Ecosystem size mediates the effects of resource flows on biodiversity and ecosystem function at different scales.
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**Abstract**

Ecosystem size and resource flows are key factors driving biodiversity and ecosystem function. However, whether and how ecosystem size and resource flows interact to affect biodiversity and ecosystem function has been largely overlooked. Here, we investigated how ecosystem size asymmetry affects biodiversity and function of two-patch meta-ecosystems connected through flows of non-living resources. We conducted a microcosm experiment, mimicking resource flows between ecosystems of different sizes, yet otherwise being identical, or between ecosystem of same sizes. We found that meta-ecosystems with asymmetric ecosystem sizes had higher α- diversity but lower β-diversity and ecosystem function (total biomass) than their unconnected counterparts, while such an effect was not found for meta-ecosystems of identical patch sizes. Our work demonstrates of how cross-ecosystem dynamics modulated by differences in patch sizes affect biodiversity and function, with a direct implication for conservation and management of connected ecosystems.
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**Introduction**

Ecosystem size is a key factor driving biodiversity. Ecologists have known for a long time that larger ecosystems harbour more biodiversity than smaller ecosystems (species-area relationship; MacArthur & Wilson (1963)). The concept dates back to the late 1700s during the second Pacific voyage of James Cook. There, naturalists Johann Reinhold Forster and Georg Forster noted 'Islands only produce a greater or less number of species, as their circumference is more or less extensive'(Forster, 1778), which has been empirically and experimentally corroborated many times since (e.g., Fukami, 2004; Losos & Ricklefs, 2009; Wilson, 1961). The various reasons why larger ecosystems harbour more biodiversity is still an ongoing field of research (Losos & Ricklefs, 2009) and the individual roles of different processes (e.g., speciation, dispersion) contributing to this pattern are still debated (e.g., Valente et al., 2020). The main explanation for the phenomenon has been that species go extinct at lower rates in larger ecosystems (MacArthur & Wilson, 1963, 1967), as they have more habitat types (Kallimanis et al., 2008; Williams, 1943), more niche diversity (e.g., Ren et al., 2022), and less ecological drift (e.g., Gilbert & Levine, 2017), with extensive theoretical, comparative, and experimental extensions (e.g., Hanski & Ovaskainen, 2000; Luo et al., 2022; Wang & Altermatt, 2019). Furthermore, ecosystem size can also change ecosystem function (LeCraw et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2021). For example, larger ecosystems can be more productive because they have community compositions which allows them to use resources more efficiently (complementarity effects) (Delong & Gibert, 2019).

Furthermore, ecosystems are rarely isolated in space, and spatial flows and subsidies of non-living resources among ecosystems (e.g., leaf litter, carcasses, inorganic nutrients; herein, "resource flows"; see Gounand et al., 2018 for a review) are—next to ecosystem size—a key abiotic factor affecting biodiversity and ecosystem function. For example, salmon carcasses transported from rivers to land by wolves and bears can decrease riparian plant biodiversity by making communities dominated by nutrient-rich species (Hocking & Reynolds, 2011). Other examples show that subsidies from marine algal wrack can either increase or decrease plant biodiversity, on sand dunes (Del Vecchio et al., 2017) or rainforests on tiny islands (Obrist et al., 2022), respectively. As another example, aquatic insects can increase the function (production) of riparian birds which feed on them (Nakano & Murakami, 2001). Likewise, meta-ecosystem theory predicts that resource flows can affect biodiversity by modifying species interactions and persistence (Gravel, Mouquet, et al., 2010; Marleau et al., 2014; Peller et al., 2022). For example, resource flows can delay competitive exclusion by increasing local available resources (Gounand et al., 2017) or instead prevent the local establishment of dispersing species by increasing the abundance of the resident competitors (Gravel, Mouquet, et al., 2010). Furthermore, resource flows should increase meta-ecosystem production if they transport resources from ecosystems that are good at producing biomass to ecosystems that are good at transforming non-living resources into consumers (Harvey et al., 2023). However, despite recognition that both ecosystem size and resource flows can affect biodiversity and ecosystem function, their interactive effect has largely been overlooked.

Ecosystem size can influence the amount and effect of resource flows. For example, the size of a body of water regulates the amount of resources it exports : the larger a lake or a river, the more insects emerge from it per metre of reach (Gratton & Vander Zanden, 2009), while the size of the receiving watershed would determine the effects of aquatic resource import: for instance, the larger a watershed, the more diluted its fertilisation from salmon carcasses (Hocking & Reimchen, 2009). As resource flows can influence biodiversity and ecosystem function, while also ecosystem size can influence resource flows, the hypothesis that ecosystem size can influence biodiversity and ecosystem function through resource flows emerges as a generic and natural phenomenon.

