



HAL
open science

La clonalité : un processus majeur de la dynamique spatiale et du fonctionnement des communautés végétales en systèmes prairiaux

Anne-kristel Bittebière

► **To cite this version:**

Anne-kristel Bittebière. La clonalité : un processus majeur de la dynamique spatiale et du fonctionnement des communautés végétales en systèmes prairiaux. Sciences de l'environnement. Université Rennes 1, 2012. Français. NNT: . tel-00725017

HAL Id: tel-00725017

<https://theses.hal.science/tel-00725017>

Submitted on 23 Aug 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



THÈSE / UNIVERSITÉ DE RENNES 1
sous le sceau de l'Université Européenne de Bretagne

pour le grade de
DOCTEUR DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE RENNES 1

Mention : Biologie

Ecole doctorale Vie-Agro-Santé (VAS)

présentée par

Anne-Kristel Bittebiere

Préparée à l'unité de recherche U.M.R. 6553 Écobio
« Écosystèmes, Biodiversité, Évolution »
Observatoire des Sciences de l'Univers de Rennes

**La clonalité : un
processus majeur de
la dynamique spatiale
et du fonctionnement
des communautés
végétales en
systèmes prairiaux**

**Thèse soutenue à Rennes
le 2 Avril 2012**

devant le jury composé de :

Tomáš HERBEN

Professor, Institute of Botany, Academy of Sciences
of the Czech Republic, *Rapporteur*

François GILLET

Professeur, UMR 6249, Université de Franche-
Comté, *Rapporteur*

Deborah GOLDBERG

Professor and Chair, Ecology and Evolutionary
Biology, University of Michigan, *Examineur*

Sara PUIJALON

Chargée de Recherche, UMR 5023, Université de
Lyon 1, *Examineur*

Bernard CLEMENT

Maître de Conférences, UMR 6553, Université de
Rennes 1, *Directeur de thèse*

Cendrine MONY

Maître de Conférences, UMR 6553, Université de
Rennes 1, *Co-directeur de thèse*

LA CLONALITE : UN PROCESSUS MAJEUR DE LA DYNAMIQUE
SPATIALE ET DU FONCTIONNEMENT DES COMMUNAUTES
VEGETALES EN SYSTEMES PRAIRIAUX



CLONAL GROWTH: A MAJOR PROCESS OF PLANT COMMUNITY
SPATIAL DYNAMICS AND FUNCTIONING IN GRASSLAND
SYSTEMS

REMERCIEMENTS

C'est avec émotion que je termine cette thèse en rédigeant ces dernières pages de remerciements. J'ai souvent songé pendant ces trois ans à ce que je pourrais bien dire à toutes les personnes qui ont pu m'aider d'une façon ou d'une autre. Pourtant, je me rends compte aujourd'hui à quel point l'exercice est compliqué. Je voudrais trouver les mots justes pour simplement vous dire à tous « Merci ». Pour moi, ce travail n'est pas seulement le mien, c'est aussi le votre, une thèse c'est avant tout un travail d'équipe.

L'encadrement

En premier lieu, je souhaite remercier Bernard Clément et Cendrine Mony pour m'avoir encadrée pendant ces trois ans. Tous deux ont toujours été très présents et disponibles en toutes circonstances, prêts à m'apporter leur aide aussi bien pour les expérimentations au jardin que pour les analyses de données. Je pense pouvoir affirmer qu'assez peu de doctorants ont eu la chance d'être aussi bien encadrés. Merci à tous les deux de m'avoir fait confiance, j'espère en avoir été digne. Merci Bernard, de m'avoir aidée à déterminer les bouquets d'espèces que j'avais pu ramener du terrain et essayé de m'enseigner votre savoir en la matière. Merci Cendrine, pour m'avoir fait découvrir la « Guerre des clones » et m'avoir permis de participer à ce projet de recherche. Merci aussi pour ton enthousiasme contagieux et pour la facilité que j'ai eu à discuter et à travailler avec toi.

Je tiens par ailleurs à remercier Marc Garbey, pour m'avoir si chaleureusement accueillie au sein du laboratoire de Houston et initiée aux « Computer Sciences ». Merci pour votre grande patience et votre disponibilité. Cela a toujours été un plaisir de discuter modélisation avec vous autour d'un café.

Merci aux membres de mon comité de thèse pour leurs commentaires constructifs sur mon travail : Gudrun Bornette, Aude Ernoult, Yannick Outreman et Jean-Sébastien Pierre. Je remercie également Jean-Sébastien et Yannick pour leur aide précieuse en statistiques. Merci aussi à Aude qui au-delà de notre collaboration, m'a apportée son soutien et ses conseils.

Le laboratoire

Mon premier Merci va à mon acolyte Nolwenn pour sa très large contribution aux manips de cette thèse. Merci pour la qualité de ton travail, c'est toujours agréable d'avoir quelqu'un sur qui on peut compter. Merci aussi pour les bons moments partagés, pour les fous rires et les pétages de plomb au jardin et pour avoir parfois (souvent ;-)) ronchonné avec moi contre le froid et la pluie. Il y aura toujours une petite noisette pour toi au jardin.

Merci Marie-Lise, ça a été un vrai plaisir de travailler et de partager le bureau avec toi. Merci pour ta gentillesse, tes conseils toujours avisés et tes encouragements.

Gracias Assu pour ton inoxydable bonne humeur, tes encouragements et pour m'avoir tenu compagnie si souvent en ces longues soirées d'hiver passées au labo.

Merci Thomas pour ton incroyable patience et pour t'être toujours montré disponible à chacun de mes débarquements impromptus dans ton bureau. Merci d'avoir essayé de m'enseigner la magie de R.

Merci à Pilip pour notre « précieuse et fructueuse collaboration autour de ces charmantes petites fleurs jaunes » (Louâpre, 2011). Rien que pour te voir essayer de les planter sans te salir les mains, ça valait le coup ! ;D

Merci à Stéphane pour le temps passé avec moi à enseigner la vie des plantes. C'étaient vraiment de bons moments.

Merci à tous les petits stagiaires avec qui j'ai pu travailler : Mathilde, Pauline F., Pauline LG., Lucie D., Lucie B., Maxime, Alexis, Mathieu, Alexandre et Yen. Merci pour votre gentillesse, votre investissement et votre curiosité. Un merci supplémentaire à Mathilde pour avoir essayé par tous les moyens de recruter du monde pour nous aider. Dommage, ça n'a pas fonctionné comme tu l'espérais ;-).

Merci à toutes les personnes qui en cette fin de Juillet 2009 se sont mobilisées et ont donné de leur temps pour qu'on puisse finir les manips : Chloé, Benoit, Alvin, Junior, Florian, Lulu et Julia. De tels élans de solidarité font vraiment chaud au cœur. Merci aussi aux étudiants du

Master Environnement Droit (promo 2008-2009) qui ont participé au montage de la manip principale.

Merci à Guillaume, Olivier, Fouad, Thierry et Louis pour leur aide au jardin notamment avec le montage des dispositifs ou avec la fauche. Merci aussi pour votre bonne humeur, vos encouragements et pour nous avoir offert un abri accueillant à la serre avec un café chaud quand le climat jouait contre nous.

Merci à Marie-Paule, Nathalie et Valérie G. pour leur aide avec les manip. Merci pour votre disponibilité et votre patience. Merci également à Yoann, qui s'est retrouvé embarqué dans cette aventure par la force des choses (ou la force de quelqu'un ☺).

Merci aux membres de l'équipe Paysaclim, pour la bonne ambiance de travail, en particulier dans le couloir du 14B. Merci à mes colocataires de bureau actuels ou passés : Pierre, Violette, Marie-Lise, Diabi, Lisa et Rémi. Merci pour les moments de franche rigolade et pour avoir toléré tout mon bazar.

Merci à mes potos de labo Lison, Charlène et Pierrot. Merci d'avoir partagé avec moi ces trois années parfois difficiles. J'ai toujours trouvé auprès de vous le réconfort dont j'avais besoin. Merci également aux piliers du Journal Club (Stéphane, Stéphane, Marie, Thiago, Nico, Benjamin, Pilip, Joffrey) pour la bonne ambiance et les moments de détente bien mérités.

Merci à toute l'équipe des thésards de Houston : David, Guillaume, Rémi, Malek et Warea. Merci de m'avoir aussi bien intégrée et aidée à faire mes premiers pas dans le monde des modélisateurs. Un merci particulier à Rémi, David et Guillaume pour m'avoir accueillie dans leur bureau, pour leur gentillesse, leurs conseils et tous les bons moments au travail et en dehors. Merci encore à Guillaume qui m'a en plus aidée pour à peu près tout, durant mon séjour.

Enfin, merci à toutes celles qui nous simplifient la vie chaque jour : Valérie B., Tifenn, Isabelle, Sandra et Jocelyne. J'ai une petite pensée émue pour Jocelyne qui a vraiment tout fait pour nous chouchouter quand elle était là.

Les extérieurs au laboratoire

Je remercie Marie-Noëlle et Marc pour leur accueil chaleureux à Houston et m'avoir fait découvrir le Texas : sa campagne et ses long horns, ses alligators, sa « gastronomie » et ses plages. Je pense que ma peau se souviendra encore longtemps de mon passage à Galveston !

Merci à Jean-François (Jef) pour ses dispositifs expérimentaux tous plus ingénieux les uns que les autres avec surtout un montage facile pour les bricolos du dimanche comme moi. Merci aussi d'avoir parfois sacrifié tes soirées pour m'aider.

Les proches

Je dédie ces trois ans de travail à mes proches. A mes parents et à mon frère, pour m'avoir toujours soutenue à la fois moralement et financièrement. Merci, je n'aurais jamais pu aller jusque là sans vous. A Mathieu, à qui je ne pourrais jamais exprimer toute ma gratitude. Un immense merci pour ta disponibilité, ta patience, ta complicité et pour tout ce que tu m'apportes chaque jour. Merci aussi d'avoir si bien géré la vaisselle ces dernières semaines, maintenant que tu sais faire, tu vas pouvoir continuer ☺.

Je termine en rendant hommage à Aristote, fondateur de la botanique et le premier scientifique à avoir décrit la compétition entre les organismes. Lui aussi, en son temps, a dû passer quelques heures à quatre pattes le nez dans la pelouse.

However beautiful the strategy, you should occasionally look at the results.

*Sir Winston Churchill
(1874 - 1965)*

LIST OF PAPERS

This thesis is based on the following articles, which are either published, in revision, submitted or in preparation, and are hereafter referred to by their roman numerals:

- Article I** **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Mony C., Clément B., Garbey M. 2011. Modeling competition between plants using an Individual Based Model: Methods and effects on the growth of two species with contrasted growth forms. *Ecological Modelling*, doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2011.05.028.
- Article II** Benot M.-L.[†], **Bittebiere A.-K.**[†], Ernoult A., Clément B., Mony C. Clonal dispersal as a mechanism of fine-scale pattern formation in grassland communities. *Submitted to Journal of Ecology*. († for equal contribution of authors)
- Article III** Louâpre P., **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Clément B., Pierre J.-S., Mony C. Analogies between clonal plant and animal foraging: Evidence of information acquisition regarding local richness and spatial variance. *In revision for PLoS ONE*.
- Article IV** **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Renaud N., Clément B., Mony C. In press. Morphological response to competition for light in the clonal *Trifolium repens* L. (Fabaceae). *American Journal of Botany*.
- Article V** **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Garbey M., Smaoui M., Clément B., Mony C. A comparative study of plastic and non-plastic plant individuals under competition: importance of clonal architecture determinants. *In prep.*
- Article VI** **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Clément B., Mony C. Ecosystem production depends on clonal traits: experimental evidence derived from mesocosm communities. *Submitted to Journal of Ecology*.
- Article VII** **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Mony C., Ernoult A., Clément B. Field margin plant communities: importance of the occurring clonal growth strategies for water quality preservation. *In prep.*

For ease of reading, the references cited in these manuscripts were all grouped in a single section at the end of this thesis.

Introduction générale	1
Partie I : Structure de la thèse	3
1. CONTEXTE SCIENTIFIQUE	5
2. OBJECTIFS DE LA THESE	8
3. ORGANISATION DE LA THESE	9
Partie II : Revue littéraire	11
1. DYNAMIQUE SPATIALE DES COMMUNAUTES DE PLANTES	12
1.1. Les descripteurs de la dynamique spatiale des communautés	12
1.1.1. Un patron spatial	12
1.1.2. Importance de l'échelle locale pour la dynamique de la communauté	13
1.2. Les mécanismes sous-jacents	14
1.2.1. L'hétérogénéité de l'environnement	14
1.2.2. Les interactions biotiques	15
1.2.3. Natalité et dispersion	16
1.3. La dispersion : un processus clé	17
1.3.1. Deux modes de colonisation de l'espace	17
1.3.2. La reproduction clonale : un mécanisme méconnu de formation des patrons spatiaux	18
2. ROLE DES PROPRIETES CLONALES DANS LE POTENTIEL COMPETITIF DES ESPECES	21
2.1. Un potentiel compétitif caractérisé par un trade-off entre colonisation et occupation locale de l'espace	21
2.2. Un potentiel compétitif soutenu par les propriétés clonales	23
2.2.1. L'acquisition des ressources via l'intégration physique	23
2.2.2. Le partage des ressources et l'échange d'information via l'intégration physiologique	24
2.2.3. Le stockage des ressources excédentaires	25
2.3. Déterminisme des traits clonaux	25
3. LES REPNSES PLASTIQUES A LA COMPETITION	27
3.1. Les stratégies de résistance à la compétition	27
3.2. La plasticité intra-clone	27
3.2.1. Le foraging	27
3.2.2. La spécialisation des modules	29
3.3. L'importance des paramètres de l'environnement compétitif pour la plasticité de la plante	31
3.3.1. L'importance des paramètres d'hétérogénéité spatiale et temporelle de la compétition	31
3.3.2. Prédicibilité des variations spatio-temporelles de l'environnement	33
4. DES TRAITS DE REPNSE AUX TRAITS D'EFFET	34
4.1. Les fonctions liées aux patrons spatiaux des communautés de plantes	34
4.2. Importance des traits d'effet comme prédicteurs des fonctions écosystémiques	34
4.3. L'intervention potentielle des traits clonaux dans les fonctions écosystémiques	35
Méthodologie – Trois approches complémentaires pour étudier les prairies	39
1. MODELE D'ETUDE	42
1.1. Les prairies	42
1.2. Les bandes enherbées	42
1.2.1. Des systèmes prairiaux particuliers	42
1.2.2. Cadre législatif de la création des bandes enherbées	43

1.2.3. Pratiques de gestion autorisées	43
1.2.4. Les fonctions environnementales des bandes enherbées	44
2. EXPERIMENTATIONS EN CONDITIONS CONTROLEES	45
2.1. Communautés expérimentales d'espèces à croissance clonale	45
2.1.1. Choix des espèces cultivées	45
2.1.2. Caractérisation de la croissance des espèces en l'absence de compétition	46
2.1.3. Assemblages d'espèces clonales cultivés en mésocosmes	46
2.2. Réponse d'espèces clonales à la compétition	48
2.2.1. Cultures au sein de différents environnements nutritifs	48
2.2.2. Cultures d'une espèce cible en présence de compétiteurs à stratégies de croissance clonale contrastées	50
3. MODELISATION DE LA CROISSANCE D'UNE POPULATION DE PLANTES CLONALES	52
3.1. Le modèle PRAIRIE	52
3.1.1. Principe	52
3.1.2. Règles de croissance d'un individu clonal	53
3.1.3. Règles d'interactions des individus clonaux	57
3.1.4. Paramètres du modèle	58
3.2. Déroulement d'une simulation	59
3.3. Paramètres de sortie calculés	61
Article I – Modeling competition between plants using an IBM	62
4. DES BANDES ENHERBEES EXPERIMENTALES INTEGREES A UN PAYSAGE BOCAGER	73
4.1. Présentation du site LTER Armorique	73
4.2. Dispositif des bandes enherbées expérimentales	74
Chapitre 1 – La clonalité : un mécanisme de structuration des communautés végétales	81
Préface	83
1. OBJECTIFS DU CHAPITRE 1	83
2. DEMARCHE MISE EN ŒUVRE	84
3. PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS	84
Article II – Clonal dispersal as a mechanism of fine-scale pattern formation	87
Chapitre 2 – Les traits clonaux : des traits de réponse à la compétition	113
Préface	115
1. OBJECTIFS DU CHAPITRE 2	115
2. DEMARCHES MISES EN ŒUVRE	116
3. PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS	117
Article III – Analogies between clonal plants and animal foraging	121
Article IV – Morphological response to competition for light	133
Article V – Importance of clonal architecture determinants	149
Chapitre 3 – Les traits clonaux : des traits d'effet ?	165
Préface	167
1. OBJECTIFS DU CHAPITRE 3	167
2. DEMARCHE MISE EN ŒUVRE	167
3. PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS	168
Article VI – Ecosystem production depends on clonal traits	169

Chapitre 4 – Application à la mise en place des bandes enherbées dans les paysages agricoles	183
Préface	185
1. OBJECTIFS DU CHAPITRE 4	185
2. DEMARCHES MISES EN ŒUVRE	186
3. PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS	187
Article VII – Importance of the occurring clonal growth strategies for water quality preservation	189
Discussion générale	201
1. LA CLONALITE : UN MECANISME CLE DE FORMATION DES PATRONS SPATIAUX	205
1.1. Importance des stratégies de croissance clonale	205
1.2. Dynamique temporelle des patrons spatiaux	207
2. DES COMPOSANTES DE L'ARCHITECTURE CLONALE SOUS INFLUENCE DE LA COMPETITION	207
2.1. Une stratégie de foraging dépendante de l'identité du compétiteur	207
2.2. Influence de la compétition sur l'architecture clonale	210
3. LES TRAITS CLONAUX : DES TRAITS D'EFFET	211
4. DES COMMUNAUTES VEGETALES AU PAYSAGE	213
5. CONCLUSION ET PERSPECTIVES	214
Références	219
Annexes	249

~ Introduction Générale ~

Partie I : Structure de la thèse	... page 3
Partie II : Revue littéraire	... page 11
Dynamique spatiale des communautés de plantes	... page 12
Rôle des propriétés clonales dans le potentiel compétitif des espèces	... page 21
Les réponses plastiques à la compétition	... page 27
Des traits de réponse aux traits d'effet	... page 34

PARTIE I : STRUCTURE DE LA THESE

1. CONTEXTE SCIENTIFIQUE

La dynamique de la communauté végétale détermine le devenir des espèces et leurs possibilités de coexistence. Une des difficultés majeures dans la prévision de la dynamique d'un système prairial réside dans le fait que la grande majorité des espèces végétales (jusqu'à 70% en zones tempérées - [van Groenendael & de Kroon, 1990](#) -) ont la capacité de coloniser l'espace à grande distance par reproduction sexuée (croisement de gamètes mâle et femelle) mais aussi à courte distance par reproduction asexuée ou clonale. Celle-ci consiste en la production, par embryogenèse somatique, d'individus appelés « modules » ou « ramets » (terme anglophone), génétiquement identiques et potentiellement indépendants ([van Groenendael et al., 1996](#)). Parmi la diversité de formes de croissance clonale existant, nous nous sommes focalisés sur les formes en réseaux de modules qui sont les plus abondantes au sein des prairies tempérées ([Klimeš et al., 1997](#)). Ainsi, les modules peuvent rester connectés entre eux via des tiges modifiées (stolons ou rhizomes) de façon très transitoire ou pour une durée beaucoup plus longue de parfois plusieurs années ([Oborny et al., 2001](#) ; [Oborny & Kun, 2002](#)). Cette architecture en réseau confère aux plantes des propriétés particulières comme des échanges ou du stockage de ressources grâce aux connexions ([Alpert & Stuefer, 1997](#) ; [Stuefer & Huber, 1999](#)). L'architecture de ce réseau est variable selon les espèces, différant principalement par son degré d'agrégation ce qui détermine la stratégie de croissance. Un réseau très dispersé avec peu de ramifications caractérise une stratégie dite « guérilla » tandis qu'à l'inverse, un réseau très agrégé, présentant des distances inter-modules faibles et un grand nombre de ramifications, définit une stratégie « phalange » ([Lovett Doust, 1981](#)). A l'extrême, chez certaines espèces dites « cespiteuses », les modules semblent même soudés entre eux. Toutes ces caractéristiques, propres aux plantes clonales, leur confèrent un grand pouvoir compétitif et sont donc déterminantes pour l'issue des interactions de compétition et par conséquent pour la dynamique de la communauté. Pourtant, à ce jour, les études de dynamique de communautés végétales se focalisent surtout sur des communautés comprenant des espèces annuelles, négligeant l'importance des propriétés clonales qui s'exprime à plusieurs niveaux.

En système prairiaux, les individus ne sont pas distribués de façon homogène mais présentent plutôt une structuration spatiale ([Herben & Hara, 2003](#)). Il est largement reconnu que cette structuration peut avoir des effets fondamentaux sur la dynamique des

communautés de plantes (Purves & Law, 2002) notamment sur les mécanismes de coexistence entre les espèces (Tilman, 1994). Cependant, dans la littérature, peu de travaux mettent en lien les processus et les patrons spatiaux observés (Murrell et al., 2001). La dispersion, en particulier par croissance clonale, a néanmoins été proposée comme le processus intrinsèque majeur sous-jacent aux patrons des communautés de plantes prairiales (Herben & Hara, 2003), bien que cette hypothèse n'ait pas été testée expérimentalement. Notamment, elle générerait de l'agrégation à très fine échelle (Kershaw, 1963 ; Harada & Iwasa, 1996). Cette agrégation étant dépendante de la distance entre les modules parents et fils (Zobel et al., 2010), elle pourrait dépendre de la stratégie de croissance clonale de l'individu mais également de celles de ses compétiteurs. En effet, l'organisation spatiale des compétiteurs déterminée par leurs stratégies de croissance conditionnerait la répartition spatiale des ressources. Les plantes clonales étant douées d'une capacité de foraging, elles pourraient modifier leurs patrons de croissance afin d'exploiter au mieux les ressources disponibles.

Les caractéristiques des patrons spatiaux des espèces végétales herbacées seraient donc sous le contrôle de leur architecture clonale. Celle-ci résulte de l'interaction de trois composantes : le structural blue-print (*i.e.* l'architecture basique), l'ontogénie et la plasticité (Huber et al., 1999). Le fort potentiel plastique des plantes clonales leur permet de répondre à leur environnement, notamment à son hétérogénéité. Ainsi, elles peuvent optimiser la morphologie de leurs modules pour maximiser localement l'acquisition des ressources (lumière et nutriments) (Marcuvitz & Turkington, 2000) mais elles présentent également la particularité de « se mouvoir » latéralement positionnant les modules dans les patchs les plus favorables (Slade & Hutchings, 1987 ; de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995 ; Oborny & Cain, 1997). Le type d'informations utilisées par les plantes pour adapter précisément leur réponse plastique reste encore inconnu. La qualité de l'environnement de la plante dépend de la présence des compétiteurs. Les caractéristiques de son environnement compétitif (*e.g.* l'identité ou la densité des compétiteurs) pourraient donc influencer son comportement de foraging. L'architecture du réseau clonal constituant un élément expliquant le succès des plantes en prairie (van Kleunen et Fisher, 2001), il apparaît important de déterminer quels processus impliqués dans l'établissement de cette architecture permettent de maximiser les performances des clones selon les conditions d'intensité et de réponse à la compétition.

Les patrons spatiaux des communautés influencent le fonctionnement des écosystèmes, en particulier leur productivité (Pacala & Deutschmann, 1995). Les traits clonaux pourraient alors influencer le fonctionnement des écosystèmes au travers des patrons qu'ils génèrent. Notamment, les traits interviennent au cours des processus d'acquisition des ressources par les plantes, puisqu'ils déterminent le placement des modules portant les organes foliaires et racinaires (Huber et al., 1999), à l'origine du prélèvements des nutriments et de la production de carbone au sein de la plante. Leurs effets pourraient même opérer à long terme et être donc plus intenses puisque les traits clonaux agissent en amont des traits foliaires au cours des processus d'acquisition des ressources.

Le fonctionnement des écosystèmes peut être mis au service de l'homme (Chapin et al., 2000 ; Kremen, 2005). Par exemple, la biomasse produite par les prairies est employée comme fourrage pour le bétail. La valorisation des fonctions supportées par les communautés prairiales a conduit à la mise en place des bandes enherbées au sein des paysages agricoles, suite aux réglementations de la Politique Agricole Commune (PAC). Ces systèmes prairiaux particuliers (il s'agit de bandes herbeuses linéaires d'une largeur approximative de six mètres) ont de multiples objectifs : limiter les apports d'intrants (pesticides, nitrate, phosphore) dans les cours d'eau longeant les parcelles agricoles, servir d'habitat refuge pour la biodiversité locale et exceptionnellement fournir une production de fourrage supplémentaire. Cependant, les agriculteurs ne disposent pas de recommandations de semis ou de modalités de gestion visant à maximiser les services supportés par ces bandes enherbées. Les connaissances théoriques issues de ce travail de thèse pourraient être réinvesties dans ce cadre appliqué.

2. OBJECTIFS DE LA THESE

Le premier objectif de cette thèse est d'étudier la dynamique des communautés végétales de prairie en se basant sur les règles d'assemblage spatial des espèces à reproduction clonale. Nous cherchons en particulier à déterminer :

- (i) quelle est l'importance de la clonalité dans les processus de structuration spatiale des communautés de plantes, en nous basant sur l'hypothèse que les stratégies de croissance clonales de l'individu mais aussi de ses compétiteurs sont déterminantes pour son patron spatial (chapitre 1).
- (ii) comment s'opère la mise en place de l'architecture effective de la plante en situation de compétition. Plus précisément, nous établirons dans un premier temps quelles sont les informations utilisées par la plante pour définir son comportement de foraging et dans un deuxième temps nous étudierons les effets de l'identité du compétiteur sur ce comportement. Nous établirons dans un troisième temps, quels sont les traits, impliqués dans le structural blueprint et l'ontogénie de la plante, qui déterminent l'efficacité de sa réponse plastique en fonction de l'intensité de la compétition (chapitre 2).

Le deuxième objectif de cette thèse concerne l'étude de la relation entre la structure et les fonctions des communautés végétales de prairie. Nous cherchons à savoir si les traits clonaux peuvent être des traits indicateurs de la fonction de production (chapitre 3). En effet, les traits clonaux intervenant dans les processus d'acquisition des ressources par le placement des structures portant les organes racinaires et foliaires, pourraient avoir des effets à long terme sur la production de la communauté végétale.

Les connaissances théoriques issues de ce travail pourront être appliquées à la mise en place des bandes enherbées dans les paysages agricoles notamment afin de déterminer des semis permettant de maximiser les fonctions de ces systèmes prairiaux particuliers (chapitre 4).


3. ORGANISATION DE LA THESE

Cette thèse débute par une revue littéraire (en deuxième partie de cette introduction générale) visant à dresser l'état des connaissances actuelles sur la dynamique des communautés de plantes clonales en prairie et sur les liens entre structure et fonctions écosystémiques au sein de ces communautés. Cet état de l'art permet de disposer des éléments nécessaires à la conception des expérimentations et à la discussion des résultats obtenus. Il s'organise autour de quatre points principaux :

- (i) l'importance des processus de dispersion notamment par croissance clonale pour l'émergence et la dynamique des patrons spatiaux au sein des communautés végétales de prairie et la conséquence de cette structuration spatiale pour la coexistence entre espèces.
- (ii) le rôle des propriétés clonales dans le potentiel compétitif des espèces.
- (iii) les réponses plastiques à la compétition impliquant la croissance clonale.
- (iv) la mise en relation des patrons spatiaux déterminés par les traits clonaux et des fonctions des communautés végétales prairiales.

La seconde partie de cette thèse concerne la présentation des différentes approches expérimentales ou de modélisation mises en œuvre pour traiter les différentes questions posées. Elle comprend plus particulièrement une description des dispositifs expérimentaux sur le terrain et en conditions contrôlées ainsi que du modèle individu centré utilisé. Un article scientifique en anglais a notamment été intégré à cette partie car il présente le travail de développement du modèle effectué au cours de la thèse, concernant la modélisation des interactions de compétition entre les individus clonaux ([Article I](#)).

La présentation des résultats obtenus au cours de ce travail s'articule autour de quatre chapitres (1 à 4) (Figure 1), traitant chacun de l'un des objectifs de cette thèse. Ils débutent par une préface détaillant les questions abordées, la démarche suivie ainsi que les principaux résultats obtenus. Ces résultats sont ensuite présentés et discutés sous forme d'articles scientifiques en anglais, acceptés, soumis dans des revues à comité de lecture ou en préparation.



Quelle est l'importance de la clonalité et en particulier des stratégies de croissance clonale pour la structuration de la communauté végétale en prairie ? [1] ; [II]

Quelles sont les informations utilisées par la plante pour établir son comportement de foraging ? [2] ; [III]

Quels sont les effets des caractéristiques de l'environnement compétitif sur les traits clonaux ? [2] ; [IV]

Quels traits impliqués dans le structural blue-print et les processus d'ontogénie permettent de maximiser le succès de l'individu en fonction de la réponse et de l'intensité de la compétition ? [2] ; [V]

Les traits clonaux influencent-ils la fonction de production en prairie ? [3] ; [VI]

Quel semis permet de maximiser les fonctions supportées par les bandes enherbées dans les paysages agricoles ? [4] ; [VII]

Figure 1. Structure de la thèse. [1] chapitre ; [II] article.

PARTIE II : REVUE LITTERAIRE

IMPORTANCE DE LA CLONALITE DANS LA DYNAMIQUE DES COMMUNAUTES DE PLANTES.

CONSEQUENCES POUR LEUR STRUCTURE ET LEURS FONCTIONS.

1. DYNAMIQUE SPATIALE DES COMMUNAUTÉS DE PLANTES

1.1. Les descripteurs de la dynamique spatiale de la communauté

1.1.1. Un patron spatial

Gleason (1976) propose que les communautés végétales constituent une juxtaposition fortuite d'individus. Selon cette théorie, les plantes devraient donc être localisées indépendamment les unes des autres et tout l'espace devrait avoir la même probabilité d'être occupé (*i.e.* pas d'écart de la distribution des individus par rapport à un processus homogène de Poisson) (Herben et al., 2000 ; Law et al. 2002). Cette distribution homogène est en réalité très inhabituelle : les communautés végétales sont spatialement structurées (Watt, 1947 ; Kershaw, 1963 ; Thórnallsdóttir, 1990 ; Herben & Hara, 2003) (Figure 2). Les individus d'une même espèce tendent à s'agréger, même si un patron surdispersé a été ponctuellement observé, notamment en milieux extrêmes (Kikvidze et al., 2005). Les patrons des mélanges de plusieurs espèces sont plus complexes, variant de la ségrégation de deux espèces dans l'espace (absence de corrélation) à l'agrégation (corrélation positive) (Herben & Hara, 2003).



Figure 2. Structuration spatiale d'une communauté végétale : l'exemple d'une prairie méso-hygrophile (Sougeal, 2007). Ici la structuration serait liée aux processus internes à la communauté ainsi qu'à une différence de modalités de gestion (à gauche pâturage seul, à droite fauche associée au pâturage).




Figure 3. Patrons spatiaux de quatre espèces dominantes relevés dans un plot permanent d'une prairie de montagnes, de 1984 à 1994. Les nuances de gris indiquent la densité de modules par espèce dans une cellule (blanc indique l'absence de l'espèce). Extrait de [Law et al. \(1997\)](#).

Les patrons spatiaux sont dynamiques, à l'exception de ceux liés à l'hétérogénéité inhérente de l'environnement (différence de profondeurs de la roche mère par exemple) ([Herben & Hara, 2003](#)). Les paramètres globaux des patrons spatiaux tendent à être conservés mais les agrégations d'individus bougent ou disparaissent, remplacées alors par d'autres nouvellement formées ([Herben & Hara, 2003](#)). Des suivis de patrons spatiaux réalisés sur plusieurs années ont ainsi montré un fort taux de renouvellement des espèces à échelle locale, suggérant qu'elles sont mobiles ([Turkington & Harper, 1979](#) ; [Herben et al., 1993b](#) ; [Thórhallsdóttir, 1990](#) ; [Law et al., 1997](#)) (Figure 3).

1.1.2. Importance de l'échelle locale pour la dynamique de la communauté

La coexistence entre les espèces implique une partition de niches ([Chesson, 2000](#) ; [Amarasekare, 2003](#)). Pourtant ce phénomène est limité entre espèces végétales car elles partagent des besoins pour un faible nombre de ressources ([Lehman & Tilman, 1997](#) ;

Herben & Hara, 2003). Paradoxalement, les communautés végétales sont très riches en espèces notamment les communautés de prairie lorsqu'elles sont considérées à échelle spatiale fine (Klimeš, 1999). Tilman (1994) propose alors que la structuration spatiale des individus serait un facteur de coexistence au sein des communautés végétales. Les plantes étant caractérisées par un style de vie sessile, les interactions avec leurs compétiteurs sont locales (Mack & Harper, 1977 ; Silander & Pacala, 1985). La structuration spatiale des individus définit alors la vision qu'a la plante de sa communauté (« the plant's eye view » – Turkington & Harper, 1979 –) ce qui affecterait le processus de compétition interspécifique et en modifierait l'issue (Silvertown et al., 1992 ; Stoll & Prati, 2001). En effet, des arrangements spatiaux différents d'un même pool d'espèces initial conduisent à terme, à des communautés de compositions différentes. L'arrangement spatial de la communauté à échelle fine serait donc aussi important pour l'issue de la compétition que la densité des compétiteurs (Silvertown et al., 1992).

1.2. Les mécanismes sous-jacents

Malgré la récurrence des patrons spatiaux au sein des communautés végétales, il n'existe toujours pas de consensus concernant les processus à l'origine de leur formation et de leur maintien (Herben & Hara, 2003).

1.2.1. L'hétérogénéité de l'environnement

La structuration spatiale des communautés végétales est en partie déterminée par les paramètres d'hétérogénéité de l'environnement (Figure 4). Ceux-ci peuvent être soit temporels, comme des différences de temps écoulé depuis un épisode de perturbation, soit spatiaux (Herben et al., 1993a ; Herben & Hara, 2003). Il existe alors deux types de patrons respectivement liés à une hétérogénéité inhérente de l'environnement (*e.g.* des variations de profondeur de la roche mère) (Kershaw et al., 1963 ; Law et al., 2002) et à une hétérogénéité induite par la végétation elle-même (répartition des ressources en lumière et en nutriments). Ce deuxième type d'hétérogénéité spatiale est variable dans le temps du fait de la prise continue en nutriments par les plantes et des apports par décomposition de la matière organique (Jackson & Caldwell, 1993 ; Herben et al., 2000).

1.2.2. Les interactions biotiques

L'environnement biotique influence également la distribution spatiale des individus à échelle fine (Kershaw, 1963 ; Bertness & Ellison, 1987 ; Law et al., 2002 ; Herben & Hara, 2003) (Figure 4). Si les interactions positives de type facilitation (*e.g.* abri) seraient à l'origine de la structure des communautés végétales de certains environnements extrêmes (Choler et al., 2001 ; Meron et al., 2004), la majorité des patrons spatiaux sont générés par des interactions de compétition (Law et al., 2002 ; Herben & Hara, 2003).




Figure 4. Processus à l'origine des patrons spatiaux des espèces. En bleu les facteurs internes, en vert les facteurs externes à la communauté. D'après Herben & Hara (2003).

La compétition résulte d'un besoin commun des plantes pour une ressource limitée (lumière, eau ou nutriments) qui conduit à la diminution de la croissance, de la survie et du succès reproducteur d'au moins l'un des individus interagissant (*sensu* Begon et al., 1996). La compétition est classiquement caractérisée au travers de quatre composantes : (i) la zone d'interaction, (ii) l'intensité de la compétition, (iii) les effets de la compétition et (iv) la réponse à la compétition (Berger et al., 2008; Gibson et al., 1999; Goldberg, 1987; Weigelt and Jolliffe, 2003). La zone d'interaction correspond au voisinage proche des individus soulignant que la compétition est un processus intervenant localement (Murrell et al., 2001; Purves and Law, 2002). Mack & Harper (1977) ont ainsi montré que 69% des variations de performances individuelles chez des espèces annuelles de milieu dunaire pouvaient être expliquées par la présence de compétiteurs dans un rayon de deux centimètres autour de la plante. De même, Silander & Pacala (1985) ont conclu que le rayon du voisinage d'*Arabidopsis thaliana* correspondait à cinq centimètres. L'intensité de la compétition décrit dans quelle mesure celle-ci diminue la qualité de l'environnement d'un individu. Ainsi, en situation de compétition les individus reçoivent par exemple une

lumière de moins bonne qualité *i.e.* présentant un ratio de photons rouges (R) et de photons rouges lointains (FR) faible (Leeflang, 1999 ; Marcuvitz & Turkington, 2000). En effet, les feuilles de la canopée vont absorber préférentiellement les photons rouges et transmettre les photons rouges lointains (Ballaré et al., 1990 ; Leeflang, 1999 ; Marcuvitz & Turkington, 2000). Cette intensité est déterminée par la densité des compétiteurs, leur taille (en termes de biomasse ou de hauteur), leur identité (Goldberg & Landa, 1991) ainsi que leur distance à la plante (Weiner, 1982 ; Berger et al., 2008). Elle génère donc de l'hétérogénéité dans l'environnement de l'individu. Les conséquences de la compétition sur sa croissance, sa survie ou sa reproduction désignent les effets de la compétition (Goldberg 1987; Weigelt and Jolliffe, 2003). Il existe notamment une relation de densité-dépendance négative entre la densité en compétiteurs du voisinage d'un individu et sa taille en fin de croissance (Firbank & Watkinson, 1987). La réponse à la compétition caractérise les adaptations locales de la plante en vue de maintenir ses performances malgré la présence des compétiteurs (Goldberg and Fleetwood, 1987; Goldberg and Landa, 1991).

La dynamique à long terme et la structure spatiale de la communauté dépendent de l'issue des interactions de compétition (Herben & Hara, 2003).

1.2.3. Natalité et dispersion

Les patrons spatiaux se développent rarement à partir d'un système homogène. Au début de la succession végétale, alors même que l'espace est encore nu, la distribution des plantes est affectée par l'hétérogénéité de l'environnement et par une distribution stochastique des propagules (Watt 1947 ; Herben & Hara, 2003). Cette structuration spatiale « précoce » est ensuite renforcée par la dispersion des graines ou des modules issus respectivement de la reproduction sexuée ou clonale des individus (Figure 4).

La distance de dispersion des graines ou des propagules se détachant de la plante mère avant leur établissement présente une grande variabilité inter- et intraspécifique, allant de quelques millimètres à plusieurs centaines de kilomètres (Herben & Hara, 2003). De telles distances restent néanmoins rares car la majorité des graines tombent à proximité du parent agrégeant localement les individus d'une même espèce (Rees et al., 1996 ; Law et al., 2002). La distance de dispersion suit ainsi une loi de décroissance exponentielle

(Zobel et al., 2010) (Figure 5). Cette distance est également sous la dépendance du vecteur de dispersion des graines.




Figure 5. Lois hypothétiques de probabilité d'établissement en fonction de la distance à la plante mère basées sur la distance de dispersion (i) par les graines ou (ii) par la clonalité. Ces lois ne prennent pas en compte les possibilités d'interaction de compétition entre la plantule et la plante mère. D'après Zobel et al. (2010).

Cette agrégation liée à la reproduction sexuée est encore accentuée par la clonalité. Les nouveaux individus produits par croissance végétative se forment à une distance plus courte et globalement constante de l'individu parent (Figure 5), générant des patrons agrégés à échelle fine (quelques centimètres) (Kershaw, 1963 ; Harada & Iwasa, 1996). La distance de dispersion est, dans ce cas, conditionnée par l'architecture du réseau clonal et par conséquent dépend largement de l'espèce (Zobel et al., 2010). Cette agrégation des modules liée à la clonalité peut conduire notamment à la formation de patrons monoclonaux (Schmid, 1986). Elle pourrait également être accentuée et stabilisée dans le temps par un phénomène opérant via l'intégration physiologique, de discrimination des compétiteurs par rapport aux modules d'un même clone (Herben & Novoplansky, 2008).

