

Genotypic variation in a foundation tree drives ecological network structure

Matthew K. Lau^{1,2,*}, Louis J. Lamit², Rikke R. Naesbourg³, Stuart R. Borrett⁴, Matthew A. Bowker⁵, and Thomas G. Whitham¹

¹Department of Biological Sciences and Merriam-Powell Center for Environmental Research, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA

²Harvard Forest, Harvard University, 324 N Main St, Petersham, MA 01366, USA

³University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

⁴Department of Biology and Marine Biology, University of North Carolina Wilmington, 601 South College Road, Wilmington, NC, 28403, USA

⁵School of Forestry, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011, USA

*matthewklau@fas.harvard.edu

ABSTRACT

Biological evolution occurs in the context of complex networks of interacting species in which natural selection defines the structure of ecological networks. Fundamental to this evolutionary process is the discovery of a genetic basis to ecological network structure. Although previous work has demonstrated that tree genotype contributes to interaction network structure at the scale of forest stands, the contribution of tree genetics to localized interaction networks at the scale of individual trees has not yet been explored. To test the degree to which tree genetics can contribute to network structure across scales from trees to stands, we conducted quantitative modeling of interaction network for a community of epiphytic lichens in a long-term experimental common garden of genotyped trees of a foundation species (*Populus angustifolia*). We found three main results: 1) Tree genotype strongly contributed to network structure explaining over a third of the variation in lichen interaction networks, 2) Multiple aspects of interaction network structure varied in response to genotype, including network size, the number of interactions, linkage density and connectance, 3) At the stand scale, we also found significant modular structure of plant-lichen networks resulting in part from the combination of trees of the same genotype tending to have similar community compositions and supporting similar lichen interaction networks dominated by positive interactions. These results support the hypothesis that variation in ecological interaction networks can result from genetically based variation in foundation species. Although these results are for a community of sessile organisms in close proximity to the tree, this study opens the possibility for a genetic basis to both direct and indirect interactions among species in complex communities.

1 Introduction

2 Methods

3 Field observations in common garden and natural riparian forest stands

4 The study was conducted along the Weber River, UT (USA), which is a cottonwood (*Populus* spp.) dominated riparian
5 ecosystem. Although two native species, *Populus angustifolia* (James) and *Populus fremontii* (S. Watson), occur here and are
6 known to hybridize, only pure or advanced generation backcrosses of *P. angustifolia* were sampled in order to avoid the effect
7 of the hybridization between these two species.

8 A common garden was used to isolate the effect of tree genotype from the effect of the localized microenvironment associated
9 with each individual and spatial autocorrelation. Asexually propagated clones of genotyped *P. angustifolia* individuals were
10 obtained from wild collections and planted randomly in a single field (0.025 km²) at the Ogden Nature Center, Ogden, UT in
11 1992. A total of thirteen genotypes replicated between 3 and 8 times each, were chosen for sampling. Genotype names were
12 previously published². Observations were made in the common garden in October 2010 and May 2011.

13 Results

	Df	SumsOfSqs	MeanSqs	F.Model	R2	Pr(>F)
onc.geno	12.00000	163.74158	13.64513	1.87165	0.33795	0.04100
Residuals	44.00000	320.77902	7.29043		0.66205	
Total	56.00000	484.52060			1.00000	

Table 1. Pseudo-F Table for the perMANOVA test of genotype effect on lichen network similarity.

14 Network Response to Tree Variation

15 Genetic Structure Generates Forest Scale Network Structure




Figure 1. Lichen interaction networks were constructed by conducting field observations in 1 cm² cells within a 10 cm² grid on each tree using a checkerboard pattern (grey cells). Thus, a set of N total cell observations were recorded for each tree with the presence or absence of each species recorded for each cell. Applying a null-model based procedure¹, we calculated and removed non-significant ($\alpha = 0.05$) co-occurrences to produce the network associated with an individual tree.




Figure 2. Significant lichen interaction network structure resulting from tree genotypic variation was observed in the common garden. A) A network diagram showing significant interactions averaged over all trees shown as edges connecting lichen species shown as vertices. B) Genotype centroids (points) of NMDS ordinated lichen networks (± 1 S.E.). Arrows show the magnitude and direction of correlation of the ordinated networks with tree bark roughness (R), network connectance and lichen species abundances (Xg = *Xanthomendoza galericulata*, Xm = *X. montana*, Ch = *Caloplaca holocarpa*, Cs = *Candelariella subdeflexa*, Rs = *Rinodina* (unknown species), Ls = *Lecanora* (unknown species), Pm = *Phyciella melanchra*, Pa = *Phycia adscendens*, Pu = *Phycia undulata*).




Figure 3. Connectance significantly varied among genotypes.

16 Discussion

17 References

- 18 1. Araújo, M. B., Rozenfeld, A., Rahbek, C. & Marquet, P. A. Using species co-occurrence networks to assess the impacts of cli-
19 mate change. *Ecography (Cop.)*. **34**, 897–908 (2011). URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2011.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2011.06919.x)
20 [06919.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2011.06919.x) DOI 10.1111/j.1600-
21 0587.2011.06919.x.

22 Acknowledgments

23 This work was supported by the National Science Foundation grant (DEB-0425908) and Integrative Graduate Research
24 Traineeship (IGERT) fellowships for M.L. and L.L. The Ogden Nature Center staff helped to maintain the common gardens.
25 Lichen sampling was supported by Todd Wojtowicz, Luke Evans and David Solance Smith.

26 Author contributions statement

27 M.L. and L.L. conceived the study, M.L. and L.L. conducted the field work, R.N. assisted in lichen identifications, M.L. wrote
28 the first draft of the manuscript, S.B. and T.W. contributed substantively to the conceptual development, T.W. established the
29 common garden. All authors contributed to revisions of the manuscript.

30 Additional information