Here, we tested if and how ecosystem size mediates the influence of resource flows on biodiversity and ecosystem function using a protist microcosm experiment (Altermatt et al., 2015; Benton et al., 2007; Cadotte & Fukami, 2005). We constructed two-patch meta-ecosystems connected by resources flows between ecosystems following disturbance (we use “patch” as a synonym for “ecosystem”). We compared biodiversity in two-patch meta-ecosystems where we manipulated the relative size of local ecosystems (symmetric vs asymmetric sizes) while keeping constant total meta-ecosystem size. We found that ecosystem size asymmetry significantly influences biodiversity and ecosystem function through resource flows. Resource flows in meta-ecosystems with asymmetric ecosystem sizes increased their α-diversity and decreased their β- diversity and ecosystem function (total biomass). Contrastingly, resource flows had no effect on either α-diversity, β-diversity, or ecosystem function in meta-ecosystems with symmetric ecosystem sizes.

**Materials and methods**

*Experimental design*

We studied how asymmetry in ecosystem size mediates the effect of resource flows on biodiversity and ecosystem function in meta-ecosystems via a microcosm experiment containing an aquatic protist community (Altermatt et al., 2015). Specifically, we compared two-patch meta-ecosystems with either symmetric or asymmetric sizes (yet identical total size) either connected by non-living resource flows or unconnected (see Fig. 1). All replicates started with identical initial communities. We evaluated the resource flows effect by comparing connected systems with pairs of unconnected ecosystems of the same size and symmetry properties (controls; referred to as unconnected meta-ecosystems). Meta-ecosystems were of identical total size (volume: 45 ml), with symmetric meta-ecosystems being composed of two identical sized patches (each 22.5 ml), while asymmetric meta-ecosystems being composed of a 7.5 ml and a 37.5 ml patch, respectively. Symmetric and asymmetric meta-ecosystems are called MMMM and SLLs, respectively, with S, M, L referring to Small (7.5 ml), Medium (22.5 ml), and Large (37.5 ml) ecosystems, respectively, and subscripts referring to the size of the connected ecosystem. Respective unconnected controls of the resource effect are referred to as MM and SL (without subscripts).

To understand the effects of the size of the connected ecosystem, we also established two control meta-ecosystems connecting two small ecosystems (SSSS) and two large ecosystems (LLLL), respectively (see Fig. 1). To understand what the effect of the size of the connected ecosystem was, we compared local ecosystems that were connected to either small or large ecosystems. We did this by comparing SL with SS and LS with LL. All above combinations were replicated five-fold.

*Experimental setup*

Our initial communities consisted of eight heterotrophic ciliates (*Blepharisma* sp., *Colpidium* sp., *Loxocephalus* sp., *Paramecium aurelia*, *Paramecium caudatum*, *Spirostomum* sp., *Spirostomum teres*, and *Tetrahymena cf. pyriformis*), two mixotrophic ciliates able to photosynthesise (*Euglena gracilis* and *Euplotes aediculatus*), and one rotifer (*Cephalodella* sp.), subsequently all referred to as “protists”. We cultured protists in autoclaved bottles with standard protist medium (0.46 g of Protozoa Pellet by Carolina per L of water) and a bacterial mix (*Serratia fonticola*, *Bacillus subtilis*, and *Brevibacillus brevis*) serving as food for protists and constituting 5 % of the total culture volume. See Altermatt et al. (2015) for further details and protocols.

At the start of the experiment (day zero), we established a master-mix of the protist community consisting of all 11 species mixed at 1/11 of their carrying capacity and supplemented with standard protist medium (15 % of the volume). The experiment was conducted in 50 ml centrifuge tubes, with each tube representing an ecosystem. We pipetted 7.5 ml, 22.5 ml, and 37.5 ml of the master-mix to constitute the small, medium, and large ecosystems, respectively. The replicates were randomised in position and kept in an incubator at 20 °C with constant lighting for the remainder of the experiment.

*Disturbances and* non-living *resource flows*

Because it is logistically difficult to separate living species from non-living resources, spatial flows were associated with disturbances, whose mortality effect was controlled in the unconnected ecosystems. More specifically, every four days (starting on day five) we boiled a fixed volume of the community of each ecosystem for 30 seconds to turn every organism into non-living resources (i.e., local disturbance). We investigated whether resource flows level affect our results by considering two levels of disturbances, either boiling 5.25 ml of each ecosystem (low disturbance) or boiling 6.75 ml (high disturbance), which represented 70 % and 90 % of a small ecosystem, 23.3 % and 30 % of a medium ecosystem, and 14 % and 18 % of a large ecosystem, respectively in the low and high disturbance treatments. After boiling the sampled volumes in a microwave, we subsequently let them cool down to room-temperature, and then poured them to the connected recipient ecosystems, creating bidirectional resource flows. In the unconnected controls, the same volume was disturbed, but poured back to the originating ecosystem to control for the mortality associated with cross-ecosystem resource flows. As resource flow effects on biodiversity were mediate by patch size on both low and high disturbance, but ecosystem function only at high disturbance, we here focus on the results of the high disturbance level yet give the results for the low disturbance level in Appendix S3. Throughout the experiment, the total volume of the ecosystems was held constant by compensating evaporation loss with deionised water (see Appendix S1).