1.3. La dispersion : un processus clé

1.3.1. Deux modes de colonisation de l'espace

Au sein des communautés végétales, une majorité d'espèces (jusqu'à 70% - van Groenendael & de Kroon, 1990 -) présente une stratégie mixte de colonisation de l'espace. La clonalité est particulièrement répandue dans les habitats où les possibilités de croissance verticale sont limitées par les conditions environnementales (faible productivité, épisodes fréquents de perturbation) ou par la saisonnalité (Klimeš et al., 1997). La colonisation par reproduction clonale permet à la plante de s'étendre rapidement pour coloniser de

nouveaux habitats proches mais également de les occuper efficacement (forte densité locale des modules). Elle influence donc principalement la dynamique locale de la communauté en maintenant les populations déjà établies et en permettant leur expansion. A l'inverse, la colonisation par reproduction sexuée permet de coloniser des habitats libres plus éloignés (Winkler & Söcklin, 2002 ; Söcklin & Winkler, 2004) et de connecter les patches de population les plus isolés (Eriksson, 1996 ; Husband & Barrett, 1996 ; Honnay & Bossuyt, 2005). La reproduction sexuée permet également le brassage génétique des populations (Eriksson, 1989 ; 1997). Ces deux modes de colonisation diffèrent par les échelles temporelles auxquelles ils interviennent puisque la colonisation par reproduction clonale est immédiate alors que la colonisation par reproduction sexuée nécessite d'attendre la germination des graines intervenant à la belle saison (Fahrig et al., 1994). Le succès d'établissement des descendants diffère également entre ces deux modes de colonisation de l'espace (Winkler & Fisher, 2002) conditionnant la fitness de l'individu clonal (Fisher & van Kleunen, 2002).

Un trade-off entre reproduction clonale et sexuée a été fréquemment démontré (Law et al., 1983 ; Eriksson, 1997 ; Piquot et al., 1998). L'allocation à l'un ou l'autre mode de reproduction dépend en effet du génotype (Fisher & van Kleunen, 2002), de l'espèce (Eckert & Barrett, 1993) et de l'environnement de l'individu. La reproduction clonale est favorisée au sein des environnements hostiles à l'établissement des individus à partir de graines (*e.g.* pauvres, froids) (Söcklin & Winkler, 2004) alors que l'allocation à la reproduction sexuée est plus importante en environnement compétitif (Winkler & Söcklin, 2002 ; Zobel, 2008). La clonalité peut également interagir avec la reproduction sexuée en influençant la production et le taux de recrutement des graines (Eriksson, 1989 ; 1997 ; Charpentier, 2002 ; Söcklin & Winkler, 2004).

1.3.2. La reproduction clonale : un mécanisme méconnu de formation des patrons spatiaux

Les mécanismes de formation des patrons spatiaux via la croissance clonale restent méconnus car la majorité des études portant sur le rôle de la dispersion ont été menées sur des communautés de plantes annuelles (Bergelson, 1990 ; Rees et al., 1996 ; Stoll & Prati, 2001).

- Définition de la clonalité

Au sens le plus large, toutes les plantes sont clonales. Du fait de la spécialisation tardive de leurs cellules (totipotence) et de leur organisation modulaire (Harper, 1977), où chaque module comprend des tissus somatiques et méristématiques, toutes les plantes peuvent être régénérées à partir de l'une de leur partie (van Groenendael et al., 1996). Dans cette étude nous nous baserons sur la définition qui décrit les plantes clonales comme étant capables de produire naturellement des modules génétiquement identiques et potentiellement indépendants par croissance clonale (Herben et al., 1994a ; van Groenendael et al., 1996 ; Klimeš et al., 1997) encore appelée multiplication végétative (Schmid, 1990).

Les modules (ou *ramets* – terme anglophone –) possédant les organes nécessaires à l'acquisition des ressources (feuilles et racines), ils peuvent survivre indépendamment de la plante mère, une fois eux-mêmes établis au sein d'un site favorable (Harper, 1977 ; Alpert & Stuefer, 1997). Il existe une grande diversité de formes de croissance néanmoins, les prairies sont majoritairement constituées d'espèces présentant des modules connectés par des tiges modifiées à croissance plagiotrope (horizontale) (*i.e.* CGO 9, 10 et 11). Ces connexions peuvent être aériennes (stolons et *runners*) et/ou souterraines (rhizomes) (Klimeš et al., 1997). Ces plantes clonales à structure en réseaux sont caractérisées par un partage des fonctions : les modules sont spécialisés dans l'acquisition locale des ressources et les connexions contribuent à l'expansion du clone et à l'exploration de l'espace.

L'ensemble de modules interconnectés forme le fragment clonal ou clone physiologique (Eriksson & Jerling, 1990) que l'on distingue du « genet » ou clone génétique issu d'un zygote (graine) et correspondant à l'ensemble des fragments clonaux génétiquement identiques produits par multiplication végétative (Harper & White, 1974 ; Herben et al., 1994a ; Pan & Price, 2002). La durée de vie des modules est finie mais le genet peut se perpétuer indéfiniment en produisant de nouveaux modules. Le clone génétique peut ainsi significativement repousser sa sénescence et survivre parfois jusqu'à plusieurs centaines voir milliers d'années en colonisant des surfaces de plusieurs hectares (*e.g.* clones génétiques de *Pteridium aquilinum* – Harper, 1977 – ; ou *Populus tremuloides* – Cook, 1985 –).

- La clonalité, un moteur de mobilité

La mobilité végétative (*i.e.* la mobilité par croissance clonale) correspond à la distance entre les modules parent et fils (Tamm et al., 2002). Elle est modulée par l'environnement biotique et abiotique de la plante : la compétition pour la lumière au cours des stades précoces de la succession végétale, les perturbations (*e.g.* sécheresse récurrente) (Klimeš, 1999) ou encore la richesse du sol en phosphore ou potassium (Sammul et al., 2003) peuvent la favoriser. Elle reste néanmoins déterminée pour la plus grande part, par la stratégie de croissance des clones (Herben et al., 1993b). Cette mobilité végétative combinée à l'établissement de nouveaux individus issus de graines expliquerait la dynamique temporelle des patrons spatiaux au sein des communautés végétales (Herben et al., 1994b ; Klimeš, 1999 ; Oborny & Kun, 2002 ; Tamm et al., 2002 ; Wildová et al., 2007b ; Zobel et al., 2010).

2. ROLE DES PROPRIETES CLONALES DANS LE POTENTIEL COMPETITIF DES ESPECES

2.1. Un potentiel compétitif caractérisé par un trade-off entre colonisation et occupation locale de l'espace

Le potentiel compétitif d'une plante (« competitive ability ») se détermine par sa capacité à diminuer les ressources, les rendant indisponibles pour les autres (effet compétitif) et par sa capacité à se maintenir en dépit de la présence des compétiteurs (réponse compétitive) (Goldberg, 1987 ; 1990 ; Goldberg & Landa, 1991 ; Keddy et al., 1994). Ces potentiels compétitifs dépendent largement des espèces (Goldberg 1987 ; Keddy et al., 1994). Leur hiérarchie influence de façon significative l'issue de la compétition (Goldberg & Landa, 1991) et donc la formation des patchs monodominants. Considérant par exemple la compétition pour la lumière qui est asymétrique (Berger et al., 2008), atteindre la dominance dépend de la capacité de la plante à surpasser en hauteur ses compétiteurs (émergence plus précoce, utilisation de réserves pour maximiser le taux de croissance) (Bertness & Ellison, 1987 ; Herben & Hara, 1997 ; Grime, 2001). Ces interactions sont donc peu espèce-spécifiques bien que les effets compétitifs des espèces par unité de biomasse peuvent varier (Herben et Hara, 2003). Néanmoins, au sein d'habitats caractérisés par une faible productivité ou des épisodes de perturbation récurrents (herbivorie) limitant la croissance en hauteur des individus, l'identité des compétiteurs peut être déterminante, notamment pour l'accès à la ressource spatiale (Herben et al., 1993b ; Herben & Hara, 1997 ; 2003). En effet, la capacité à acquérir l'espace est très variable selon les espèces car elle repose sur leurs patrons d'expansion spatiale, mettant notamment en jeu l'architecture de la plante.

Lovett Doust (1981) a décrit pour la première fois un spectre d'architectures de ce réseau clonal (déterminisme de cette architecture présenté en 2.2.1.), caractérisé par un trade-off entre occupation locale et colonisation de l'espace. A une extrémité de ce spectre se trouvent les espèces à stratégie « guérilla » à croissance rapide, qui infiltrent la végétation alentour maximisant les contacts interspécifiques et présentant des modules largement espacés (stratégie de colonisation). Par opposition, la stratégie « phalange » caractérise les espèces formant un front ininterrompu de modules agrégés, qui se propagent lentement et excluent ainsi les autres plantes de leur territoire (stratégie de consolidation) (Figure 6). Ces espèces maximisent les contacts intraclonaux du fait de leurs entre-nœuds

très courts (Lovett Doust 1981 ; Schmid 1986). Chez certaines espèces comme *Lolium perenne*, les connexions entre modules ne peuvent généralement même plus être distinguées, caractérisant une stratégie cespiteuse (phalange extrême).




Figure 6. Une architecture clonale caractérisée par un trade-off entre colonisation et occupation locale de l'espace.

Les espèces guérilla sont favorisées en milieux hétérogène ou peu productif à l'inverse des phalanges, préférant un milieu homogène ou riche (Lovett Doust, 1981 ; Humphrey & Pike, 1998 ; Herben, 2004). L'issue de la compétition impliquant des espèces phalanges ou guérillas dépend de la densité des modules compétiteurs. Les guérillas peuvent coloniser rapidement les espaces nus alors que les phalanges sont plus adaptées à des environnements densément peuplés (Schmid & Harper, 1985 ; Winkler & Schmid, 1995 ; Cheplick, 1997 ; Humphrey & Pike, 1998). La coexistence et donc la diversité seraient favorisées en présence d'espèces de mobilités végétatives contrastées (Schmid & Harper, 1985 ; Herben et al., 1994b ; Herben, 1996 ; Moora et al., 2009). Les espèces guérillas, très mobiles, colonisent rapidement l'espace mais à long terme la mortalité de leurs ramets crée des trouées exploitables par les espèces phalanges à expansion lente mais à grande persistance locale (Wildová et al., 2007b). Les espèces guérillas moins compétitives augmentent leurs chances de rencontrer un compétiteur de potentiel compétitif équivalent ou inférieur au leur, par leur grande mobilité. Certaines espèces guérillas comme *Trifolium repens* se montrent même sélectives par rapport à l'identité de leurs voisins (Thórhallsdóttir, 1990). Ce trade-off entre colonisation et occupation locale de l'espace constituerait alors l'un des mécanismes principaux de la coexistence entre espèces végétales (Amarasekare, 2003 ; Lenssen et al., 2005 ; Wildová et al., 2007b).

2.2. Un potentiel compétitif soutenu par les propriétés clonales

2.2.1. L'acquisition des ressources via l'intégration physique

La croissance clonale reposant sur des organes de type stolon ou rhizome conduit à la formation de réseaux complexes de modules (Figure 7). Ces structures sont soit transitoires si les connexions inter-modules ont une durée de vie très courte (stratégie séparatrice) soit perdurent jusqu'à plusieurs années, constituant l'intégration physique entre les modules (Oborny et al., 2001 ; Oborny & Kun, 2002). La stratégie séparatrice est favorisée en milieu riche et homogène car elle s'affranchit des coûts de maintien des connexions. Du point de vue écologique cette stratégie est donc équivalente à celle des plantes unitaires (Herben et al., 1994a). A contrario, les plantes intégratrices sont favorisées en milieu hétérogène (Caraco & Kelly, 1991 ; Oborny et al., 2000) car la structure en réseau de ces plantes leur confère des propriétés écologiques et physiologiques particulières.




Figure 7. Organisation du réseau clonal.

L'architecture du réseau clonal gouverne le placement des structures d'acquisition des ressources (*i.e.* les modules portant les racines et les feuilles) dans le temps et l'espace (Huber et al., 1999) déterminant ainsi la mobilité du clone (Tamm et al., 2002). Elle caractérise la longueur des entre-nœuds (ou « spacers »), la fréquence de ramification des connexions (Stuefer & Huber, 1998) et les angles de branchement (Bell, 1984 ; de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995). Les connexions issues du module initialement formé sont primaires et se ramifient pour donner les connexions d'ordres supérieurs (Huber & Stuefer, 1997).

2.2.2. Le partage des ressources et l'échange d'information via l'intégration physiologique

Chez les plantes clonales, il existe des échanges d'eau, de nutriments, de photosynthétats et d'hormones entre différents modules d'un même réseau clonal assurant son intégration physiologique via les connexions (Pitelka & Ashmun, 1985 ; Marshall, 1990). Ce processus a été mis en évidence chez de nombreuses espèces clonales notamment *Podophyllum peltatum*, *Maianthemum bifolium* ou encore *Trifolium repens* (Chapman et al., 1992 ; Landa et al., 1992 ; D'Hertefeld & Jónsdóttir, 1994).

Généralement, le flux de substances se fait de façon acropétale *i.e.* en direction des modules nouvellement formés de façon à soutenir leur croissance (Pitelka & Ashmun, 1985). Des flux basipétales peuvent cependant soutenir la reprise d'un module endommagé (Landa et al., 1992) ou permettre la suppression des bourgeons latéraux par dominance apicale (Oborny, 2004). Ces échanges de substances entre puits et sources permettent aux plantes clonales intégratrices de coloniser des environnements défavorables (*e.g.* milieux pauvres) ou hétérogènes (D'Hertefeld & Jónsdóttir, 1994). Le degré d'intégration physiologique varie selon les espèces (D'Hertefeld & Jónsdóttir, 1994) mais également entre les individus au sein d'une même espèce soulignant le déterminisme génétique de ce processus (Alpert, 1999 ; van Kleunen et al., 2000). La distance d'intégration est également variable. Des études ont ainsi montré que des translocations pouvaient se faire jusqu'à un mètre au travers d'une dizaine de générations de modules (Oborny et al., 2001) qui forment l'unité d'intégration (Integrated Physiological Unit – IPU –) (Oborny & Kun, 2002). Néanmoins, le maintien de ce processus présente un coût pour la plante et il peut même parfois s'avérer délétère puisqu'il facilite la progression des pathogènes ayant infecté la plante (Caraco & Kelly, 1991 ; Kelly, 1995 ; van Kleunen et al., 2000).

Les interactions compétitives entre les individus génèrent de l'hétérogénéité à échelle fine favorisant les espèces clonales intégratrices (Oborny et al., 2000 ; Herben, 2004). Les effets des compétiteurs peuvent en effet être « moyennés » sur l'ensemble du clone conduisant à des performances équivalentes des différents modules connectés. Les effets d'une espèce voisine sur la croissance d'un module dépendent alors des voisins rencontrés par le reste du clone (Hartnett & Bazzaz, 1985). Ces espèces intégratrices réagissent donc à la composition de la communauté à l'échelle du clone physiologique

plutôt qu'à celle du module (Oborny et al., 2001). L'intégration permet aussi à de nouveaux modules de s'implanter dans des patchs déjà densément peuplés augmentant alors le taux de propagation du clone (Gough et al., 2002). Par ailleurs, Herben (2004) a mis en évidence un phénomène de rétroaction entre l'architecture et le processus d'intégration physiologique chez les plantes clonales qui modifierait leur potentiel compétitif.

2.2.3. Le stockage des ressources excédentaires

Les connexions entre modules peuvent également servir d'organes de stockage de réserves (carbohydrates) à plus ou moins long terme (Stuefer & Huber, 1998 ; 1999). La quantité de ressources stockées dans les tissus de ses connexions durant l'année précédente influence le potentiel compétitif d'une plante clonale déjà établie. En effet, la plante utilise ces ressources en début de nouvelle saison pour développer rapidement son feuillage, lui permettant de préempter l'espace dans la canopée et d'avoir accès à la ressource lumineuse (Grime, 2001). Le stockage de réserves peut également jouer un rôle dans la dynamique du clone en régulant le nombre de nouveaux modules produits, réduisant la compétition intracclone (Watson, 2008).

2.3. Déterminisme des traits clonaux

Les traits clonaux sont sous le contrôle de trois déterminants : le structural blue-print, l'ontogénie et la plasticité (Huber et al., 1999). Le structural blue-print correspond à une combinaison de traits phylogénétiquement fixés déterminant l'architecture basique de la plante notamment le nombre de bourgeons disponibles pour le développement des connexions (Bell, 1984). Cependant, l'architecture d'individus appartenant à une même espèce peut considérablement varier au travers des limites fixées par le structural blue-print au cours de l'ontogénie (*i.e.* le développement de l'individu) (Bell, 1991). Par exemple chez *Potentilla reptans*, l'initiation de la ramification des connexions n'intervient pas de façon régulière au cours des premiers stades ontogéniques (Huber & Stuefer, 1997). Le processus de ramification est en effet soumis à une régulation faisant intervenir des hormones notamment l'auxine, sécrétée par le méristème apical et inhibant l'activation des méristèmes latéraux (dominance apicale) (Watson et al., 1997 ; Oborny, 2004). L'ontogénie affecte également l'intégration physiologique (soutient à la croissance des

modules jeunes prioritairement) et le stockage de réserves, qui peuvent être remobilisées pour assurer la croissance de la plante après une période de repos (mauvaise saison) (Watson, 2008). Les variations des traits clonaux peuvent également être liées à la réponse plastique de la plante à son environnement biotique ou abiotique.

3. LES REPONSES PLASTIQUES A LA COMPETITION

3.1. Les stratégies de résistance à la compétition

Au sens de [Novoplansky \(2009\)](#), il existe trois stratégies de résistance à la compétition. L'évitement permet à la plante de minimiser ses interactions compétitives. Ce type de réponse caractérise par exemple les espèces qui orientent leur croissance dans la direction de moindre interférences ([Ross & Harper, 1972](#) ; [Richards et al., 2010](#)). La confrontation maximise l'influence négative des plantes sur les performances de leurs voisins (*e.g.* allélopathie). Enfin, la tolérance maximise les performances de la plante au sein d'un environnement défavorable généré par la présence des voisins. La compétition générant de l'hétérogénéité au sein de l'habitat des plantes (composition du voisinage, distribution des ressources...), leur réponse plastique devrait donc leur permettre de maximiser leurs performances dans cet environnement hétérogène.

3.2. La plasticité intra-clone

La plasticité est définie comme l'aptitude d'un génotype unique à produire des phénotypes différents en fonction des conditions environnementales ([Bradshaw, 1965](#) ; [Sultan, 1995](#)). Chez les plantes clonales, la plasticité intra-clone est caractérisée par le foraging et la spécialisation des modules (partage du travail).

3.2.1. Le foraging

La plasticité de certaines plantes clonales leur permet de modifier leur croissance de façon à adopter une architecture plus compacte au sein des habitats favorables (*i.e.* riches en ressource et/ou pauvres en compétiteurs). Dans un environnement hétérogène, cette plasticité permettrait au clone de placer de façon sélective, ses modules dans les meilleurs micro-habitats, augmentant sa fitness ([van Kleunen et Fisher, 2001](#)) indépendamment de la productivité globale de l'habitat ([Kleijn & van Groenendael, 1999](#)). Par analogie avec des observations menées chez les animaux, ce type de plasticité a été considéré comme une manifestation d'un comportement de foraging chez les plantes clonales ([Slade & Hutchings, 1987](#) ; [de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995](#) ; [Oborny & Cain, 1997](#)).

D'après les travaux de [Sutherland & Stillman \(1988\)](#), une plante clonale ayant une stratégie optimale de foraging devrait présenter une réduction de la longueur de ses entre-nœuds ainsi qu'une augmentation de la ramification de ses connexions au sein des patchs favorables et au contraire développer de longs entre-nœuds et des connexions peu ramifiées dans les patchs défavorables. L'importance des angles de branchements dans la stratégie de foraging apparaît comme variable selon les études ([Cain, 1994](#) ; [Cain et al., 1996](#) ; [Oborny & Cain, 1997](#)). Le type de réponse décrit par [Sutherland & Stillman \(1988\)](#) a été observé notamment chez *Glechoma hederacea* en réponse à la disponibilité en lumière et en nutriments ([Slade & Hutchings, 1987](#)). Néanmoins, des travaux menés chez d'autres espèces ont mis en évidence que le comportement de foraging n'est pas universellement répandu chez les plantes clonales et qu'il dépend de l'espèce ([de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995](#)). En effet, si *G. hederacea* ([Price & Hutchings, 1996](#)) et *Prunella vulgaris* ([Schmidt, 1986](#)) allongent leurs entre-nœuds en réponse à la présence de compétiteurs, *Amphibromus scabrivalvis* par exemple les raccourcit ([Cheplick, 1997](#) ; [Cheplick & Gutierrez, 2000](#)). Un comportement de foraging est également plus fréquemment observé chez les espèces stolonifères que rhizomateuses ([de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995](#)). De plus, les variations de longueur d'entre-nœud et dans une moindre mesure, de la fréquence de ramification des connexions, sont plus marquées chez les espèces stolonifères ([Kleijn & van Groenendael, 1999](#)).

Ce foraging horizontal est complété par un foraging vertical ([van Kleunen & Fisher, 2001](#)). Pour acquérir efficacement la lumière, les plantes optimisent la hauteur de leurs organes photosynthétiques en allongeant leurs pétioles ([Marcuvitz & Turkington, 2000](#); [Kurashige & Agrawal, 2005](#)). La morphologie des feuilles peut également être modifiée par une augmentation de la surface spécifique foliaire ou de la quantité de biomasse allouée à leur tissu ([Sultan, 1995](#); [Lavorel & Garnier, 2002](#)).

En présence de compétiteurs, les apex de stolons perçoivent un faible ratio R : FR ([Leeflang, 1999](#) ; [Marcuvitz & Turkington, 2000](#)) qui déclenche des modifications de la balance des phytohormones au sein du clone augmentant alors la dominance apicale. Cette dominance s'exprime par une augmentation de la longueur des entre-nœuds et une inhibition des bourgeons latéraux à l'origine des ramifications, déterminant une architecture permettant au clone de fuir les patchs pauvres en lumière. A l'inverse, en l'absence de compétiteurs, le ratio R : FR est élevé et la dominance apicale est supprimée,

conduisant à une architecture clonale plus agrégée (Slade & Hutchings, 1987). L'utilisation des hormones comme messenger entre les modules présente un intérêt majeur pour le clone. Une faible altération du ratio R : FR perçu au niveau de l'apex d'une connexion et témoignant de l'approche d'un patch occupé par des compétiteurs, modifie suffisamment le contenu hormonal de la plante pour déclencher une réponse anticipative limitant la croissance du clone dans cette direction (Novoplansky et al., 1990 ; Oborny, 2004).

La réponse à la disponibilité en nutriments se base également sur des processus de suppression / activation des bourgeons latéraux. Une prise de nutriments, en particulier d'azote, accrue au niveau d'un module stimule la synthèse de cytokinines induisant un retard sur l'élongation des entre-nœuds ainsi qu'une levée de dormance des bourgeons latéraux (Slade & Hutchings, 1987 ; Kleijn & van Groenendael, 1999).

3.2.2. La spécialisation des modules

Dans un environnement hétérogène, la plupart des patches ne sont pas simplement bons ou mauvais mais possèdent le plus souvent, à la fois des caractéristiques favorables et défavorables pour la croissance des plantes car les ressources nécessaires à leur survie covarient spatialement de façon négative (Hutchings & Wijesinghe, 1997). Ainsi, les patches riches en nutriments peuvent être occupés par une végétation dense, diminuant la disponibilité en lumière. A l'inverse, les patches pauvres en nutriments sont généralement moins densément occupés et sont donc comparativement caractérisés par un fort niveau de luminosité (Stuefer & Hutchings, 1994). Dans ces habitats, le comportement de foraging du clone peut être accompagné d'une spécialisation morphologique de ses modules dans l'acquisition de la ressource la plus abondante localement, les différentes ressources acquises étant ensuite partagées par translocation (intégration physiologique) (Price & Marshall, 1999 ; Alpert & Stuefer, 1997). Ce phénomène de spécialisation assorti d'une coopération entre modules (partage du travail) peut être induit par l'hétérogénéité de l'environnement (réponse plastique) ou être programmé dans le développement de la plante (Alpert & Stuefer, 1997 ; Charpentier & Stuefer, 1999). Cette spécialisation des modules se manifeste par un ratio racine / tige fort dans les patches riches en nutriments et faible dans les patches riches en lumière (Figure 8), permettant aux clones d'optimiser l'acquisition des ressources, jusqu'à produire plus de biomasse en environnement hétérogène qu'en environnement homogène (Birch & Hutchings, 1994 ; Stuefer et al.,

1994). Ce système de coopération entre les modules implique une possibilité de transport basipétale des ressources (Stuefer & Hutchings, 1994) et pourrait dépendre de la durée de vie des modules. En effet, les espèces dont les modules ont une durée de vie courte comme *Glechoma hederacea*, n'investiraient pas dans ce type de plasticité (Stuefer & Hutchings, 1994). Néanmoins, le partage du travail entre les modules présente des risques pour le clone notamment puisqu'il réduit les capacités d'autonomie des modules. En cas de rupture des connexions suite à une perturbation, une maladie ou juste par sénescence, les modules spécialisés pourraient souffrir d'un plus fort taux de mortalité. De plus, la translocation des ressources à un coût qui doit être compensé par les bénéfices engendrés par cette plasticité (Alpert & Stuefer, 1997).




Figure 8. Partage du travail chez les plantes clonales.

Le foraging et le partage du travail chez les plantes clonales augmentent la fitness des clones en environnement hétérogène. Au sens de Novoplansky (2009), ils s'apparentent respectivement à une stratégie d'évitement et à une stratégie intermédiaire entre confrontation et tolérance. Ces réponses plastiques peuvent constituer un investissement risqué pour la plante.

3.3. L'importance des paramètres de l'environnement compétitif pour la plasticité de la plante

3.3.1. L'importance des paramètres d'hétérogénéité spatiale et temporelle de la compétition

Les bénéfices de la plasticité des modules et des connexions dépendent de la coïncidence spatio-temporelle entre la distribution de la ressource déterminée par la présence des compétiteurs et les réponses plastiques des modules, ainsi que du patron et de la fréquence avec laquelle les variations pertinentes de l'environnement se produisent dans l'habitat des espèces (Huber et al., 2004 ; de Kroon et al., 2005).

Le grain de l'hétérogénéité spatiale par rapport à la taille de l'unité de réponse (un module et un entre-nœud de connexion) est déterminant pour le caractère adaptatif d'une réponse plastique (Oborny & Cain, 1997). Si l'hétérogénéité intervenait à une échelle plus fine, chaque unité de réponse ressentirait toutes les variations possibles de l'environnement tandis qu'à une échelle plus grossière l'environnement apparaîtrait comme homogène à l'individu. Dans ces cas, il n'y aurait donc aucun avantage à la plasticité. Celle-ci serait avantageuse uniquement lorsque l'environnement varie spatialement à une échelle intermédiaire, *i.e.* plus large que l'unité de réponse mais plus petite que la distance de dispersion entre les modules parents et fils (Alpert & Simms, 2002) (Figure 9a). Dans l'intervalle de taille des patches perceptibles par la plante, des patches plus grands permettraient d'augmenter le niveau de spécialisation des modules (Wijesinghe & Hutchings, 1997) mais n'auraient aucun effet sur le comportement de foraging du clone (Wijesinghe & Hutchings, 1999).

L'amplitude des variations des conditions environnementales entre deux patches (niveau de contraste) correspond à la deuxième dimension de l'hétérogénéité spatiale. La plasticité devrait présenter un avantage pour la plante au sein d'un environnement caractérisé par des patches moyennement contrastés (Figure 9a). En effet, si les contrastes entre patches sont faibles, l'hétérogénéité de l'environnement n'a pas d'effet sur les performances de la plante, il n'est donc pas avantageux pour elle d'investir dans la plasticité. A l'inverse, si les contrastes sont élevés, une réponse plastique n'est pas suffisante pour permettre au clone de survivre au sein de deux environnements différents

(Wijesinghe & Hutchings, 1997 ; 1999 ; Alpert & Simms, 2002). Le comportement de foraging du clone et le niveau de spécialisation de ses modules sont tous deux influencés par le niveau de contraste entre les patches de l'environnement. Ces deux types de réponses plastiques sont plus efficaces lorsque les contrastes entre patches sont plus importants (dans la limite de ce qui tolérable par la plante) (Wijesinghe & Hutchings, 1999).

Par conséquent, à qualités environnementales identiques, l'efficacité de la plante à exploiter des habitats dépendra largement de la structuration spatiale de leurs patches de ressources (Wijesinghe & Hutchings, 1999) générés par la présence de compétiteurs (Jackson & Caldwell, 1993; Herben et al., 2000).




Figure 9. Caractère adaptatif de la plasticité en fonction (a) de la taille et des contrastes entre patches et (b) de la durée de maintien des conditions de l'environnement par rapport au temps de réponse des modules. D'après Alpert & Simms (2002).

Investir dans une réponse plastique est risqué pour les plantes si les différences de distribution spatiale des ressources changent au cours du temps, de sorte que l'architecture du réseau clonal et la morphologie des modules ne correspondent plus à leur environnement (Alpert & Stuefer, 1997). Ce risque est élevé si le rythme de changement de l'environnement correspond à celui de la réaction plastique des modules. Pour que la plasticité du clone reste avantageuse au sein d'un environnement qui varie au cours du temps, il faut alors que le trait réponde rapidement par rapport à la durée de maintien des conditions environnementales (Alpert & Simms, 2002 ; de Kroon et al., 2005) et que les

modules puisse changer de spécialisation rapidement (Alpert & Stuefer, 1997) (Figure 9b). Cette dernière condition dépend notamment de l'état du module (de Kroon et al., 2005).

3.3.2. Prédicibilité des variations spatio-temporelles de l'environnement




Figure 10. Avantage de la plasticité en fonction de la prédictibilité de l'environnement. D'après Alpert & Simms (2002).

La prédictibilité de l'environnement détermine la valeur adaptative d'une stratégie de croissance. Il s'agit en effet d'un meilleur indicateur des changements de coûts liés à la plasticité que la productivité et la variabilité de l'environnement (Oborny, 1994a ; 1994b). Une hétérogénéité spatiale et temporelle plus prévisible par la plante devrait favoriser sa plasticité (Alpert & Simms, 2002) (Figure 10). Par exemple un faible ratio R : FR au niveau du sol, indique de façon plus certaine une disponibilité en lumière dans la direction verticale qu'horizontale. Les plantes tendent donc à

être plus plastiques au niveau de leurs structures verticales (pétiole, feuilles) qu'horizontales (connexions) (Huber, 1997 ; Huber & Hutchings, 1997). De même, au sein d'un habitat forestier, un faible ratio R : FR n'indique pas une plus grande disponibilité en lumière dans la direction verticale de sorte que les modules se montrent moins plastiques dans cet habitat par rapport aux prairies (Dong, 1995). Par ailleurs, pour un niveau donné de prédictibilité de l'environnement, une plasticité pouvant intervenir plus tard dans le développement de la plante est plus avantageuse car elle ne requiert pas de celle-ci qu'elle ait prédit les conditions de son environnement longtemps à l'avance (Alpert & Simms, 2002).

4. DES TRAITS DE REPOSE AUX TRAITS D'EFFET

Les facteurs environnementaux (les interactions biotiques comme la compétition, les conditions climatiques ou le régime de perturbation) agissent comme des filtres déterminant quels individus persistent au sein de la communauté végétale et quels traits les caractérisent (Keddy, 1992 ; Diaz et al., 1999 ; Violle et al., 2007). Ces traits peuvent être utilisés pour estimer les processus de l'écosystème et notamment son fonctionnement (production de biomasse, cycle des nutriments...) (Lavorel & Garnier, 2002). Les traits influençant le fonctionnement de l'écosystème sont alors qualifiés de traits d'effet (Diaz & Cabido, 2001 ; Lavorel & Garnier, 2002 ; Violle et al., 2007).

4.1. Les fonctions liées aux patrons spatiaux des communautés de plantes

Les patrons spatiaux des communautés semblent influencer le fonctionnement des écosystèmes (Pacala & Deutschmann, 1995 ; Tilman & Kareiva, 1997) même si encore peu de littérature est disponible sur ce sujet. Pacala & Deutschmann (1995) ont ainsi montré par une étude de modélisation, que l'arrangement spatial des individus d'espèces arborescentes jouait sur la fonction de production de la communauté. Ce résultat a été confirmé en milieux arides, notamment parce que la structure agrégée des individus permettait une maximisation de l'acquisition des ressources en eau et en nutriments (Aguiar & Sala, 1999). D'autres fonctions comme le recyclage des nutriments et l'infiltration de l'eau sont également influencées par l'arrangement spatial des individus au sein de systèmes composés d'organismes encroûtants (cyanobactérie, lichen...). Maestre et al. (2005) ont montré une relation positive entre le couvert des organismes encroûtants et la respiration du sol. En effet, le carbone atmosphérique fixé par ces organismes est ensuite relâché dans le sol, stimulant son activité microbienne.

4.2. Importance des traits d'effet comme prédicteurs des fonctions écosystémiques

L'hypothèse de « Masse ratio » proposée par Grime (1998) postule que les fonctions de l'écosystème et de la communauté sont déterminés par les traits d'effet (Chapin et al., 2000 ; Eviner & Chapin, 2003) des espèces dominantes (*i.e.* contribuant majoritairement à la biomasse totale) et qu'elles sont relativement insensibles aux variations de richesse des espèces subordonnées ou transitives. L'hypothèse de masse ratio prend explicitement en

compte le nombre, l'abondance relative et l'identité (au travers de traits quantitatifs) des espèces présentes (Garnier et al., 2004). Elle conduit à la notion de trait agrégé à l'échelle de la communauté (T), correspondant à la somme des valeurs de traits de chaque espèce pondérées par leurs abondances relatives (Violle et al., 2007). Un processus de l'écosystème (P) serait alors une fonction de ce trait agrégé (T), $P = f(T)$ (Vile et al., 2006 ; Suding et al., 2008). Cette relation entre le trait d'effet et la fonction devrait se vérifier du niveau de l'individu à celui de la communauté ou de l'écosystème (Violle et al., 2007).

Se basant sur cette approche, plusieurs auteurs ont pu établir des relations entre traits d'effet et fonctions de l'écosystème. La production de biomasse en prairie a ainsi été reliée au taux de croissance des espèces (Relative Growth Rate) (Vile et al., 2006) et à la morphologie des feuilles via la surface spécifique foliaire (Specific Leaf Area – SLA –) et le taux de matière sèche foliaire (Leaf Dry Matter Content – LDMC –) (Garnier et al., 2004 ; 2007). De même, le taux de décomposition de la litière et les concentrations en carbone et en azote du sol, témoignant du recyclage des nutriments dépend de la SLA, du LDMC et du contenu en azote des feuilles (Garnier et al., 2004).

4.3. L'intervention potentielle des traits clonaux dans les fonctions écosystémiques

Weiher (1999) a suggéré que les traits clonaux sont des traits fonctionnels. La croissance clonale pouvant être à l'origine de la formation des patrons spatiaux, les traits clonaux la caractérisant seraient des indicateurs de ces patrons. Ils pourraient donc constituer des traits d'effet pour toutes les fonctions de l'écosystème qui leur sont associées. En particulier, les traits clonaux étant à l'origine d'un placement efficace des structures d'acquisition des ressources (les modules portant les racines et les feuilles) dans les patches les plus favorables (de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995; Huber et al., 1999), ils pourraient en théorie être des traits d'effet pour la production de biomasse. De même, la clonalité pourrait influencer la fonction de pollinisation au sein des communautés végétales (Charpentier, 2002). La croissance clonale participe à l'attraction des pollinisateurs en agrégeant localement la ressource en fleurs (Thompson, 2001). Pourtant à ce jour, aucune étude ne s'est focalisée sur la relation entre les traits clonaux des plantes et les fonctions de la communauté végétale.

~ Methodologie ~

Trois approches complémentaires pour étudier les prairies

Modèle d'étude	... page 42
Expérimentations en conditions contrôlées	... page 45
Modélisation de la croissance d'une population de plantes clonales	... page 52
Des bandes enherbées expérimentales intégrées à un paysage bocager	... page 73
 Article I – Modeling competition between plants using an Individual Based Model: Methods and effects on the growth of two species with contrasted growth forms	 ... page 62

Cette partie méthodologie présente le modèle d'étude de cette thèse, *i.e.* les systèmes prairiaux, ainsi que les méthodes mises en œuvre pour traiter les questions exposées en introduction. Les analyses statistiques menées sur les résultats issus de ces travaux seront présentées dans les différents articles.

L'étude des systèmes prairiaux menée au cours de ce travail de thèse a été basée sur trois approches complémentaires :

- une approche expérimentale en conditions contrôlées
- une approche de modélisation
- une approche expérimentale *in situ*

Les expérimentations au jardin fournissent les données nécessaires au calibrage des modèles et constituent un système simplifié par rapport à une communauté évoluant *in situ*. Néanmoins, les suivis sur le long terme sont fastidieux car les systèmes évoluent lentement et les réseaux des différents clones sont souvent difficiles à distinguer en communauté. La modélisation permet de résoudre ces problèmes mais également de tester facilement un grand nombre d'assemblages d'espèces et de facteurs, en séparant les effets respectifs liés à chacun d'eux. Enfin, l'approche *in situ* permet de vérifier en conditions réelles les résultats obtenus par les deux autres approches.

1. MODELE D'ETUDE

1.1. Les prairies

Les prairies semi-naturelles présentent une valeur écologique et environnementale, particulièrement au sein des paysages agricoles. Elles y assurent des fonctions de réservoirs de biodiversité, de préservation de la qualité des eaux par leur pouvoir épurateur, de stockage de carbone mais aussi de récréation.

Les communautés végétales de prairie sont dominées par des espèces herbacées majoritairement clonales (Klimeš et al., 1997). En zone tempérées, le taux de clonalité au sein des prairies a ainsi été estimé à 70% (van Groenendael & de Kroon, 1990). Il existe une grande diversité de formes de croissance clonale. Néanmoins, les formes dominantes sont celles dérivées de tiges modifiées à croissance plagiotrope (stolon, rhizome) formant des réseaux de modules (Klimeš et al., 1997) dont le degré d'agrégation dépend de la stratégie de croissance de l'espèce (Lovett Doust, 1981). Cette thèse se focalise sur les espèces clonales appartenant à cette forme.

1.2. Les bandes enherbées

1.2.1. Des systèmes prairiaux particuliers

Depuis 2005, les réglementations européenne et nationale imposent la mise en place de bandes enherbées en bordure des parcelles agricoles, le long des cours d'eau. Situées en lisière des parcelles cultivées, elles marquent la transition entre les parcelles et d'autres éléments naturels (haies, cours d'eau, bosquets) et/ou artificiels (fossés, chemins, routes) composant le paysage rural. Ces habitats semi-naturels font partie des éléments structurels des bords de champs (Marshall & Moonen, 2002) notamment en système bocager.

Ces bandes enherbées constituent des systèmes prairiaux particuliers. Il s'agit en effet de systèmes herbacés linéaires comprenant une majorité d'espèces à croissance clonale, assurant la pérennité du couvert végétal. Les particularités de ces bandes enherbées résident dans le fait qu'elles sont semées et soumises à des apports parfois élevés de pesticides, de fertilisants ou d'eau en provenance des cultures adjacentes.

1.2.2. Cadre législatif de la création des bandes enherbées

Les bandes enherbées font partie des mesures de Bonnes Conditions Agro-Environnementales (BCAE) constituant un critère d'attribution des aides de la Politique Agricole Commune. La liste des BCAE est définie par chacun des états membres ; en France, la BCAE « bandes tampons » règlemente les conditions de mise en place des bandes enherbées pour la protection des cours d'eau contre les pollutions diffuses. Selon le décret d'application de cette BCAE (Mars 2010), tous les cours d'eau figurant sur la liste définie au niveau préfectoral doivent être bordés de bandes enherbées. La loi Grenelle II promulguée le 12 juillet 2010, prévoit de compléter sous trois ans ce réseau de bandes enherbées, en vue de créer des réseaux de corridors biologiques fonctionnels. Des schémas de cohérence écologique visant à organiser leur mise en place devraient être créés à l'échelle régionale (décret d'application en attente). Les cours d'eau classés « BCAE » sont également concernés par la directive européenne « Nitrates » du 12 décembre 1991. Les bandes enherbées, implantées dans le cadre de la transcription en droit français (décret du 10 janvier 2001) de cette directive, doivent mesurer 5 m de large au minimum. Une liste des espèces autorisées et interdites dans les semis peut être définie au niveau préfectoral ; par exemple les légumineuses (Fabacées) ne sont pas autorisées ou seulement sous certaines conditions (en association avec des Poacées). En 2010, la mise en œuvre du quatrième programme d'action de la directive entraîne l'obligation de border par des bandes enherbées, l'ensemble des cours d'eau situés en Zones Vulnérables (zones définies au niveau préfectoral).

