-L