*Sampling*

To determine the abundance, species identity, biomass, and traits of protists in each ecosystem, we took videos of 0.2 ml samples from each ecosystem every four days, starting at day zero. While the first two time points (day 0 and 4) took place before the first disturbance, all other time points were always taken three days after the disturbance to leave communities recover as much as possible from disturbances. We took a 5 s video of each sample at 1.6x magnification, using Hamamatsu Orca Flash 4.0 (Herrsching am Ammersee, Germany) camera. At the last two time points (days 24 and 28), we took two samples per ecosystem to reduce the sampling error and increase chances of detecting individuals at low densities (each metric was averaged across the two samples). We also took videos of all protist monocultures to construct a training dataset of each species’ traits for species identification. We took sufficient videos of each monoculture to capture at least 100 individuals of each species.

*Quantifying biomass and biodiversity*

We used the R-package BEMOVI to identify and characterise protist species in the communities (Altermatt et al., 2015; Pennekamp et al., 2015; Pennekamp & Schtickzelle, 2013). We first extracted moving particles' traits (e.g., speed, shape, size) in the videos, and used these traits to filter out particles that were not protists and obtain an average abundance of protist individuals per volume. We also measured as a proxy for ecosystem function protist biomass. The total area of protists (as area per volume medium), and subsequently used this “bioarea” as a proxy of biomass (hereafter referred to as “biomass”), which is a fair assumption given the roundish shape of protists. We then identified protist species using a support vector machine model (Cortes et al., 1995; r-package “e1071”: Dimitriadou et al., 2006) that employed traits extracted from species monocultures as predictor variables. Last, we calculated local biodiversity (α-diversity) using the Shannon Index (Shannon, 1948). At the meta-ecosystem scale, we calculated biodiversity through (i) mean local diversity (mean α-diversity) as Shannon Index averaged across ecosystems, (ii) among-community diversity (β- diversity) as the Bray-Curtis index (Bray & Curtis, 1957), and (iii) total biodiversity (γ- diversity) as the total number of species persisting at the meta-ecosystem level.

*Statistical analysis*

To understand the effects of resource flows on biodiversity over time in symmetric and asymmetric meta-ecosystems, we performed statistical analysis using mixed-effect models with the 'lme4' package in R (Bates et al., 2015). The analysis excluded the initial two time points preceding the disturbances (grey zones in all figures), as their inclusion would interfere with our understanding of the impact of disturbances and resource flows.

At the meta-ecosystem level, to examine resource flows effects, we compared SLLS to SL and MMMM to MM. SL and MM were virtual meta-ecosystems created from unconnected ecosystems that is, pairing two ecosystems to calculate the diversity and total biomass (yet without having these ecosystems connected by flows of resources). We constructed these virtual control meta-ecosystems by creating all possible pairs (without replacement) of unconnected ecosystems (25 SL pairs and 10 MM pairs). To test the influence of the resource flow connection on a response variable (α-, β-, γ- diversity, total biomass), we examined the effects of the resource flow connection and its interaction with time by comparing a full model (including the predictor variable interacting with time as a fixed effect) to a null model (including only time as a fixed effect) using ANOVA. Significant results indicated that the predictor variable interacted with time to affect the response variable. Similarly, we assessed the influence of the predictor variable alone (without its interaction with time) by comparing with ANOVA a reduced model (including the predictor variable and time as fixed effects) with the null model. Significant results indicated that the predictor variable affected the response variable without interacting with time. In the full, reduced, and null models, random effects considered the impact of replicates on the correlated intercept and the slope of the relationship between the response variable and time. For each of comparisons, we performed multiple comparisons iteratively, resulting in a distribution of p-values. Each iteration involved unconnected meta-ecosystems with differently paired ecosystems (without resampling). The presented p-values are the means of their respective distributions. See Tables S1 for the p values associated with meta-ecosystem models.

At the local level, to examine resource flow effects, we investigated whether the size of the connected ecosystem influenced resource flows effects–comparing SL to SS and LS to LL–and whether resource flows had an effect when happening between ecosystems of the same size–comparing SS to S, MM to M, and LL to L. To test the influence of the resource flow connection or size on a response variable (Shannon Index, biomass). We made the same model comparisons as at the meta-ecosystem level (but without iterations). See Tables S2 for the p values associated with ecosystem models.