1.2.3. Pratiques de gestion autorisées

La gestion des bandes enherbées repose généralement sur le labour avant semis, la fauche ou le broyage, le traitement phytosanitaire et la fertilisation étant interdits. Le mode de gestion autorisé dépend à la fois du type de déclaration des bandes enherbées et de la réglementation correspondant à la situation donnée (BCAE ou Directive Nitrates). Les bandes peuvent également être déclarées en jachère (gel) ou en prairie, ajoutant des règles de gestion spécifiques qui peuvent encore être cumulées avec d'autres règles si l'espace déclaré est aussi affilié à d'autres systèmes (*e.g.* espace protégé, Zones d'Excédent

Structurel). La pratique la plus répandue consiste à broyer le couvert de façon répétée à partir de la pousse de printemps.

1.2.4. Les fonctions environnementales des bandes enherbées

Les bandes enherbées ont été créées pour leurs effets positifs sur l'environnement. Notamment, elles limitent l'érosion des sols et les mouvements de polluants vers les cours d'eau en contrebas de parcelles agricoles et servent d'habitats refuges ou de corridors écologiques pour la faune et la flore. L'efficacité des bandes enherbées à assurer ces fonctions dépend de leur couvert végétal et en particulier de sa composition. Cependant, à ce jour, les agriculteurs ne disposent d'aucune recommandation concernant le semis à utiliser.

2. EXPERIMENTATIONS EN CONDITIONS CONTROLEES

2.1. Communautés expérimentales d'espèces à croissance clonale

La croissance clonale des plantes influencerait la dynamique de leur communauté. Afin de tester cette hypothèse, des assemblages d'espèces clonales présentant des stratégies de croissance contrastées (avec différents degrés d'expansion spatiale) ont été testés parallèlement à des cultures témoins des espèces en l'absence de compétition. Ces assemblages diffèrent (i) par le nombre et la nature des stratégies de croissance clonale en mélange et (ii) par le nombre d'espèces représentant chacune des stratégies.

2.1.1. Choix des espèces clonales cultivées

Les espèces cultivées sont des espèces communes de prairies tempérées sélectionnées sur la base de leurs stratégies de croissance clonale. Ces stratégies sont distribuées le long d'un gradient d'agrégation des modules (Lovett Doust, 1981). A une extrémité, se situent les espèces « guérillas » caractérisées par un réseau lâche avec de longues connexions généralement opposées aux espèces « cespiteuses » dont les entre-nœuds sont tellement courts que les modules apparaissent soudés, formant une structure en touffe. Les espèces « phalanges » aux connexions courtes et ramifiées présentent une stratégie intermédiaire. Ces stratégies décrivant en réalité un continuum, les espèces ont été choisies de façon à maximiser les différences architecturales inter-stratégies. Cette sélection est donc basée sur les traits d'architecture des espèces, obtenus par des bases de données comme CLO-PLA (Klimeš & Klimešová, 1999) ou par la littérature (de Kroon & Knops, 1990; Tamm et al., 2002; Benot et al., 2009). Chaque stratégie de croissance clonale comprend finalement quatre espèces incluant une dicotylédone et trois monocotylédones de façon à respecter les proportions de ces types observées en prairie (Tableau 1) (Ernout, unpublished data).

Tableau 1. Espèces représentant chaque stratégie de croissance clonale.

	Guérilla (G)	Phalange (P)	Cespiteuse (C)
	<i>Elytrigia repens</i> L.	<i>Brachypodium pinnatum</i> L.	<i>Lolium perenne</i> L.
Monocotylédone	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> L.	<i>Festuca rubra</i> L.	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L.
	<i>Holcus mollis</i> L.	<i>Agrostis tenuis</i> Sibth.	<i>Holcus lanatus</i> L.
Dicotylédone	<i>Ranunculus repens</i> L.	<i>Anthemis nobilis</i> L.	<i>Centaurea nigra</i> L.

2.1.2. Caractérisation de la croissance des espèces en l'absence de compétition

De façon à caractériser la croissance des espèces en l'absence de compétition en termes de performances ou de morphologie, dix clones de chaque espèce ont été plantés en avril 2010 et cultivés pendant une saison (quatre mois) au sein du jardin expérimental de l'Université de Rennes 1. Les 120 unités de cultures de cette expérimentation avaient été randomisées au sein du dispositif expérimental.


2.1.3. Assemblages d'espèces clonales cultivés en mésocosmes

Des assemblages expérimentaux des 12 espèces prairiales sélectionnées ont été plantés dans des mésocosmes mis en place au sein du jardin expérimental de l'Université de Rennes 1 en Mai 2009.

Deux facteurs ont été testés au sein de ce dispositif :

- la nature et le nombre de stratégies de croissance clonale présentes dans le mélange (une, deux ou trois), toutes les combinaisons de stratégies ayant été établies : G, C, P, PC, PG, CG, PGC (soit sept types de mélange).
- le niveau de richesse spécifique par stratégie : une seule espèce (respectivement *E. repens*, *B. pinnatum* et *L. perenne* pour les stratégies guérilla, phalange et cespiteuse) ou quatre espèces simultanément (Figure 1).

La combinaison de ces deux facteurs conduit à 14 types de communautés différents. Les dix réplicats de chaque type d'assemblage ont été distribués aléatoirement au sein du dispositif expérimental comprenant au total 140 mésocosmes de $1.30 \times 1.30 \times 0.25 \text{ m}^3$.



Dispositif expérimental de 140 mésocosmes de 1.30 × 1.30 × 0.25 m³ (Juin 2010)

Figure 1. Principe du dispositif expérimental de 140 mésocosmes.

Dans chaque mésocosme, 48 modules ont été plantés selon un patron hexagonal (Birch et al., 2007) sur un substrat composé à 20% de sable et 80% de terre de jardin. Ces 48 modules ont été également distribués entre toutes les espèces présentes dans le mélange et leurs positions sur le patron de plantation initial ont été randomisées (Figure 1).

Un apport en engrais minéral à diffusion lente (teneur NPK : 20/5/10) a été fait juste avant la plantation de façon à homogénéiser les quantités en nutriments du sol entre tous les mésocosmes. Les caractéristiques moyennes du sol sont alors les suivantes : $\text{NO}_3^- = 34.4 \mu\text{g.g}$; $\text{C/N} = 7.21$; $\text{P} = 0.37 \text{ mg.g}$; $\text{PO}_4^{2-} = 40.3 \mu\text{g.g}$. Un arrosage uniforme automatisé a été mis en place en période estivale. Une fauche annuelle avec exportation de la biomasse aérienne est effectuée sur chaque mésocosme à la fin de l'été. Les apports extérieurs de graines (par désherbage manuel) ainsi que la reproduction sexuée des espèces

cultivées (par coupe des fleurs) ont été supprimés de façon à se focaliser sur la composante clonale de la dynamique de la communauté.

Des suivis de patrons spatiaux, de traits clonaux et des fonctions associées aux différents assemblages ont été réalisés au cours de cette expérimentation.

Ce dispositif expérimental nous a permis d'aborder les questions liées à la structuration spatiale des communautés végétales en relation avec les stratégies de croissance clonales des espèces ([Article II](#)), d'étudier la relation entre les traits clonaux et la fonction de production des communautés ([Article VI](#)) et de tester l'efficacité d'assemblages d'espèces par rapport aux fonctions attendues d'une bande enherbée ([Article VII](#)). Les questions liées à la plasticité des traits clonaux ont été abordées à l'échelle spécifique, ce qui a nécessité la mise en place de deux expérimentations complémentaires présentées ci-dessous.

2.2. Réponse d'espèces clonales à la compétition

De façon à étudier la plasticité de la croissance clonale en réponse à l'environnement biotique, deux types d'expérimentations ont été mises en œuvre à l'échelle spécifique visant à déterminer (i) le type d'information sur l'environnement utilisé par la plante pour adapter sa réponse ([Article III](#)) et (ii) les effets des caractéristiques de l'environnement compétitif sur cette réponse ([Article IV](#)).

2.2.1. Cultures au sein de différents environnements nutritifs

Cette expérimentation vise à déterminer le type d'information utilisé par la plante pour adapter son comportement de foraging à la disponibilité en ressource de l'environnement. Les effets de la qualité et de la variabilité de la ressource en nutriments du sol sur la stratégie de croissance clonale ont été testés sur deux espèces de potentilles – *Potentilla reptans* et *Potentilla anserina* (Rosacées) – de façon à limiter les différences de réponse liées à la phylogénie. Quatre traitements ont été testés : trois traitements définis par une qualité de ressource trophique constante (pauvre, moyenne ou riche) et un traitement présentant une qualité de ressource trophique globalement moyenne mais variable.

L'expérimentation s'est déroulée au sein du jardin expérimental de l'Université de Rennes 1 de Juillet à Octobre 2010. Les trois niveaux de ressource en nutriments du sol ont été établis au travers de mélanges sable / terreau : pauvre 3:1, moyen 1:1 et riche 1:3. Ce terreau contenait un engrais à diffusion lente ($0.44 \text{ kg.m}^{-3} \text{ N}$, $0.5 \text{ kg.m}^{-3} \text{ P}$, $0.56 \text{ kg.m}^{-3} \text{ K}$) assurant une qualité de sol constante au cours de l'expérimentation. Afin de limiter les différences de réponse liées au génotype, quatre ramets appartenant au même clone ont été assignés à un réplicat de chaque traitement testé. Chaque individu clonal a été cultivés en pots de $8 \times 8 \times 7 \text{ cm}^3$ disposés en ligne, un pot pour chaque ramet (Figure 2). Les ramets initiaux ont été plantés dans un sol de qualité moyenne de façon à limiter le stress de transplantation. La qualité du second au 13^e pot correspond au traitement testé tandis que les pots 14 à 16 ont été remplis avec du sol de qualité moyenne de façon à avoir des conditions environnementales comparables en fin de croissance.

Les effets de la qualité et de la variabilité de la ressource sur le comportement de foraging des individus clonaux ont été évalués par la mesure de tous les entre-nœuds du stolon primaire.

Les cultures ont été arrosées chaque jour et les connexions secondaires ou les fleurs développées en cours de croissance ont été coupées.




Figure 2. Dispositif expérimental. Les lettres désignent les traitements testés: P pauvre, M moyen, R riche et V variable.

2.2.2. Cultures d'une espèce cible en présence de compétiteurs à stratégies de croissance clonale contrastées

Cette expérimentation a pour objectif de déterminer la réponse de *Trifolium repens* à l'identité de ses compétiteurs au travers de leurs effets sur l'intensité et l'hétérogénéité de la compétition. Elle a été menée au sein du jardin expérimental de l'Université de Rennes 1 de Mars à Août 2009. *T. repens* appartenant à la famille des Fabacées qui présentent une symbiose racinaire avec rhizobium (fixateur du diazote de l'air), cette expérimentation s'est focalisée sur la réponse de *T. repens* à la compétition pour la lumière.

La croissance de *T. repens* a été soumise à quatre régimes compétitifs. Un clone de l'espèce cible a été cultivé avec quatre types de matrices, caractérisées par différentes stratégies de croissance clonale : cespiteuse (*Lolium perenne*), guérilla stolonifère (*Agrostis stolonifera*), guérilla rhizomateuse (*Elytrigia repens*) et une monoculture (*Trifolium repens*) (Klimeš et al., 1997; Lovett-Doust, 1981). Un traitement témoin (sans compétition) a également été établi. Pour contrôler l'effet lié au génotype, 10 clones de l'espèce cible ont été collectés et cultivés en pots avant le début de l'expérimentation afin d'obtenir cinq modules de même âge. Chacun de ces modules a ensuite été assigné à l'un des 10 réplicats de chaque traitement répartis de façon aléatoire parmi les 50 unités de culture.

Au sein de chaque unité de culture de $80 \times 80 \times 20 \text{ cm}^3$, les clones formant la matrice ont été plantés selon un patron hexagonal avec au centre le clone cible de *T. repens* (Figure 3), sur un substrat composé de 10% de sable et 90% de terre de jardin. Les clones composant les matrices ont été plantés deux mois avant les clones cibles afin que ces matrices soient suffisamment développées pour exercer une pression compétitive.




Figure 3. Patron de plantation des clones de la matrice et du clone cible de *Trifolium repens*. Les points représentent les 36 clones compétiteurs, la croix représente le clone cible.

La hauteur maximale de *T. repens* étant d'environ 20 cm, les individus des matrices ont été maintenus à cette hauteur tout au long de l'expérimentation pour conserver une hauteur identique entre les matrices et la cible. Les cultures ont été arrosées chaque jour et les adventices ont été régulièrement éliminées de façon manuelle.

A l'issue de cette expérimentation, les performances des différents clones ainsi que leurs traits de croissance verticale et horizontale ont été mesurés et reliés aux valeurs d'intensité et d'hétérogénéité de la compétition.

3. MODELISATION DE LA CROISSANCE D'UNE POPULATION DE PLANTES CLONALES

L'approche de modélisation a été menée en parallèle de l'approche expérimentale. Elle a pour objectif de développer un modèle de croissance d'un assemblage d'individus clonaux en compétition. Cette approche est complémentaire de l'approche expérimentale car elle permet d'établir quels sont les traits clonaux impliqués dans le succès d'une population, en distinguant les effets de chaque propriété clonale et en testant facilement un grand nombre de combinaisons de valeurs de traits (ce qui est impossible expérimentalement) ([Article V](#)). Cette approche a été développée en collaboration avec le Department of Computer Science de l'Université de Houston (Texas, Etats-Unis) au sein duquel un séjour de trois mois a été effectué.

3.1. Le modèle PRAIRIE

3.1.1. Principe

Le modèle PRAIRIE est un modèle individu centré qui simule la croissance d'un assemblage de plantes clonales mono- ou hétérospécifique sur une saison, sans intervention de processus de mortalité ou de reproduction sexuée. Les modèles individus centrés présentent l'intérêt de décrire les écosystèmes à partir de l'individu : son comportement et ses caractéristiques (taille, espèce, ...) déterminent les propriétés émergentes du système au sein duquel il opère ([Grimm & Railsback, 2005](#)). L'unité élémentaire du modèle est le clone, modélisé sous la forme d'un réseau d'unités « modules » reliées entre elles par des unités « connexions » non photosynthétiques. Les modules permettent l'acquisition de ressources (biomasse) tandis que les connexions interviennent dans leur stockage et translocation. L'espace est représenté par une grille hexagonale offrant six directions de croissance et des interactions compétitives équilibrées entre les modules ([Birch et al. 2007](#)). Les paramètres de croissance des plantes sont fonction du temps.

Le modèle comprend deux niveaux : le modèle PRAIRIE qui décrit les règles d'interactions entre clones et le modèle CLONAL simulant la croissance d'un individu ([Mony et al., 2011](#)) (Figure 4).




Figure 4. Principe de fonctionnement du modèle PRAIRIE.

3.1.2. Règles de croissance d'un individu clonal

CLONAL gouverne la croissance en deux dimensions de chaque plante clonale au travers de 19 paramètres d'entrée et de neuf lois stochastiques de croissance relatives au métabolisme, au stockage des ressources, à la forme et à la stratégie de croissance de la plante.

- Métabolisme de la plante et stockage des ressources

A chaque pas de temps t , la quantité totale de ressource du clone $R_T(t)$ est calculée suivant l'équation (L1):

$$(L1) R_T(t) = R_T(t-1) + \sum_{g=1}^{g=n} R_g(t-1) - aC, R(1) = 1$$

où $R_g(t)$ est le gain net en ressource de chaque unité de croissance g (par accumulation de biomasse pour les unités "module", par stockage pour les unités "connexion"), C le coût de création d'une unité de croissance g (ce coût peut varier selon s'il s'agit d'une unité

module ou connexion) et a égal à zéro si aucune nouvelle unité est ajoutée au clone, égal à un sinon.

L'accumulation de biomasse intervient à l'échelle du module et a été modélisée par une loi logistique à chaque pas de temps :

$$(L2) \quad \frac{dB_r(t)}{dt} = r_p (1 - r_s) B_r(t) \left(1 - \frac{B_r(t)}{r_{mr}} \right)$$

avec $B_r(t)$ la biomasse du module r , r_p une constante donnant la quantité de biomasse produite par photosynthèse, $1 - r_s$ la fraction de biomasse allouée à la formation de réserves à long terme et r_{mr} la biomasse maximale atteignable par un module.

La ressource disponible pour la croissance d'un module r est calculée sur l'ensemble des unités de croissance appartenant à la même unité d'intégration physiologique (IPU) suivant :

$$(L3) \quad R_{IPU}(r) = \sum_{g=1}^{r=n_{IPU}} R_g$$

où R_g est la ressource de l'unité de croissance g , n_{IPU} est le nombre d'unités de croissance composant l'IPU. R_g est nulle pour une unité de connexion qui stocke les ressources sur le long terme (ressources indisponibles pour la croissance).

- Forme de la plante et colonisation spatiale

La colonisation de l'espace par croissance clonale repose sur deux processus : l'élongation des connexions existantes et l'addition de nouvelles branches à partir des modules (ramification). Ici les processus conduisant à la croissance spatiale du clone seront détaillés en l'absence de réponse plastique à la compétition.

La colonisation spatiale débute par la détermination du processus de croissance intervenant :

$$(L4) p_{el/br} = \alpha, \alpha \in [0; 1]$$

où $p_{el/br}$ est la probabilité d'élongation et α une variable aléatoire entre 0 et 1. $p_{el/br(0)}$ est fixé comme seuil pour établir quel processus de croissance intervient à un pas de temps donné. Si $p_{el/br} > p_{el/br(0)}$ le clone croit par élongation, si $p_{el/br} < p_{el/br(0)}$ le clone croit par ramification.

A chaque pas de temps, la plante croit par l'élongation ou la ramification de l'une de ses connexions, possédant la plus forte probabilité P_{el} ou P_{br} de s'allonger ou de se ramifier respectivement.

La probabilité P_{el} de chaque connexion (c) de s'allonger est calculée suivant :

$$(L5) P_{el}(c) = \beta \left(\frac{1}{(1 + E_l G(c)) (1 + E_g L(c))} \right), \beta \in [0; 1]$$

où β est une variable aléatoire entre 0 et 1, $G(c)$ et $L(c)$ sont la génération et la longueur de la connexion respectivement, E_g et E_l des variables exprimant la dépendance de l'élongation par rapport à la génération et à la longueur de la connexion respectivement.

L'unité de croissance créée au cours du processus d'élongation (connexion ou module) est définie en relation avec la distance inter-module D_r attribuée à chaque module r : si la distance depuis le dernier module est inférieure à D_r une unité de connexion est créée, sinon un nouveau module est mis en place. D_r suit une loi stochastique :

$$(L6) D_r = d_0 + \mu d_1, \mu \in [0; 1]$$

où d_0 et d_1 sont des entiers représentant un nombre d'unités de connexion.

Dans le cas d'un processus de ramification, CLONAL définit quelle connexion doit se ramifier. La probabilité de ramification de chaque connexion du clone $P_{br}(c)$ est calculée suivant :

$$(L7) P_{br}(c) = \gamma \frac{(1 + B_l L(c))}{(1 + B_g G(c))}, \gamma \in [0 ; 1] \text{ if } G(c) < 3$$

$$P_{br}(c) = 0 \quad \text{if } G(c) \geq 3$$

avec γ une variable aléatoire comprise entre 0 et 1, $G(c)$ et $L(c)$ respectivement la génération et la longueur de la connexion. B_l et B_g expriment la dépendance du processus de ramification par rapport à la longueur et à la génération de la connexion respectivement.

Chaque module (r) de la connexion sélectionnée a une probabilité P_{br} de porter la nouvelle branche :

$$(L8) P_{br}(r) = \delta \left(\frac{1}{e + B_p d(r)} \right), \delta \in [0 ; 1]$$

où δ est une variable aléatoire comprise entre 0 et 1, e une constante, $d(r)$ la distance entre le module r et la base de la connexion à laquelle il appartient, et B_p une variable exprimant la dépendance du processus de ramification à la distance module - base de la branche.

Pour un processus de ramification, l'unité de croissance produite est obligatoirement une unité de connexion.

La probabilité p_g de créer une nouvelle unité de croissance pour l'élongation ou la ramification du clone, est calculée en considérant la quantité de ressources disponibles suivant (L9) :

$$(L9) P_g = \varepsilon \left[1 + \log \left(\frac{R_{IPU}}{c_g} \right) \right], \varepsilon \in [0 ; 1] \text{ if } R_{IPU} \geq c_g$$

$$P_g = 0 \quad \text{if } R_{IPU} < c_g$$

avec $p_g = p_{\text{module}}$ ou $p_{\text{connexion}}$ selon la nature de l'unité de croissance à créer, $c_g = c_r$ or c_c le coût de production d'un module ou d'une unité de connexion respectivement, ε une variable aléatoire appartenant à l'intervalle 0-1 et R_{IPU} la quantité de ressources disponibles au sein de l'IPU. L'unité de croissance est créée lorsque $p_g > p_{g0}$, p_{g0} étant donnée comme paramètre d'entrée du modèle.

La compétition intra et inter-clones empêche la création de modules dans les cellules qui sont déjà occupées par d'autres modules mais n'affecte pas la création des unités de connexion qui peuvent être mises en place quelque soit le statut de la cellule cible (libre ou occupée par une unité module ou connexion). Si cette règle de compétition est satisfaite, une nouvelle unité est créée et le coût de création de l'unité (c_g) est prélevé à l'IPU. Sinon, aucune unité n'est ajoutée au clone. Une seule unité de croissance est mise en place par pas de temps.

3.1.3. Règles d'interactions des individus clonaux

Le modèle PRAIRIE décrit les règles d'interaction de compétition entre les différents clones. Plusieurs méthodes (61 au total) recensées dans la littérature ont été testées afin de modéliser ces interactions entre des individus appartenant à deux espèces aux stratégies de croissance clonale contrastées ([Article I](#)). La compétition y a été caractérisée au travers de quatre paramètres (la zone d'interaction entre les individus, son intensité, ses effets sur la plante cible et la réponse plastique de cette plante cible) pour lesquels plusieurs modèles ont été testés. Aucune distinction n'a été faite entre la compétition intra- et interclone. Les résultats de cette étude montrent que les performances et l'architecture des individus appartenant aux deux espèces étudiées varient en fonction de la méthode de modélisation de la compétition utilisée. Les effets de la méthode de modélisation de la compétition sur

les paramètres de sortie dépendent également de l'espèce et de l'assemblage considéré. Cette étude souligne donc l'importance du choix des modèles simulés pour l'issue de la dynamique des assemblages de plantes clonales et propose un panel de méthodes réalistes pour modéliser les interactions de compétition entre individus clonaux.

3.1.4. Paramètres du modèle

Le modèle CLONAL repose sur 19 paramètres d'entrée impliqués dans les neuf lois de croissance stochastique. Pour chacun de ces paramètres différentes valeurs ont été testées (Tableau 2). Chaque combinaison de valeurs des paramètres définit alors une espèce.

Tableau 2. Paramètres d'entrée du modèle CLONAL. Les valeurs de paramètres ont été déterminées par expérimentation et revue littéraire.

Signification	Label	Valeurs
Métabolisme et stockage des ressources		
Incrément de biomasse par pas de temps par module via la photosynthèse (L2)	r_p	0.3
Biomasse allouée à la formation de réserves dans les unités de connexion (L2)	r_s	0.1
Coût pour la création d'une unité module (L1) (L9)	c_r	1
Coût pour la création d'une unité de connexion (L1) (L9)	c_c	0.5
Biomasse maximale atteignable par un module (L2)	r_{mr}	20
Quantité de ressource maximale stockée dans une unité de connexion	r_{mc}	10
Seuil de probabilité pour la création d'une nouvelle unité de croissance	p_{g0}	0.6
Nombre d'unités de croissance au sein de l'IPU (L3)	n_{IPU}	10
Forme de la plante et colonisation spatiale		
<i>Structural blue-print</i>		
Nombre maximal de branches se développant depuis le module initial	n_0	2; 4; 6
Nombre maximal de branches se développant depuis les autres modules	n_b	1; 2
Distance inter-module minimale (L6)	d_0	1; 2; 3; 4
Variabilité de la distance inter-module (L6)	d_1	0; 2
Seuil de probabilité pour le processus d'élongation	$p_{el/br(0)}$	0.2; 0.5; 0.8
<i>Ontogénie</i>		
Dépendance de l'élongation à la longueur de la connexion (L5)	E_l	0.02; 0.2; 2
Dépendance de l'élongation à la génération de la connexion (L5)	E_g	0.001; 0.01; 0.1
Dépendance de la ramification à la longueur de la connexion (L7)	B_l	0.001; 0.01; 0.1
Dépendance de la ramification à la génération de la connexion (L7)	B_g	0.02; 0.2; 2
Constante de (L8)	e	0; 1
Dépendance de la localisation de la ramification à la distance module-base de la connexion (L8)	B_p	0.001; 0.01; 0.1


3.2. Déroulement d'une simulation

La phase d'initialisation du modèle PRAIRIE définit (i) les dimensions de la grille de la prairie et la durée (nombre de pas de temps) de la simulation et (ii) le nombre d'unités élémentaires (*i.e.* clones) à semer sur cette prairie ainsi que les positions aléatoires de leurs modules initiaux. A chaque pas de temps, PRAIRIE applique les processus de croissance décrit par CLONAL à tous les clones pris dans un ordre aléatoire. Un nouveau pas de temps débute alors jusqu'à ce que la simulation soit terminée (Figure 5).

3.3. Paramètres de sortie calculés

A l'issue des simulations menées avec le modèle PRAIRIE différents paramètres de sortie ont été calculés pour caractériser (i) les performances des clones en termes de biomasse et nombre de modules et (ii) l'architecture des clones (nombre et longueur des connexions). Ces paramètres sont des moyennes calculées sur les réplicats de simulation.

Les campagnes de simulation ont été menées par Volunteer Computing. A travers le monde, des volontaires disposant d'une connexion internet, ont mis à disposition de la plateforme BOINC (Berkeley Open Infrastructure for Network Computing) (Anderson, 2004) leurs ressources informatiques non utilisées pour réaliser des simulations. Cette étude est intégrée au projet « Virtual Prairie » (ViP) accessible via le site : <http://vcsc.cs.uh.edu/virtual-prairie> qui rassemble aujourd'hui des milliers d'ordinateurs de volontaires. Les études en lien avec le projet ViP sont, à notre connaissance, les premières en écologie à se baser sur ce mode de simulation.



Modeling competition between plants using an Individual Based Model: Methods and effects on the growth of two species with contrasted growth forms

A.-K. Bittebiere^{a,*}, C. Mony^a, B. Clément^a, M. Garbey^b

^a UMR 6553 Ecobio, University of Rennes 1, Av. du Général Leclerc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France

^b Department of Computer Science, University of Houston, 501 Philipp G. Hoffman Hall, Houston, TX 77204-3010, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Available online xxx

Keywords:
Competition
Individual Based Model
Clonal plant
Method comparison

ABSTRACT

Individual Based Models are emergent modeling approaches that are developed on the behavior of interacting individuals to study ecosystems properties. Their relevance resides in the validity of the interaction rules between individuals defined in the model. Competitive interactions between plant individuals can be implemented from the combination of four main attributes: (i) the zone of interaction of the target plant, (ii) the intensity of competition, (iii) the effect of competition, and (iv) the target plant response. This study aims at determining the effects of the method used for modeling competition on the performance and individual architecture of two species. We simulated the growth of a guerilla and of a phalanx species either in monoculture or in mixture using 61 methods for modeling competition derived from the published literature and implemented in an Individual Based Model. We showed that (i) the performance and individual architecture of the two species varies with the modeling method, (ii) the effect of the modeling method on the model outputs depends on the species and on the assemblage considered. We subsequently emphasized the importance of accurately calibrating models in particular with experimental data. We finally proposed basic rules supported by literature to evaluate the relevance of the different methods tested.

© 2011 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The last twenty years have seen the emergence of numerous models, which are specified to use individuals as their basic unit (Grimm, 1999; Judson, 1994; Uchmański and Grimm, 1996). In contrast with the classical analytical models, the so-called Individual Based Models (IBMs), really make an improvement by being developed “bottom-up” rather than “top-down” (Grimm, 1999). IBMs describe the ecological system from the individuals' point of view: their behavior and characteristics (size, physiology, genotype, ...) determine the emergent properties of the system within which they operate (DeAngelis et al., 1994; Lomnicki, 1988). Specifically, this approach has largely improved the modeling of clonal plants systems by incorporating particular characteristics linked with clonality (Herben and Suzuki, 2002; Wildová et al., 2007).

Clonal individuals have the capacity of colonizing space at short distances through asexual reproduction, by producing genetically identical and potentially independent ramets that are connected through horizontal stems to form a clonal fragment or genet (van Groenendael et al., 1996). Resources may also be translocated within the clone through connections (i.e. physiological integration), thus supporting the growth of juvenile ramets (Herben, 2004).

Competitive interactions are local (Berger et al., 2008; Herben et al., 2000; Murrell et al., 2001; Purves and Law, 2002) and usually strongly influenced by both ramet characteristics (i.e. size, age, genotype) (Berger et al., 2008; Grimm and Railsback, 2005) and genet clonal properties (i.e. space colonization strategy, physiological integration) (Herben, 2004; Humphrey and Pyke, 1998). As a result, classical population or community-level models seem to have poor significance compared to IBMs to investigate questions about clonal plant community dynamics (Berger et al., 2008; Judson, 1994). Nevertheless, rules regulating the interactions of the basic units are essential for simulating a realistic system. Individual Based Models are therefore sensitive to the way in which they are defined. The determination of these rules presents an obvious challenge, since interactions are not just the sum of individual

Abbreviations: IBM, Individual Based Model; ZI, zone of interaction.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +33 223236663.

E-mail addresses: annekristel.bittebiere@orange.fr (A.-K. Bittebiere), cendrine.mony@univ-rennes1.fr (C. Mony), bernard.clement@univ-rennes1.fr (B. Clément), garbey@cs.uh.edu (M. Garbey).

properties (Grimm and Railsback, 2005; Law et al., 1997; Weigelt et al., 2007), especially in the case of clonal plants where individuals may be defined at two related scales (i.e. the ramet and the genet).

Among all interactions, competition has been recognized as one of the main factors that structure plant communities and determine system dynamics (Gibson et al., 1999; Rees et al., 1996; Warren et al., 2002; Wilson, 2007). Competition arises as a result of the shared requirement by plants for a limited resource, which leads to a decrease in growth, survival and/or the reproductive success of competing individuals (Weigelt and Jolliffe, 2003; Wilson, 2007). Competition is classically characterized by four components: (i) the zone of interaction, (ii) the intensity of competition, (iii) the effect of competition, and (iv) the individual response to competition (Berger et al., 2008; Gibson et al., 1999; Goldberg, 1987; Weigelt and Jolliffe, 2003). The zone of interaction usually refers to the individual neighborhood since this is now admitted that plants are sensitive to the competitive interactions they experience in their close environment rather than in the overall community (Murrell et al., 2001; Purves and Law, 2002). Competition intensity and effect describe to what extent competition decreases the environmental quality of an individual and the potential consequences on its growth (Weigelt and Jolliffe, 2003). Furthermore, the response of the individual designates the local architectural adaptation of plants to maintain their performance in the presence of competitors (Goldberg and Fleetwood, 1987; Goldberg and Landa, 1991). Many studies have based models of plant interaction on these four competition attributes (Bauer et al., 2002; Herben and Suzuki, 2002; Kun and Oborny, 2003; Weiner, 1982), through diverse mathematical descriptions with different levels of complexity and realism. Yet, studies comparing the effects of different mathematical descriptions on model outputs are still scarce (Herben and Novoplansky, 2010).

Hence, in the current study we developed a method to compare different models of competition between clonal plants using the same modeling conditions. For each of the four competition attributes, we selected two to five different models derived from a survey of the published literature, and subsequently tested them using IBM PRAIRIE. We aimed at evaluating the effect of the modeling method on the performance and on the clonal architecture of two species cultivated alone or in mixture. These species are characterized by contrasted strategies of spatial colonization (guerilla and phalanx) chosen to be representative of the competitive strategies and architectures displayed by clonal plants in real systems. These strategies have been largely studied (Fischer et al., 2004; Humphrey and Pyke, 1998; Lovett Doust, 1981) giving us literature support to compare and evaluate the effects of the modeling methods tested on the model outputs.

2. Growth of interacting clonal units

2.1. Model principles

We developed an individual-based model, which simulates the growth of a clonal plant population or community for one growing season without mortality or sexual reproduction. Indeed modeling the accurate process of ramet mortality is difficult (experimental data remain scarce) and sexual reproduction is assumed to be negligible (seeds germination occur generally at the beginning of the following growth season). Each clonal plant was considered as a branched network of ramets that were linked through non-photosynthetic connections. Space was represented by a hexagonal grid allowing six possible growing directions and balanced competitive interactions between ramets, especially for diagonal interactions (Birch et al., 2007). The plant growth parameters are a function of the time step t .

2.2. Model structure

The Individual Based Model PRAIRIE relies on the model CLONAL, which simulates the two-dimension growth of one clone (Mony et al., 2011). This model is defined by 16 input parameters of eight stochastic growth rules, characterizing the clonal properties relative to the (i) metabolism and storage of resource, (ii) form and spatial colonization of the plant. The initialization phase of PRAIRIE first determines the dimensions of the prairie and the number of time steps for each simulation run. Second, it provides the number of clones to sow on the prairie and the position of their initial ramet. At each time step, the prairie model simulates the growth of each clone, which is selected in a random order, using the CLONAL model [for a detailed description of the model see Mony et al. (2011) and Appendix A]. A single growth unit per clone (either a ramet or a connection cell) is created per time step if the amount of resource required for its creation is available. The nature of the growth unit produced depends on the interrampet distance implemented as a model parameter. If the distance from the last ramet is lower than this parameterized interrampet distance then a connection cell is produced, otherwise a ramet is settled. Ramets allow for the acquisition of resource which may have the meaning of plant biomass while the connection cells are only used for storage and transport of resources. Competition rules between ramets depend on the method being used for modeling competition that is tested during the simulation. Connection units are not affected by competition and can be created for colonization regardless of the cell status (occupied by a ramet or a connection unit or available). Once all clones have grown, a new time step begins until the entire run is completed.

3. Methods for modeling competition

3.1. Adaptation of models to PRAIRIE

Several models were originally used to investigate mixture dynamics of either annual species or species growing in a non-grid-based environment. These models were therefore adapted to fit with PRAIRIE, allowing comparison in the same referential. Nevertheless, certain models, particularly those that defined competition intensity by the probability to win competition (Colasanti et al., 2007; Oborny et al., 2000; Silvertown et al., 1992) or by the number of overlapping ramets (Oborny, 1994a,b) did not match with the structure of the PRAIRIE code, and were not included in this study.

3.2. Zone of interaction

Each ramet present in the zone of interaction of a focal ramet is assumed to be a competitor for space (scenarios 1–3) and resources (scenarios 2 and 3) without any distinction between related and unrelated ramets.

Scenario 1: Zones of interaction (ZI) were not defined; individuals compete only for space and not for resources (Fischer et al., 2008; Winkler and Klotz, 1997). This first scenario is the basis of the simplest method for modeling competition that is tested (Table 1; method 1). Competition only affects the probability of ramet implantation without any calculation of competition intensity. It may be assumed to be an extreme case of the second scenario, in which the radius of the ZI of ramet i (ω_i) is equal to zero.

Scenario 2: The area of the plant ZI is fixed. It can be limited either to a certain number of cells in cellular automata, generally the four cells surrounding the target with a square lattice environment, termed the von Neumann neighborhood (Mágori et al., 2003; Oborny et al., 2001; Silvertown et al., 1992) or to a fixed-radius

A.-K. Bittebiere et al. / Ecological Modelling xxx (2011) xxx–xxx

Table 1
Description of the methods for modeling competition tested in this study.

Competition effect	Zone of interaction	Competition intensity	Plant response	Number of methods with $cp_0 = 0.03$	Number of methods with $cp_0 = 0.06$	
Ramet establishment probability	No interaction zone	Not implemented	A	1		
Ramet establishment probability and biomass accumulation	$\omega_i = \omega_0$ with $\omega_0 = 1$	$cp_j = cp_0$	A	2	32	
			B	3	33	
			C	4	34	
			D	5	35	
			E	6	36	
	cp_j variable			A	7	37
				B	8	38
				C	9	39
				D	10	40
				E	11	41
	$\omega_i = \omega_0$ with $\omega_0 = 2$	$cp_j = cp_0$		A	12	42
				B	13	43
				C	14	44
				D	15	45
				E	16	46
	cp_j variable			A	17	47
				B	18	48
				C	19	49
D				20	50	
E				21	51	
ω_i variable	$cp_j = cp_0$		A	22	52	
			B	23	53	
			C	24	54	
			D	25	55	
			E	26	56	
cp_j variable			A	27	57	
			B	28	58	
			C	29	59	
			D	30	60	
			E	31	61	

A: no response of the plant; B: modification of the elongation or of the ramification directions; C: reduction of the interramet distance; D: elongation of the interramet distance independent of the species; and E: elongation of the interramet distance dependent of the species.

circular area with the target plant as its center in a continuous environment (Silander and Pacala, 1985; Turnbull et al., 2004). We tested:

$$\omega_i = \omega_0 \tag{1}$$

where ω_i is the radius in number of cells of the hexagon delimiting the ZI of focal ramet i and ω_0 is the constant (Table 1; methods 2–21). The cell width measures approximately 1.5 cm giving a radius of the interaction zone of $1.5 \times \omega_0$ cm.

Scenario 3: The radius of the target plant ZI may vary as a function of its size, which is represented either by its stem radius or by its diameter (Bauer et al., 2002; Wild and Winkler, 2008) or its biomass (Wyszomirski et al., 1999). This suggests that individual resource uptake increases with size (Goldberg, 1987). We assumed that a ramet cannot accumulate more than a certain amount of biomass B_{\max} . A ramet reaching B_{\max} is supposed to have a fixed zone of interaction characterized by its radius ω_{\max} (the neighborhood size of a mature ramet stop increasing). The radius of the ZI (in number of cells) of a growing ramet i is thus calculated following (2):

$$\omega_i(B_i, t) = 1 + \left[(\omega_{\max} - 0.5) \times \left(\frac{B_i(t)}{B_{\max}} \right) \right] \tag{2}$$

where $\omega_i(B_i, t)$ is varying as a function of the biomass of the focal ramet i ($B_i(t)$), weighted by the ZI radius and the biomass of a mature ramet (respectively ω_{\max} and B_{\max}). The cell width measures approximately 1.5 cm, therefore in this scenario the radius of the ZI of a given ramet varies in a range of 1.5 cm to $1.5 \times \omega_{\max}$ cm (Table 1; methods 22–31).

3.3. Competition intensity

Weiner (1982) and Turnbull et al. (2004) based their definitions of competition intensity on the competitive pressure applied by each competitor on the target. We adapted and implemented this version in our models. Hence, competition intensity $I_i(\omega_i, t)$ is described as the sum of competitive pressures cp_j which is applied by all competitors j of the focal ramet i , as indicated in Eq. (3):

$$I_i(\omega_i, t) = \sum_j cp_j \tag{3}$$

Scenario 1: The first model that is tested assumes that all neighboring ramets present the same competitive pressure cp_0 (Table 1; methods 2–6, 12–16 and 22–26):

$$cp_j = cp_0, \text{ with } cp_0 \text{ a constant} \tag{3.1}$$

Scenario 2: In a second model, the competitive pressure of competitor j is a function of its biomass ($B_j(t)$), which is known to be strongly related to competitive ability (Goldberg, 1987), and its distance to the focal plant (d_j) (Berger and Hildenbrandt, 2000; Berger et al., 2008; Firbank and Watkinson, 1987; Weiner, 1982) (Table 1; methods 7–11, 17–21 and 27–31), as indicated in the following Eq. (3.2):

$$cp_j(B_j, d_j, t) = cp_0 \frac{B_j(t)}{B_{\max} \times d_j^2} \tag{3.2}$$

3.4. Competition effect

In clonal plants, the clone grows by establishing new ramets and accumulating biomass. Thus, clones compete for both space (Silvertown et al., 1992) and resources (Weigelt and Jolliffe, 2003).

Scenario 1: The clones are only in competition for space. New ramets cannot be created in cells that are already occupied by other ramets (Fischer et al., 2008). This scenario has been implemented in the simplest method for modeling competition, where any interaction zone was defined (Table 1; method 1).

Scenario 2: This scenario combines the effect of competition on both ramet implantation (similar to the first scenario) and biomass accumulation (Table 1; methods 2–31). The hyperbolic function has been recognized as the optimal mathematic form to describe the relationship between focal plant biomass and the effect of competition (Harper, 1965; Holliday, 1960; Silander and Pacala, 1985; Weiner, 1982). A hyperbolic term comprising the competition intensity $I_i(\omega_i, t)$ experienced by the ramet i (calculated following Eq. (3)) was introduced in the law of biomass accumulation to model the competition effect on biomass as following:

$$\frac{dB_i(t)}{dt} = r_p(1 - r_s)B_i(t) \left(1 - \frac{B_i(t)}{B_{max}}\right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + I_i(\omega_i, t)}\right) \quad (4)$$

where B_i is the biomass of the ramet i , r_p is a constant providing the energy supplied to a ramet by photosynthesis, $1 - r_s$ the fraction of biomass allocated to long-term reserve formation.

3.5. Target plant response

Plants are limited in their movements and thus in their possibility to choose their neighbors emphasizing the importance for them of being plastic to increase their probability of survival under various competitive regimes (Novoplansky, 2009; Oborny and Cain, 1997). Plants may either respond passively or actively to competition. In contrast to passive responses, active responses require the integration (i.e. perception–transduction) of environmental information releasing the plastic modification of plant architectural development (van Kleunen and Fischer, 2005).

Scenario 1: No active plasticity in the clone architecture was implemented in the model (Fischer et al., 2008; Herben and Novoplansky, 2010) (Table 1; plant response A).

Scenario 2: Plants may orient their growth in the direction of the least competitive pressure (Richards et al., 2010; Ross and Harper, 1972), as implemented for instance in the models of Herben and Suzuki (2002) or Herben and Novoplansky (2010). At each time step, the plant grows by the elongation or the ramification of one of its connections, characterized by the highest probability P_{el} or P_{br} to elongate or branch respectively. These probabilities comprise a hyperbolic term relative to the competition intensity which reduces the probability of a connection located in a zone of high competitive interference to elongate or branch, thus favoring a growth in the direction of least intense competition (Table 1; plant response B).

If an elongation occurs, competition intensity $I_k(\omega_k, t)$ is calculated on the ZI of each potentially colonized cell k (i.e. the cells next to each apex of the connections), and then introduced in the probability P_{el} of each connection (c) to elongate, as indicated in the following Eq. (5.1):

$$P_{el}(c) = \beta \left(\frac{1}{(1 + E_l G(c))(1 + E_g L(c))} \right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + I_k(\omega_k, t)} \right), \quad \beta \in [0; 1] \quad (5.1)$$

where β is a random variable in the range 0–1, $G(c)$ and $L(c)$ are the generation number and the length of the connection respectively, E_g and E_l variables express the dependence of elongation on generation number and the length of the connection, respectively.

If a ramification occurs, CLONAL first defines which connection should branch. Each ramet (r) of the selected connection may hold the new branch in two possible directions. $I_k(\omega_k, t)$ is then calculated based on the ZI of each potentially colonized cell k (i.e. the left and the right cells of each ramet r possibly holding the branch) (Herben and Novoplansky, 2010) and introduced in the probability $P_{br}(r, k)$ of each ramet r to support the new branch in each direction k , as indicated in the following Eq. (5.2):

$$P_{br}(r, k) = \delta \left(\frac{1}{e(1 + B_p d(r))} \right) \left(\frac{1}{1 + I_k(\omega_k, t)} \right), \quad \delta \in [0; 1] \quad (5.2)$$

where δ is a random variable in the range 0–1, e is a constant, $d(i)$ is the distance between ramet i and the basis of the connection it belongs to, and B_p is the variable expressing the dependence of the branching process on the distance of the ramet to the basis of the branch.

In the case of zone of interaction defined by the third scenario (where ω is the function of ramet biomass), ω_k was fixed to $\omega_0 = 1$, for both the elongation or ramification process to calculate $I_k(\omega_k, t)$, assuming that the biomass and resource requirements of a juvenile ramet are weak.

Scenario 3: In response to their competitive environment, plants may actively reduce their inter-ramet distance (Cheplick and Gutierrez, 2000; Humphrey and Pyke, 2001) by integrating information about competitor location. This aggregation of ramets decreases competition intensity by increasing the number of intraspecific contacts relatively to interspecific ones, thereby avoiding competitive exclusion (Lenssen et al., 2005; Murrell et al., 2002). This was implemented in the elongation procedure of connections (Table 1; plant response C).

When a clone connection elongates, the type of growth unit (either a ramet or a connection cell) created at the connection apex is defined in relation with the interrampet distance given as a model parameter. Nevertheless, when a ramet unit has to be created in a cell, which is already occupied by another ramet, the interrampet distance is reduced of one cell to allow the settling of the new ramet.

Scenario 4: Another plastic response observed in clonal plants is the elongation of the interrampet distance to avoid competitors (Weijschedé et al., 2008) as it was described by Winkler and Stöcklin (2002) in their growth model of *Hieracium pilosella* L. If the site for the establishment of a new ramet is already occupied by another ramet, the connection reacts plastically by increasing the interrampet distance of one cell per time step until the new ramet finds a free site. This elongation is limited by the parameter T_s which is the maximal extension of the parameterized interrampet distance. If the ramet has not found a free cell after its plastic search, the connection stops elongating. The value of the threshold T_s can be either identical for the two simulated species (Table 1, plant response D) or dependent of the species (Table 1, plant response E). For the phalanx species the value of T_s is identical for both responses D and E. We therefore tested only four plastic responses for this species.

4. Virtual prairies

4.1. Simulation experiments

The prairial system simulated using IBM PRAIRIE comprises a total of N individuals equally distributed between all species. In this study, we tested $N = 48$ individuals. These individuals were sown on a grid of 150×150 cells following a hexagonal pattern (Birch et al., 2007), with each initial ramet being located at a distance of seven cells from neighbors. Initial ramets were also located at a minimum distance of 54 cells from the prairie limits to avoid any boundary effect during the growth of the clones. The hexagonal grid, which offers a limited number of initial growing directions, and the

A.-K. Bittebiere et al. / Ecological Modelling xxx (2011) xxx–xxx

Table 2
Parameters of the methods used for modeling competition.

Competition parameter	Symbol	Reference equation	Unit	Selected value	Reference
Zone of interaction					
Constant radius of the interaction zone	ω_0	(1)	Number of cells	1; 2	[1]
Maximum radius of the interaction zone	ω_{\max}	(2)	Number of cells	5	[2,3]
Maximal biomass reached by a mature ramet	B_{\max}	(2), (3.2), and (4)		20	[4]
Competition intensity					
Constant competitive pressure	cp_0	(3.1) and (3.2)		0.03; 0.06	
Plant response					
Threshold of the internode elongation	T_s		Number of cells	1 for all species; 1 for the phalanx vs. 3 for the guerilla species	[5]

[1]: Mack and Harper (1977); [2]: Silander and Pacala (1985); [3]: Turnbull et al. (2004); [4]: Mony et al. (2011); and [5]: Winkler and Stöcklin (2002).

hexagonal plantation pattern generate a high probability of connection collisions between neighboring clones, thus blocking growth in the early time steps of the simulation. The initial plantation pattern was therefore given slight noise, in which a variation of more or less one cell is added when positioning the initial ramet of each clone. Each clone grows during 225 time steps on an individual grid of 79×79 cells which is wide enough to ensure that the clone cannot reach its boundaries during the simulation replicates. We studied the growth of two species differing by their clonal strategy (either phalanx or guerilla) cultivated in monocultures or in mixture. These cultures were simulated using each of the 61 methods for modeling competition (Table 1) of which parameters are given in Table 2. The same parameter values were used for both species, except for the architectural parameters (Table 3) which were chosen to simulate the clonal growth of a phalanx and of a guerilla species *sensu* Lovett Doust (1981) (respectively a dense and ramified vs. a sparse clonal network). The global performance (total biomass and number of ramets) and individual architecture (number and maximum length of connections) of each species in the three simulated cultures were calculated by the model.

4.2. Data analysis

To test for the effect of the competition modeling method on the prairie and individual traits, we used ANOVA procedures in RTM 2.12.2. We consider as maximizing or minimizing the trait value, all methods giving a mean trait included in $[\bar{X}_{\max}; X_1]$ or $[X_2; \bar{X}_{\min}]$ respectively, with \bar{X}_{\max} and \bar{X}_{\min} respectively the maximal and the minimal trait mean calculated for the 61 methods for modeling competition tested and X_1 and X_2 calculated as following:

$$X_1 = \bar{X}_{\max} - 0.25 \times (\bar{X}_{\max} - \bar{X}_{\min})$$

$$X_2 = \bar{X}_{\min} + 0.25 \times (\bar{X}_{\max} - \bar{X}_{\min})$$

To compare the growth of the guerilla and the phalanx populations in mixture, we considered their relative performance and architecture. First, the variations of the relative performance of the two populations were assessed through the ratio of the phalanx population biomass and the total biomass of the mixture. Second, two ratios were calculated to determine the architecture of the pha-

lanx relatively to the guerilla population ($R_{p/c}$): the ratio of maximal length of connection and the ratio of number of connections in the phalanx and the guerilla individuals.

5. Results

5.1. Prairie performance

The method for modeling competition had a significant effect on the performance traits of the three prairies simulated (Table 4). In the phalanx monoculture for instance, the biomass varied from 1059.40 (± 14.86) to 4776.76 (± 240.85) and the number of ramets from 750.05 (± 27.35) to 945.30 (± 19.11).

Six methods (numbers 9, 19, 29, 39, 49 and 59) maximized the biomass of all prairies. These methods were characterized by a competition intensity defined as a function of the biomass and distance to the target of competitors (scenario 3.3.2) and a plastic response corresponding to a reduction of the interrampet distance (scenario 3.5.3) (Fig. 1). The number of ramets was maximized by 12 competition modeling methods (numbers 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39, 44, 49, 54 and 59) all corresponding to the implementation of the reduction of the interrampet distance as a plastic response independently of the other components of competition (Fig. 1). For both traits of performance, the same methods were selected whatever the type of plant assemblage.

Methods minimizing biomass depended on the type of prairie (Table 1). The biomass produced by the phalanx monoculture and the phalanx/guerilla mixture were minimized by the same methods (Fig. 1). These methods implemented a definition of the competition intensity based on a fixed competitive pressure (scenario 3.3.1). Guerilla monocultures produced less biomass with the ZI modeled with a wide fixed radius neighborhood (scenario 3.2.2) and a fixed competitive pressure with $cp_0 = 0.06$ (Fig. 1). Method 1, which is the simplest method for modeling competition, induced an intermediate biomass whatever the prairie considered. The number of ramets was minimized by all other methods (included method 1).

The method for modeling competition also affected the relative performance of the phalanx and guerilla populations in mixture (Table 1). The phalanx population represented 49–63% of the total biomass of the mixture. Eleven methods maximized the phalanx biomass over the guerilla (Fig. 2). These methods, similar to those that maximized the total number of ramets, corresponded to the implementation of the reduction of the interrampet distance as a response to competition. The lowest percentages of phalanx biomass were reached by seven methods (numbers 12, 15, 16, 42, 43, 45 and 46) characterized by a fixed-radius ZI ($\omega_0 = 2$) and a fixed

Table 3
Architectural parameter values of the simulated populations.

Parameter	Guerilla	Phalanx
Number of connection buds on the initial ramet	2	4
Number of connection buds on ramets	1	2
Interrampet distance	3	1

A.-K. Bittebiere et al. / Ecological Modelling xxx (2011) xxx–xxx

Table 4
 Summary of the analyses of variance of the effect of the factor “method for modeling competition” on the traits calculated in the three cultures simulated (monocultures of phalanx and guerilla, phalanx/guerilla mixture) and characterization of the modeling methods maximizing or minimizing the trait values. ^{ns} $P > 0.05$; ^{***} $P < 0.001$. Max/min: respectively the maximal or minimal mean trait calculated among the 61 methods tested. Number of max/min: number of methods for modeling competition grouped maximizing or minimizing the traits values (see Section 3 for details). Mean of max/min group: mean value of the trait calculated on the corresponding groups of method. $R_{p/c}$: ratio of the trait values observed in the phalanx and in the guerilla populations in the phalanx–guerilla mixture. SD: standard deviation.

Prairie	Trait	Effect of the method for modeling competition				Characteristics of the methods giving the maximal or minimal values of traits					
		df	F	P	Max (SD)	Number of max	Mean of max group (SD)	Min (SD)	Number of min	Mean of min group (SD)	
Performance traits	Phalanx	Biomass	48	1296.5	***	4776.76 (240.85)	6	4739.60 (241.28)	1059.40 (14.86)	18	1512.02 (263.67)
		Number of ramets	48	133.9	***	945.3 (19.11)	12	932.6 (27.34)	750.05 (27.35)	37	771.24 (29.74)
	Guerilla	Biomass	60	672.25	***	2792.28 (160.43)	6	2732.21 (136.38)	1094.28 (13.10)	16	1245.21 (91.92)
		Total biomass	60	1097.7	***	370.2 (10.86)	12	357.76 (15.39)	208.5 (5.91)	49	215.16 (7.73)
Phalanx and guerilla	Total biomass	60	1447.5	***	3699.19 (217.26)	6	3644.40 (194.36)	1053.20 (15.90)	23	1404.03 (212.44)	
	Percentage of phalanx biomass	60	214.56 88.34	***	690.63 (19.55) 0.63 (0.02)	12	675.27 (22.55) 0.62 (0.03)	520.27 (18.52) 0.49 (0.009)	48	536.86 (22.26) 0.51 (0.02)	
Architectural traits	Phalanx	Max length of connection	48	0.82	ns						
		Number of connections	48	3.74	***	18.52 (3.38)	11	18.19 (3.05)	15.44 (3.15)	16	15.86 (3.33)
Guerilla	Max length of connection	60	1.17	ns							
	Number of connections	60	19.9	***	6.17 (1.99)	9	5.85 (1.57)	3.48 (1.37)	49	3.77 (1.14)	
Phalanx and guerilla	Max length of guerilla connection	60	1.09	ns							
	Max length of phalanx connection	60	0.8	ns							
	Total number of guerilla connections	60	12.89	***	5.92 (1.38)	12	5.51 (1.44)	3.08 (0.97)	49	3.41 (1.09)	
	Total number of phalanx connections	60	1.96	***	20.04 (3.01)	9	19.81 (3.27)	16.83 (3.19)	16	17.12 (3.29)	
Phalanx and guerilla	$R_{p/c}$ max length of connection	60	1.19	ns							
	$R_{p/c}$ number of connection	60	4.16	***	6.61 (2.51)	19	6.2 (2.39)	3.68 (1.24)	12	3.84 (1.35)	

A.-K. Bittebiere et al. / Ecological Modelling xxx (2011) xxx-xxx




Fig. 1. Characterization of the methods for modeling competition maximizing or minimizing the biomass and the number of ramets of the prairie. For each competition component, the barplots give the number of occurrence of each tested scenario in the groups of methods maximizing (white bars) or minimizing (colored bars) the trait value. Zone of interaction: ω_0 no interaction zone, ω_1 and ω_2 fixed radius neighborhood with 1 or 2 cells of radius respectively, ω_{-1} radius of the neighborhood function of the plant biomass; Competitive intensity: f_0 not implemented, f_1 and f_2 fixed competitive pressure equal to 0.03 and 0.06 respectively, v_1 and v_2 variable competitive pressure with cp_0 equal to 0.03 and 0.06 respectively; target plant response: p_1 no plasticity, p_2 modification of the elongation direction, p_3 shortening of the interramet distance, p_4 elongation of the interramet distance independent of the species, p_5 elongation of the interramet distance dependent of the species.

competitive pressure (with cp_0 equal to 0.03 or 0.06) (Fig. 2). The guerilla biomass was higher than phalanx biomass in two methods although the two populations were close to equivalence in these cases. These two methods were characterized by a wide fixed radius ZI, a fixed competitive pressure with $cp_0 = 0.06$ and an elongation of the interramet distance as a response to competition.

5.2. Individual clonal architecture

The individual clonal architecture was partially sensitive to the modeling method: the maximal length of connection was independent of the scenario used for both species whereas the number of connections varied for instance from $15.44 (\pm 3.15)$ to $18.52 (\pm 3.38)$




Fig. 2. Characterization of the methods for modeling competition maximizing or minimizing the percentage of phalanx biomass in the phalanx-guerilla mixture. For each competition component, the barplots give the number of occurrence of each tested scenario in the groups of methods maximizing (white bars) or minimizing (grey bars) the trait value. Zone of interaction: ω_0 no interaction zone, ω_1 and ω_2 fixed radius neighborhood with 1 or 2 cells of radius respectively, ω_{-1} radius of the neighborhood function of the plant biomass; Competitive intensity: f_0 not implemented, f_1 and f_2 fixed competitive pressure equal to 0.03 and 0.06 respectively, v_1 and v_2 variable competitive pressure with cp_0 equal to 0.03 and 0.06 respectively; target plant response: p_1 no plasticity, p_2 modification of the elongation direction, p_3 shortening of the interramet distance, p_4 elongation of the interramet distance independent of the species, p_5 elongation of the interramet distance dependent of the species.

A.-K. Bittebiere et al. / Ecological Modelling xxx (2011) xxx-xxx




Fig. 3. Characterization of the methods for modeling competition maximizing or minimizing the number of individual connections in the three prairies. For each competition component, the barplots give the number of occurrence of each tested scenario in the groups of methods maximizing (white bars) or minimizing (grey bars) the trait value. Zone of interaction: ω_0 no interaction zone, ω_1 and ω_2 fixed radius neighborhood with 1 or 2 cells of radius respectively, ω_{-1} radius of the neighborhood function of the plant biomass; Competitive intensity: f_0 not implemented, f_1 and f_2 fixed competitive pressure equal to 0.03 and 0.06 respectively, v_1 and v_2 variable competitive pressure with cp_0 equal to 0.03 and 0.06 respectively; target plant response: p_1 no plasticity, p_2 modification of the elongation direction, p_3 shortening of the interrmet distance, p_4 elongation of the interrmet distance independent of the species, p_5 elongation of the interrmet distance dependent of the species.

in the phalanx monoculture and from 3.48 (± 1.37) to 6.17 (± 1.99) in the guerilla monoculture (Table 1). The number of connections was maximized (for both species) and minimized (only for the guerilla species) by the same methods than those maximizing and minimizing the total number of ramets (see Section 5.1; Fig. 3). Minimizing the number of connections in phalanx species requires different methods depending on the type of assemblages (monoculture or mixture). In monoculture, phalanx species had the lowest number of connections when the target response was modeled as plastic with a change in the elongation direction (scenario 3.5.2). In mixtures, the five scenarios of target plant response gave similar results. The scenarios of zone of interaction and competition intensity were also slightly different depending on the assemblage. The number of connections in phalanx was minimized by the narrow fixed radius ZI and the fixed competitive pressure with $cp_0 = 0.03$ in mixture and by all fixed radius ZI and the fixed competitive pressure with $cp_0 = 0.06$ in monoculture.

The ratio of the number of connections between the phalanx and the guerilla species in mixture was significantly influenced by the method for modeling competition (Table 1) varying from 3.68 (± 1.24) to 6.61 (± 2.51). This ratio was maximized by 19 methods with a dominance of methods implementing the competition intensity defined with a fixed competitive pressure (with $cp_0 = 0.06$) (Fig. 4). The lowest values of $R_{P/G}$ number of connections were obtained with the 12 methods implementing the reduction of the interrmet distance as a plastic response to competition (Fig. 4).

6. Discussion

6.1. Importance of the modeling method in the determination of plant performances

We found in the literature a high variability in the models describing the plant competitive interactions (Bauer et al., 2002;

A.-K. Bittebiere et al. / Ecological Modelling xxx (2011) xxx–xxx




Fig. 4. Characterization of the methods for modeling competition maximizing or minimizing the ratio of the number of connection between the phalanx and the guerilla populations in the phalanx-guerilla mixture. For each competition component, the barplots give the number of occurrence of each tested scenario in the groups of methods maximizing (white bars) or minimizing (dark-colored bars) the trait value. Zone of interaction: ω_0 no interaction zone, ω_1 and ω_2 fixed radius neighborhood with 1 or 2 cells of radius respectively, ω_{-1} radius of the neighborhood function of the plant biomass; Competitive intensity: f_0 not implemented, f_1 and f_2 fixed competitive pressure equal to 0.03 and 0.06 respectively, v_1 and v_2 variable competitive pressure with cp_0 equal to 0.03 and 0.06 respectively; target plant response: p_1 no plasticity, p_2 modification of the elongation direction, p_3 shortening of the interramet distance, p_4 elongation of the interramet distance independent of the species, p_5 elongation of the interramet distance dependent of the species.

Herben and Suzuki, 2002; Kun and Oborny, 2003; Weiner, 1982). However, our results suggest that the method used to model competition has a strong effect on the resulting performance at the population level and on the competitive outcomes between two species of contrasting architectures.

Performance in monocultures depended on the plant plastic response to competition for ramet production and on the interaction between plastic response and competition intensity for biomass production. Indeed, the reduction of the interramet distance in response to competition maximized performance. This plastic response limits the investment in connections for the benefit of ramets producing biomass. Reduction of the interramet distance consists in a “competitive avoidance” strategy reported in the review of Novoplansky (2009) and considered as promoting plant performance in competitive environments (Cheplick, 1997; Cheplick and Gutierrez, 2000). The maximum biomass is reached by a combination of this plastic response and competition intensity implemented as dependent of the competitor biomass and distance to the target. With this scenario of competition intensity, the competitive pressure of each competitor is weighted, subsequently reducing the competitive effect on the biomass accumulation through photosynthesis. If a convergent result was found for all species form on maximization of the population performance, the methods leading to the lowest productivities differed between the phalanx and the guerilla monocultures. Performance in guerillas monoculture are minimized by a combination of the wide fixed-radius ZI and the highest fixed competitive pressure whereas in the phalanx monoculture, all fixed competitive pressure minimized the biomass production and no scenario of zone of interaction was dominant. Because competitive interactions are equivalent between related and unrelated ramets, the competitor density in the ZI of a ramet depends on the genet growth form and on the size of the ZI. For the aggregated phalanx form, the competitor density is high whatever the size of the ZI, which explains why no neighborhood scenario was determinant to minimize the productivity of the phalanx monoculture. On the contrary, in the dispersed guerilla form increasing the size of the ZI increases the competitor density thus decreasing the productivity of the guerilla monoculture.

Beyond the total performance of the community, the method impacted also the relative performance of the species when grown in mixtures, advantaging one species over the other and affecting the competitive outcome. We demonstrated that the reduction of the interramet distance in response to competition increased the phalanx biomass whereas a combination of a fixed radius

ZI (with $\omega_0=2$) and a fixed competitive pressure favored the guerilla form. With a radius of two cells, the ZI of each ramet of phalanx clones comprised related ramets because of the short interramet distance parameterized for this species. These competitive conditions maximized therefore the intraclonal competition for phalanx genet. Some authors have tested a differential effect of intra- vs. inter-clonal competition (“self discrimination”, Herben and Novoplansky, 2008). The introduction of self discrimination would have shifted competition from the level of ramets to that of genet.

6.2. Importance of the modeling method in the resulting architectural traits of the individuals

Our results demonstrated that the modeling method may partially impact the resulting growth form of the individuals, especially their branching intensity. This suggests that the modeling method have no impact on the capacity of the individual to explore space (through the production of long connections) but may have an impact on the resistance of the individual to inter-clonal competition and on its susceptibility to intra-clonal competition.

Branching was particularly favored by the reduction of the interramet distance implemented as response to competition. This may be explained by an indirect effect of the maximized biomass acquisition, enhancing the global growth of the clone, and by an increased number of ramets, which can potentially hold new branches. Clones tend thus to shift their growth strategy from spatial exploration to local consolidation (de Kroon and Schieving, 1990; Lovett Doust, 1981; Song et al., 2002). In contrast, methods conducting to less branched clones were (i) species-dependent and (ii) assemblage-dependent: in the phalanx species, we observed an interactive effect of the competition intensity (fixed radius ZI) and the plastic response to competition (growth in the direction of least interference). Such effect was noticed in monocultures whereas in mixture, the scenario of the narrow fixed-radius ZI ($\omega_0 = 1$) alone led to this type of individual architecture. The effects of the competition intensity and ZI on the number of connections are directly linked with the clone performance. The scenarios minimizing the number of connections are indeed similar to those that minimize the phalanx biomass either in monoculture or in mixture. Thus, clones are less branched because their global growth is slowed down. The modification of the growth direction as plastic response would promote the elongation compared to the ramification of clone connections. The maximal length of the connection remains however the same likely because the elongation process of connec-

A.-K. Bittebiere et al. / Ecological Modelling xxx (2011) xxx–xxx

tions depends on their generation and length (Mony et al., 2011). We therefore assume that this plastic response may promote the increase in length of the secondary and tertiary connections. In the guerilla species, all scenario except the reduction of the interrampet distance lead to poorly branched clones either in monoculture or in mixture. The reduction of the interrampet distance increases indeed the number of ramets and thus the number of potential sites for development of branches.

The modeling method had also an effect on the relative morphological difference between phalanx and guerilla individuals. Both species were parameterized as differing in interrampet distance and number of connection buds. Nevertheless, a convergence of branching pattern between the two growth forms in mixture was promoted by the reduction of the interrampet distance in response to competition without any effect on the relative difference in the length of connections. The increase in number of connections was higher in the guerilla than in the phalanx individuals likely because of the ramet aggregation in phalanx that limits branching possibilities by spatial congestion. These structural–spatial constraints may explain why phalanx species appears generally less plastic than guerilla species (Sutherland and Stillman, 1988). However, because of the gridded environment, the fineness of reduction of the interrampet distance was limited (Bithell and Macmillan, 2007). Relatively to their mean interrampet distance, a reduction of one cell corresponded to a stronger plastic response in phalanx than in guerillas. This may have an effect on the species architectural response in phalanx compared to guerillas.

6.3. Improving the modeling of clonal plant competition

This comparative study may have some implications for further modeling of plant clonal competition.

At first we demonstrated that within all components of competition (zone of interaction, competition intensity and effect, and target plant response), modeling the plastic response to competition is determinant for the population and individual performance and the resulting architectural traits of individuals. We showed in particular that the effects of the scenarios of plastic response to competition (i) interact with the effects of the scenarios of other competition components like the ZI or the competition intensity and depended on (ii) the species and (iii) the type of assemblage considered. These observations may explain why authors have found a high diversity of plastic responses to competition in plants (Sutherland and Stillman, 1988) even in the same clonal species like *Trifolium repens* (Hutchings et al., 1997; Leeftang, 1999, 2000; Thompson, 1993; Weijschedé et al., 2008). This highlights the importance of developing experiments on plastic response to competition considering the characteristics of the plant competitive environment (neighborhood size, heterogeneity, nature of the competitors, ...) to give support to the development of accurate models.

We demonstrated also that species identity can interact with the effect of the method of competition, stressing the particular importance of a precise and realistic parameterization of the species. Models that are calibrated at the community scale remain scarce (Herben and Suzuki, 2002) for two major reasons. While some clonal processes, such as resource storage in the clone connections, have been widely investigated (Cheplick and Gutierrez, 2000; Stuefer and Huber, 1999; Suzuki and Stuefer, 1999), others such as physiological integration (Alpert, 1999) or architectural rules (Huber and Stuefer, 1997; Huber et al., 1999) remain poorly known since their assessment requires respectively ¹⁴C tracer studies (Landa et al., 1992) and regular spatial monitoring (Benot et al., 2010), explaining the difficulties of finding calibration data. Model validation is also complicated because it

presents a complex challenge to measure and accumulate output data on competing clones since many plants present below-ground clonal connections (Sammul et al., 2003, 2004) and the collection of data on ramet dynamics requires long term studies (Wikberg and Svensson, 2003). Hence, pursuing the development of the IBM PRAIRIE required further research in particular for the calibration of the input parameter to simulate several clonal species in interaction.

Within the 61 methods for modeling competition tested, some can be explicitly rejected as giving irrelevant results compared to simple rules based on the wide knowledge on phalanx/guerilla strategies. For instance, the ratios of the number and maximal length of connections between the phalanx (highly ramified clonal network with slow radial spread) and the guerilla individuals (long and poorly ramified connections) in the mixture must be respectively greater and lower than one to respect the classical description of these contrasting growth forms (Cheplick, 1997; Humphrey and Pyke, 1998; Lovett Doust, 1981). All methods validate the rules on the ratio of number of connections (which varies between 3.68 for the method 54 and 6.61 for the method 23). Nevertheless, this comparison presents a limitation because the number of buds for the branch creation at each node is given in the model as a species parameter. The second rule on the ratio of maximal length of connection was also statistically validated although two methods gave a mean ratio equal to 0.9. In terms of relative performance, the simulations should give a better competitive advantage to the phalanx form over the guerilla form in the mixture as reported in the literature (Cheplick, 1997; Humphrey and Pyke, 1998; Schmid and Harper, 1985; Svensson et al., 2005). This competitive hierarchy was respected by all methods except methods 45 and 46 for which we found a percentage of phalanx biomass equal to 49% however close to equivalence. Further description of precise mixtures should be performed to better evaluate the relevance of the methods tested.

7. Conclusion

We demonstrated that (i) the modeling method influenced the population and individual performance and the resulting architectural traits of individuals in the different assemblages (monocultures or mixture) and that (ii) it had an interactive effect with species growth form. Our study showed that despite high variations in the model outputs depending on the method used for modeling competition, many methods gave similar results, especially the simplest method 1. This suggests that complex methods are in some case unnecessary for catching global tendencies in population and community dynamics. The original approach of the present study facilitated the comparison of different modeling scenarios for a given process in the same simulation conditions allowing the identification of the effects of the scenario on the model outputs. Such approaches contribute towards identifying the limits of exploiting data simulated with these scenarios and identifying the dominant factors determining the relationship between competition and individual performance or morphology in clonal plant communities. This approach may contribute also to one of the main concerns when creating a model which is uniting simplicity and realism (Grimm, 1999; Grimm and Railsback, 2005).

Acknowledgements

We thank Gail Schofield for English corrections; Malek Smaoui for assistance in computer science. This project benefited from the Grant ANR-08-SYSC-012 of the Agence Nationale de la Recherche.

Appendix A. Description of the model CLONAL

A.1. Clone metabolism and resource storage

At each time step t the total amount of resource of the clone $R_T(t)$ is calculated following Eq. (A1):

$$R_T(t) = R_T(t-1) + \sum_{g=1}^{g=n} R_g(t-1) - aC, \quad R(1) = 1 \quad (A1)$$

where $R_g(t)$ is the net gain of resource (by biomass accumulation for ramets or storage for connection units) of each growth unit g , C is the cost for creating one growth unit (the value of C may differ between a ramet and a connection unit) and a equal to zero if no new unit is added to the clone, one otherwise.

Biomass accumulation through photosynthesis occurs at the ramet scale and is assumed to follow a logistic law at each time step t :

$$\frac{dB_i(t)}{dt} = r_p(1 - r_s)B_i(t) \left(1 - \frac{B_i(t)}{B_{max}}\right) \quad (A2)$$

with $B_i(t)$ the biomass status of the ramet i , r_p a constant providing the energy supplied to a ramet by photosynthesis, $1 - r_s$ the fraction of biomass allocated to long-term reserve formation and B_{max} the maximal biomass reachable by a ramet. If competition has an effect on the biomass accumulation (see Section 3.4) a hyperbolic term of competition intensity is introduced in the logistic law of biomass accumulation [Eq. (4)].

The resource available for the growth of a ramet i is calculated overall growth units belonging to the same integrative physiological unit (IPU) following:

$$R_{IPU}(i) = \sum_{g=1}^{i=n_{IPU}} R_g \quad (A3)$$

where R_g is the resource of the growth unit g , n_{IPU} is the number of growth unit in the IPU. R_g is null for a connection unit which stores only long-term resource unavailable for growth.

A.2. Plant form and spatial colonization

Clonal colonization of space relies on two processes: the elongation of existing connections or the addition of new branch from a ramet unit. The spatial colonization thus started by determining which of these two processes occurs at the given time step following (A4)

$$p_{el/br} = \alpha, \quad \alpha \in [0; 1] \quad (A4)$$

where $p_{el/br}$ is the probability to elongate and α a random variable between 0 and 1.

We fixed $p_{el/br(0)}$ as the threshold value for elongation vs. branching process. If $p_{el/br} > p_{el/br(0)}$ this is an elongation process whereas if $p_{el/br} < p_{el/br(0)}$ this is a branching process.

Subsequently, if an elongation process occurs, the model calculates the probability to elongate $P_{el}(c)$ of each connection c as following:

$$P_{el}(c) = \beta \left(\frac{1}{(1 + E_l G(c))(1 + E_g L(c))} \right) \quad (A5)$$

where β is a random variable in the range 0–1, $G(c)$ and $L(c)$ are the generation number and the length of the connection respectively, E_l and E_g variables express the dependence of elongation on generation number and the length of the connection, respectively.

In the case of a branching process, CLONAL first determines which of the clone connections will branch by comparing their branching probability $p_{br}(c)$ calculated following (A6):

$$P_{br}(c) = \gamma \left(\frac{1 + B_l L(c)}{1 + B_g G(c)} \right), \quad \gamma \in [0; 1] \quad \text{if } G(b) < 3 \quad (A6)$$

$$P_{br}(c) = 0 \quad \text{if } G(b) \geq 3$$

where γ is a random variable in the range of 0–1 and B_l and B_g express the dependence of branching on the generation number and length of the connection respectively.

Each ramet (r) of the selected connection may then hold the new branch with a probability P_{br} calculated as following:

$$P_{br}(r) = \delta \left(\frac{1}{e(1 + B_p d(r))} \right) \quad (A7)$$

where δ is a random variable in the range 0–1, e is a constant, $d(r)$ is the distance between ramet r and the basis of the connection its belongs to, and B_p is the variable expressing the dependence of the branching process on the distance of the ramet to the basis of the connection.

When the plant can plastically respond to competition by modifying its growth in the direction of the less competitive interference, a hyperbolic term comprising the competition intensity is added in the calculation of $p_{el}(c)$ and $p_{br}(r)$ (see Section 3.5 and Eqs. (5.1) and (5.2)).

A.3. Updating process

Within each time steps, four phases are processed in the following order:

- Calculation of resources (A2).
- Calculation of the location of the new growth unit ((A4)–(A7)).
- Determination of the nature of the growth unit (either a ramet or a connection cell). In the case of an elongation, the type of growth unit is defined in relation with the interrampet distance given as a model parameter: if the distance from the last ramet is lower than the parameterized interrampet distance a connection unit is created, otherwise a ramet unit is produced. For a ramification process, a connection unit is created. The plasticity in response to competition implemented in the third and the fourth scenario (see Section 3.5) may interfere with the determination of the nature of the growth unit.
- Calculation of the probability p_g of creating the new growth unit considering the amount of resource available. This calculation is done following (A8)

$$P_g = \varepsilon \left[1 + \log \left(\frac{R_{IPU}}{C_g} \right) \right], \quad \varepsilon \in [0; 1] \quad \text{if } R_{IPU} \geq C_g \quad (A8)$$

$$P_g = 0 \quad \text{if } R_{IPU} < C_g$$

with $p_g = p_{ramet}$ or $p_{connection}$ depending on the nature of the growth unit to create, $C_g = C_r$ or C_c the production cost of one ramet or one connection unit respectively, ε a random variable in the range of 0–1 and R_{IPU} is the available resource within the IPU.

The growth unit is created when $p_g > p_{g0}$, p_{g0} given as a model parameter.

Finally, ramet units can be created only if the target cell is not already occupied by another ramet (excepted in certain cases of plastic response to competition tested here) whereas connection units are created regardless the cell status (see Section 3.4). If this last condition is fulfilled a new growth unit is created and the IPU is depleted of C_g , otherwise the growth unit is not produced. At each time step, one growth unit only per clone is created.

4. DES BANDES ENHERBÉES EXPERIMENTALES INTEGRES A UN PAYSAGE BOCAGER

4.1. Présentation du site LTER Armorique

La Zone Atelier Armorique est située au nord-est du département de l'Ille-et-Vilaine (35) (48° 36' N, 1° 32' W). Il s'agit d'une zone de polyculture et élevage principalement laitier. Les paysages y sont contrastés : le nord est caractérisé par un paysage de culture intensive avec de grandes parcelles remembrées tandis que le sud présente un maillage bocager dense et des parcelles de petites tailles (Figure 6).

Cette zone atelier fait l'objet d'études depuis près de 20 ans. A l'échelle nationale, la Z.A. Armorique est membre du réseau « zone atelier » de l'Institut Ecologie et Environnement du CNRS mais elle est également l'un des seuls sites français labellisés à l'échelle internationale. Ce site atelier est en effet, inscrit dans deux programmes internationaux : le réseau européen LTER-Europe (European Long Term Ecological Research Network) qui vise à analyser et prédire les changements de la biodiversité, des paysages et des services rendus et le réseau international ILTER (International Long Term Ecological Research Network) consistant en un réseau de sites où une recherche en écologie et en socio-économie est effectuée sur le long terme. Ces suivis comprennent par exemple une caractérisation du paysage et de l'occupation des sols, des mesures climatiques (*e.g.* températures) et des recensements de populations animales (micro-mammifères, carabes) et végétales.

En particulier, des suivis floristiques ont été menés depuis 2006 sur une cinquantaine de bandes enherbées réparties sur la Zone Atelier Armorique. Les caractéristiques topographiques (surface, périmètre), floristiques (identités et abondances des espèces) et paysagères (présence de cours d'eau ou de haie, culture adjacente) sont connues. Les relevés floristiques ont été effectués au sein de neuf quadrats (dimensions $0.5 \times 2 \text{ m}^2$) organisés en trois transects, espacés de 50 m et transversaux à la bande. Les occurrences des différentes espèces ont été notées au sein de chaque quadrat. Trois campagnes de relevés, réparties sur 2006, 2007 et 2008, ont été effectuées.




Figure 6. Occupation des sols sur la Zone Atelier Armorique en 2009. Les rectangles violets indiquent la position des bandes enherbées expérimentales.

4.2. Dispositif des bandes enherbées expérimentales

Les connaissances théoriques issues des travaux effectués par les approches de modélisation et d'expérimentation en conditions contrôlées, pourront être réinvesties pour

définir un semis optimal par rapport aux fonctions attendues des bandes enherbées. Ce semis sera testé *in situ*.

Dans l'optique de cette étude, un réseau d'agriculteurs susceptibles d'être volontaires pour y participer a été mis en place. Dans un premier temps, ces agriculteurs ont donné leur accord pour tester sur leurs bandes un semis optimal à dire d'experts.

Cette expérimentation encore en cours a été mise en place dans l'objectif : (i) de tester un semis inédit et choisi à dire d'experts comme étant optimal par rapport aux diverses fonctions des BE (ii) de tester sa fonctionnalité écologique et agronomique en conditions non contrôlées et (iii) de tester des modes de gestion pressentis comme également optimaux.



Figure 7. Vue d'une bande enherbée expérimentale en bordure de champs de maïs (Juin 2010).