**Results**

At the meta-ecosystem level, resource flows increased mean α-diversity, decreased β- diversity, and decreased total biomass in meta-ecosystems with asymmetric patch sizes (SLLS; Fig. 2 purple solid versus dashed lines) but not in meta-ecosystems with identical (symmetric) patch sizes (MMMM; Fig. 2 green solid versus dashed lines). SLLS had a higher mean α-diversity (p = 0.019), lower β-diversity (p = 0.012), and lower total biomass (p = 0.003) compared to SL unconnected meta-ecosystems (purple lines in Fig. 2a, 2b, 2d respectively). MMMM had the same mean α- and β-diversity , as well as total biomass (green lines in Fig. 2a, 2b, and 2d, respectively, p > 0.1), compared to MM pairs. Resource flows did not influence γ-diversity in either asymmetric or symmetric meta-ecosystems, as SLLS had the same γ-diversity as SL pairs (purple lines in Fig. 2c, p > 0.1) and MMMM had the same γ-diversity as MM pairs (green lines in Fig. 2c, p > 0.1).

At the local level, small ecosystems that were connected to large ecosystems had higher diversity (Shannon Index) (solid vs dotted brown lines in Fig. 3a, p = 0.002) and biomass (solid vs dotted brown lines in Fig. 3b, p = 0.019, connection interacted with time) than when unconnected (SL vs S). This effect on biodiversity can be broken down into two components. First, the size of the connected ecosystem, as being connected to large ecosystems led to greater biodiversity (solid vs dotted brown lines in Fig. 3a, p = 0.013) (SL vs SS). Second, the presence or absence of the connection, as small ecosystems when connected to other small ecosystems were more diverse (dashed vs dotted brown lines in Fig. 3a, p = 0.012) than when unconnected (SS vs S). We observed a similar but weak (marginally not significant) trend for biomass, as being connected to large led to greater biomass (solid vs dashed brown lines in Fig. 3b, p = 0.060) than when connected to small ecosystems (SL vs SS), as well as being connected to other small ecosystems (dashed vs dotted brown lines in Fig. 3b p = 0.071) instead of being unconnected (SS vs S).

Also at the local level, large ecosystems that were connected to small ecosystems were similar in their biodiversity (solid vs dotted blue lines in Fig. 3a, p > 0.1) but had lower biomass (solid vs dotted blue lines in Fig. 3b, p = 0.001) than when unconnected (LS vs L). For large ecosystems, the connection with small ecosystems decreased their biomass (solid vs dashed blue lines in Fig. 3b, p = 0.036) (LS vs LL). This effect was mediated by the size of the connected ecosystem, as when large ecosystems were connected to other large ecosystems, the effect was not observed (dashed vs dotted blue lines in Fig. 3b, p > 0.01) (LL vs L).

Finally, in medium ecosystems we observed a weak, yet marginally non-significant, trend of resource flows slightly increasing biodiversity (Fig. S8, p = 0.081) and biomass (Fig. S8, p = 0.062) in connected ecosystems compared to if they were unconnected (MM vs M).

**Discussion**

Our microcosm experiment shows that ecosystem size asymmetry can mediate the effects of bidirectional resource flows on biodiversity. Meta-ecosystems with asymmetric ecosystem sizes (SLLS) had more similar communities (lower β-diversity) but maintained higher biodiversity across the two patches (higher mean α-diversity) than asymmetric yet unconnected ecosystems (SL). Notably, these effects were not observed in meta-ecosystems with symmetric ecosystem sizes, indicating a mediating role of ecosystem size. These results could be explained by the connection of the small ecosystem to a larger ecosystemincreasing its biodiversity (SL had greater biodiversity than SS and S). As small and large ecosystems were identical aside from their size (resources, community composition, etc.), the effects of the connection can be attributed to ecosystem size. In contrast, resource flows did not affect biodiversity in large ecosystems (biodiversity was similar between Ls, LL, and L). Ultimately, our study showed that the effects of bidirectional resource flows on biodiversity were mediated by ecosystem size.