Six bandes enherbées expérimentales ont été semées au printemps 2010 au sein de la Zone Atelier Armorique grâce à la collaboration de cinq agriculteurs volontaires. Ces bandes étaient initialement localisées en bordure de maïs. Le semis utilisé a été mis au point par un groupe de travail constitué d'experts des différentes fonctions des bandes enherbées, après étude des données déjà acquises au cours des programmes de recherche menés sur la Zone Atelier (ECOSOC). Ce semis devrait favoriser les fonctions attendues

d'une bande (épuration des nitrates, conservation de la biodiversité). Il comprend des graminées présentant des stratégies de croissance clonale contrastées : guérilla (*Agrostis stolonifera*), phalange (*Festuca rubra*) et cespiteuses (*Lolium perenne* et *Phleum pratense*), ainsi que des dicotylédones à fleurs favorisant les insectes pollinisateurs (*Lotus corniculatus*, *Trifolium pratense*, *Anthemis tinctoria*, *Centaurea cynanus* et *Fagopyrum esculentum*) (Figure 7). Ces bandes sont gérées par une fauche annuelle tardive à la fin de l'été, période à laquelle la plupart des espèces ont fini leurs cycles de croissance et de reproduction. Le produit de fauche est exporté.

Les données issues de ces différentes approches ont été valorisées dans les quatre chapitres de la thèse comme suit :

- Chapitres 1 et 3 : utilisation du dispositif expérimental de mésocosmes (2.1.)
- Chapitre 2 : conjugaison des expérimentations réalisées sur des espèces cibles (dispositifs décrits en 2.2.1. et 2.2.2) et de simulations menées via le modèle PRAIRIE (3.)
- Chapitre 4 : confrontation des suivis réalisés sur les bandes enherbées de la Zone Atelier Armorique (4.) avec les résultats issus de l'expérimentation en mésocosmes (2.1.)

~ Chapitre 1 ~

La clonalité : un mécanisme de structuration des
communautés végétales

Préface ... page 83

Article II – Clonal dispersal as a mechanism of fine-scale pattern
formation in grassland communities ... page 87

PREFACE

1. OBJECTIFS DU CHAPITRE 1

Les patrons spatiaux sont récurrents au sein des communautés végétales. Il n'existe pourtant pas de consensus sur les mécanismes qui ont conduit à leur formation (Herben & Hara, 2003). La dispersion locale a été proposée comme le mécanisme principal de structuration des communautés végétales (Law & Dieckmann, 2000). Cependant, la plupart des études ont été menées sur des communautés d'espèces annuelles (Rees et al., 1996 ; Stoll & Prati, 2001), négligeant la clonalité, alors qu'il s'agit du processus majeur de dispersion en prairie (Otsus & Zobel, 2002; Benson & Hartnett, 2006), générant une agrégation à échelle fine (Kershaw, 1963 ; Harada & Iwasa, 1996). La distance de dispersion entre les modules parent et fils étant principalement établie par la stratégie de croissance des espèces, nous faisons l'hypothèse que celle-ci serait déterminante pour la formation des patrons spatiaux. De plus, les compétiteurs génèrent de l'hétérogénéité à échelle fine (Jackson and Caldwell, 1993; Herben et al., 2000), dont le degré peut être modulé par leur stratégie de croissance clonale. Les plantes clonales étant capables d'adapter leur architecture en réponse à l'hétérogénéité de l'environnement en modifiant leurs traits clonaux (Slade & Hutchings, 1987; Cain et al., 1996), les stratégies de croissance des compétiteurs pourraient influencer les patrons spatiaux des espèces.

Ce chapitre a donc pour principal objectif de déterminer par quels mécanismes la croissance clonale influence la structuration de la communauté végétale. Plus précisément deux questions seront traitées :

- ✓ La stratégie de croissance clonale de l'espèce influence-t-elle son patron spatial à échelle fine ? (Article II)
- ✓ Les variations des patrons spatiaux des espèces sont-elles liées aux stratégies de croissance clonale de leurs compétiteurs ? (Article II)

2. DEMARCHE MISE EN ŒUVRE

Le travail présenté dans ce chapitre se base sur une approche expérimentale menée en conditions contrôlées sur des communautés végétales cultivées en mésocosmes (dispositif présenté en 2.1. de la partie Méthodologie). Ces communautés diffèrent par la nature (phalange, guérilla, cespiteuse) et le nombre de stratégies de croissance clonale en mélange, quatre espèces représentant chacune d'elles. Afin d'étudier les effets de la stratégie de croissance clonale d'une espèce et de ses compétiteurs sur son patron spatial, les communautés ont été cartographiées en Octobre 2010, en utilisant une grille de $80 \times 80 \text{ cm}^2$, divisée en 256 cellules de 5 cm^2 . Le grain de cette grille correspondrait à l'échelle des interactions de compétition entre espèces végétales prairiales (Purves & Law 2002). L'occurrence des espèces implantées dans chacune des cellules a été notée. Les patrons décrits ont été comparés (i) entre espèces caractérisées par différentes stratégies de croissance clonale au sein d'un même environnement compétitif (ii) et pour une même espèce, au sein de différents environnements compétitifs. Ces patrons spatiaux ont été analysés via le logiciel Programita avec une méthode statistique de point pattern ; des fonctions de densité de probabilité distance-dépendantes (« O-ring statistics ») ont été utilisées. Les patrons spatiaux ont été caractérisés au travers de deux indices décrivant localement le degré d'agrégation (colonisation) et de coexistence (occupation) de chaque espèce. Un troisième indice de performance spatiale a également été défini, donnant la capture de l'espace par l'espèce relativement aux autres espèces présentes dans le mélange.

3. PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS

Les résultats présentés dans le chapitre 1 démontrent que la dispersion par croissance clonale est un processus clé pour la mise en place d'une structuration spatiale au sein de la communauté végétale. Notre étude souligne, en dépit d'un effet espèce, que les stratégies de croissance clonale des individus déterminent la structure de la communauté végétale à échelle fine (quelques centimètres) générant une diversité de patrons spatiaux distribués le long du continuum guérilla-phalange-cespiteux (Article II). Les espèces cespiteuses minimisent la colonisation de l'espace mais l'occupent de façon efficace à l'inverse des espèces guérilla. Les espèces phalanges présentent des valeurs intermédiaires de colonisation et d'occupation locale de l'espace. Les traits de dispersion clonale peuvent donc être considérés comme des indicateurs des patrons spatiaux. Néanmoins, si les

hiérarchies des patrons spatiaux en fonction de la stratégie de croissance clonale sont conservées, les caractéristiques de ces patrons sont modulées par l'environnement compétitif et en particulier par les stratégies de croissance clonale des compétiteurs (Article II). Par exemple, les espèces à stratégie cespiteuse adoptent un comportement défensif, protégeant leur territoire clonal en augmentant leur agrégation en présence des espèces à stratégie guérilla qui les envahissent. Les espèces phalanges restent « placides », elles ne modifient pas leur agrégation en fonction de leur environnement compétitif. Les espèces guérillas présentent la stratégie de croissance la plus performante en terme de capture de l'espace alors que les phalanges sont les moins performantes.

Ces résultats suggèrent que l'identité des compétiteurs (les espèces auxquelles ils appartiennent) ainsi que leurs stratégies de croissance clonale, plutôt que leur seule présence, sont déterminantes pour la structuration de la communauté végétale. Cette structure pouvant en retour affecter l'issue des interactions biotiques au sein de la communauté (Herben & Hara, 2003), cette étude souligne l'importance du trade-off entre colonisation et consolidation spatiale comme mécanisme clé de coexistence au sein des communautés végétales prairiales.

La variabilité des patrons spatiaux en réponse à l'identité des compétiteurs suggèrent que les mécanismes de plasticité opérant à l'échelle de l'individu pourraient spécifiquement prendre en compte cette identité.

Clonal dispersal as a mechanism of fine-scale pattern formation in grassland communities

M.-L. Benot^{1,2,†}, A.-K. Bittebiere^{1,†}, A. Ernoult¹, B. Clément¹, C. Mony¹

† these authors contributed equally to the study

¹UMR 6553 Ecobio, CNRS - University of Rennes 1, Av. du Général Leclerc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France

²INRA, UR874-Grassland Ecosystem Research Unit, 234 Av. du Brézet, 63100 Clermont-Ferrand, France

Article Informations	Abstract
<p><i>Article history:</i></p> <p>Submitted to <i>Journal of Ecology</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>Keywords:</i></p> <p>Clonal plants Competitive neighborhood characteristics Grassland community O-ring statistics Phalanx vs. Guerilla strategy Spatial structure</p>	<p>Spatial patterns are a common feature of plant communities. However, the mechanisms leading to their formation remain unknown. The clonal dispersal strategy of a species is commonly acknowledged to determine the extent of individual ramet aggregation and its ability to compete for space, while the clonal dispersal strategy of neighboring species may influence its environment heterogeneity. Thus, not only the clonal dispersal strategy of a species, but also those of its competitors may influence the fine-scale spatial pattern of a species. In this paper, we compare spatial patterns of species characterized by different clonal dispersal strategies (guerilla, phalanx, and caespitose) in seven types of experimental species assemblages. Two questions were addressed: (i) does the species clonal dispersal strategy influence species spatial patterns; (ii) are changes in fine-scale spatial patterns of a focal species modulated by the clonal dispersal strategy of its neighbors? Species spatial patterns were recorded for each species assemblage, and were then analyzed using point-pattern analysis. Despite strong species-specific effects, caespitose (i.e., extreme phalanx) species displayed the highest level of local aggregation, which is indicative of limited space colonization, and the lowest level of local coexistence with other species, which is indicative of a high level of space occupation. The opposite pattern was observed in guerilla species, while that of phalanx species was intermediate between the other two strategies. The species spatial patterns were modulated by the clonal dispersal strategies of competitors, providing evidence for the importance of neighbor identity in the spatial patterning of plant communities. This study also emphasized the importance of the trade-off between space occupation and colonization as a key mechanism of species coexistence in grassland communities.</p>

Introduction

Spatial patterns are a common feature of plant communities (Watt, 1947; Kershaw, 1963; Herben & Hara, 2003). However, the underlying processes that generate such spatial structure have yet to be identified.

Both theoretical (Silander & Pacala, 1985) and experimental studies (Stoll & Prati, 2001; Kikvidze et al., 2005) have suggested that, due to their sessile life-style, plant lives are mostly determined at a local scale via abiotic (e.g., resource availability) and biotic factors, such as the

specific composition of their neighborhood (the so-called “plant’s eye-view” of the community, [Turkington & Harper, 1979](#)), rather than the spatial average of the overall community (e.g., mean-field assumption). This viewpoint assumes that spatial structure affects the fate of plant populations or communities, even at a scale of a few centimeters ([Mack & Harper, 1977](#); [Silander & Pacala, 1985](#); [Stoll & Prati, 2001](#)), which emphasizes the importance of identifying fine-scale mechanisms of pattern formation. Spatial patterns may be determined by several mechanisms, either solely or in combination ([Tilman & Kareiva, 1997](#); [Condit et al., 2000](#); [Dieckmann et al., 2000](#)). Hence, species aggregation patterns are expected to result from environmental heterogeneity, which may be generated by (i) the vegetation itself ([Condit et al., 2000](#); [Bolker et al., 2003](#); [Montaoya et al., 2009](#)), (ii) internal processes, such as dispersal ability ([Hubbell, 1979](#); [Bolker et al., 2003](#); [Seidler & Plotkin, 2006](#)), or (iii) local biotic interactions ([Bolker & Pacala, 1999](#); [Seabloom et al., 2005](#)). Therefore, experimental studies of simplified multi-species plant communities might prove a valuable tool for disentangling the relative effect of these parameters on plant spatial patterns.

Local dispersal (through seeds or vegetative reproduction) has been proposed as one of the factors that shape spatial correlations within and among species ([Law & Dieckmann, 2000](#)). Most experimental studies on pattern formation in plants have focused on annual species ([Bergelson, 1990](#); [Rees et al., 1996](#); [Stoll & Prati, 2001](#)). However, in grassland communities, clonal growth is the major driver of dispersal ([Otsus & Zobel, 2002](#); [Benson & Hartnett, 2006](#)) that generates

fine-scale aggregations, because it places daughter ramets at a short distance from their parents ([Kershaw, 1963](#); [Harada & Iwasa, 1996](#); [Herben & Hara, 2003](#)). In clonal plants, this distance between parent and daughter ramets is mainly determined by the clonal dispersal strategy, which results from a trade-off between space colonization and space occupation ([Wildova et al., 2007b](#)), and has traditionally been classified along a gradient from phalanx to guerilla strategies ([Lovett-Doust 1981](#)). Clonal plants forming an uninterrupted front of aggregated ramets with a slow radial propagation are at one extreme of the gradient ([Lovett-Doust, 1981](#); [Cheplick, 1997](#); [Humphrey & Pike, 1998](#)), which is expected to maximize local occupation of space. The so-called phalanx strategy has often been used to characterize plants with short (termed phalanx strategy here; e.g., [Slade & Hutchings, 1987](#); [Humphrey & Pyke, 1998](#)) to almost inexistent connection internodes (termed caespitose strategy here; e.g., [Welker & Briske, 1992](#); [Cheplick, 1997](#); [Briske & Derner, 1998](#); [Humphrey & Pyke, 1998](#)). At the other extreme of the gradient, plants displaying a guerilla strategy produce long and poorly ramified connections that infiltrate the surrounding vegetation and generate networks of widely spaced ramets ([Lovett-Doust, 1981](#)). Hence, the guerilla strategy is expected to maximize the colonization of space. However, the effect of the clonal dispersal strategy on plant spatial patterns may also be modulated by the local environment.

Plant neighborhood characteristics, such as competitor size, density or identity (i.e., the species they belong to), are known to influence the outcome of competition ([Goldberg & Landa, 1991](#)).

Nevertheless, most studies investigating the role of competitive interactions in plant community structuring have focused on the presence of competitors *per se* (Bertness & Ellison, 1987; Lepš & Kindlmann, 1987), neglecting the importance of their identity. Still, competition for space relies on the ability of plants to reach and colonize available patches, which is strongly species-specific (Herben et al., 1993a; Herben & Hara, 1997; 2003; Wildova et al., 2007b) and, for perennial species, is mostly determined by clonal dispersal strategies (Schmid & Harper, 1985; Cheplick, 1997; Humphrey & Pike, 1998). Competitors may also generate fine-scale environmental heterogeneity (Jackson and Caldwell, 1993; Herben et al., 2000), which may be modulated by clonal dispersal strategies. Clonal plants may be able to adjust their foraging behavior in response to this environmental heterogeneity by altering their clonal traits (Slade & Hutchings, 1987; Cain et al., 1996). Therefore, the clonal dispersal strategies of competitors should influence spatial pattern formation.

We set up an experiment using seven types of simplified grassland communities, composed of plant species with different clonal dispersal strategies, to investigate the effect of these strategies on fine-scale pattern formation (i.e., within distance ranges of a few centimeters). We specifically addressed two main questions. First, do clonal dispersal strategies influence the fine-scale spatial patterns of species? We expected the local occupation of space to increase and local colonization of space to decrease along a gradient of caespitose-phalanx-guerilla strategies. Second, are the fine-scale spatial patterns of species modulated by the clonal dispersal strategies of neighbors? In this

instance, we primarily distinguished clonal dispersal strategies based on architectural traits. Finally, we used recent techniques of point pattern analysis to characterize the spatial patterns of plants, as a combined description of local colonization and local occupation of space.

Materials and methods

Plant material

We delineated three clonal dispersal strategies (guerilla, phalanx, and caespitose) to represent the gradient of clonal networks described by Lovett Doust (1981). For each strategy, we searched a large panel of common temperate grassland species, to select the most representative ones. This selection was based on the species architectural traits obtained with databases such as CLO-PLA (Klimeš & Klimešová, 1999), or through previous experimental works (de Kroon & Knops, 1990; Tamm et al., 2002; Benot et al., 2009). For each strategy, we finally selected four species, which displayed either above- or below-ground connections, and comprised one dicotyledon and three monocotyledons (Table 1). The classification of these 12 species (i.e., four species for each for the three clonal dispersal strategies) was confirmed through PCA analysis of a set of architectural traits measured using 10 individuals from each species (results not shown). Clonal individuals of these species were sampled from the field margins around Rennes (Brittany, West France) in April 2009. The individuals were of standardized size: in guerilla and phalanx species, clonal individuals were composed by a mature ramet (one node, its leaves and axillary buds) with one internode of

Table 1. Species representing each clonal dispersal strategy.

	Guerilla (G)	Phalanx (P)	Caespitose (C)
Monocotyledon	<i>Elytrigia repens</i> L.	<i>Brachypodium pinnatum</i> L.	<i>Lolium perenne</i> L.
	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> L.	<i>Festuca rubra</i> L.	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L.
	<i>Holcus mollis</i> L.	<i>Agrostis tenuis</i> Sibth.	<i>Holcus lanatus</i> L.
Dicotyledon	<i>Ranunculus repens</i> L.	<i>Anthemis nobilis</i> L.	<i>Centaurea nigra</i> L.

connection (Huber et al., 1999; Stuefer & Huber, 1999), while in caespitose species of initial individuals allowed them to have stored resources to support survival after transplantation, as well as living axillary buds for clonal development.

Experimental design

To study species spatial patterns in different competitive environments, the experimental communities, comprising the 12 selected species, were planted in the experimental garden of the University of Rennes in May 2009.

Seven types of species assemblage were tested, differing in the nature and the number of co-occurring clonal dispersal strategies (one, two, or three); all combinations of clonal dispersal strategies were tested: three mono-strategy assemblages [caespitose (C), phalanx (P), or guerilla (G) species alone], three bi-strategy assemblages (caespitose and phalanx species, caespitose and guerilla species, or phalanx and guerilla species), and one three-strategy assemblage (caespitose, phalanx, and guerilla species combined). Eight replicates of each type of community were randomly positioned within the experimental area, comprising 56 culture plots of $1.30 \times 1.30 \times 0.25 \text{ m}^3$. In each culture plot, 48 clonal individuals were planted following a hexagonal pattern (Birch et al., 2007). The substrate was homogeneous within and among all experimental plots, and was composed of sand (20%) and ground soil (80%). The

the individual constituted three joined ramets forming a tuft. This standardization individuals were equally distributed over all co-occurring species, and their position on the plantation pattern was randomized.

To focus only on dispersal linked with clonal growth, and avoid seed production, all mature flowers were cut off. Weeds were regularly removed, and the culture plots were watered every two days during the dry season. Above-ground vegetation was mown once a year at the end of the summer.

Data collection

In October 2010, we recorded the spatial patterns of all species present in the experimental communities using a square lattice of $80 \times 80 \text{ cm}^2$ centered on the culture plot. The lattice was positioned in this way as it eliminated individuals at the edge of the plantation pattern, which did not have six neighboring competitors, and thus minimized the edge effect. In the studied assemblages of clonal plants, the isolation of individual ramets would have been almost impossible or, at best, highly time-consuming, and beyond the scope of this study. Thus, we recorded presence/absence data in $5 \times 5 \text{ cm}^2$ cells of the lattice (256 cells in total). The presence of a species was denoted when a ramet rooted in the target cell. We selected this cell size as it is larger than single ramets, but smaller than clonal fragments, and corresponds well to the scale at which interactions are likely to occur for

grassland plant species (Purves & Law 2002).

Fine-scale spatial pattern analysis

The experiment was set up so that initial abiotic conditions (light, nutrients, and edaphic conditions), as well as initial plant density within and between experimental plots, and were homogeneous. Thus, we assumed that spatial patterns only depended on second-order processes. Our aim was to describe fine-scale patterns, as a combined description of local colonization and local occupation of space, for each species in all plots. Hence, we used distance-dependent density probability functions, which are often referred to as the O-ring statistics (Wiegand & Moloney, 2004). The O-ring statistic is directly linked to the pair-correlation function $g(r)$, with $O(r) = \lambda g(r)$, λ being the intensity of the pattern (Wiegand & Moloney, 2004; Law et al., 2009).

Local colonization of space — Local colonization of space corresponded to the ability of a plant to expand in the surrounding space. To describe the colonization of space, we used the univariate pair-correlation function $O_{11}(r)$, which directly measures the average density of points of pattern 1 (i.e., the spatial pattern of the target species sp_1), at a distance r from all points of pattern 1.

Given the diffuse nature of spatial colonization by clonal plants (i.e., from the cell it initially occupies, an individual plant colonizes neighboring cells in a continuous way), the density of adjacent cells colonized by a plant is expected to more strongly decrease with distance when spatial colonization is low (on very local

distances) than for plants with high spatial colonization (on longer distances). Consequently, we adapted the aggregation index proposed by Réjou-Méchain et al. (2011) as an indicator of local colonization of space. We calculated the index of local aggregation, A_{loc} , as minus the slope of $O_{11}(r)$ on $\log(r)$ for a radius r , ranging between 1 and 3 neighboring cells (i.e., within the distance range [5–15 cm]). This short distance range corresponded to the fine scale that we were interested in for this study. A_{loc} co-varied negatively with local colonization, whereby high values of A_{loc} reflected low colonization, whereas low values of A_{loc} reflected high colonization.

In addition, we compared the observed univariate spatial pattern of the target species sp_1 to patterns expected under the homogeneous Poisson null model (also referred to as Complete Spatial Randomness, CSR). Greater than expected observations of $O_{11}(r)$ indicated aggregation, while lower than expected observations corresponded to regularity at scale r .

Local occupation of space — Local occupation of space represented the ability of a plant to form a physical barrier that prevented neighbors from colonizing the area it already occupied. We described occupation of space using the bivariate pair-correlation function $O_{12}(r)$, which measures the average density of points of pattern 2 at a distance r away from all points of pattern 1, thus describing the spatial association of patterns 1 and 2 at the scale r (Wiegand & Moloney, 2004; Law et al., 2009). In this analysis, each point of pattern 1 corresponded to the presence of the target species sp_1 within a cell, while each point of pattern 2

corresponded to the presence of at least one species of the assemblage other than the target species ($sp_{i \neq 1}$) within a cell.

More precisely, we characterized the local occupation of space using the level of local coexistence of the target species sp_i with respect to other species in the assemblage. We expected plants characterized by a low level of spatial occupation to allow plants of other species within the cells they occupied, whereas plants with a high level of spatial occupation should exclude other species from the cells they occupied. Thus, we calculated the local coexistence index, C_{loc} , as the value of $O_{12}(r)$ within cells occupied by target points of pattern 1 (i.e., at distance $r = 0$). This index co-varied negatively with the level of local occupation of space, whereby it decreased with increasing local occupation of space, ranging between 0 and 1.

To complement the conclusions reached with C_{loc} , we carried out each analysis with the appropriate null model. We aimed to determine whether species sp_1 , given its own univariate spatial pattern, influenced the spatial pattern of the other species. Thus, the observed bivariate pattern was compared to pattern expected under the Antecedent Condition null model (i.e., location of pattern 1 remained fixed, while pattern 2 was randomly distributed within the grid) (Wiegand & Moloney 2004). Greater than expected observation of $O_{12}(r)$ indicated coexistence between species sp_1 and the rest of the assemblage, while lower than expected observation of $O_{12}(r)$ indicated segregation between species sp_1 and the rest of the assemblage.

We calculated univariate and bivariate O-ring statistics using the grid-based approach of the Programita software

(Wiegand & Moloney 2004). The smallest spatial unit for analysis corresponded to one 5×5 cm² cell of the sampling lattice. All analyses were carried out up to a maximal distance that was equal to half the length of our square study plots, $r_{max} = 8$ cells (40 cm), and with ring width $dr = 1$ cell (5 cm). For each null model, we generated 99 Monte-Carlo simulations, and created approximately 99% simulation envelopes from the highest and lowest value for each distance r . Deviation from simulation envelopes at a given distance indicated departure from the expected pattern of the null model.

For illustrative purposes, we combined the results from each replicate plot per assemblage, either for each species ($n_{max} = 8$ replicates) or for each clonal dispersal strategy (i.e., the results for each species characterized by a given clonal strategy were combined: $n_{max} = 4$ species $\times 8$ replicate plots = 32 replicates) (Raventós et al. 2010). As the number of replicates that could be combined was limited to 24, we randomly selected the replicates for combining in the analyses per clonal strategy whenever the whole number of replicates exceeded 24.

Space capture

As an indicator of species spatial performance, we described relative space capture by a species compared to the other species of the assemblage, within the entire experimental plot. We calculated $\Delta cover$ as the relative difference between the observed relative percentage cover and the relative percentage cover expected under the assumption of equal colonization of space among species. $\Delta cover = -1$ indicated the disappearance of a species from the plot, negative values indicated

that the species was scarcer than expected, and increasing positive values indicated an increasing dominance of the species in the vegetation cover (Table 2).

Statistical analyses

We empirically fixed a threshold of 10 cells colonized by the target species within a plot, under which spatial pattern analysis was not carried out. Below this threshold, the number of points was too low to ensure sufficient statistical power, and led to jagged plots that could not be analyzed. Consequently, the number of replicates could dramatically be reduced for some species, mainly due to the disappearance of some clonal fragments during the experiment. In particular, spatial pattern analysis was not carried out for the caespitose species *Lolium perenne*, due to high mortality of clonal fragments, regardless of the assemblage (Appendices A1-2). We also did not carry out spatial pattern analysis for the phalanx species *Anthemis nobilis* in the C-P-G assemblage or *Agrostis tenuis* in both P-G and C-P-G assemblages (Appendices A3-4). Finally, the guerilla species *Holcus mollis* was excluded from spatial pattern analysis for the C-G assemblage (Appendices A5-6).

As one species was characterized by a single clonal dispersal strategy (caespitose, phalanx, or guerilla), some species were absent from some assemblages. For instance, there were no caespitose species in the bi-strategy phalanx-guerilla assemblage. Thus, we partitioned the whole dataset into several subsets. To analyze the link between clonal dispersal strategy and species spatial pattern, we partitioned data according to the type of assemblage, which led to the formation of five subsets: mono-strategy

(caespitose, phalanx, and guerilla species alone), caespitose-phalanx, caespitose-guerilla, phalanx-guerilla, and caespitose-phalanx-guerilla assemblages. For each assemblage, we carried out linear-model ANOVAs on each synthetic index of spatial pattern (A_{loc} , C_{loc}) and space capture ($\Delta cover$), with clonal dispersal strategy as the main effect and species effect nested into strategy (Crawley, 2007). For a target species sp_i , $\Delta cover$ depended on the relative cover of all species within the assemblage. Thus, we did not carry out the analysis for this index in mono-strategy assemblages, where all species corresponded to the same clonal strategy (no possible strategy effect).

To determine how the type of neighborhood affected species spatial pattern, we separately carried out three linear-model ANOVAs on each synthetic index of spatial pattern and space capture for caespitose, phalanx, and guerilla species, using the assemblage and the species as main factors. Data for a given species were included in the analyses providing that they were available for at least two replicates. Consequently, in some assemblages, the spatial patterns for a given clonal dispersal strategy did not include all of the four species representing a particular strategy. For each analysis, we selected the most parsimonious model by sequentially removing non-significant terms from higher-order interactions to single factors (Crawley, 2007). Data were log-normalized, when necessary, to meet the assumptions of the analyses. Tukey Honestly Significant Different (HSD) tests were used for post-hoc comparisons. Linear-model ANOVAs were performed using the R software version 2.8.1. (R Development Core Team, 2008).

Table 2. Description of the synthetic indices of local colonization of space (local aggregation), local occupation of space (local coexistence), and space capture (Δ cover).

Index name	Index calculation	Expectations
Indicator of local colonization of space		
Local aggregation (A_{loc})	Minus the slope of $O_{11}(r)$ against $\log(r)$ for r ranging between 1 and 3 cells i.e., [5-15cm].	\searrow with \nearrow colonization of space
Indicator of local occupation of space		
Local coexistence (C_{loc})	Value of $O_{12}(r)$ at $r = 0$	\searrow with \nearrow occupation of space
Indicator of spatial performance		
Space capture (Δ cover)	$\Delta_{cover\ sp_i} = \left(\frac{Cover\ obs\ sp_i - Cover\ exp\ sp_i}{Cover\ exp\ sp_i} \right)$ <p>with $Cover\ obs\ sp_i = \frac{\text{Number of cells colonized by } sp_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{number of cells occupied by } sp_i}$,</p> <p>and $Cover\ exp\ sp_i = 25, 12.5$ or 8.33% in 1-, 2-, and 3-strategy assemblages, respectively</p>	-1: mortality of all individuals of species i <0: colonization less than expected =0: colonization equal to expected >0: colonization more than expected

Results

In this study, each clonal dispersal strategy was represented by a set of four species (one Dicotyledon and three Monocotyledons). Regardless of the clonal dispersal strategy, our results showed significant species-specific effects on species spatial patterns and their response to neighboring species (type of assemblage), highlighting the importance of inter-specific variability in spatial patterning. However, despite such inter-specific differences, our results demonstrated that the spatial patterns of species depended on several parameters, comprising (i) the clonal dispersal strategy of the species itself, (ii) the way it was modulated by its biotic environment and, in particular, the clonal dispersal strategy of neighboring species.

Inter-specific variations in spatial patterns

Statistical analyses revealed a significant species effect on plant spatial patterns and space capture, even among species representing the same clonal dispersal strategy (significant strategy \times species effects, except for A_{loc} and C_{loc} in C-P and C_{loc} in P-G assemblages; Table 3).

These results were confirmed by significant species effects, when data for all assemblages were considered within each strategy, except for C_{loc} with phalanx species (Table 4). In addition, species characterized by the same clonal dispersal strategy tended to respond differently to the neighborhood, as revealed by significant assemblage \times species effects, except for C_{loc} for phalanx species (Table 4). Regarding the shape of curves resulting from univariate and bivariate spatial analyses for each species, such inter-

specific differences were the most pronounced among guerilla species and, in particular, between the Dicotyledon *Ranunculus repens* and other guerilla species (Appendices A5-6). Nevertheless, these inter-specific differences rarely masked the effects of the main factors (i.e., the clonal dispersal strategy and assemblage) (Tables 3, 4).

Impact of clonal growth strategy on species spatial patterns

Species local colonization of space depended on the clonal dispersal strategy. In mono-strategy assemblages, departure of univariate O-ring statistics from the CRS null model at scales ranging between one and two to four adjacent cells (10–20 cm) was the weakest for guerilla species (Figs. 1i-l). Guerilla species were also characterized by the lowest level of local aggregation, A_{loc} (Table 3), confirming their ability to colonize space at relatively long distances. As expected, caespitose species represented the other extreme of local colonization, with the highest values of A_{loc} in all types of assemblages, and a large positive departure from the CSR null model (Fig. 1a-d). Despite a substantial positive departure from the CSR null model, the index of local aggregation, A_{loc} , indicated that the ability of phalanx species to colonize local space was intermediate between caespitose and guerilla strategies (Table 3). This hierarchy in the local colonization of space, which was the lowest for caespitose, intermediate for phalanx, and the most extensive for guerilla species, remained consistent, regardless of the assemblage (Table 3).

Regarding bivariate analyses, the index of local coexistence C_{loc} described the tendency of a species to tolerate or




Figure 1. Univariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ for caespitose (A-D), phalanx (E-H), and guerilla species (I-L). Each graph represents a combination of eight replicate plots for all species representing a strategy. Average \pm se indices of small-scale aggregation (A_{loc}) of replicate plots and species are indicated for each pattern. Solid lines and circles represent the observed statistics; dashed lines indicate 99% simulation envelopes (highest and lowest values of 99 Monte-Carlo simulations) of the CSR null model. The spatial resolution represents one cell ($5 \times 5 \text{ cm}^2$). Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). For each strategy, different lower-case letters indicate significant difference of A_{loc} between assemblages. Univariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ of each species are provided separately in the supplementary material.

Table 3. Results of linear-model ANOVAs testing the strategy and species effect on the three synthetic indices of plant spatial patterns. Species effect was nested into strategy. Comparison of means resulted from Tukey HSD post-hoc tests. ns *P*-value > 0.05, * *P*-value < 0.05, ** *P*-value < 0.01, *** *P*-value < 0.001, – indicates that the effect was not significant and removed for model simplification.

		Strategy	Strategy × Species	Comparison of means
Mono-strategy assemblages (C, P, G)				
A _{loc}	n = 78	F = 199.63 ^{***}	F = 6.53 ^{***}	G < P < T
C _{loc}	n = 78	F = 187.38 ^{***}	F = 6.00 ^{***}	T < P < G
Bi-strategy assemblage Caespitose & Phalanx species (C-P)				
Δ cover	n = 64	F = 32.07 ^{***}	F = 14.02 ^{***}	P < T
A _{loc}	n = 45	F = 19.30 ^{***}	–	P < T
C _{loc}	n = 45	F = 7.82 ^{**}	–	T < P
Bi-strategy assemblage Caespitose & Guerilla species (C-G)				
Δ cover	n = 64	F = 6.18 [*]	F = 53.73 ^{***}	T < G
A _{loc}	n = 41	F = 71.08 ^{***}	F = 3.23 [*]	G < T
C _{loc}	n = 41	F = 0.71 ^{ns}	F = 6.91 ^{***}	
Bi-strategy assemblage Phalanx & Guerilla species (P-G)				
Δ cover	n = 64	F = 264.48 ^{***}	F = 34.74 ^{***}	P < G
A _{loc}	n = 44	F = 76.21 ^{***}	F = 6.18 ^{***}	G < P
C _{loc}	n = 44	F = 0.055 ^{ns}	F = 1.91 ^{ns}	
Tri-strategy assemblage (C-P-G)				
Δ cover	n = 96	F = 97.51 ^{***}	F = 23.06 ^{***}	P < T < G
A _{loc}	n = 59	F = 118.04 ^{***}	F = 8.43 ^{***}	G < P < T
C _{loc}	n = 59	F = 9.79 ^{***}	F = 2.48 [*]	T < P = G

Table 4. Results of linear-model ANOVAs testing the assemblage and species effect on the three synthetic indices of spatial pattern. ns *P*-value > 0.05, * *P*-value < 0.05, ** *P*-value < 0.01, *** *P*-value < 0.001, – indicates that the effect was not significant and removed for model simplification.

		Assemblage	Species	Assemblage × Species
Caespitose strategy				
Δ cover	n = 128	F = 20.80 ^{***}	F = 103.40 ^{***}	F = 2.55 [*]
A _{loc}	n = 91	F = 8.17 ^{***}	F = 8.22 ^{***}	–
C _{loc}	n = 91	F = 59.27 ^{***}	F = 7.59 ^{***}	–
Phalanx strategy				
Δ cover	n = 127	F = 88.25 ^{***}	F = 41.53 ^{***}	F = 10.76 ^{***}
A _{loc}	n = 72	F = 1.36 ^{ns}	F = 5.12 ^{**}	F = 2.44 [*]
C _{loc}	n = 72	F = 51.71 ^{***}	–	–
Guerilla strategy				
Δ cover	n = 128	F = 20.20 ^{***}	F = 150.20 ^{***}	F = 4.95 ^{***}
A _{loc}	n = 104	F = 13.49 ^{***}	F = 31.63 ^{***}	–
C _{loc}	n = 104	F = 33.06 ^{***}	F = 23.21 ^{***}	F = 4.46 ^{***}

exclude other species from the cells it occupied. In mono-strategy assemblages, C_{loc} was the highest for guerilla, intermediate for phalanx, and the lowest for caespitose species (Fig. 2; Table 3). Accordingly, the negative deviation of the observed bivariate pattern from the antecedent null model was the largest for

caespitose species, whereas no deviation was observed for guerilla species. Altogether, these results indicated that caespitose species strongly occupied local space, limiting inter-specific contacts, whereas, at the other extreme, guerilla species frequently coexisted with other species.




Figure 2. Bivariate O-ring statistics $O_{12}(r)$ patterns for caespitose (A-D), phalanx (E-H), and guerilla species (I-L). Each graph represents a combination of eight replicate plots for all species representing a strategy. Average \pm se indices of local coexistence (C_{loc}) of replicate plots and species are indicated for each pattern. Solid lines and circles represent the observed statistics; dashed lines indicate 99% simulation envelopes (highest and lowest values of 99 Monte-Carlo simulations) of the Antecedent condition null model. The spatial resolution represents one cell ($5 \times 5 \text{ cm}^2$). Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). For each strategy, different lower-case letters in parentheses indicate significant difference of C_{loc} between assemblages. Bivariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ of each species are provided separately in the supplementary material.

Response of species spatial patterns to neighborhood characteristics

For caespitose and guerilla species, local colonization of space was modulated by the clonal strategy of neighboring species, as indicated by significant assemblage effects on the index of local aggregation, A_{loc} , for both strategies (Table 4). Colonization of surrounding space by guerilla species was limited in the presence of caespitose species (increase in local aggregation in assemblages C-G and C-P-G, Fig. 1j, l), whereas the presence of phalanx species alone had no effect on local aggregations. These results were corroborated by larger positive deviations from the CSR null model in the C-G and C-P-G assemblages (Fig. 1j, l) than in G and P-G assemblages (Fig. 1i, k). Regardless of the assemblage, caespitose species were characterized by a strong positive deviation of the observed univariate pattern from the CRS null model, at fine scales (within a radius of two to three adjacent cells, depending on the assemblage, Fig. 1a-d). However, although the presence of guerilla species alone had no significant effect, the local aggregation of caespitose species tended to increase when grown with phalanx species, and reached its maximal value in the three-strategy assemblage (Figs. 1a-d). Phalanx ability to colonize space was, on average, not significantly affected by the type of assemblage, despite species-specific differences (Table 4; Fig. 1e-h).

Local occupation patterns also varied in response to the clonal strategy of species constituting the neighborhood. For caespitose species, local occupation remained high regardless of the assemblage, as indicated by low values of C_{loc} and negative deviation from the

antecedent condition null model (Fig. 2a-d). However, local occupation of space significantly decreased in the presence of guerilla species, either alone (C-G) or in assemblages with phalanx species (C-P-G) (Fig. 2c, d). Conversely, local occupation of space was not affected by the presence of phalanx species alone (C-P) (Fig. 2b; Table 4). Similarly, local occupation of space by phalanx species was not affected by caespitose species (C-P), but significantly decreased in the presence of guerilla species, as indicated by values of C_{loc} close to 1, and no deviation of the observed bivariate pattern from the antecedent condition null model in either P-G or C-P-G assemblages (Fig. 2f-h; Table 4). For guerilla species, the index of local coexistence C_{loc} was the highest when they only developed with phalanx species (P-G), was intermediate in the mono-strategy assemblage (G) and three-strategy assemblage (C-P-G), and was the lowest when in the presence of caespitose species alone (C-G) (Fig. 2i-l; Table 4). These results indicate that the local coexistence of guerilla species with phalanx species was even greater than among guerilla species alone. In contrast, local coexistence with caespitose species was rather limited, especially in the C-G assemblage, which was the only assemblage where the observed pattern deviated from the null model, but only slightly (Fig. 2j).

Space capture

Species relative cover (i.e., the relative number of cells colonized by a species compared to other species constituting the assemblage), was unbalanced at both the species and clonal dispersal strategy level. Regardless of the assemblage, space

capture was, on average, the lowest for phalanx species, which expanded less than other species (negative values of $\Delta cover$), and the largest for guerilla species (positive values of $\Delta cover$) (Fig. 3c, e; Table 3). Space capture was rather homogeneous among phalanx species and, to a lesser extent, caespitose species (except for *Lolium perenne*, for which mortality was high in all assemblages) (Fig. 3b, d). Conversely, guerilla species proved to be highly variable regarding their ability to capture space within a plot ($\Delta cover$) (Fig. 3f). *Elytrigia repens* dominated plant cover in all assemblage types, contrasting with *Ranunculus repens* and *Holcus mollis*, which were dominated by other species. For *Agrostis stolonifera*, space capture depended on the assemblage,

only being positive when mixed with phalanx species (Fig. 3f).

The strength of space capture also depended on the assemblage, such as the clonal dispersal strategy of neighboring species (Table 4). For both guerilla and phalanx species, relative cover tended to be more balanced when they developed in assemblages with caespitose species only (with smaller divergence of observed cover from expected cover, Table 4). For caespitose species, space capture also depended on the strategy of species constituting the assemblage; caespitose species dominated the cover when grown only with phalanx species, but expanded less than expected when guerilla species were present (Fig. 3a).




Figure 3. Relative variation between species relative cover expected under the assumption of equal space colonization among species ($\Delta cover$). Values are averages ($\pm se$) of replicates plots and (a, c, e) all species representing a spatial strategy or (b, d, f) for each species individually. Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). Different lower-case letters indicate significant differences (post-hoc Tukey HSD tests).

Discussion

The present study provided new key elements that addressed the gap between observed spatial patterns in plant communities and the processes responsible for these patterns. Despite species-specific effects, our results demonstrated that the spatial patterns of clonal plants grown in assemblages depend on both the species clonal dispersal strategy (i.e., traits associated with clonal dispersal) and the clonal dispersal strategy of neighboring species.

Clonal growth strategy as a predictor of species spatial patterns

Using a large panel of clonal plant species, our study revealed contrasting plant spatial patterns at a very fine scale (of up to 15 cm), leading to the conclusion that clonal growth generates a variety of plant spatial patterns. Supporting [Purves & Law \(2002\)](#), who stated that spatial patterning was often studied at distances larger than those at which biotic interactions are likely to occur (but see e.g., [Herben et al., 1993a](#); [Klimes, 1999](#)), our results showed that investigating the role of dispersal in plant pattern formation requires measurements at very fine scales, especially for grassland communities.

Regardless of the assemblage, our study showed that patterns of local colonization and occupation of space depend on the species clonal dispersal strategy. This result indicates that spatial patterns of clonal plant species may be predicted, at least to some extent, by traits linked with clonal architecture. In accordance with our first hypothesis, spatial patterns may be arranged along a continuum that is defined using the clonal

dispersal strategy. At one extreme of this continuum, caespitose species minimized the colonization of space (as shown by their highest degree of local aggregation), while maximizing occupation of space (as shown by their lowest degree of local coexistence with other species). As expected, guerilla species represented the other extreme of this continuum, whereas phalanx species were characterized by intermediate values of both local colonization and local occupation of space.

Influence of neighborhood characteristics on spatial patterns

Although general hierarchies in the spatial pattern of species characterized by different clonal strategies were maintained regardless of the assemblage, our results demonstrated that the clonal growth strategy of neighboring species can modulate spatial pattern formation.

For caespitose and guerilla species, the pattern of local colonization of space responded differently to the identity of neighbors, whereas it remained fixed for phalanx species. First, the colonization of space by caespitose species was reduced in the presence of phalanx species alone (tendency in the C-P assemblage) or mixed with guerilla species (in the C-P-G assemblage). Such modification in local colonization might have enhanced the ability of caespitose species to form a physical barrier to protect their clonal territory ([Humphrey & Pyke, 1998](#); [Gough et al., 2002](#)), as indicated by the preservation of a high level of occupation of space in the presence of phalanx species alone. However, caespitose species failed to protect their territory efficiently in the presence of guerilla species, which managed, at least to a certain extent, to

enter the tuft (increase in the index of local coexistence). In guerilla species, the presence of caespitose species generated a significant decrease in the colonization of space, paralleled with either an increase or no change in the occupation of space (in the C-G and the C-P-G assemblages respectively).

Two processes may explain these overall variations in species spatial patterns in response to the neighborhood, although we could not disentangle their relative effects based on our current experimental design. First, plastic modifications in the clonal architecture of individuals and, especially, of internode length, have already been demonstrated in response to competition (Cheplick & Gutierrez, 2000; Humphrey & Pike, 2001; Weijschedé et al., 2008). Such variation in clonal architecture may specifically depend on the identity of their neighbors (Callaway et al., 2003). Second, local events of ramet mortality may free space within individual clonal territory. Hence, such demographic variations could have been primarily responsible for the decrease in occupation of space observed for caespitose plants in the presence of guerilla competitors. The fixity in the pattern of colonization of space recorded in phalanx species may be linked with their potentially weak plasticity, especially when compared to guerilla species (Sutherland & Stillman, 1988).

Consequences in the efficiency of space capture

Overall, our observations confirmed the existence of a trade-off in clonal plants, between colonization and the consolidation of space (Cheplick, 1997; Humphrey & Pyke, 1998; Gough et al., 2002), which is

likely to generate costs and benefits to the plant.

Guerilla species were the most efficient at capturing space, since they dominated the cover of all types of multi-strategy assemblages, despite the colonization of space requiring a major investment in connections. Nevertheless, their spatial spread was hampered by caespitose species (second strongest competitors), possibly due to their tightly packed structure (Lovett Doust, 1981; Humphrey & Pike, 1998) and their ability to retain available nutrients (Derner & Briske, 1999). Caespitose species are also usually considered to maximize intracolonial contacts (Lovett Doust 1981; Schmid 1986; Humphrey & Pike, 1998), reducing the probability of meeting individuals with greater competitive ability (Murrell et al., 2001; Stoll & Prati, 2001). Differences in the success of these two strategies are consistent with previous studies. Guerilla species can rapidly colonize and exploit open spaces, being better competitors than caespitose species in the short-term (Schmid & Harper, 1985; Cheplick, 1997; Humphrey & Pike, 1998). In addition, the infiltration of guerilla species within the clonal territory of caespitose species, led to an increase in the number of their interspecific contacts. The success of guerilla species may have been enhanced by ramet traits supporting their competitive ability compared to caespitose species. These non-clonal traits may be related to resource acquisition (i.e., light or nutrients), such as shoot height, especially in *Elytrigia repens*, or root size, as in *Ranunculus repens*.

In contrast, phalanx species were always dominated by other species, suggesting that an intermediate strategy, which lacked the ability to spread

extensively or to resist competitor invasions, is not efficient in the competition for space. This demonstrates that it is worth displaying contrasting strategies to coexist (Schmid & Harper, 1985; Herben et al., 1994a) and, thus, emphasizes the importance of consolidation (capacity to conserve a territory) – or colonization trade-off – as an element to explain coexistence in grassland communities (Amarasekare, 2003; Lenssen et al., 2005; Wildová et al., 2007b).

However, these competitive hierarchies among clonal growth strategies were established after just two years of cultivation, and the phalanx strategy is known to be more efficient in the long term (Gough et al., 2002). Therefore, it remains to be tested whether the structure of these hierarchies change across time.

Inter-specific variations in spatial patterns and space capture

Within the same clonal strategy, we found significant species effects on the spatial pattern and spatial performance within a plot (space capture). Although traits associated to clonal architecture proved to be good predictors of species spatial patterns, our results indicated that other features, which are intrinsic to species, may explain intra-strategy variations in the formation of this spatial pattern. For instance, such features may include demographic parameters (e.g., ramet birth and death rate, or ramet lifespan), physiological integration, or non-clonal traits, such as traits associated with the ability to acquire resources (i.e., height or root size). Connection and ramet life span vary among clonal species, lasting from a few months to several

consecutive years (Klimeš et al., 1997). Different mortality rates between organs constituting a clonal fragment may generate a discrepancy between the shape of the connection network (as described by architectural traits) and the effective location of rooted ramets (Wildová et al., 2007b). Besides, different locations of translocation sinks over the clonal network may completely modify the clonal architecture (Herben, 2004). Finally, investment in other plant functions, associated with vegetative growth or sexual reproduction, may divert available resources and influence ramet and connection birth and death rates, thus affecting the effective spatial pattern.

Non-clonal traits, which were not considered in the present study, might also explain observed inter-specific differences, particularly regarding space capture and survival within the plots. For instance, high mortality rates recorded for the caespitose grass *L. perenne* in all assemblage types cannot be linked to its own clonal dispersal strategy or to the clonal strategy of neighbors. Instead, these mortality rates may be due to a weak competitive ability in the undisturbed environment encountered within the experimental plots. Furthermore, contrasting growth rates might affect ramet birth rates (i.e., the number of ramets produced during the time of the experiment), being a possible explanation for the discrepancy in space capture between species such as *E. repens* and *R. repens*.

As advocated by de Kroon & Schieving (1990), and supporting Stream's (1976) definition of a strategy, clonal strategies should not be characterized based on traits associated with clonal architecture and ramet positioning alone.

The consideration of larger sets of traits associated with clonal growth may further contribute to our understanding of the role of clonality in plant spatial pattern formation.

Concluding remarks


To conclude, clonal dispersal emerges as a key element of spatial pattern formation in plant communities. Although spatial patterns of clonal plants may depend on several factors, particularly the intrinsic features of species, our study provided evidence that clonal dispersal strategies may rapidly (i.e., after only two experimental years) shape the fine-scale spatial structure of the plant community, by generating diverse spatial patterns from an initial random distribution of individuals. In addition, spatial patterns were modulated by the clonal dispersal strategy of the surrounding plants. Thus, these results led to the fundamental conclusion that the identity of neighbors, rather than the simple presence of competitors, must be considered when investigating spatial patterning in plant communities. In turn, plant spatial structure may influence the outcome of competitive interactions, either directly or indirectly, through changes in the feedback of the spatial distribution of resources ([Herben & Hara, 2003](#)).

This study emphasized the importance of a trade-off between space consolidation and colonization as a key mechanism of species coexistence in grassland communities.


Acknowledgements

The authors thank N. Renaud for assistance with the data collection and J.-S. Pierre for helpful comments on statistical analyses. We are also grateful to T. Wiegand, who kindly provided access to Programita software. The English was corrected by G. Schofield. This project benefited from the grant ANR-08-SYSC-012 provided by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (France).


Appendices




A1. Univariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ for caespitose species. Each graph represents a combination of the eight replicate plots. Average +/- se indices of local aggregation (A_{loc}) of replicate plots (n = number of replicates) are indicated for each pattern. Solid lines and circles represent the observed statistics; dashed lines indicate 99% simulation envelopes (highest and lowest values of 99 Monte-Carlo simulations) of the CSR null model. The spatial resolution represents one cell (5×5 cm²). Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). No analysis was carried out for *L. perenne*, due to not enough cells being colonized (always <10) within all replicate plots.




A2. Bivariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ for caespitose species. Each graph represents a combination of the eight replicate plots. Average \pm se indices of local coexistence (C_{loc}) of replicate plots (n = number of replicates) are indicated for each pattern. Solid lines and circles represent the observed statistics; dashed lines indicate 99% simulation envelopes (highest and lowest values of 99 Monte-Carlo simulations) of the CSR null model. The spatial resolution is represents one cell ($5 \times 5 \text{ cm}^2$). Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). No analysis was carried out for *L. perenne*, due not enough cells being colonized (always <10) within all replicate plots.




A3. Univariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ for phalanx species. Each graph represents a combination of the eight replicate plots. Average \pm se indices of local aggregation (A_{loc}) of replicate plots (n = number of replicates) are indicated for each pattern. Solid lines and circles represent the observed statistics; dashed lines indicate 99% simulation envelopes (highest and lowest values of 99 Monte-Carlo simulations) of the CSR null model. The spatial resolution represents one cell (5×5 cm²). Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). No analysis was carried out for *A. nobilis* in C-P-G assemblage and for *A. tenuis* in P-G and C-P-G assemblages, due not enough cells being colonized (always <10) within all replicate plots of these assemblages.



A4. Bivariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ for phalanx species. Each graph represents a combination of the eight replicate plots. Average \pm se indices of local coexistence (C_{loc}) of replicate plots (n = number of replicates) are indicated for each pattern. Solid lines and circles represent the observed statistics; dashed lines indicate 99% simulation envelopes (highest and lowest values of 99 Monte-Carlo simulations) of the CSR null model. The spatial resolution is represents one cell (5×5 cm²). Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). No analysis was carried out for *A. nobilis* in C-P-G assemblage and for *A. tenuis* in P-G and C-P-G assemblages, due to not enough cells being colonized (<10) within all replicate plots of these assemblages.



A5. Univariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ for guerilla species. Each graph represents a combination of the eight replicate plots. Average \pm se indices of local aggregation (A_{loc}) of replicate plots (n = number of replicates) are indicated for each pattern. Solid lines and circles represent the observed statistics; dashed lines indicate 99% simulation envelopes (highest and lowest values of 99 Monte-Carlo simulations) of the CSR null model. The spatial resolution represents one cell (5×5 cm²). Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). No analysis was carried out for *H. mollis* in C-G assemblage, due to not enough cells being colonized (<10) within all replicate plots of this assemblage.



A6. Bivariate O-ring statistics $O_{11}(r)$ for guerilla species. Each graph represents a combination of the eight replicate plots. Average \pm se indices of local coexistence (C_{loc}) of replicate plots (n = number of replicates) are indicated for each pattern. Solid lines and circles represent the observed statistics; dashed lines indicate 99% simulation envelopes (highest and lowest values of 99 Monte-Carlo simulations) of the CSR null model. The spatial resolution represents one cell (5×5 cm²). Capital letters in parentheses indicate the type of assemblage (C caespitose, P phalanx, and G guerilla species under 1-strategy, 2-strategy, or 3-strategy assemblages). No analysis was carried out for *H. mollis* in C-G assemblage, due not enough cells being colonized (<10) within all replicate plots of this assemblage.

~ Chapitre 2 ~

Les traits clonaux : des traits de réponse à la compétition

	Préface	... page 115
Article III	– Analogies between clonal plant and animal foraging: Evidence of information acquisition regarding local richness and spatial variance	... page 121
Article IV	– Morphological response to competition for light in the clonal <i>Trifolium repens</i> L. (Fabaceae)	... page 133
Article V	– A comparative study of plastic and non-plastic plant individuals under competition: importance of clonal architecture determinants.	... page 149

PREFACE

1. OBJECTIFS DU CHAPITRE 2

A l'issue du chapitre 1, il ressort que les traits clonaux architecturaux peuvent être considérés comme des indicateurs des patrons spatiaux des communautés végétales. La plasticité de ces traits agit sur le degré d'agrégation des réseaux clonaux (de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995). Celle-ci pourrait donc expliquer, au moins en partie, les variations des patrons spatiaux dépendantes de l'environnement compétitif, mises en évidence dans le chapitre 1. Ce chapitre 2 vise donc à identifier les processus opérant à l'échelle du clone qui pourraient expliquer les phénomènes observés à l'échelle de la communauté.

La réponse du clone à son environnement (biotique ou abiotique) par modification plastique de ses traits clonaux, lui permet de positionner ses modules dans les patchs d'habitat les plus favorables (Slade & Hutchings, 1987 ; de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995 ; Oborny & Cain, 1997). Ce comportement est souvent assimilé au foraging des animaux. Il implique notamment que le clone est capable d'utiliser des paramètres caractérisant la distribution spatiale de la ressource comme informations lui permettant d'adapter son comportement. Par analogie avec des observations faites chez d'autres organismes (Louâpre et al., 2010 ; Tentelier et al., 2009), nous faisons l'hypothèse que ces informations pourraient correspondre à la qualité locale et à la variabilité de la ressource.

La compétition entre les plantes est un processus complexe. Considérée à l'échelle d'un clone (*i.e.* une structure croissant dans les directions verticales et horizontales), elle comprend plusieurs composantes comme l'intensité et l'hétérogénéité de la compétition, dont les valeurs pourraient dépendre de l'identité des compétiteurs. Ces deux composantes déterminent la qualité locale des ressources et génèrent de l'hétérogénéité dans leur répartition (Jackson and Caldwell, 1993; Herben et al., 2000). L'intensité de la compétition pourrait alors induire une réponse au niveau des modules, notamment par une modification de la morphologie des feuilles afin d'augmenter leur efficacité dans l'acquisition de la ressource lumineuse. L'hétérogénéité de la compétition étant perçue par le clone entier (intégration physiologique) (Turkington et al., 1991), elle pourrait être à l'origine d'une modification plastique de la croissance horizontale du clone pour favoriser le placement de ses modules dans les patchs les plus favorables.

La compétition constitue un filtre environnemental sélectionnant les espèces dont les traits, notamment ceux déterminant l'architecture de la plante, leur permettent de persister dans les conditions qu'elle génère (Lavorel & Garnier, 2002). Plusieurs stratégies de réponse de la plante peuvent diminuer l'impact de la compétition sur sa croissance (Novoplansky, 2009) : la confrontation, la tolérance et l'évitement. Chez les plantes clonales, la stratégie d'évitement favorise la croissance du clone dans la direction de moindres interférences. Néanmoins, l'efficacité de cette réponse pourrait dépendre de l'environnement du clone (Alpert & Simms, 2002). Cette réponse plastique interagit avec le structural blue-print (*i.e.* l'architecture basique de la plante donnant son nombre de bourgeons axillaires par exemple) et les processus ontogéniques pour donner l'architecture effective du clone (Huber et al., 1999). Ces traits seraient donc impliqués dans le succès de la plante et pourraient influencer l'efficacité de sa réponse plastique.

Les objectifs principaux de ce chapitre sont :

- ✓ D'identifier les informations décrivant la distribution spatiale de la ressource utilisées par les plantes clonales pour adapter leur comportement de foraging. (Article III)
- ✓ De déterminer l'importance de l'identité du compétiteur pour la mise en place de la stratégie de réponse de la plante clonale. (Article IV)
- ✓ De déterminer l'architecture clonale permettant de favoriser le succès de l'individu plastique ou non-plastique en situation de compétition et d'identifier les traits impliqués dans le déterminisme de cette architecture. (Article V)

2. DEMARCHES MISES EN ŒUVRE

Les travaux présentés dans ce chapitre ont nécessité la mise en œuvre d'une double approche expérimentale et de modélisation.

L'approche expérimentale est basée sur la culture d'individus clonaux afin de déterminer leurs réponses comportementales (foraging) à divers environnements. Dans une

première expérience portant sur deux espèces de *Potentilla*, ces environnements ont différé par la moyenne et la variabilité de la qualité de leur substrat de croissance ([Article III](#)) (dispositif expérimental présenté en 2.2.1. partie Méthodologie). Les effets de ces deux types d'information sur le comportement de foraging des individus clonaux ont été évalués par la mesure de tous les entre-nœuds du stolon primaire. Afin de déterminer si les plantes clonales construisent leur expérience à partir de ces informations, la réponse des plus jeunes modules relativement aux conditions trophiques ressenties par les modules parents a également été étudiée. Dans une seconde expérience, des clones de *Trifolium repens* ont été cultivés seuls et au sein d'environnements compétitifs différant par l'identité du compétiteur : *Elytrigia repens* (guérilla), *Agrostis stolonifera* (guérilla), *Lolium perenne* (cespiteuse), *Trifolium repens* (guérilla) ([Article IV](#)) (dispositif expérimental présenté en 2.2.2. partie Méthodologie). Les caractéristiques de croissance verticale et horizontale de *T. repens* ont été comparées entre ces différents traitements et ont été reliées aux paramètres d'intensité et d'hétérogénéité de la compétition mesurés au sein de ces traitements.

Les traits impliqués dans le déterminisme de l'architecture clonale (structural blueprint et ontogénie) permettant de maximiser la fitness de l'individu dans différentes conditions d'intensité et de réponse à la compétition, ont été identifiés via une méthode de modélisation basée sur un modèle individu centré (présenté en 3. partie Méthodologie). Celle-ci permet de distinguer les effets respectifs de chacun des 11 traits testés ([Article V](#)). L'architecture effective de ces clones « optimaux » par rapport aux conditions de compétition a également été déterminée. Trois densités d'individus (1, 50 et 300 individus) et deux niveaux de plasticité des individus ont été testés, conduisant à l'étude de six prairies virtuelles. Les campagnes de simulation ont été réalisées par volunteer computing permettant d'avoir un grand nombre de répliqués.

3. PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS

Nos résultats démontrent au travers des exemples de *Potentilla reptans* et de *P. anserina*, que les plantes clonales perçoivent la qualité et la variabilité de l'environnement et utilisent au moins l'un de ces paramètres comme information pour adapter leur comportement de foraging. Les deux espèces répondent en effet à la qualité de la ressource agrégeant les modules dans les patchs riches, tandis que seule *P. reptans* répond à sa variabilité. Ces

informations sont intégrées sur le clone et constituent son expérience, construite de modules en modules et influençant son comportement de foraging ([Article III](#)) (Figure 1). Les décisions comportementales des modules les plus jeunes sont prises relativement à la qualité de l'environnement expérimentée par les modules parents chez *P. anserina* et dans une moindre mesure chez *P. reptans*. Chez cette espèce, seul un accroissement de la qualité de son environnement génère une modification de son comportement. Cette étude soutient donc l'analogie qui est faite entre le comportement de foraging des animaux et celui des plantes clonales.

Nous avons démontré que le comportement de foraging des clones est sous la dépendance des caractéristiques de leur environnement compétitif, en particulier de l'identité du compétiteur ([Article IV](#)). Cette identité détermine en effet les valeurs d'intensité et d'hétérogénéité de la compétition, qui traduisent indirectement la qualité et la variabilité de l'environnement des plantes, informations qu'elles utilisent pour établir leur comportement de foraging (Figure 1). L'intensité et l'hétérogénéité de la compétition ont un effet interactif sur les traits de performance et de croissance verticale des clones ainsi que sur leur nombre de branches. Les autres traits clonaux caractérisant les longueurs de connexions répondent également à l'intensité et à l'hétérogénéité de la compétition. Par exemple, l'hétérogénéité de la compétition favorise l'élongation des connexions du clone, permettant une exploration plus efficace de l'espace.

Nos résultats ont mis en évidence que la réponse plastique testée, *i.e.* une stratégie d'évitement par croissance dans la direction de moindres interférences, est adaptative seulement pour des densités en compétiteurs faibles à modérées. Cette réponse a favorisé une architecture dispersée chez l'individu seul et une architecture agrégée chez les individus en compétition. Le succès de l'individu plastique ou non plastique est favorisé quelque soit l'intensité de la compétition par une architecture en étoile (forte ramification initiale et faible longueur d'entre-nœud) et une faible influence des processus ontogéniques sur cette architecture basique. La résistance à la compétition ainsi que l'efficacité de la réponse plastique sont apparues dépendantes de traits caractérisant principalement le structural blue-print de la plante (développement sympodial et faible dominance apicale) et réduisant l'importance des processus ontogéniques (Figure 1).




Figure 1. La mise en place de l'architecture effective des clones : un processus sous l'influence des interactions de compétition. : numéros des articles concernés.

En prairie, les traits clonaux sont impliqués dans les processus de formation des patrons spatiaux. Ces patrons spatiaux ont un effet important sur les fonctions écosystémiques et notamment la productivité. Le chapitre 3 cherche à mettre en évidence un lien entre les traits clonaux et cette fonction.

Analogy between clonal plant and animal foraging: Evidence of information acquisition regarding local richness and spatial variance

P. Louâtre¹, A.-K. Bittebiere¹, B. Clément¹, J.-S. Pierre¹, C. Mony¹

¹UMR CNRS 6553 ECOBIO / UMS 3343 OSUR, University of Rennes 1, Rennes, France.

Article Informations	Abstract
<p><i>Article history:</i></p> <p>In revision for <i>PLoS ONE</i></p>	<p>Clonal plants exhibit complex growth patterns to maximize resource uptake from the environment. Clonal species respond to spatial heterogeneity by variability in internode length or branching frequency. This morphological plasticity is now considered an active foraging response, leading to ramet aggregation in favorable environments. These growth strategies exhibit analogies with animal behavior. Resource distribution data is commonly obtained from animal habitats. We hypothesized that clonal plants also collect and treat information. In the present study, we investigated the analogy between animal and clonal plant foraging behavior, emphasizing the response of clonal plants to differences in resource distribution. We quantitatively assessed differences in resource local mean and variance, based on modifications in the phenotypic response of two <i>Potentilla</i> species (<i>Potentilla anserina</i> and <i>P. reptans</i>) foraging on different artificial environments. Internode lengths along a primary linear stolon were measured following growth under four environmental conditions, including rich, medium, poor soils, or a soil of varying quality (a random series of these soils). We also tested the experimental treatment effect of the clone on its foraging response. Results demonstrated that the two related species responded similarly to the quality of the environment (i.e. soil quality), however <i>P. reptans</i> responded to resource distribution variability. In both species, treatment effects by the entire genet influenced the plastic response at the ramet level. Our results demonstrated that, consistent to foraging animals, clonal plants responded similarly from ramet to ramet, and adjusted their foraging behavior accordingly.</p>

Introduction

Animals effectively respond to spatial heterogeneity and the unpredictability of environmental conditions, and have evolved adaptive responses to maximize fitness (Karban, 2008). Animal foraging behaviors have long been of interest to ecologists, including prey choice or patch residence time (Emlen, 1966; Mac Arthur et al., 1966; Charnov, 1976; Danchin et al.,

2008). Currently, a growing number of studies have extended these concepts to plants (Kelly, 1990; Hutchings & de Kroon, 1994; Mc Nickle & Cahill, 2009). Similar to the environmental conditions of animals, nutrients, light, and water are a spatially distributed resource with fine-scale variations for plants (Chazdon et al., 1988; Jackson & Caldwell, 1993; Hutchings & de Kroon, 1994; Gross et al., 1995). Plants tend to maximize resource

uptake performing efficient foraging strategies (Bazzaz, 1996; Trewavas, 2006). Clonal plants exhibit specific morphological traits, resulting in a definitive foraging analogy between animals (Oborny & Cain, 1997; Mc Nickle et al., 2009). Clonal species are composed of feeding sites (ramets) bridged by spacers (stolons or rhizomes), and ramets are sessile units established in the soil after rooting (Li & Wang, 2006; Mc Nickle et al., 2009). As a consequence, a clonal plant can be viewed as a mobile forager, not by moving a foraging unit, but by growing supplemental foraging units, a fundamental difference with animals. For this reason, clonal plants occupy an interesting position between mobile animals, and immobile plants (Oborny & Cain, 1997).

Efficient adaptation to changing environmental conditions suggests compiling information. The first type of relevant information for organisms is recognition of local patch quality. This has been demonstrated in many animal taxa, such as birds, insects, and a variety of mammals, including humans [e.g. Vásquez et al. (2006); Louâtre et al. (2010); Bacon et al. (2011); Louâtre et al. (2011)]. For example, animals adjust residence time according to patch richness, respectively increasing or decreasing time in rich or poor patches (Charnov, 1976). In clonal plants, a temporal investment in patch area corresponds to the spatial aggregation of ramets in favorable sites (Mc Nickle et al., 2009). Indeed, clonal plants respond spatially to local soil quality by decreasing internode length in suitable areas, either for light (Slade & Hutchings, 1987; Dong, 1993; Dong et al., 1994) or nutrients (Slade & Hutchings, 1987). Local soil quality is important for clonal plants as an indicator of area richness around the ramet.

Internode length between two ramets should decrease if richness is high in order to aggregate daughter ramets in the favorable area. Alternatively, internode length should increase if richness is low to avoid an unfavorable area.

Variability in resource distribution is the second type of information typically processed by foraging animals. In animals, patch quality may vary spatially, and the organism encounters an unpredictable spatial and temporal environment (Oaten, 1977). If an organism assesses the resource distribution variability as unsuitable, it can risk leaving a favorable patch without finding another favorable one. Therefore, animals process information about patch variability to modify foraging behavior adaptively (Giraldeau, 2008; Tentelier et al., 2009). Clonal plants also respond to the resource heterogeneity by modifying foraging behavior (Macdonald & Lieffers, 1993; Wijesinghe & Hutchings, 1997). Data on resource distribution variability indicates the expected levels of soil quality at a given distance from the ramet i.e. internode length should be shorter in a highly variable resource distribution. However, under more homogeneous conditions, the environment is more predictable even at longer distances. The internode length depends on local soil richness.

The foraging behavior of clonal plants should vary from ramet to ramet based on past environmental conditions, where successful ramets pass information on to the next ramet, consistent with animal behavior. Animals collect and retain information from patch to patch, building experiences from the environment, and adjusting behaviors accordingly. Recent studies compared foraging behavior in clonal plants with

information sampling in animals (Gómez & Stuefer, 2006; Magyar et al., 2007). It is plausible that environmental responses are processed from ramet to ramet, and this adaptation is of primary importance for plants to deal with heterogeneous environments. In addition, the response to heterogeneous environments (i.e. information) may be modified by former experience of the clonal plant (i.e. past change in conditions between ramets).

We hypothesized the following: (i) clonal plants recognize and respond to the quality and variability of surrounding environmental conditions; and (ii) the response depends on the experience acquired by older ramets of the clone. We observed the behavioral response of two clonal plant species growing under artificial environments. The environmental conditions differed by the average or variability of soil quality. We assessed the effects of the two types of information on the two clonal plant species foraging behavior by measuring internode lengths of a primary linear stolon. We subsequently determined the behavioral response of the youngest ramets relative to the genet experience developed by mother sampling ramets.

Materials and Methods

The biological material

Two closely related stoloniferous species, *Potentilla reptans* L. and *P. anserina* L. (Rosaceae) were chosen. A close phylogenetic relationship between the species should prevent too broad a range of treatment responses. Adult rosettes of both species form long, sympodial stolons with rooted ramets at each node (Eriksson, 1986a; Stuefer et al., 1994; Stuefer &

Huber, 1998). Rooting occurs if the lower part of the stolon node contacts moist soil (personal observation). Internodes are usually 10 to 20 cm long, depending on environmental conditions, and internode position along the stolon (de Kroon et al., 1994; Stuefer & Huber, 1998). In the absence of physical disturbance, ramets remain connected throughout one growing season (Stuefer et al., 2002). The two species are commonly distributed in disturbed habitats, including grazed grasslands, road margins, and lake and river shorelines (Eriksson, 1986a; Stuefer et al., 1994). *Potentilla anserina* also occurs on seashores and in salt marshes (Eriksson, 1988).

Pre-treatment conditions

In winter 2009, 12 genets of *P. anserina* and *P. reptans* were randomly collected from three different sites in Western France. At two localities, both species were present and collected; the remaining two collection sites were exclusive to each species. The three sites were chosen to represent typical habitats for the species, and included mown and grazed meadows, and wet oligotrophic or eutrophic meadows. Four clones of each species per site were collected with sufficient distance among individuals to assume each clone corresponded to a different genotype. Clones were cultivated for six months on a garden soil substrate under uniform outdoor conditions at the University of Rennes (France) experimental garden. Twelve genets of each species were required to characterize the same growing conditions. Therefore, we transplanted the newly produced ramets of each clone to trays filled with a substrate of medium quality (50% sand and 50% compost, see

below) in early May 2010. Plants were watered every two days to prevent water stress. On 1 July 2010, we removed four clonal units from each of the 12 pre-cultivated clones from the two species. The clonal unit was comprised of one ramet (a rooted node, its leaves, and its axillary buds) with one internode connection. Clonal units were of similar size and age.

The experiment

The experiment was conducted at the University of Rennes (France) experimental garden from the beginning of July to the beginning of October 2010. Each of the four related units was randomly assigned to one replicate of four treatments. Each clone was cultivated in square plastic pots ($8 \times 8 \times 7 \text{ cm}^3$) arranged in a line, one pot assigned to the cultivation of one ramet (Fig. 1). We tested three soil quality levels using different sand and compost mixtures: Poor (P) 3:1, Medium (M) 1:1, Rich (R) 1:3, and Variable (V), comprised of individual pots of P, M, and R soils. The compost contained a slow diffusing fertilizer (amounts equivalent to $0.44 \text{ kg.m}^{-3} \text{ N}$, $0.5 \text{ kg.m}^{-3} \text{ P}$, $0.56 \text{ kg.m}^{-3} \text{ K}$), which ensured stable soil quality throughout the experiment. The Poor, Medium, and Rich treatments were characterized by a null variance in soil quality, whereas the Variable treatment had an average quality equal to the medium treatment with a non-null variance (Fig. 1). We transplanted the clonal units in the first pots of each line with a medium quality soil to limit transplantation stress. Soil quality in the second to 13th pots corresponded to the tested treatment, and the last three pots of the line (14-16) were filled with a medium quality soil to have comparable soil

nutrient conditions among treatments at the end of clonal growth (Fig. 1). Plants were watered daily, and weeds were removed manually. During clonal growth, secondary connections and flowers were excised. We harvested each clone as soon as one of its ramets rooted in the last pot of the line, and measured each internode length.




Figure 1. The experimental design. Clonal growth was oriented in the direction indicated by the arrow with a single ramet per pot. The letters designate the different treatments tested: P=poor, M=medium, R=rich, and V=variable (see Materials and Methods section for details).

Statistical analysis

We analyzed internode lengths from ramets two to 13 using Generalized Additive Models (Hastie & Tibshirani, 1990), Package GAM in R 2.13.1, see (Hastie, 2011) due to a non-linear response of ramets in each series. GAM extends linear and generalized linear models to include smooth function of explanatory variables. GAM facilitated internode length prediction by estimating unspecific functions of predictor variables, including soil richness or prior plant response. We studied the effects of (i) soil quality; and (ii) resource distribution variability response exhibited by the two models,

regardless of the response shape. We included clone origin as covariate in the two models. Autocorrelation of residuals was avoided by including the previous internode length as covariate. The absence of significant autocorrelation was verified using the acf function (package Stats – R 2.13.1). Generalized Linear Models (Poisson distribution with a log link function) were used to analyze two other responses; flower and secondary connection numbers excised during the experiment. Internode lengths between the last four ramets (13-16) were independently analyzed. These data were collected in pots subjected to different overall conditions (P, M, R, and V), at the very end of a direction of constrained growth, and 14-16 in all four treatments were grown in M soil. We used Generalized Estimated Equations (GEE Package Geepack R 2.13.1), including the pot series as a clumped factor, and Tukey's HSD post hoc test (Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference at $\alpha = 0.05$). Repeated measures analyses followed Zeger & Liang (1986).

Results

Effect of soil quality on genet foraging behavior

Mean internode length increased from ramets in pots 2 to 6 or 7 in both *Potentilla* species, and subsequently stabilized or decreased regardless of treatment (ramets in pots 6 or 7 to 13) (Fig. 2). Soil quality showed a significant effect on internode length in *P. anserina* ($F_{2,347.5} = 4.3$, $P < 0.05$), and *P. reptans* ($F_{2,374.2} = 3.5$, $P < 0.05$). In both species, shorter internode lengths were observed in the R-treatment, and similar internode lengths

in the P- and M-treatments (Table 1). The clone origin and pre-treatment internode lengths also influenced the following internode lengths in *P. anserina* ($F_{2,347.5} = 12.1$, $P < 0.001$, and $F_{2,374.2} = 27.7$, $P < 0.001$, respectively), and *P. reptans* ($F_{1,347.5} = 82.5$, $P < 0.001$, and $F_{1,374.2} = 61$, $P < 0.001$, respectively) (Table 1).

The flower and secondary connection number excised during the experiment were not influenced by different soil qualities in *P. reptans* ($\chi^2 = 10.7$, $df = 12$, $P = 0.55$, and $\chi^2 = 48.1$, $df = 50$, $P = 0.55$) and *P. anserina* ($\chi^2 = 24.9$, $df = 24$, $P = 0.41$, and $\chi^2 = 34.8$, $df = 38$, $P = 0.61$, respectively).




Figure 2. Mean internode length (\pm Standard Error) of *P. anserina* (a) and *P. reptans* (b) from ramets 2 to 13 in the four treatments (solid = Poor, dashed=Medium, dotted=Rich, dotdash=Variable).

Table 1. Generalized additive equations showing the effects of average soil quality and clone origin on internode length of *P. anserina* and *P. reptans* (from ramets 2 to 13).

Species	Factor / Covariable	modality	β	SE	t	P
<i>Potentilla anserina</i>	Treatment	Medium	0.000	0.000		
		Poor	0.132	0.246	0.537	0.591
		Rich	-0.529	0.244	-2.166	0.031
	Clone's origin	Site A	0.000	0.000		
		Site C	-0.831	0.243	-3.418	< 0.001
		Site B	-1.240	0.259	-4.784	< 0.001
Previous internode length		0.426	0.047	9.083	< 0.001	
<i>Potentilla reptans</i>	Treatment	Medium	0.000	0.000		
		Poor	0.262	0.251	1.043	0.297
		Rich	-0.431	0.253	-1.702	0.047
	Clone's origin	Site D	0.000	0.000		
		Site A	1.684	0.295	5.704	< 0.001
		Site B	-0.781	0.256	-3.043	< 0.01
Previous internode length		0.379	0.048	7.806	< 0.001	

Notes: β : estimated regression coefficients; SE: β standard error; P: β significance.

Effect of resource variability on genet foraging behavior

Resource distribution variability modified genet response in *P. reptans*, but not in *P. anserina* ($F_{1,267.7} = 4.1$, $P > 0.05$, $F_{1,178.9} = 0.2$, $P > 0.05$, respectively). Internode length decreased under V-treatment conditions relative to the M-treatment (Table 1). Clone origin and previous internode length exhibited significant effects on the following internode lengths in *P. reptans* ($F_{2,178.9} = 4.1$, $P < 0.05$; $F_{1,178.9} = 24.5$, $P < 0.001$, respectively), and *P. anserina* ($F_{2,267.7} = 19.5$, $P < 0.001$; $F_{1,267.7} = 48.7$, $P < 0.001$, respectively) grown under V-treatment soil conditions.

Flowers and secondary connections removed during the experiment did not significantly differ between the M- and V-treatments in *P. reptans* ($\chi^2 = 2.70$, $df = 5$, $P > 0.05$, and $\chi^2 = 23$, $df = 22$, $P > 0.05$, respectively), and *P. anserina* ($\chi^2 = 7.8$, $df = 8$, $P > 0.05$, and $\chi^2 = 11.9$, $df = 13$, $P > 0.05$, respectively).

Genet experience effect on ramet foraging behavior

The genet experience effect on foraging behavior in *P. anserina* and *P. reptans* was tested by comparing internode lengths from ramets 13 to 16 (Fig. 3). The internode lengths among the last four ramets were dependent on treatment in *P. anserina* and *P. reptans* (GEE, $\chi^2 = 44.2$, $df = 6$, $P < 0.001$; $\chi^2 = 28.1$, $df = 6$, $P < 0.001$, respectively). The last three internode lengths in *P. anserina* did not vary following growth in the M- or V-treatments, however results showed respective decreased and increased internode lengths following P- and R-treatment conditions (Fig. 3a, Table 2). The last three internode lengths in *P. reptans* remained constant in the M-, R-, and V-treatments, and internode length decreased significantly between each ramet in the P-treatment (Fig. 3b, Table 2).




Figure 3. Mean internode length (\pm Standard Error) of *P. anserina* (a) and *P. reptans* (b) between the last four ramets (13-16) in the four treatments (internode length between the 13th and 14th ramet in dark, 14th and 15th ramet in grey, and 15th and 16th ramet in light grey).

Table 2. Generalized additive equations showing the effects of variability in resource distribution, and clone origin on internode length of *P. anserina* and *P. reptans* (from ramets 2 to 13).

Species	Factor / Covariable	modality	β	SE	t	P
<i>Potentilla anserina</i>	Treatment	Medium	0.000	0.000		
		Variable	-0.115	0.252	-0.456	0.649
	Clone's origin	Site A	0.000	0.000		
		Site C	-0.038	0.305	-1.266	0.207
		Site B	-0.903	0.315	-2.865	< 0.01
Previous internode length		0.340	0.068	4.946	< 0.001	
<i>Potentilla reptans</i>	Treatment	Medium	0.000	0.000		
		Variable	-0.508	0.250	-2.035	< 0.05
	Clone's origin	Site D	0.000	0.000		
		Site A	1.632	0.354	4.610	< 0.001
		Site B	-0.887	0.314	-2.825	< 0.01
Previous internode length		0.406	0.593	12.6984	< 0.001	

Notes: β : estimated regression coefficients; SE: β standard error; P: β significance

Discussion

Local soil quality and distribution variability as determinant information for clonal plants

The present study served to determine the information clonal plants collect to

respond to resource availability and habitat heterogeneity. Under our experimental conditions, plant internode lengths of a primary stolon characterized the foraging response. Clonal ramification and sexual reproduction were not modified by the treatments, suggesting that the change in internode length is independent of a

Table 3. Tukey's HSD multiple comparison's test of mean internode lengths of *P. anserina* and *P. reptans* between the last four ramets (13-16) for each treatment.

Species	Internodes	Treatment							
		Poor		Medium		Rich		Variable	
		Diff.	P	Diff.	P	Diff.	P	Diff.	P
<i>Potentilla</i>	14-13	-1.11	0.332	-0.38	0.916	0.70	0.639	-1.58	0.448
<i>anserina</i>	15-13	-2.36	0.013	-1.08	0.510	2.77	0.004	-1.32	0.564
	15-14	-1.25	0.251	-0.70	0.754	2.06	0.033	0.25	0.978
<i>Potentilla</i>	14-13	-2.28	0.008	0.13	0.984	-0.92	0.700	-0.38	0.940
<i>reptans</i>	15-13	-4.15	<0.001	-0.40	0.858	0.17	0.988	-1.27	0.511
	15-14	-1.87	0.031	-0.54	0.765	1.09	0.607	-0.89	0.717

Notes: Internodes are identified by the rank of the ramet initiating the stem. Diff: Difference of mean internode lengths (cm), P: Significant difference at 95% family-wise confidence level.

possible change in resource allocation to ramification vs. main branch, or allocation to sexual vs. asexual reproduction. Internode length varied with treatment conditions, indicating at least two information types were used by clonal plants in response to the environment: local richness and variability in the soil resource.