To ask Tianna if we should take off this first mechanism, as it could not be present in the low disturbance. Notably, we found resources flowing between ecosystems of different sizes impacting both α- and β-diversity by increasing the biodiversity of the ecosystem in the smaller patch. We could think of three ways small-patch ecosystems may have had more biodiversity. First, resource quantity: via a net import of resources into small ecosystems, as large ecosystems had a greater density of photosynthetic species than small ecosystems (Fig. S9). The total volume, and in principle also the total nutrient levels, of flows was reciprocal and a closed system at the meta-ecosystem scale. However, through differences in community composition, in particular of the autotrophic species, total carbon availability could increase, for example through photosynthesis and slower competitive exclusion dynamics in large system. Consequently, small ecosystems could have imported more newly fixed carbon from large ecosystems than they exported. As large ecosystems had more photosynthetic individuals, they would enrich the system in carbon, creating more photosynthetic biomass, which created more detritus when they were disturbed, and therefore a large resource flow. The import of resources could then have allowed unproductive small ecosystems to sustain more biodiversity as more resources allow more individuals to persist, and therefore promoting greater population abundance of rare species and preventing their extinction (species energy theory, see Wright, 1983). This mechanism would create a source-sink dynamics of resources (Gravel, Guichard, et al., 2010): there is a net movement of newly fixed carbon from large to small ecosystems. Thus, our work would support a growing body of studies which suggest defining sources and sinks based on directions of spatial flows (Loreau et al., 2013). Second, resource diversity: as there is a higher protist diversity in large ecosystems, the corresponding exported detritus might have been more diverse with respect to carbon compounds and biomolecules, potentially creating more niches for protists to coexist in small ecosystems. Third, resource quality: as more protist detritus was moved from large to small ecosystems, large ecosystems were more productive, if the detritus of protists was of higher quality than in other resource forms (e.g., bacterial detritus, inorganic nutrients), it would have sustained a higher growth of individuals and therefore higher biodiversity in the small ecosystem.

To ask Tianna if I should add a paragraph on mechanism causing differences in size to influence ecosystem function.

Our study shows that meta-ecosystems of the same total size, yet differing in local ecosystem size, can differ in their biodiversity and function. Meta-ecosystem ecology shows that resource flows between ecosystems can impact biodiversity (e.g., Gounand et al., 2017; Gravel, Mouquet, et al., 2010; Marleau & Guichard, 2019; Peller et al., 2022) and ecosystem function (e.g., Gounand et al., 2014; Harvey et al., 2023; Marleau et al., 2010). For example, meta-ecosystem theory predicts resource flows can influence persistence of species and the coexistence of competitors (Gounand et al., 2017; Gravel, Mouquet, et al., 2010). Detritus flowing from productive ecosystems could for instance allow the persistence of species in unproductive ecosystems that would otherwise go extinct (Gravel, Mouquet, et al., 2010). Also, for example, resources exchanged between autotrophic and heterotrophic ecosystems can increase or decrease meta-ecosystem productivity, according to whether resource stoichiometry exacerbates or relaxes their limiting nutrients (Pichon et al., 2023). However, meta-ecosystem theory and previous experiments have typically assumed the size of connected ecosystems to be the same (but see Harvey et al., 2018, 2020), thereby ignoring how differences in ecosystem size observed in natural systems (e.g., Fahrig, 2003) may modulate local and meta-ecosystem richness and function through flows of resources. Our results suggest that integrating ecosystem size into meta-ecosystem ecology would help us further our comprehension of how resource flows shape biodiversity. In particular, we suggest that resource flowing into large ecosystems should have a limited influence, whereas meta-ecosystem theory generally predicts effects on all ecosystems.

Our study also shows how the effect of resource flows on a recipient ecosystem’s diversity can be influenced by the size of the donor ecosystem where the resource flows originate. The subsidised island biogeography theory (Anderson & Wait, 2001) states that resources flowing into an ecosystem can influence its biodiversity, making its biodiversity deviate from what we would expect from species-area relationships, especially in small ecosystems. This has been supported by field studies, for instance with resource flows increasing the diversity of bird species more in smaller than in large islands (Obrist et al., 2020). Our results are in line with this finding, showing that resource flows between small ecosystems changed their biodiversity (Ss was more diverse than S), but not between large ecosystems (LL was as diverse as L). However, whether the size of the connected ecosystem influences the effects of resource flows has been overlooked by subsidised island biogeography. Here, we showed that the biodiversity of an ecosystem is greater when connected to a larger ecosystem relative to when connected to an ecosystem of the same size (SL was more diverse than SS). Field studies already support that the size of the connected ecosystem can influence the connected ecosystem. For example, some studies found that larger watersheds can (i) increase lake primary production, as they transport more phosphorus (Knoll et al., 2003), (ii) sustain fewer lake consumers that rely on sediments, as sediments are transported less (lower water flow, gentler slopes, and increased sedimentation) (Babler et al., 2011), and (iii) sustain longer river food chains, as they have more water flow, hence less hydrological variation and therefore a more stable environment (Sabo et al., 2010). Therefore, we suggest that subsidised island biogeography (Anderson & Wait, 2001) should not only study how the size of the focus ecosystems mediates the effects of resources on the shape of species-area relationships but also how the size of the connected ecosystems changes this relationship. For example, we might find that the diversity of macroinvertebrates in a lake might be higher than expected by their size (according to subsidies island biogeography) when the lake is connected to a larger rather than a small forest. These effects could extend to biomass too.