At the genet scale, the two species responded to local soil quality similarly; internodes were shorter when the soil quality was rich. This adaptive behavior facilitates ramet aggregation to consolidate occupation of favorable patches, and maximize resource acquisition, as reported in *Glechoma hederacea* (Slade & Hutchings, 1987; Cain, 1994). Resource distribution variability was only detected as environmental information in *P. reptans*. The variable soil treatment resulted in shorter internodes compared to the medium soil treatment, although these were of similar average resource levels. Hutchings (1999) reported similar results as adaptive under variable nutrient conditions. This allows clones to be more productive in variable conditions than in constant ones by administering specific resource allocations

to experimental ramets fixed in favorable sites. In response to the resource distribution variability, *P. reptans* received a local signal regarding soil quality, but also past information acquired by older ramets.

Resource quality and variability were not the only factors determining foraging behavior in the two *Potentilla* species. Internode plasticity was limited, regardless of the nutrient resource, and influenced by previous internode length. Internode growth was therefore interplay between foraging behavior, structural constraints, and resource availability (Huber et al., 1999). Clone origins also determined plant response by influencing internode length in the two species. Results indicated the pre-treatment conditions did not have an effect on plant response. It is plausible we selected different genotypes with different foraging behavior from the different collecting sites. Therefore, the foraging response of clonal plants may result from information of two different origins, an active sampling of the resource distribution during the genet life, and an adaptation to the genet condition, what

behavioral ecologists call a “genetic knowledge of the environment” in animals (Mc Namara et al., 2006). Because our experiment was designed to study the influence of information actively used by clonal plants, further investigations are required to quantify the influence of environmental adaptation on the foraging behavior of clonal plants.

Integrated information and relative perception of soil quality

Internode length was dependent on resource quality locally sampled by a ramet, but also on the resource quality previously experienced by an entire clone. Local richness information is accessible for a single ramet rooted in soil. However, variability information requires sharing among ramets, which could be achieved by integration through the clonal network. Genets decreased (in both species) or increased (only in *P. anserina*) internode length in medium quality soil under previous poor or rich resources, respectively. Consistent with animals, experience dependent behavior of clonal plants may be adaptive, when the resource distribution among patches is not well known. Eliassen et al. (2009) showed the efficiency of learning habitat parameters in animal foraging behavior depends on the spatial variability of the resource. In plants, memory-like processes might be found in the modification of information flow through the network pattern of clonal plants (Trewavas, 2005a). This experience dependent behavior, as well as a response to the variability in resource distribution requires a mechanism to exchange information between connected ramets. It still isn't clear how this transfer of past information occurs. The mechanism may

rely on some physiological integration between connected ramets in *P. reptans* and *P. anserina* (Stuefer et al., 1994; Oborny et al., 2001). Information transduction may be performed through plant hormones (auxin or abscisic acid), or resource molecules (sugar or ionic nutrients) (Sachs, 2001; Oborny, 2004). The absence of a response in *P. reptans* from rich to medium soil conditions may be due to lower soil nutrient requirements for growth compared to *P. anserina* (Ellenberg et al., 1992).

Different foraging behavior between species

A similar response to the variability in resource distribution was observed in *P. anserina* and *P. reptans*. Both species displayed similar mean internode lengths, indicating the difference in behavioral response was independent of a size effect. However, two processes may be responsible for foraging behavior. First, a difference may exist in integration distance between the two species. Species of *Potentilla* were reported to exhibit differences in integration distance, and within *Fragaria chiloensis* (Rosaceae) genotypes (Alpert, 1999; Alpert et al., 2003). *Potentilla reptans* may display a shorter physiological integration distance than *P. anserina*, in which the resource variability would be integrated along the entire genet. *Potentilla anserina* consequently displayed a similar response in the Medium and Variable treatment. A local change in the resource quality may thus alter the overall resource level within the stolon, and induce a response in internode length.

Second, the two species may alter their foraging strategies differently,

favoring plasticity in the resource acquiring organs (i.e. photosynthetic tissues or roots), or in exploration organs (i.e. spacers). *Potentilla reptans* plasticity in response to shade was shown to preferentially occur in resource acquiring organs (e.g. petiole length), rather than in exploration organs (e.g. internode length) (Huber, 1996; Zhang et al., 2000). Therefore, we expect *P. anserina* to exhibit increased phenotypic plasticity in exploration organs than resource acquiring organs. Consequently, the species detects resource variability through a certain number of sampling points. These responses may explain the species adaptation to small-scale resource heterogeneity, and distribution in disturbed habitats (Eriksson, 1986b; 1988; Stuefer et al., 1994). However, more work is needed to resolve the effects of these two processes, which may be responsible for plant responses to soil quality and variability.

Clonal plants and animals: similarities in foraging?

Adaptations in heterogeneous environments provide organisms the capacity to perceive and use information regarding resource quality and variability. Our study demonstrated that clonal plants share with animals some similarities in behavioral adjustment. More than a passive reaction norm, clonal plants recognize both local soil quality, and variance in resource distribution, which is closed from the information available to animals foraging on a patchy resource. Mc Nickle et al. (2009) argued for a new conceptual foundation of optimality in plant foraging behavior, and we demonstrated that similarities in information processing between plants and animals should inspire

proximal mechanism studies based on information processed by clonal plants in the broader field of behavioral ecology. One limitation of this approach is that plants do not have any known nervous system to process information [see Alpi et al. (2007)]. However, the network structure of clonal plants is composed of ramets and spacers, exempting them of requiring a proper complex nervous system. Indeed, any network of interconnected modules (neurons, ramets) seems capable of such processes (Trewavas, 2003; 2005b; 2006; de Kroon et al., 2009).

A growing body of literature exists addressing the analogies between foraging animals and plants, allowing researchers to propose relevant questions regarding plant ecology and evolution with concepts emerging from other disciplines. Considering specific elements of animal and plant models, we highlighted principal convergent analogies between plants and animals, including the nature of information used during foraging, and the effect of resource sampling and genetic knowledge from adaptive behavior. The effect of plant experience on ramet behavior takes the comparison a step further by suggesting similarities between animal memory and clonal integration, opening the field of foraging behavior in clonal plants to embark on several more avenues of investigation.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for financial support from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche for CM (ANR-08-SYSC-012) and Maxime Bavière for technical support.

Morphological response to competition for light in the clonal *Trifolium repens* L. (Fabaceae)

A.-K. Bittebiere¹, N. Renaud¹, B. Clément¹, C. Mony¹

¹UMR 6553 Ecobio, CNRS - University of Rennes 1, Av. du Général Leclerc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France

Article Informations	Abstract
<p><i>Article history:</i></p> <p>In press in <i>American Journal of Botany</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>Keywords:</i></p> <p>Clonal architecture</p> <p>Competition intensity</p> <p>Competition heterogeneity</p> <p>Plasticity</p> <p><i>Trifolium repens</i></p>	<p><i>Premise of the study</i>— Plant communities in temperate zones are dominated by clonal plants that can plastically modify their growth characteristics in response to competition. Given that plants compete with one another, and the implications this has for species coexistence, we conducted a study to assess how clonal species morphologically respond to competition for light depending on its intensity and heterogeneity which are determined by the competitor species.</p> <p><i>Methods</i>— We assessed the morphological response to competition for light of the clonal species <i>Trifolium repens</i> L. by measuring its growth performance, and vertical and horizontal growth traits. We used five competitive environments: one without competitor and four differing by their competitor species creating different conditions of competition intensity and heterogeneity.</p> <p><i>Key results</i>— <i>T. repens</i> morphological response to competition for light depended on the competitor identity. Competition intensity and heterogeneity, determined by competitor identity, had an interactive effect on most traits. The increase in petiole elongation and specific leaf area due to increased competition intensity was observed only at low to intermediate competition heterogeneity. Competition heterogeneity promoted the elongation of clone connections allowing space exploration.</p> <p><i>Conclusions</i>— Our results demonstrated that intensity and heterogeneity of competition, which depended on competitor identity, are of primary importance in determining the plastic response of <i>T. repens</i>. This emphasizes that it is important to consider the fine-scale spatial distribution of individuals when studying their interactions within plant communities.</p>

Introduction

Plant communities are structured mainly by competitive interactions between individuals (Gibson et al., 1999). In temperate zones of the world, these communities are dominated by clonal plants (van Groenendael & de Kroon, 1990) capable of producing genetically identical and potentially independent offspring through vegetative growth (van

Groenendael et al., 1996; Eckert, 1999). These clonal plants are characterized by a plastic modular structure. Each genetic individual (genet) consists of repeated ramets, growing vertically to exploit local soil nutrients and light; these ramets are arranged in a branched network allowing the horizontal spread of the clone (Harper, 1981; Hutchings, 1999). The combination of horizontal and vertical growth allows clonal plants to explore space and acquire

resources in three dimensions. Competition may influence this three dimensional growth by inducing plastic morphological changes in the plant architecture (Herben & Novoplansky, 2010). Identifying the characteristics of the competitive environment that influences this plastic morphological response is of special interests as it can have fundamental implications for species coexistence and diversity in plant communities.

Competitors locally deplete resources generating spatial heterogeneity in their repartition (Jackson & Caldwell, 1993; Herben et al., 2000) and potentially reducing their individual performances (Cheplick & Gutierrez, 2000; Marcuvitz & Turkington, 2000). Plants can buffer these negative effects through plastic modifications of their three dimensional architecture (Sultan, 1995; Novoplansky, 2009). In particular, to efficiently capture light, plants may optimize the height of their photosynthetic organs by elongating their stems or petioles (Marcuvitz & Turkington, 2000; Kurashige & Agrawal, 2005). They may also alter their leaf morphology by increasing the specific leaf area (SLA) or the total biomass allocated to leaf tissues (Sultan, 1995; Lavorel & Garnier, 2002). In addition, the genet can move laterally by positioning new ramets into more favorable conditions (zones of less competitive interference) (Huber et al., 1999); this lateral movement has been referred to as foraging behavior (Slade & Hutchings, 1987; Wijesinghe & Whigham, 2001). The network architecture then exhibits a decrease in branching frequency (Slade & Hutchings 1987; Dong 1994) and an increase in the internode length, thereby positioning the offspring ramets further away from the parent ramets (Cain, 1994; Hutchings et al., 1997).

Competition among plants is a complex process that, when considered at the clone level (i.e. a vertically and horizontally spreading structure), can be divided into different components, such as intensity or spatial heterogeneity (Berger et al., 2008). Competition intensity describes the degree to which competition decreases the environmental quality of an individual (Weigelt & Jolliffe, 2003) whereas competition heterogeneity refers to the uneven spatial arrangement of competitors (Law & Diekmann, 2000; Herben, 2004). Because competition intensity occurs on small scales (few centimeters) (Mack & Harper, 1977; Silander & Pacala, 1985), it affects the rooted elements of clones. Competition intensity may thus induce a response at the ramet level, especially through a change in allocation of mass to morphological traits associated with resource acquisition (e.g., leaves, stems, or roots). Competition heterogeneity can be perceived by the entire clone owing to physiological integration (Turkington et al., 1991) and may induce changes in the plant horizontal architecture that place new ramets in patches with more resources.

In this study, we tested the effects of five different competitive environments on the growth of *Trifolium repens* L. These environments differed in the competitor species, which were chosen to represent contrasting growth patterns of above-ground biomass. Although belowground competition has been shown to have consequences on plant growth even in Fabaceae species (Gersani et al., 2001; Murphy & Dudley, 2007), we were only interested in the effects of the aboveground competition for light on the growth of *T. repens*. Gersani et al. (2001) demonstrated that belowground competition affected the sexual reproduction (seed production) and

the amount of biomass allocated to roots compared to shoots in Fabaceae. We thus hypothesized that the traits chosen to characterize the vertical and horizontal growth of *T. repens* would essentially be altered in response to the aboveground competition. We explicitly tested three hypotheses: (i) Growth characteristics will be affected by competitor identity; (ii) competition intensity should affect vertical growth characteristics; (iii) competition heterogeneity would affect horizontal growth characteristics.

Materials and methods

The experiment

This study investigated how a clonal plant plastically responds to the characteristics of its competitive neighborhood. To test a panel of competitive treatments, a clonal fragment of the target species was grown with four types of matrices: caespitose, stoloniferous guerilla, rhizomatous guerilla and in monoculture. A no competition control treatment was also set up. Ten replicates of each of the five culture treatments were randomly distributed among 50 experimental units, and the experiment was run from the 4th of March to the 2nd of August 2009.

Plant material

The species studied in this experiment are common in European temperate grasslands. Each of the four matrix species represents different strategies of clonal growth (Klimeš & Klimešová, 1999): *Agrostis stolonifera* L. (guerilla stoloniferous), *Elytrigia repens* L. (guerilla rhizomatous), *Lolium perenne* L.

(caespitose) and *Trifolium repens* L. (guerilla stoloniferous) (Klimeš et al., 1997; Lovett-Doust, 1981). Guerilla species present a sparse clonal network with long connections whereas caespitose species are characterized by a tussock structure with highly aggregated ramets.

The target species, *Trifolium repens*, is characterized by above-ground stoloniferous organs and harbors N₂-fixing symbionts in root nodules, which limit its sensitivity to soil nitrogen availability even in competition with grasses (Elgersma et al., 2000). This root nodulation was checked at harvest, to confirm that the target clones suffered principally from light competition under our experimental conditions. All plants were collected at the end of February 2009 on field margins around Pleine-Fougères (Brittany, France) (Burel et al., 1998). To control for genotypic effect, ten different clones of the target species were collected and each was used in one replicate of the five treatments (de Kroon et al., 1994). These ten clones were cultivated in pots before the experiment began to obtain five new ramets of the same age and growth history.

All individuals were washed and standardized before planting: for the three guerilla species, the basic unit planted in each replicate consisted of one ramet [a node, its roots and leaves, and the leaf axillary meristems (Huber et al., 1999)] and one internode of connection, which contained nutrient reserves to facilitate the early growth of the ramet (Stuefer & Huber, 1999). For the caespitose species *Lolium perenne*, the basic unit was composed of four connected ramets forming a tussock structure. Within each species, the planted ramets were all similar in size.

Planting design

The experiment was conducted in the garden of the University of Rennes (France). The clonal fragments were planted in a hexagonal pattern (Fig. 1) in culture units of $80 \times 80 \times 20 \text{ cm}^3$ on a substrate composed of 10% sand and 90% garden soil. The hexagonal pattern has been widely used in studies of plant competition because it allows the relative positions of the neighbors of each plant to be equivalent and symmetric, thereby providing for balanced competitive interactions (Birch et al., 2007). The matrix individuals were planted at the beginning of March 2009. The target individuals were planted two months later at the beginning of May 2009. During this two-month interval period, any dead matrix individuals were replaced. This delay allowed the matrix to be well established by the time the targets were planted. The entire growth process of the targets was thus constrained by the competitive environment. Since the maximum height of *Trifolium repens* is about 20 cm, we maintained the matrix individuals at this height by cutting them throughout the experiment to avoid competitive exclusion of the target individuals. Cultures were watered every two days and all weeds were removed regularly.

Data collection

After the 21 weeks of cultivation, each experimental unit of the competitive treatments was divided into a 20×20 grid of cells, each cell measuring $4 \times 4 \text{ cm}^2$. We excluded the outermost 8 cm of each grid to avoid boundary effects; there were thus




Figure 1. Planting pattern of matrix and target clones in the experimental units. The points represent the 36 matrix individuals (*Agrostis stolonifera*, *Elytrigia repens*, *Lolium perenne* or *Trifolium repens*); the cross represents the target clone of *Trifolium repens*. Target plants in the control treatment had no matrix competitors.

a total of 256 cells in each grid. The matrix biomass (except the 8 cm external frame) was harvested, dried at $65 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ for 48 h and weighed as a measure of the competition intensity (Goldberg et al., 1987; Weigelt et al., 2002). In order to evaluate the spatial heterogeneity of competition, the vegetation maximum height was measured in each of the 256 cells of the grid, and the variance calculated.

Vertical plasticity of the target plants was characterized by petiole elongation, specific leaf area (SLA), and mass allocation to leaf. These traits were measured on three ramets, each positioned at the fourth node from the apex of the three longest stolons (Weijschedé et al., 2008), and the mean values were calculated. Specific leaf area was determined following the protocol of Cornelissen et al. (2003). To assess the mass allocation to leaf and the petiole elongation, the ramet, petiole and leaf masses were weighed after drying at $65 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$

for 48 h and the petiole length was measured.

We assessed horizontal plasticity of the target plants by four traits: length of the primary stolon, total length of branches, mean internode distance of the primary stolon, and number of branches. All of these traits were assessed non-destructively using geographic information system (GIS) analysis of photographs (Benot et al., 2010). The positions of the ramets along the stolons were marked with colored pins, and then the clone was photographed using a camera mounted on a standardized structure 1.30 m above the culture unit. After correcting optical deformations with PTGui, the pictures were digitized in ArcGis 9.1. and the measurements were taken.

To assess overall clone performance, we weighed the clone total aboveground dry mass, and used GIS to calculate the total number of ramets produced by the clone (Weijsschedé et al., 2006).

Data analysis

First, the culture treatment effects on the traits of *Trifolium repens* were assessed by ANOVA or ANCOVA using the linear mixed-effects model (LME) procedures in R 2.10.0. (package nlme). LME models are especially useful to take into account the possible difference in the mean response between blocks in the experiment (here created by the different genetic origins of the clones) (Crawley, 2007; Bolker et al., 2009). The culture treatment (five modalities) was considered a fixed factor and the target clone genotype a random factor. A square root or a log transformation of the data was used to satisfy the assumptions of homoscedasticity

and normality of the model residuals when necessary. When the effect of the culture treatment was significant, differences in traits among treatments were determined using contrasts post-hoc tests. These contrasts tests were performed using the esticon procedure in R 2.10.0. (package doBy) with a Bonferonni correction to control for multiple comparisons. When used after an ANCOVA, the contrasts tests allowed for accounting the covariate effect in the pairwise comparisons of trait means.

Second, to test for the effects of the competition intensity and competition heterogeneity on the clone traits, we performed a multiple regression analysis using the linear model (LM) procedures in R 2.10.0. We used type II ANOVA or ANCOVA to determine whether the explanatory variables of the regression and their interaction have a significant effect on the trait values. The variance of the vegetation height (calculated on the 256 height measurements of the grid) and the matrix biomass were respectively used as measures of the competition heterogeneity and intensity in each culture unit. The data were log or square root-transformed when necessary, to satisfy the assumption of the normal distribution of model residuals.

For the first and second analyses, ANCOVA were used (i) to describe the mass allocation to leaf (leaf mass with the ramet mass as covariate) and the petiole elongation (petiole length with the petiole mass as covariate) rather than using a ratio to avoid erroneous significance due to differential variances (Jasienski & Bazzaz, 1999) and (ii) to eliminate the size effect from the analyses of the horizontal trait plasticity. We then calculated the adjusted means of these traits correcting for the covariate effect.

Third, we tested the effects of the culture treatment on the competition intensity and competition heterogeneity values using a non-parametric Kruskal Wallis test.

Results

Effects of the culture treatment on clone traits

Culture treatment had a significant effect on the performance traits of *Trifolium repens* (Table 1). Competition significantly reduced performances relative to the no-competition control as measured by both total biomass and number of ramets (Figs. 2a, b). Competitor identity had a significant effect on clone performances: the clone biomass and number of ramets were strongly reduced in intraspecific competition whereas they were maximized in presence of the guerilla stoloniferous and rhizomatous matrices.

Culture treatment had a significant effect on all vertical and horizontal traits of *Trifolium repens* (Table 1). The petiole elongation was reduced in the stoloniferous and the no-competition treatment (Fig. 2c) while higher SLA and lower mass allocation to leaf were found in the intraspecific treatment (Figs. 2d, e). Target plants grown under intraspecific competition also had significantly shorter primary stolon as well as the lowest number of branches (Figs. 2f, g). Target plants growing in all other treatments displayed similar mean interramet distance (Fig. 2i). In the presence of competitors, the total length of branches was greatest when the target plants were cultivated with the guerilla stoloniferous matrix (*A. stolonifera*) and rhizomatous (*E. repens*)

matrices and intermediate with the caespitose matrix (*L. perenne*) (Fig. 2h).

The within-genotype variance was higher than the between-genotype variance in all *T. repens* traits (Table 1), suggesting that clones with different genotypes responded similarly to the five culture treatments (the block effect created by the different genetic origins was not significant).

Competition intensity and heterogeneity and plant traits

We tested a wide range of values of competition intensity and heterogeneity associated with the different culture treatments. The intensity and heterogeneity of competition depended on the culture treatment (respectively, $\chi^2 = 45.42$, $df = 4$, $P\text{-value} < 0.001$ and $\chi^2 = 37.34$, $df = 4$, $P\text{-value} < 0.001$) (Figs. 3a, b). The relationship between the competition intensity and the competition heterogeneity was weak and hardly significant ($R^2 = 0.08$, $p\text{-value} = 0.05$) (Fig. 3c).

Competition intensity had significantly negative effects on most traits (Table 2, Fig. 4) except petiole elongation and SLA, which both increased significantly, and mean interramet distance, which was not significantly affected. Competition heterogeneity significantly positively influenced three of the four horizontal traits (length of primary stolon, total length of branches, mean interramet distance) and the number of ramets and significantly negatively impacted both SLA and petiole elongation (Table 2, Fig. 4). Five traits were sensitive to both intensity and heterogeneity of competition (number of ramets, petiole elongation, SLA, length of primary stolon,




Figure 2. Mean (\pm SE) traits displayed by the clones of *Trifolium repens* in the five culture treatments: (a) biomass, (b) number of ramets, (c) petiole elongation, (d) mass allocation to leaf, (e) SLA, (f) number of branches, (g) length of primary stolon, (h) total length of branches, (i) mean intraramet distance. Results from statistical analyses are given in Table 1. When indicated, the means are adjusted for the covariate effects (these are least square means predicted from the models). Different letters above the bars indicate significant differences in trait means between treatments (contrast post-hoc tests). C: Caespitose matrix; I: Intraspetic competition; NC: No competition; R: Rhizomatous matrix; S: Stoloniferous matrix; MAL: Mass allocation to leaf; MIRD: Mean intraramet distance; Adj.: adjusted; sqrt: square root; length of prim. sto.: length of primary stolon; tot. length of bran.: total length of branches.

Table 1. Comparison of performance, vertical and horizontal trait values displayed by *Trifolium repens* in the five culture treatments. The mean trait values were compared between treatments using ANOVAs or ANCOVAs, which were performed with a mixed model procedure including the culture treatment as a fixed factor. The variation created by the different genetic origins of the clones was taken into account with the random factor genotype. The significance of the random factor was assessed through the comparison of the within and between group variances given as outputs in the mixed model summary in R™ 2.10.0.

Traits	test	Culture treatment (df = 4)			nature	Covariate (df = 1)			Culture treatment × Covariate (df = 4)			Genotype	
		F	P	F		F	P	F	P	within genotype variance	between genotype variance		
Performance traits													
Biomass ‡	Anova	66.40	***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.51	0.27	
Number of ramets ‡	Anova	79.99	***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.34	0.14	
Vertical traits													
Petiole elongation (adj. petiole length) †	Ancova	16.08	***	Petiole mass	291.42	***	1.62	ns	0.06	0.01			
SLA ‡	Anova	12.94	***	-	-	-	-	-	0.02	4.00×10 ⁻⁴			
Mass allocation to leaf (adj. leaf mass) †	Ancova	42.14	***	Ramet mass	776.51	***	1.63	ns	7.7×10 ⁻⁵	5.1×10 ⁻⁵			
Horizontal traits													
Number of branches ‡	Ancova	50.49	***	Clone mass	318.26	***	3.50	*	0.22	0.04			
Length of primary stolon	Ancova	10.85	***	Clone mass	30.88	***	1.47	ns	1.1×10 ⁷	3.1×10 ⁻⁷			
Total length of branches ‡	Ancova	78.82	***	Clone mass	355.77	***	8.07	***	0.38	2.0×10 ⁻⁹			
MIRD	Ancova	3.87	**	Clone mass	7.71	**	0.77	ns	0.26	4.9×10 ⁻³			

Notes: asterisks indicate significant difference: ns not significant; * P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001. adj.: adjusted; MIRD: Mean interramet distance. † square root transformation ; ‡ log transformation.




Figure 3. Competition intensity and heterogeneity in the five culture treatments: (a) mean (\pm SE) intensity of competition, (b) mean (\pm SE) heterogeneity of competition, (c) relationship between competition intensity and heterogeneity in the five culture treatments. C: Caespitose matrix; I: Intraspecific competition; NC: No competition; R: Rhizomatous matrix; S: Stoloniferous matrix.

total length of branches); comparison of the regression slopes suggested that competition intensity had greater effects on these traits than heterogeneity. The intensity \times heterogeneity interaction was significant for all traits except length of the primary stolon, total length of branches and mean interramet distance (Table 2).

Interestingly, for some traits (clone biomass, petiole elongation, SLA, and number of branches), high matrix heterogeneity inverted the effects of competition intensity. That is, although clone biomass and number of branches decreased under intense competition alone, they increased under intense competition combined with high heterogeneity, and while both petiole elongation and SLA increased under intense competition, they decreased under intense competition with high heterogeneity (Fig. 4). We observed a similar effect of high competition intensity inverting the effects of heterogeneity: a slight increase in the competition intensity generated a negative effect of the heterogeneity on the petiole elongation and the SLA and a positive effect on the number of branches, mass allocation to leaf, and number of ramets.

Discussion

Response of clone traits to competition

Competition decreased overall plant performance as measured by both biomass and ramet number and generated a plastic response in *T. repens* in traits associated with both vertical and horizontal growth. We observed a shade-avoidance response (elongation of petioles and increase in SLA) either to lower light availability in the competitive neighborhood (Huber et al., 1998; Weijschedé et al., 2008) or to changes in the red (R) to far-red (FR) wavelength ratio (R:FR) from reflected light (Ballaré et al., 1990). The observation that leaves increased SLA but did not increase in mass under competition suggested that they became thinner and wider to increase the efficiency of photosynthetic activity.

As expected, horizontal growth traits changed in response to competition with a global decrease in the number and the length of branches relative to total clone mass. However, we did not observe significant changes in our measures on the primary stolon (except in intraspecific




Figure 4. Variations of the traits of *Trifolium repens* in function of competition intensity, competition heterogeneity and their interaction: (a) biomass, (b) number of ramets, (c) petiole elongation, (d) mass allocation to leaf, (e) SLA, (f) number of branches, (g) length of the primary stolon, (h) Total length of branches, (i) mean interramet distance. The significance of the effects of the competition intensity and heterogeneity and the regression slope values are given in Table 2. Three levels of H(1) or I(2) were chosen to plot the interaction effects on the traits values: low (lowest value of H or I), intermediate (mean value) and high (highest value). I: intensity of competition; H: heterogeneity of competition; Petiole elong.: petiole elongation; MAL: mass allocation to leaf; L. of prim. sto.: length of primary stolon; Tot. l. of bran.: total length of branches; MIRd: mean interramet distance. † square root transformation ; ‡ log transformation.

Table 2. Effects of the competition intensity and heterogeneity on the traits of *Trifolium repens*. The effects of the competition components on the different traits were assessed through multiple regressions and the significance of the explanatory variables was determined through ANOVAs and ANCOVAs. For the ANCOVAs, there was no significant interaction involving the covariate (results not shown).

Traits	test	Intensity (df = 1)			Heterogeneity (df = 1)			Intensity × Heterogeneity (df = 1)			Covariate (df = 1)		
		F	P	slope	F	P	slope	F	P	slope	nature	F	P
Performance traits													
Biomass †	Anova	80.76	***	-1.29	0.67	ns	-0.15	13.16	***	0.87	-	-	-
Number of ramets ‡	Anova	108.66	***	-1.07	5.78	*	0.33	10.02	**	0.49	-	-	-
Vertical traits													
Petiole elongation (adj. petiole length) †	Ancova	33.36	***	0.87	5.53	*	-0.61	12.39	**	-1.04	Petiole mass	173.73	***
SLA ‡	Anova	31.77	***	2.48	122.47	*	-1.70	143.72	*	-2.08	-	-	-
Mass allocation to leaf (adj. leaf mass) †	Ancova	50.69	***	-0.003	2.49	ns	0.001	5.84	*	0.002	Ramet mass	381.10	***
Horizontal traits													
Number of branches †	Ancova	23.88	***	-1.39	1.71	ns	0.24	7.45	**	0.85	Clone mass	29.89	***
Length of primary stolon	Ancova	9.35	**	-7.19	10.34	**	5.93	0.35	ns	1.38	Clone mass	2.48	ns
Total length of branches †	Ancova	15.71	***	-3.73	6.70	*	1.89	0.19	ns	0.39	Clone mass	71.75	***
MIRD	Ancova	3.87	ns	-0.22	4.92	*	0.19	0.005	ns	0.007	Clone mass	0.88	ns

Notes: the slopes indicated are those of the multiple regressions; asterisks indicate significant difference: * P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; ns = not significant. adj.: adjusted; MIRD: Mean interramet distance. † square root transformation ; ‡ log transformation.

competition), which suggests that there was a modification of the spatial arrangement of the clone. Individual plants may change their growth form by promoting the growth of a long primary stolon instead of developing numerous branches of shorter length. Maintaining long stolons may increase the ability of a plant to detect favorable microsites in which to develop new ramets (Cain, 1994). In the absence of any competition, a honeycomb-like growth form (*i.e.* a hexagonal architecture with 60° branching angles) would maximize the centrifugal spread and area colonized by a clonal fragment and would minimize intra-clonal competition (Smith and Palmer, 1976; Benot et al., 2009). The control individuals displayed indeed mean branching angles of 60.6° (\pm SE = 2.1) and colonized an area of 2.9×10^3 cm² (\pm SE = 0.4×10^3) that is 92% of the culture unit area (without the outermost 8 cm).

The magnitude of both types of response, either vertical or horizontal depended on competitor identity.

Importance of the intensity and spatial heterogeneity of competition

We demonstrated that competitor identity had an effect on the intensity and the spatial heterogeneity of competition. We also showed an interactive effect of competition intensity and heterogeneity on plant traits, specifically in all measures of performance and of vertical plasticity.

The effect of competition intensity on vertical traits depended on competition heterogeneity: increase in petiole elongation and SLA was observed only at low to intermediate levels of heterogeneity, while at high levels of heterogeneity, SLA and petiole elongation

were reduced in response to intense competition. These findings suggest that the response of a target species to competition depends on the height of its neighbors (Goldberg & Landa, 1991; Huber & Wiggerman, 1997), and that the shade-avoidance strategy is developed in response to intense competition only in homogeneous systems. Higher heterogeneity may compensate for resource shortages by providing microsites with greater light availability, rendering modifications to leaf traits unnecessary.

Ramet placement in such favorable microsites requires a change in horizontal growth strategy in order to increase the frequency with which they are encountered (Cain, 1994). Heterogeneity did indeed result in increased primary stolon length and mean interramet distance. This findings may explain why interramet distance has been found to increase in real competitive heterogeneous environments (Weijschedé et al., 2008) but not in plants subjected to simulated homogeneous shading in experimental settings (Leeflang, 1999). Longer stolon and mean interramet distance corresponds to a guerilla-like architecture [*sensu* Lovett-Doust (1981)], which has been demonstrated to be competitively superior in heterogeneous systems with patchy disturbance (Fahrig et al., 1994; Winkler et al., 1999). In the present experiment, higher heterogeneity resulted also in a greater number of branches under intermediate- to high-intensity competition conditions. Such changes in architecture promote space prospecting (Waite, 1994), increasing the probability of localizing favorable patches.

Contrary to our expectations, most traits linked with horizontal growth were negatively affected by competitive intensity. These responses were

independent from the direct effect of competition on plant size, suggesting instead a preferential allocation of resources to other components of growth to compensate for light shortage with increasing competition intensity. This preferential allocation may include physiological processes like an increase in carbohydrates storage for further growth (Berendse & Elberse, 1990; Cheplick, 1997). This strategy can be considered a tolerance behavior to competition (Novoplansky, 2009) and has been for instance demonstrated in the grass species *Amphibromus scabrivalvis* (Cheplick & Gutierrez, 2000).

We did not make any distinction between intraspecific and interspecific competition treatments to test the widest range of values of competition intensity and heterogeneity though Goldberg & Barton (1992) demonstrated that intraspecific competition effects could differ from effects caused by other species. In our experiment, effects of competition intensity and heterogeneity, and of competitor identity (the species it belongs to) may be partially confounded. Nevertheless, to our knowledge, this study is the first to suggest that competitor identity effects may be linked with its clonal growth determining the spatial arrangement of competition intensity and the degree of competition heterogeneity. This needs to be specifically addressed through experiments manipulating competition intensity and heterogeneity within competitive treatments characterized by the same competitor identity or using competitor species displaying the same clonal growth strategy.

Efficiency of horizontal versus vertical escape strategies in integrated clones in response to competition

The efficiency of horizontal versus vertical escape strategies in integrated clones depends on the occurrence of heterogeneity and on its predictability (Oborny, 1994; Alpert & Simms, 2002). In homogeneous neighborhoods, investing in long stolons would divert resources without enhancing light capture or biomass production. However, in patchy environments, plants could encounter favorable microsites while foraging with elongated stolons. The level of heterogeneity may have an additional role in this relative investment into horizontal versus vertical plasticity as it alters the probability of encountering favorable microsites. Some studies have shown that the size, proportion of favorable sites (in terms of nutrient concentrations), and degree of contrast with unfavorable sites within the environment have a strong impact on the relationship between architectural traits and plant performance (Wijesinghe & Hutchings 1997, 1999; Hutchings & Wijesinghe, 2008).

With respect to competition, the gap size in heterogeneous competitive environments could influence the amount of light that is reflected from nearby vegetation and sensed by the target plant. Hay et al. (2001) emphasized a strong correlation in *T. repens* between the amount of reflected light received by a clone and its horizontal plastic response at the clone level, suggesting that this species would be likely to develop a shade-avoidance response in patchy environments with small gaps (high light

intensity but low R:FR ratios) rather than with large gaps (high light intensity and high R:FR ratios). Similarly, the exploitative behavior (avoidance of dense patches) is adaptive only if the gap size is larger than the internode distance (Oborny & Cain, 1997; Herben & Novoplansky, 2010) otherwise the information perceived by the mother ramet would not be predictive of the daughter ramet environment increasing the probability of ramet misplacement. Further work is thus needed that more precisely takes into account the spatial heterogeneity of competition intensity in the studies of plant community dynamics.

Concluding remarks

To conclude, this study demonstrated that the intensity and heterogeneity of competition generated by different competitors determines the plastic response to competition both in vertical and horizontal directions. These results thus reached the fundamental conclusion that clonal plants are able to adjust according to the specific composition and spatial organization of their surrounding environment, which may promote coexistence and thus diversity in plant communities. Our study also provides new elements for the recent discussions on species recognition (Callaway et al., 2003) with new leads to understand the ability of plants to recognize competitor identity. The responses of a focal plant to the competitor identities may be partly due to their effects on the degrees of intensity and heterogeneity of competition determined by their clonal growth.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank F. Nassur and T. Fontaine for assistance with the experiment setup; Pr J.-S. Pierre and Dr Y. Outreman for help with the statistics; Dr L.L. Larkin for English review. This project benefited from a grant ANR-08-SYSC-012 from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (France).

A comparative study of plastic and non-plastic plant individuals under competition: importance of clonal architecture determinants

A.-K. Bittebiere¹, M. Garbey², M. Smaoui², B. Clément¹, C. Mony¹

¹UMR 6553 Ecobio, CNRS - University of Rennes 1, Av. du Général Leclerc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France

²Department of Computer Science, University of Houston, 501 Philipp G. Hoffman Hall, Houston, TX 77204-3010, USA

Article Informations	Abstract
<p><i>Article history:</i></p> <p>In prep.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Keywords:</i></p> <p>Adaptivity</p> <p>Competition intensity</p> <p>Ontogeny</p> <p>Plasticity</p> <p>Structural blue-print</p>	<p>Local competitive interactions strongly influence plant community dynamics. To maintain their performances under competition, clonal plants may adopt an avoidance strategy by plastically modifying their network architecture. The efficiency of this plastic response may depend on the intensity of competition and the plant ontogeny and structural blue-print. We aim at determining the effect of this plastic response on plant performance and clonal architecture depending on competition intensity. We used an Individual Based Model to simulate clone interactions within a plant population. Clonal growth was studied under three competition intensities in plastic and non-plastic individuals. Plasticity buffered the negative impacts of competition at intermediate densities of competitors by promoting clone clumping. Resistance to competition was promoted mostly by traits linked with the plant structural blue-print (weak apical dominance and sympodial growth), ontogenic processes being of secondary importance. Plasticity only modulated the selection of these traits by competition. This study underlines the importance of (i) the competitor density and focal plant traits for the adaptive nature of the plastic response and of (ii) processes occurring at the ramet level for the overall plant community. Modeling approaches especially based on IBMs coupled with volunteer computing are an efficient method for disentangling the relative effects of clone traits on its success.</p>

Introduction

Local interactions such as competition are the main drivers of plant community assemblages, determining plant spatial and temporal dynamics (Rees et al., 1996; Gibson, 1999; Warren et al., 2002; Wilson, 2007). Depending on its intensity (i.e. to what extent it decreases the quality of the individual environment), competition has an effect on plant individuals in terms of survival, growth or reproduction (Weigelt & Jolliffe, 2003). In clonal plants,

competition filters for traits promoting resistance to competition at the expense of space colonization which may increase interspecific contacts. Space colonization is indeed enhanced by a loose horizontal architecture with long connections which minimizes intraspecific contacts. By contrasts, resistance to competitors is ensured by aggregated clonal networks (highly branched with short interramet distances) promoting space occupation and limiting interspecific contacts (Schmidt, 1985; Cheplick, 1997). Therefore,

horizontal growth may be under the influence of competition intensity, varying from running to clumping architecture along a gradient of competitor density.

Negative effects of competition may be buffered by an active response of plants to cope with the presence of competitors and to maintain performance (Goldberg & Fleetwood, 1987; Goldberg & Landa, 1991). Novoplansky (2009) recognized three types of competitive responses: (i) the avoidance minimizing competitive interactions, (ii) the confrontation maximizing the negative effects of plant on their neighbors, and (iii) the tolerance maximizing plant performances under the worsened conditions generated by neighbors. In the particular case of clonal plants, where growth occurs through horizontal iterations generating a network of ramets (potential descendents) (van Groenendael et al., 1996), the avoidance response may be achieved through exploitative behavior, which enables them to grow in the direction of least interferences (Ross & Harper, 1972; Richards et al., 2010). The adaptive nature of this behavior may however depend on the plant environment (Alpert & Simms, 2002).

Plastic response induced by competition interacts with other traits at the plant level leading to the effective architecture of the plant. These other traits comprised the structural blue-print determining the basic clonal architecture (location and number of connection buds, degree of apical dominance) and the ontogeny, conditioning the activation of connection buds during the clone development (Huber et al., 1999). We suggest that the adaptive nature of the clonal architecture will depend on the

interaction of the plastic response with these other traits.

In this study, we aimed at determining within a virtual plant population and depending on the competition intensity, the effects of the competitive response on plant performances and the resulting clone architecture. We also analyzed traits involved in the adaptativity of this response. We used an Individual Based Model, which is particularly interesting to study the effects of local interactions on emerging patterns at the community scale. Model simulations were performed through volunteer computing which enables to proceed to an extensive browsing of model parameters through large scale simulations (Mony et al., 2011). We assumed more precisely that in the most performing populations: (i) increasing competition intensity should decrease plant performances and this effect may be buffered by the plant response. The effective architecture displayed in response to competition should tend to a clumped architecture. (ii) The efficiency of the plastic response may depend on the other plant traits resulting in this effective architecture.