In conclusion, our experiment provides experimental evidence that asymmetry in ecosystem size can indirectly affect biodiversity and function in meta-ecosystems through its effects on resource flows. As resource flows are a common phenomenon, we expect our findings to be of broad relevance. While we demonstrated that ecosystem size mediates the effects of resource flow on the biodiversity and function of ecosystems of the same type, resources are often also flow among ecosystems of different types, which could even aggravate the effect demonstrated. This connection among ecosystems of different types is often overlooked in studies examining the effects of ecosystem size variations on biodiversity, as they focus on the effects of the fragmentation of a single ecosystem type (mainly forests) on biodiversity. Consequently, this could imply that when aiming to conserve the biodiversity of a habitat, it might be necessary to consider how ecosystem size changes resource flow between ecosystems of the same size, as well as resource flows connecting it with ecosystems of different types surrounding it.
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**Figure legends**

Figure 1: We conducted a protist microcosm experiment to study whether differences in ecosystem size can affect biodiversity and function through resource flows. We compared two-patch meta-ecosystems with reciprocal resource flows to unconnected meta-ecosystems without resource flows. Meta-ecosystems were composed either of identical or different individual ecosystem-sizes, yet with total overall identical volume. All ecosystems in the experiment started with the same protist community of 11 species. To create resource flows, a fixed volume (red portion of the ecosystem) of each ecosystem was removed, heated to kill all organisms and release the resources, and either put back to the ecosystem (no resource flows) or reciprocally exchanged between ecosystems (resource flows). Importantly, while the volume disturbed in each ecosystem was equal, the smaller the ecosystem, the higher the percentage of disturbance compared to its overall volume. Consequently, smaller ecosystems experienced greater disturbance compared to larger ecosystems. The meta-ecosystems and unconnected ecosystems treatments were crossed with two levels of disturbance, low and high, and each treatment combination was replicated five times.

Figure 2: Resource flow influenced diversity and ecosystem function in asymmetric meta-ecosystems, but not in symmetric meta-ecosystems. Asymmetric connected meta-ecosystems (SLLS) sustained (a) higher mean α-diversity, (b) lower β-diversity, (c) same γ-diversity, and (d) lower total biomass than asymmetric unconnected meta-ecosystems (SL). For connected meta-ecosystems, dots represent means across replicates. For unconnected meta-ecosystems, dots represent the mean of all possible combinations of unconnected ecosystems assembled as virtual meta-ecosystems with the respective ecosystem size structure. Total (Tot) biomass was calculated as bioarea (mm2). Error bars represent 95 % confidence intervals; vertical grey lines represent disturbance events followed by resource flows. All systems were sampled on the same day. Points were minimally jittered along the x-axis to make the figure clear. Area in grey: time points not considered for analysis, as meta-ecosystems were sampled before the first disturbance and resource flow.

Figure 3: In SLLS, the connection between small and large ecosystems influenced single ecosystems' (a) biodiversity and (b) biomass per volume. In terms of diversity, the connection had only an effect on small ecosystems (SL had greater diversity than SS and S; LS had similar diversity than LL and L). In terms of biomass, the connection increased the biomass of small ecosystems (SL had greater biomass than SS and S) and decreased the biomass of large ecosystems (LS had less biomass than LL and L). Biomass: bioarea per volume (mm2/ml). Dots represent means across replicates; error bars represent 95 % confidence intervals; vertical grey lines represent disturbance events followed by resource flows. All systems were sampled on the same day. Points were minimally jittered along the x-axis to make the figure clear. Area in grey: time points not considered for analysis, as ecosystems were sampled before the first disturbance and resource flow.
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we the volume of ecosystems by replenishing the inevitable losses of volume that occurred through sampling and evaporation. Three

**Appendix S2 Results: High disturbance**
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Figure S1. The connection with another medium ecosystem show only a weak trend to increase (a) biodiversity and (b) biomass per volume. Dots represent means across replicates; error bars represent 95 % confidence intervals; vertical grey lines represent disturbance events followed by resource flows. All systems were sampled on the same day. Points were minimally jittered along the x-axis to make the figure clear. Area in grey: time points not considered for analysis, as ecosystems were sampled before the first disturbance and resource flow.
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Figure S2. Larger ecosystems were denser with autotrophic individuals (p = 0.026, ecosystem size interacted with time). To examine ecosystem size effects on the ratio between autotrophic and heterotrophic individuals, we built a model as when studying the effects of connection in ecosystems, replacing connection with ecosystem size. Dots represent means across replicates; error bars represent 95 % confidence intervals; vertical grey lines represent disturbance events followed by resource flows. All systems were sampled on the same day. Points were minimally jittered along the x-axis to make the figure clear. Area in grey: time points not considered for analysis, as ecosystems were sampled before the first disturbance and resource flow.

**Appendix S3 Results: low disturbance**

At the meta-ecosystem level, resource flows increased mean α-diversity and decreased β- diversity in meta-ecosystems with asymmetric patch sizes (SLLS; Fig. S3 purple solid versus dashed lines), meanwhile it increased total biomass in identical (symmetric) patch sizes (MMMM; Fig. S3 green solid versus dashed lines). SLLS had a higher mean α-diversity (p = 0.002, connection interacted with time), lower β-diversity (p = 0.007, connection interacted with time), same γ-diversity (p > 0.1), and same total biomass (p > 0.1) compared to SL (purple lines in Fig. S3a, S3b, S3c, S3d respectively). MMMM had the same mean α-, β-, and γ-diversity (green lines in Fig. S3a, S3b, and S3c respectively, p > 0.1), but higher total biomass (green lines in Fig. S3d, p = 0.026), compared to MM pairs.

At the local level, small ecosystems that were connected to large ecosystems had higher diversity (Shannon Index) (solid vs dotted brown lines in Fig. S4a, p = 0.001, connection interacted with time) than when unconnected (SL vs S). This effect on biodiversity was due to the size of the connected ecosystem, as being connected to large ecosystems led to greater biodiversity (solid vs dotted brown lines in Fig. S4a, p < 0.001, connection interacted with time) (SL vs SS). The presence or absence of the connection alone had no effect, as small ecosystems when connected to other small ecosystems were as diverse (dotted vs dashed brown lines in Fig. S4a, p > 0.1) than when unconnected (SS vs S).

Furthermore, small ecosystems that were connected to large ecosystems had higher biomass (solid vs dotted brown lines in Fig. S4b, p = 0.004) than when unconnected (SL vs S). This effect on biodiversity was also due to the size of the connected ecosystem, as being connected to large ecosystems led to greater biomass (solid vs dashed brown lines in Fig. S4b, p < 0.001) (SL vs SS). The presence or absence of the connection alone had no effect, as small ecosystems when connected to other small ecosystems had as much biomass (dashed vs dotted brown lines in Fig. S4a, p > 0.1) as when unconnected (SS vs S).

Also at the local level, large ecosystems that were connected to small ecosystems had fewer biodiversity (solid vs dotted blue lines in Fig. S4a, p = 0.048, connection interacted with time) than when unconnected (LS vs L). This might have been due to the presence of the connection itself and not the size of the connected ecosystem, as large ecosystems had the same biodiversity when connected to different patch sizes (solid vs dashed blue lines in Fig. S4b, p > 0.1) (LS vs LL) but there was a weak evidence of being connected to another large ecosystem decreased biodiversity (dashed vs dotted blue lines in Fig. S4b, p = 0.064) (LL vs L). We detected weak evidence for large ecosystems that were connected to small ecosystems to have less biomass (solid vs dotted blue lines in Fig. S4b, p = 0.064) than when unconnected (LS vs L). However, this was not significant. We found no effect of the size of the connected ecosystem on biomass (solid vs dashed blue lines in Fig. S4, p > 0.1) (LS vs LL) and only weak evidence for same size effect (dashed vs dotted blue lines in Fig. S4, p = 0.071, connection interacted with time) (LL vs L).

At the local level as well, in medium ecosystems we observed no effect of connection on biodiversity (dashed vs dotted lines in Fig. S5a, p > 0.1) in connected ecosystems compared to if they were unconnected (MM vs M). However, we observed an increase in biomass when ecosystems were connected (dashed vs dotted lines in Fig. S5b, p = 0.014, connection interacted with time) (MM vs M).

Finally, at the local level the size of the patches had no effect on the ratio between autotrophic and heterotrophic individuals (Fig. S6, p > 0.01).

In conclusion, the results of the low disturbance differed from the ones in the high disturbance as follows:

* At a meta-ecosystem level, resource flow did not decrease meta-ecosystem function in SLLS and increased meta-ecosystem function in MMMM.
* At the local level, in small ecosystems the connection increased biodiversity because of the size of the connected ecosystem.
* At the local level, in large ecosystems, resource flows decreased biodiversity and did not increase biomass.
* At the local level, in medium ecosystems the connection increased biomass.
* At the local level, larger ecosystems did not have more autotrophic individuals.
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Figure S3. Resource flow influenced diversity in asymmetric meta-ecosystems, but not in symmetric meta-ecosystems, and ecosystem function in symmetric meta-ecosystems, but not in asymmetric meta-ecosystems. For connected meta-ecosystems, dots represent means across replicates. For unconnected meta-ecosystems, dots represent the mean of all possible combinations of unconnected ecosystems assembled as virtual meta-ecosystems with the respective ecosystem size structure. Total (Tot) biomass was calculated as bioarea (mm2). Error bars represent 95 % confidence intervals; vertical grey lines represent disturbance events followed by resource flows. All systems were sampled on the same day. Points were minimally jittered along the x-axis to make the figure clear. Area in grey: time points not considered for analysis, as meta-ecosystems were sampled before the first disturbance and resource flow.
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Figure S4. In SLLS, the connection between small and large ecosystems influenced single ecosystems' (a) biodiversity and (b) relative biomass. Biomass: bioarea density (mm2/ml). Dots represent means across replicates; error bars represent 95 % confidence intervals; vertical grey lines represent disturbance events followed by resource flows. All systems were sampled on the same day. Points were minimally jittered along the x-axis to make the figure clear. Area in grey: time points not considered for analysis, as ecosystems were sampled before the first disturbance and resource flow.

A graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of a graph of

Description automatically generated

Figure S5. The connection with another medium ecosystem made medium ecosystems sustain (a) same biodiversity but (b) higher biomass density. Dots represent means across replicates; error bars represent 95 % confidence intervals; vertical grey lines represent disturbance events followed by resource flows. All systems were sampled on the same day. Points were minimally jittered along the x-axis to make the figure clear. Area in grey: time points not considered for analysis, as ecosystems were sampled before the first disturbance and resource flow.
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Figure S6. Larger ecosystems were not denser with autotrophic individuals (p > 0.1). To examine ecosystem size effects on the ratio between autotrophic and heterotrophic individuals, we built a model as when studying the effects of connection in ecosystems, replacing connection with ecosystem size. Dots represent means across replicates; error bars represent 95 % confidence intervals; vertical grey lines represent disturbance events followed by resource flows. All systems were sampled on the same day. Points were minimally jittered along the x-axis to make the figure clear. Area in grey: time points not considered for analysis, as ecosystems were sampled before the first disturbance and resource flow.

**Appendix S4 comparisons p values**

Table S1. P values of the meta-ecosystems mixed effect models. Both the full model and the null model are compared to the null model. In bold the effects that passed a test with significance level below p = 0.05.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Response variable** | **Comparison** | **Full model**  **p (high disturbance)** | **Reduced model p (high disturbance)** | **Full model  p (low disturbance)** | **Reduced model p (low disturbance)** |
| Mean α-diversity  (meta-ecosystem) | SLLS vs SL | .061 | **.019** | **.002** | .483 |
| MMMM vs MM | .225 | .115 | .591 | .788 |
| β-diversity  (meta-ecosystem) | SLLS vs SL | **.027** | **.012** | **.007** | .075 |
| MMMM vs MM | .469 | .333 | .308 | .236 |
| γ-diversity  (meta-ecosystem) | SLLS vs SL | .449 | .318 | .432 | .737 |
| MMMM vs MM | .576 | .620 | .282 | .242 |
| Total biomass  (meta-ecosystem) | SLLS vs SL | **.011** | **.003** | .105 | .264 |
| MMMM vs MM | .167 | .356 | .078 | **0.026** |

Table S2. P values of the ecosystems mixed effect models. Both the full model and the reduced model are compared to the null model. In bold the effects that passed a test with significance level below p = 0.05.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Response variable** | **Comparison** | **Full model**  **p (high disturbance)** | **Reduced model p (high disturbance)** | **Full model  p (low disturbance)** | **Reduced model p (low disturbance)** |
| Shannon Index  (ecosystem) | SL vs S | **.009** | **.002** | **.001** | **.031** |
| SL vs SS | **.045** | **.013** | **< .001** | **.004** |
| Ss vs S | **.040** | **.012** | .907 | .767 |
| MM vs M | .193 | .081 | .578 | .817 |
| LS vs L | .220 | .109 | **.048** | .330 |
| LS vs LL | .271 | .134 | .431 | .932 |
| LL vs L | .887 | .682 | .064 | .068 |
| Biomass  (ecosystem) | SL vs S | **.019** | **.032** | **.012** | **.004** |
| SL vs SS | .060 | .060 | **.001** | **< .001** |
| Ss vs S | .142 | .071 | .778 | .805 |
| MM vs M | .062 | .231 | **.014** | **.003** |
| LS vs L | **.003** | **.001** | .064 | .148 |
| LS vs LL | .085 | **.036** | .685 | .397 |
| LL vs L | .396 | .185 | .071 | .130 |
| Auto/Heterotrophic individuals’ ratio | S vs M vs L | **.026** | .109 | .161 | .291 |