Materials and methods

Principle of the model

The model simulates the growth of a clonal plant population for one growing season (colonization process of a bare soil) without mortality or sexual reproduction. Elementary units of the model are clonal plants modeled as branched network of ramet units linked through non-photosynthetic connection units. Ramets

allow for the acquisition of resource which may have the meaning of biomass while connection units are only used for resource storage and translocation. Space is represented by a hexagonal grid offering six growing directions and balanced competitive interactions between ramets (Birch et al. 2007). The plant growth parameters are function of the time step t .

The model comprises two levels: the population model PRAIRIE where the interaction rules are described and which is based on the model CLONAL simulating the growth of one individual (for a detailed description of the model see Mony et al. 2011).

Model structure

- PRAIRIE model

The initialization phase of PRAIRIE first defines the prairie dimensions and the duration of the simulation in number of time steps. Second, it provides the number of elementary units (clones) to sow on the prairie and the random position of their initial ramets.

At each time step, PRAIRIE applies the growing processes of CLONAL to each clone, selected one by one in a random order. Once all clones have grown, a new time step begins until the entire run is completed.

- CLONAL model

CLONAL governs the two-dimension growth of each clonal plant through 19 input parameters and nine stochastic growth rules relative to the metabolism and storage of resource (Appendix A1) and to the form and spatial colonization strategy of the plant. Each combination of input parameter values defines a species.

Clonal colonization of space relies on two processes: the elongation of existing connections or the addition of a new branch from a ramet unit. At each time step, the spatial colonization thus started by determining which of these two processes occurs following (1):

$$(1) \quad p_{el/br} = \alpha$$

where $p_{el/br}$ is the probability to elongate and α a random variable between 0 and 1. We fixed $p_{el/br(0)}$ as the threshold value for elongation versus branching process.

If $p_{el/br} > p_{el/br(0)}$ an elongation process occurs. A new growth unit is then added to the connection (c) characterized by the highest elongation probability P_{el} , calculated following:

$$(2) \quad P_{el}(c) = \beta \left(\frac{1}{(1 + E_l G(c)) (1 + E_g L(c))} \right) (F_N)$$

where β is a random variable in the range 0 to 1, $G(c)$ and $L(c)$ are the generation number and the length of the connection respectively, E_g and E_l variables express the dependence of elongation on generation level and the length of the connection respectively, and F_N represents a plasticity function (described below). The type of growth unit created to elongate the connection is defined in relation with the interramet distance D_r attributed to each ramet unit r : if the distance on the connection from this ramet is lower than the actual interramet distance a connection unit is created, otherwise a ramet unit is produced. D_r follows a stochastic law:

$$(3) \quad D_r = d_0 + \mu d_1, \quad \mu \in [0; 1]$$

where d_0 and d_1 are integers representing a number of connection units.

If $p_{el/br} < p_{el/br(0)}$ this is a branching process. CLONAL first defines which connection should branch. The branching probability of each clone connection $P_{br}(c)$ is calculated following:

$$(4) P_{br}(c) = \gamma \frac{(1 + B_l L(c))}{(1 + B_g G(c))} \quad \text{if } G(c) < 3$$

$$P_{br}(c) = 0 \quad \text{if } G(c) \geq 3$$

with γ a random variable in the range 0-1, $G(c)$ and $L(c)$ respectively the generation level and the length of the connection. B_l and B_g express the dependence of branching on respectively the length and the generation level of the connection.

Each ramet (r) of the selected connection may hold the new branch starting with a connection unit in two possible directions k :

$$(5) P_{br}(r,k) = \delta \left(\frac{1}{e + B_p d(r)} \right) (F_N)$$

where δ is a random variable in the range 0 to 1, e is a constant, $d(r)$ is the distance between ramet r and the basis of the connection it belongs to, B_p is the variable expressing the dependence of the branching process on the distance of the ramet to the basis of the branch, and F_N represents a plasticity function (described below).

Two plastic responses to competition were tested: either no response or plants may actively orient their growth in the direction of the least competitive pressure (exploitative behavior) (Ross and Harper, 1972; Richards et al., 2010). These responses were defined through the plasticity function F_N following:

(6) $F_N = 1$ no active response of the clone

$$F_N = 1 - \frac{N}{N_{max}} \quad \text{exploitative behavior}$$

with N the number of competitor ramets in the neighborhood of size N_{max} of each potentially colonized cell either by elongation or ramification.

At each time step, the growing process of each clone ended by the calculation of the probability p_g of creating the new growth unit considering the amount of resource available. This calculation is done following (7):

$$(7) P_g = \varepsilon \left[1 + \log \left(\frac{R_{IPU}}{c_g} \right) \right] \quad \text{if } R_{IPU} \geq c_g$$

$$P_g = 0 \quad \text{if } R_{IPU} < c_g$$

with $p_g = p_{ramet}$ or $p_{connection}$ depending on the nature of the growth unit to create, c_g the production cost of one ramet ($c_g = 1$) or one connection unit ($c_g = 0.5$), ε a random variable in the range of 0-1 and R_{IPU} is the available resource within the integrative physiological unit (i.e. the sum of the resources of the 10 growth units composing the IPU). The growth unit is created when $p_g > 0.6$. These parameter values were chosen following the results of a previous study (Mony et al., 2011).

Competition prevents the ramet creation in cells already occupied by ramets but do not affect connection units which can be created regardless of the cell status (empty or already occupied by a ramet or a connection unit). If this competition rule is fulfilled, the new growth unit is created and the IPU is depleted of c_g , otherwise the growth unit is not produced. A single growth unit per clone is created per time step.

Simulations

The simulated system is a prairie of 200×200 cells. The boundary effect is avoided by the addition of a 99×99 cells

external frame sown with the same density than the focal prairie. The individual grid size is adapted to avoid that clone reaches its boundaries while growing: 199×199 cells for a clone without competition and 99×99 cells for competing clones. Three sowing densities are tested: one clone (low intra-clonal competition), 50 clones (intermediate competition intensity) and 300 clones (high competition intensity). For each sowing density, we tested successively the two plastic responses. Six different types of prairies are thus tested.

We tested the effect on plant performance of eleven input parameters characterizing plant colonization of space and separated between plant structural blue-print and ontogeny. Two to four input parameter values (each value corresponding to one input trait) were

selected from literature or experiments (Benot, 2009) (Table 1) but instead of testing all combinations of parameter values for each treatment, we randomly selected 2,000,000 of them through a Monte-Carlo method. Each simulation ran for 300 time steps and was replicated 1000 times for the clone alone and 20 times for the prairies. These replicate numbers were determined through a previous analysis of the model convergence. The large campaigns of simulations were run on the shared software platform BOINC (Anderson, 2004) using volunteer computing (Smaoui-Feki et al., 2009).

Five output parameters were calculated to characterize the performances (biomass and number of ramets) and the architecture (number of connections, mean lengths of the primary and secondary

Table 1. Input parameters of the plant model CLONAL determining clone architecture. The numbers indicated in brackets correspond to the equation in which the parameter is involved. The parameter values tested were determined through experimentation or literature survey.

Significance	Label	Values
Structural blue print		
Maximum number of branches developing from the initial ramet	n_0	2; 4; 6
Maximum number of branches developing from other ramets than the initial	n_b	1; 2
Minimum interramet distance (3)	d_0	1; 2; 3; 4
Variability in the interramet distance (3)	d_1	0; 2
Threshold probability for the elongation process compared to branching process (apical dominance) (1)	$p_{el/br(0)}$	0.2; 0.5; 0.8
Ontogeny		
<i>Elongation process</i>		
Dependence of elongation on the length of the connection (2)	E_l	0.02; 0.2; 2
Dependence of elongation on the generation level of the connection (2)	E_g	0.001; 0.01; 0.1
<i>Branching process</i>		
Dependence of branching on the length of the connection (4)	B_l	0.001; 0.01; 0.1
Dependence of branching on the generation level of the connection (4)	B_g	0.02; 0.2; 2
Constant in (5)	e	0; 1
Dependence of the branching location on the distance of the ramet to the basis of the connection (5)	B_p	0.001; 0.01; 0.1

connections) of the clones growing on the six types of prairies. Primary connections start from the initial ramet and ramify in secondary connections. For each replicate of simulation, the means of these parameters were calculated on all clones of the prairie.

Data analysis

All analyses were performed on a data subset comprising the prairies (i.e. the simulations) which performed best in terms of clone biomass. These prairies were selected when the clone reached 75% of the maximal biomass. This threshold was fixed through a preliminary analysis of the curve describing the biomass produced in all prairies. It corresponded to the threshold at which the curve slope drastically decreases.

To study the variations of clonal trait means depending on the competition intensity and response, we calculated their percentage of variation of each trait i as following:

$$(8) \quad \Delta \text{trait}_i = 100 \times \frac{\text{trait}_{iP} - \text{trait}_{iNP}}{\text{trait}_{iNP}}$$

with trait_{iP} the mean of trait i in plastic clones and trait_{iNP} in non-plastic clones. We considered as significant variations in trait i greater than 10%.

To assess which input parameter values were determinant for the clone success, we calculated for each type of prairie and for each parameter, the frequency of each parameter value tested. Chi-square tests were performed to assess whether (i) the competition intensity and (ii) the plasticity have an effect on these frequencies. When the effect of the competition intensity was significant, partial Chi-square tests were performed to

detect differences among competition intensity modalities. A Bonferonni correction was used to control for multiple comparisons.

The input parameter values will be hereafter referred to as input traits.

Results

Effect of competition intensity and response on clone performance and architecture

Clone performances decreased along the gradient of competition intensity either in terms of biomass (mean decrease of 13% to 42% respectively for the intermediate and high density) or number of ramets (mean decrease of 20% to 55% respectively for the intermediate and high density) (Figs. 1a, b). Plasticity compensated for these competitive effects by increasing by 10% the amount of biomass produced compared to the non-plastic clones for low and intermediate density treatments. However at high density of competitors, biomass was not maintained and even decreased by 16%. Such decrease was similar when considering the number of ramets produced (increase of 11-12% in low and intermediate density treatments, decrease of 23% in the high density treatment).

The effective architecture of the best performing clones depended on the intensity of competition. At intermediate density, clones were characterized by a slight increase in the number of connections (11%) together with a decrease of their lengths (34% decrease for primary, 18% for secondary connections) (Figs. 1c-e). This decrease was amplified in densely occupied environments (64% and 42% respectively of decrease in length




Figure 1. Mean (\pm SD) performance and architectural traits of the clone growing on the six types of prairie: (a) biomass, (b) number of ramets, (c) number of connections (d) mean length of primary connection, (e) mean length of secondary connection. Light grey bars: non plastic clones; dark grey bars: plastic clones. Competition intensity: Low one clone (intra-clonal competition); Intermediate 50 clones; High 300 clones.

for primary and secondary connections) though the number of connections was maintained. Plasticity impacted the architectural traits in interaction with the intensity of competition (Figs. 1c-e): at low density, no difference occurred in the number of connections and the length of primary connection but we recorded an increase by 14% of the mean length of secondary connections. At intermediate density, we detected a significant increase by 25% of the number of connections together with a decrease by 16% of the length of the primary connections and the maintenance of the length of the secondary connections. At high density, the number of connections was maintained but mean lengths of primary and secondary connections decreased respectively by 29% and 15%.

Determinant input traits in the clone success

Seven out of the 11 architectural input traits were independent of competition intensity: these were d_0 , d_1 , n_0 , E_g , B_1 , B_g

and B_p (Table 2, Fig. 2). Some particular values of these traits promoted plant performance but they were not involved in the resistance to competition (same value selected whatever the level of competition). However, the other four traits significantly depended on competition intensity and were modulated by plastic response of the plant (Table 3). Competition intensity increased the selection of the highest number of buds ($n_b = 2$) at connection nodes. This number of buds was similar at high and intermediate competition compared to low competition. The predominance of elongation over branching ($p_{el/br(0)}$) seemed to be very determinant for low and intermediate densities whereas this importance decreased with higher densities especially for the plastic clones (2/3 with 0.2 and 1/3 with 0.5 at high density, compared to 100% with 0.2 at other densities). For plastic clones, competition intensity selected e for the value 1, reducing the importance of B_p and of the distance between the ramet and the connection basis for the ramification

process location. Competition intensity had an effect on the value distribution of E_1 independently of plasticity, with a highest

proportion of clones with 0.02 for intermediate and high densities compared to the low competition treatment.

Table 2. Comparisons of the input trait frequencies between the three competition intensities with and without plastic response. Input trait frequencies were compared using Chi-square tests. When significant differences were detected, partial Chi-square tests were performed (results are given on Fig. 2). Shaded cells correspond to cases where input trait frequencies were identical whatever the competition intensity.

Traits	Non Plastic			Plastic		
	χ^2	df	P-value	χ^2	df	P-value
Structural blue-print						
n_0	0.66	4	ns	2.35	4	ns
n_b	25.50	2	***	45.78	2	***
d_0						
d_1						
$P_{el/br(0)}$	7.18	2	*	73.18	2	***
Ontogeny						
E_1	20.16	2	***	24.35	2	***
E_g	0.15	2	ns	0.76	2	ns
B_1	0.15	2	ns	0.76	2	ns
B_g	0.23	2	ns	0.06	2	ns
e	0.39	2	ns	7.03	2	*
B_p	0.12	2	ns	0.30	2	ns

Note: asterisks indicate significant differences: ns not significant; * $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$.

Table 3. Comparisons of the input trait frequencies with and without plasticity under low, intermediate and high competition intensity. Input trait frequencies were compared using Chi-square tests. Shaded cells correspond to cases where input trait frequencies were identical with and without plasticity (no effect of the plastic response).

Traits	Low			Intermediate			High		
	χ^2	df	P-value	χ^2	df	P-value	χ^2	df	P-value
Structural blue-print									
n_0	0.56	2	ns	1.15	2	ns	0.08	2	ns
n_b	0.20	1	ns	16.1	1	***	3.10^{-3}	1	ns
d_0									
d_1									
$P_{el/br(0)}$							26.59	1	***
Ontogeny									
E_1	8.10^{-3}	1	ns	2.87	1	ns	0.57	1	ns
E_g	3.10^{-4}	1	ns	0.36	1	ns	0.01	1	ns
B_1	3.10^{-4}	1	ns	0.36	1	ns	0.01	1	ns
B_g	2.10^{-4}	1	ns	0.08	1	ns	3.10^{-3}	1	ns
e	0.25	1	ns	6.87	1	**	2.40	1	ns
B_p	0.04	1	ns	1.00	1	ns	0.12	1	ns

Note: asterisks indicate significant differences: ns not significant; * $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$.




Figure 2. Input trait frequencies in the six types of prairies. Dark symbols correspond to plastic clones (P); Light symbols to non plastic clones (NP). Letters indicate significant differences in the input trait frequencies at different competition intensities for non plastic clones, numbers for plastic clones.

Discussion

Plastic and non plastic clone architecture selected by competition

Competition induced a decrease in clone performances that plasticity buffered only at low and intermediate competitor densities. Plasticity interacted with the competition intensity to determine the clone architecture. It enhanced the growth of the single clone by increasing the elongation of its secondary connections, favoring space exploration through a better arrangement of clone connections. By contrast, at intermediate and high competitor densities, clones tended to clump. At high competitor density, the weaker performances observed in plastic clones compared to non plastic ones may be caused by higher intraclonal interferences due to their more severely clumped architecture (Lovett Doust 1981; Schmid 1986; Humphrey & Pike, 1998). Indeed, local space availability for the creation of new ramets is reduced and because of their shorter connections, clones may be unable to reach benign patches. In real systems, the number of ramets of clumped species is under the control of their birth rate limiting these intraclonal interferences (Schmid & Harper, 1985).

Self/non-self discrimination has also been proposed as mechanism favoring and stabilizing clumped structures on the long term (Herben & Novoplansky, 2008). However, plastic avoidance and self discrimination present different implications for the plant community (Herben & Novoplansky, 2010). Plastic response may indeed favor the maintenance of numerous clones under intermediate competition whereas self/non-

self discrimination displace competitive interactions from the level of ramets to the level of clones, increasing their extinction rate (Herben & Novoplansky, 2008 ; 2010).

Importance of the Ontogeny and Structural blue-print for clone success

Clone performances were enhanced whatever competition intensity and plastic ability of clones, by a star-like architecture supported by an initial ramification in six directions and a low interramet distance, and by weak effects of ontogeny on this basic architecture. Furthermore, resistance to competition (i.e. maximization of clone success under competition) depended on (i) the plant structural blue-print through the selection of a high number of potentially active axillary buds and a weak apical dominance, but also on (ii) traits reducing the importance of ontogenic processes in the set up of the clone architecture (connection elongation with E_1 and localization of the branch along the connection with e), especially at intermediate competition intensity. Ontogenic processes influence the positioning of ramet within the clone and thus the intensity of intraclonal competition. Reducing their importance limits new ramet settlement near the clone basis (i.e. the initial ramet) and thus favors the spatial expansion of the clone. It allows the clone to first preempt space and then consolidate the occupation of this clonal territory, through a high branching process based on two potentially active buds per node, which limits competitor invasions and supports clone success. Nevertheless, the number of axillary buds tested was constrained by the grid used to model clone environment. Further studies are thus

needed to assess the consequences for clone architecture and success of having more branching possibilities.

The ecological efficiency of plasticity depended on the same traits that those promoting resistance to competition. The plant plastic response only modulated the importance of these traits for the clone success. At intermediate intensity of competition, plasticity stimulates the branch production by increasing the importance of having two buds per node and reducing the selectivity of ontogenic processes on the branching location along the connection. The higher number of branches enhanced the local exploitation of favorable patches (Cain, 1994; de Kroon et al., 1994) explaining that plasticity was in this case adaptive. At high competition intensity, plasticity increases apical dominance, leading to a decrease in the occurrence of axillary bud activation. The study of the importance of the number of axillary buds

Surprisingly, competition intensity had no effect on the internode distance supporting clone success. This was always favored by a low internode distance although previous studies have shown that at low competitor density, clones with long internode distances are more successful because of their higher possibilities of space exploration (Schmid & Harper, 1985; Winkler & Schmid, 1995; Cheplick, 1997; Humphrey & Pike, 1998). This divergence may be linked with the spatial distribution of resources: in our homogeneous conditions, investing in long connections is not necessary to reach favorable sites (Lovett Doust, 1981; Humphrey & Pike, 1998) and would have been made at the expense of local resource exploitation and biomass production by ramets. However, in heterogeneous

environments such as in field situations, fine-scale mosaics of rich and poor patches may necessitate a higher allocation of biomass to explorative organs.

Adaptive value of the avoidance plastic response

The adaptive value of the avoidance plastic response depended on the species (their traits) and on the competitor density. Our results suggested that this response is adaptive at intermediate competition only for species which have a low apical dominance, a high possibility of branching based on several axillary buds, and a random arrangement of branches (i.e. not dependent on ontogenic development). Nevertheless, plasticity may increase the pool of species persisting under competition by reducing the importance of certain traits (weak apical dominance, branching location along the connection) for the clone success. Hence, plasticity buffers the selectivity of competition on plant traits. However, further studies are necessary to study plastic avoidance in systems comprising several species. Indeed, horizontal architectural complementarity between the different species may occur, increasing the efficiency of spatial resource exploitation (Hector, 1998) and thus the possibilities of species coexistence within the plant community (Amarasekare, 2003).

The avoidance strategy was adaptive only under intermediate density of competitors which may be found during the establishment of the vegetation cover or in disturbed habitats (high ramet mortality). Intermediate density of competitors generates a patchy environment resulting from the clone growth, of which patch size relatively to

plant architectural traits such as internode distance, is determinant for the plant success. The adaptive nature of the avoidance strategy at low to moderate intensities of competition relies on the ability of plants to exchange information within the clone to detect the best living sites. In the model, we made the assumption that such physiological integration is not costly for the plant which tend to be supported by [van Kleunen & Stuefer \(1999\)](#) and [van Kleunen et al. \(2000\)](#). Further work is nevertheless needed to evaluate the importance of physiological integration costs in the adaptivity of the avoidance response. At higher competitor density the spatial arrangement and the heterogeneity of the remaining available sites should not be consistent anymore with plant ability to detect them ([Oborny & Cain, 1997](#)). In such environment, a tolerance strategy may be more efficient ([Novoplansky, 2009](#); [Herben & Novoplansky 2010](#)). Such strategy may however include other clonal properties such as storage or ramet specialization.

Concluding remarks

To conclude, clonal architecture is under the influence of the interaction between competition intensity and response: the avoidance strategy increases the degree of clone clumping at intermediate and high competitor densities. Resistance to competition and plastic response efficiency are promoted by the same traits mostly characterizing the plant structural blueprint, ontogenic processes being of secondary importance. Our study thus contributed to the development of knowledge on the relative importance of the structural blue-print and ontogenic

processes for the plant response efficiency, which until now, was poorly known (but see [Geber et al., 1992](#)). The difficulty of addressing certain questions through experimentation, emphasizes the interest of modeling approaches coupled with volunteer computing, especially those based on IBMs, which focus on local interaction between individuals. As illustrated here, modeling approaches are particularly powerful to disentangle the effects of different traits on the plant effective architecture in a set of environmental conditions.

Acknowledgements

This project benefited from the grant ANR-08-SYSC-012 provided by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (France).

Appendix A. Metabolic rules of the CLONAL model.

At each time step t the total amount of resource of the clone $R_T(t)$ is calculated following the equation (A1):

$$(A1) \quad R_T(t) = R_T(t-1) + \sum_{g=1}^{g=n} R_g(t-1) - aC_g, \quad R(1) = 1$$

where $R_g(t)$ is the net gain of resource (by biomass accumulation for ramets or storage for connection units) of each growth unit g , C_g is the cost for creating one growth unit ($c_g = 1$ for a ramet and 0.5 for a connection unit) and a equal to zero if no new unit is added to the clone, one otherwise.

The biomass accumulation occurs at the ramet scale and is assumed to follow a logistic law at each time step t :

$$(A2) \quad \frac{dB_r(t)}{dt} = r_p (1 - r_s) B_r(t) \left(1 - \frac{B_r(t)}{r_{mr}} \right)$$

with $B_r(t)$ the biomass status of the ramet r , $r_p = 0.3$ a constant providing the biomass supplied to a ramet by photosynthesis, $1 - r_s$ the fraction of biomass allocated to long-term reserve formation ($r_s = 0.1$) and $r_{mr} = 20$ the maximal biomass reachable by a ramet.

The resource available for the growth of a ramet r is calculated overall growth units belonging to the same integrative physiological unit (IPU) following:

$$(A3) \quad R_{IPU}(r) = \sum_{g=1}^{r=n_{IPU}} R_g$$

where R_g is the resource of the growth unit g , $n_{IPU} = 10$ the number of growth unit in the IPU. R_g is null for a connection unit which stores only long-term resource unavailable for growth.

~ Chapitre 3 ~

Les traits clonaux : des traits d'effet ?

	Préface	... page 167
Article VI	– Ecosystem production depends on clonal traits: experimental evidence derived from mesocosm communities	... page 169

PREFACE

1. OBJECTIFS DU CHAPITRE 3

D'après les chapitres 1 et 2, les traits clonaux caractérisant les stratégies de croissance des espèces, seraient impliqués dans les processus de formation des patrons spatiaux au sein des communautés végétales herbacées. La dynamique et donc la productivité de ces communautés étant déterminées par ces patrons (Silvertown et al., 1992 ; Stoll & Prati, 2001), les traits clonaux qui les caractérisent pourraient influencer leur fonction de production. Ces traits interviennent notamment dans le processus d'acquisition des ressources en déterminant le placement des structures portant les organes foliaires et racinaires (Huber et al., 1999). Les traits de ces organes (SLA, LDMC, longueur spécifique de racine) ont eux-mêmes déjà été reliés à la fonction de production des communautés végétales (Craine et al., 2002 ; Garnier et al., 2004). Néanmoins, du fait de leur intervention plus précoce dans les processus d'acquisition des ressources, les traits clonaux pourrait avoir des effets plus importants sur la fonction de production que les traits foliaires. La relation entre les traits clonaux et la production de biomasse devrait se vérifier du niveau de l'individu à celui de la communauté. (Lavorel and Garnier, 2002; Violle et al., 2007).

Ce troisième chapitre vise à établir :

- ✓ Que les traits clonaux influencent la fonction de production au sein des communautés végétales. (Article VI)
- ✓ Que les traits clonaux sont de meilleurs prédicteurs de cette fonction que les traits foliaires comme la SLA ou le LDMC. (Article VI)

2. DEMARCHE MISE EN ŒUVRE

Les travaux présentés dans ce chapitre reposent sur une approche expérimentale basée sur des cultures en mésocosmes de communautés végétales, composées de 4 à 12 espèces distribuées le long du continuum guérilla-phalange-cespiteux (niveau « riche » du dispositif présenté en 2.1. partie Méthodologie). Ces espèces ont été choisies pour

présenter la plus large gamme de valeurs de traits clonaux. La productivité aérienne nette sur l'année de ces communautés a été mesurée par une récolte de la biomasse aérienne et reliée à une valeur agrégée des traits clonaux et foliaires étudiés. Cette méthode se base sur l'hypothèse de Mass Ratio de [Grime \(1998\)](#) qui suppose que les propriétés de l'écosystème sont déterminées par les caractéristiques des espèces dominantes. La relation entre traits et fonction de production a également été testée au niveau d'individus appartenant aux différentes espèces, cultivés en l'absence de compétiteurs (*cf.* 2.1.2 Méthodologie). Les valeurs de traits clonaux utilisées dans cette étude correspondent à des moyennes calculées sur ces individus. Les variations potentielles de ces traits liées à une plasticité de la plante en réponse à son environnement n'ont donc pas été considérées.

3. PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS

Nos résultats montrent qu'il existe une relation significative entre les traits clonaux et la fonction de production au sein des communautés végétales. La production serait ainsi plus importante au sein d'une communauté comprenant des espèces caractérisées par un faible nombre et une faible longueur de connexion et une forte proportion de modules cespiteux. Les effets des traits clonaux sur la fonction de production se sont même révélés plus forts que ceux des traits foliaires mesurés (SLA, LDMC), suggérant que les traits clonaux seraient de meilleurs indicateurs de la fonction de production. Cette relation est indépendante d'un lien entre traits foliaires et clonaux à l'échelle spécifique. Contrairement à nos attentes, le signe de cette relation s'est inversé entre les niveaux de l'individu et de la communauté, témoignant d'une modification du processus d'acquisition des ressources liée à la compétition. Des traits caractérisant une architecture agrégée favorisent la productivité en présence de compétiteurs ; à l'inverse une architecture dispersée favorise la productivité en l'absence de compétiteurs.

Cette étude suggère pour la première fois que les traits clonaux peuvent être employés comme traits d'effet pour la fonction de production en écosystème prairial et ouvre de nouvelles perspectives concernant leur utilisation en écologie fonctionnelle. Ces traits étant largement impliqués dans le processus de formation des patrons spatiaux au sein des communautés végétales, de nouvelles études seraient à mener afin d'établir s'ils pourraient constituer des traits d'effet pour toutes les fonctions liées à ces patrons comme par exemple la pollinisation ou les cycles des nutriments.

Ecosystem production depends on clonal traits: experimental evidence derived from mesocosm communities

AK. Bittebiere¹, B. Clément¹, C. Mony¹

¹UMR 6553 Ecobio, CNRS - University of Rennes 1, Av. du Général Leclerc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France

²Department of Computer Science, University of Houston, 501 Philipp G. Hoffman Hall, Houston, TX 77204-3010, USA

Article Informations	Abstract
<p><i>Article history:</i></p> <p>Submitted to <i>Journal of Ecology</i></p> <hr/> <p><i>Keywords:</i></p> <p>Biomass production</p> <p>Clonal traits</p> <p>Ecosystem functioning</p> <p>Mesocosm experiment</p>	<p>Many functional ecology studies have associated ecosystem biomass production to short-term resource acquisition processes, such as those attributed to foliar traits. However, we argue that long-term resource acquisition processes should be linked to traits governing the placement of resource acquisition organs, such as clonal traits. Therefore, relative to foliar, clonal traits should exhibit an increased effect on biomass production. We tested this hypothesis using a wide-scale mesocosm experiment based on several assemblages of species differing in clonal traits, and evaluated if the relationship between biomass production, and clonal traits is consistent at different ecological scales. Results showed that community specific aboveground net primary productivity was significantly correlated to community-aggregated values of clonal and foliar traits. Nevertheless, a stronger relationship with clonal traits was indicated, emphasizing a plant foraging strategy along the horizontal plant axis, which was determinant for the community productivity. An inverse relationship between clonal traits and biomass production was observed at the individual and the community levels, which was attributed to modifications in resource acquisition processes resulting from competitive interactions. We subsequently demonstrated that clonal traits can be used as effect traits and were indicators of resource acquisition processes mediated by competitive interactions. Consequently, we propose that clonal traits are of interest in functional ecology.</p>

Introduction

Ecosystem services are the panel of ecosystem functions that benefit humans (Hooper et al., 2005; Kremen, 2005). Grassland biomass production is one of these services, since it can be used as livestock forage. In the current context of environmental conservation, increased biomass production in the absence of supplemental chemical fertilizers is a challenge, resulting in new dimensions of scientific investigation. It has been shown that productivity depends on plant

community structure, either species composition (Kahmen et al., 2005) or richness (Tilman et al., 1996; Hector et al., 1999; Tilman et al., 2001). However, providing a set of general principles remains difficult since most results are limited to few species ecosystems (Chapin et al., 2000) with a specific suite of abiotic conditions. Mc Gill et al. (2006) proposed functional ecology as an alternative to conceptually rebuild community ecology, based on the assumption that a panel of plant traits called “effect traits” can be characterized (Diaz and Cabido, 2001;

Lavorel and Garnier, 2002) and generalize how species affect ecosystem functioning (Wilson 1999; Eviner and Chapin, 2003), and in particular biomass production (Garnier et al., 2004).

The last decade has therefore seen the emergence of many studies linking plant traits with ecosystem function (Diaz et al., 1999; Eviner, 2004; Schweitzer et al., 2004; Garnier et al., 2007; Pontes et al., 2007). Biomass production was related to traits linked with resource acquisition such as root traits (e.g. specific root length) (Eissenstat, 1991; Craine et al., 2002) or leaf traits (e.g. specific leaf area – SLA – or leaf dry matter content – LDMC – informing on photosynthetic efficiency and plant nutrient retention) (Garnier et al., 2004; Garnier et al., 2007; Pontes et al., 2007). These traits are indicative of short-term resource acquisition processes, but we argue that long-term processes should be associated with traits determining the placement of resource acquiring organs. Large SLA may indeed be less efficient than small SLA to acquire resources in the long-term, if a plant cannot accurately position leaf-supporting structures. In grassland plants, foraging is largely determined along a horizontal axis by vegetative reproduction (Cain, 1994; de Kroon and Hutchings, 1995). In most species, it is achieved through the development of a clonal network of ramets (i.e. genetically identical, and potentially independent individuals with their own photosynthetic and root organs) (van Groenendael et al., 1996). Such clonal network facilitates an efficient colonization and exploitation of resources in the most favorable sites (e.g. less densely occupied or resource rich), resulting in enhanced plant performance, either with (Weijsschedé et al., 2008) or

without competitors (Wijesinghe and Hutchings, 1999). In clonal plant communities, biomass production should therefore be closely related to clonal traits, from the individual to higher organizational scales (Lavorel and Garnier, 2002; Violle et al., 2007).

The main purpose of this study was to investigate (i) if clonal traits are effect traits for biomass production; and (ii) if clonal traits are better predictors of this particular ecosystem function than foliar traits, such as SLA and LDMC. We also expected the relationship between clonal traits and biomass production would be consistent, regardless of ecological scale. These hypotheses were tested using an experimental approach based on the cultivation of 70 mesocosms. These comprised four to twelve species forming a plant community and being chosen to display the widest range of clonal trait values. The annual specific aboveground net primary productivity of each community was measured, and correlated with an aggregated value of clonal and foliar traits. This methodology followed Grime's (1998) biomass ratio hypothesis, and assumed the ecosystem properties are determined by dominant species characteristics, which has been confirmed by Garnier et al. (2004) and Vile et al. (2006). We also tested the relationship between clonal traits and the relative growth rates of individuals representing the 12 species cultivated in the absence of competitors.

Materials and methods

Plant material

Clonal growth strategies are distributed along a gradient of clonal network

aggregation (Lovett Doust, 1981). We selected 12 guerilla, phalanx or caespitose species representing the gradient, and commonly occurring in temperate grasslands. Each clonal strategy was represented by four species, including one dicotyledonous, and three monocotyledonous species (Table 1). Individuals were collected in grasslands near Rennes (Brittany, West France) in two phases: in April 2009 to constitute the experimental mesocosm communities, and in April 2010 to be planted as controls. All clonal individuals sampled were of standardized size and structure. In guerilla and phalanx species, clonal individuals were composed of a ramet (one node, its leaves, and axillary buds) with one internode of connection (Huber et al., 1999; Stuefer and Huber, 1999); three jointed ramets forming a tuft were used in caespitose species.

Experimental design

The effects of plant species traits on biomass production were investigated in experimental mesocosm communities set up in the experimental garden of the University of Rennes (France) in May 2009. Seven community types were tested, differing in the nature and number of occurring clonal strategies (one, two, or three), all strategy combinations being tested. Ten replicates of each community type were randomly positioned in the

experimental design, comprising 70 square 1.30×1.30 m² mesocosms. In each mesocosm, 48 clonal individuals were planted on a substrate composed of 20% sand and 80% ground soil, following a hexagonal pattern to ensure balanced interactions between all neighboring individuals (Birch et al., 2007). The individuals were equally distributed among co-occurring species, and the position of each species on the plantation pattern was randomized. The aboveground vegetation in each mesocosm was harvested once per year at the end of summer.

Species traits and individual biomass were characterized using 10 clones per species planted in April 2010. The individuals were grown as controls i.e. in the absence of competition on the same substrate than in the experimental mesocosms. The 120 culture units were randomly positioned.

All culture units were watered regularly during the dry season, and weeds were manually removed.

Data collection

▪ Experimental communities

Mid-September 2010, the total aboveground vegetation of each mesocosm was mowed, and weighed to measure fresh mass. A subsample was immediately collected and weighed before and after drying at 65°C for 48h to determine harvested vegetation dry mass, and

Table 1. Species representing each clonal dispersal strategy.

	Guerilla (G)	Phalanx (P)	Caespitose (C)
Monocotyledon	<i>Elytrigia repens</i> L.	<i>Brachypodium pinnatum</i> L.	<i>Lolium perenne</i> L.
	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> L.	<i>Festuca rubra</i> L.	<i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L.
	<i>Holcus mollis</i> L.	<i>Agrostis tenuis</i> Sibth.	<i>Holcus lanatus</i> L.
Dicotyledon	<i>Ranunculus repens</i> L.	<i>Anthemis nobilis</i> L.	<i>Centaurea nigra</i> L.

calculate annual aboveground net primary productivity (- ANPP - g of dry mass per m²) (Pontes et al., 2007), and specific aboveground net primary productivity (- SANPP - the logarithm of ANPP per unit of production time) in each mesocosm (Diaz et al., 2007). Each species percent cover was also assessed within 5% precision. Edge effects were avoided by excluding the outermost 10 cm of each mesocosm, both for productivity, and species relative abundance measurements.

- Individuals cultivated in the absence of competition

Following four months of cultivation, the 120 control individuals from the 12 species were harvested. Dry masses of the aboveground part of the clone and of a mature ramet were measured by weighing after oven drying at 65°C. The ramet dry mass was used as an approximation of individual initial dry mass. Clonal architecture was evaluated using traits characterizing the degree of spatial exploration and local consolidation of clones respectively the number and maximal connection length (longest clone connection length), and proportion of caespitose ramets. The proportion of caespitose ramets was calculated as the ratio between the caespitose ramet number, and the total ramet number. Ramets considered as caespitose were ramets banded with unapparent connections, forming a tussock structure. Two foliar traits, SLA (specific leaf area), and LDMC (leaf dry matter content), were measured on a mature ramet leaf following the method of Cornelissen et al. (2003).

Data analysis

Aboveground growth of individuals cultivated in the absence of competition was assessed via relative growth rate (RGR), and calculated as follows (Castro-Diez et al. 1998):

$$(1) \text{ RGR} = \frac{\ln(\text{final AGB}) - \ln(\text{initial AGB})}{\text{number of days}}$$

where the final aboveground biomass (final AGB) was the aboveground clone dry mass at the end of the experiment (in August), and the initial aboveground biomass (initial AGB) was the planted ramet dry mass. The relationship between community SANPP and traits was tested by calculating clonal and foliar trait aggregated values (Trait_{agg}) as follows:

$$(2) \text{ Trait}_{\text{agg}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Ra}_i \times \text{trait}_i$$

where n is the number of species in the community, Ra_i the relative abundance in the community of species i, and trait_i its trait value (Violle et al., 2007). Ra_i was calculated as the ratio between the percent cover of species i, and the sum of the percent cover of the n community species.

Linear regression analyses were used to test relationships between (i) SANPP, and community aggregated trait values; and (ii) RGR, and traits of individuals cultivated in the absence of competition. Regression analyses were based on linear model (LM) procedures after confirming normality of the distribution of model residuals. Correlations between all species traits (clonal and foliar) were tested using a non-

parametric Spearman's rank correlation test, due to the non-normality of data distribution. These tests were performed using R 2.12.2. software.

Results

Relationships among species traits

The 12 species cultivated in the seven types of communities displayed a wide range of values for foliar or clonal traits (Table 2). In five species, a significant negative correlation between SLA and LDMC was observed, while only two species, *Lolium perenne* and *Festuca rubra*

showed significant correlations between the three clonal traits (Table 3). Correlations between foliar traits, and one or two clonal traits were detected in six species. Maximal connection length was negatively correlated with LDMC in *Elytrigia repens*. Connection number was positively correlated with SLA in *Agrostis stolonifera*, and with LDMC in *Brachypodium pinnatum* and *Holcus lanatus*. The proportion of caespitose ramets was positively correlated with SLA in *Festuca rubra* and *Holcus mollis*, and negatively correlated with LDMC in *E. repens* and *H. mollis*.




Figure 1. Relationships between community SANPP, and the clonal and foliar traits: (a) connection number, (b) maximal connection length, (c) proportion of caespitose ramets, (d) SLA, and (e) LDMC. The straight line represents the linear model adjustment to the data. N = 70.

Table 2. RGR and clonal and foliar trait values (mean \pm SD) measured in the 12 studied species cultivated in the absence of competition. The RGR was calculated between April and August 2010 (see Materials and Methods).

Traits	Species											
	Erep	Asto	Hmol	Rrep	Bpin	Frub	Aten	Anob	Lper	Dglo	Hlan	Cnig
RGR ($\text{g}\cdot\text{g}^{-1}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$)	0.030 \pm 0.005	0.045 \pm 0.011	0.025 \pm 0.006	0.045 \pm 0.004	0.028 \pm 0.006	0.035 \pm 0.013	0.047 \pm 0.005	0.053 \pm 0.005	0.036 \pm 0.003	0.022 \pm 0.004	0.032 \pm 0.005	0.008 \pm 0.007
Clonal traits												
Connection number	57.0 \pm 35.2	67.1 \pm 48.0	19.5 \pm 6.8	27.6 \pm 15.8	28.3 \pm 14.7	7.8 \pm 21.6	67.3 \pm 53.3	283.0 \pm 126.1	31.7 \pm 14.9	4.5 \pm 4.0	33.5 \pm 15.6	1.4 \pm 0.5
Maximal connection length (cm)	67.0 \pm 10.8	71.9 \pm 11.7	24.1 \pm 10.0	80.4 \pm 14.9	9.6 \pm 6.9	7.9 \pm 6.2	39.0 \pm 8.4	27.8 \pm 5.6	10.2 \pm 3.0	3.9 \pm 1.5	7.8 \pm 3.0	6.4 \pm 1.6
Proportion of caespitose ramets	0.79 \pm 0.23	0.01 \pm 0.04	0.28 \pm 0.22	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.54 \pm 0.33	0.98 \pm 0.05	0.14 \pm 0.13	0.00 \pm 0.00	0.66 \pm 0.29	1.00 \pm 0.01	0.69 \pm 0.27	1.00 \pm 0.00
Foliar traits												
LDMC ($\text{mg}\cdot\text{g}^{-1}$)	356.2 \pm 41.0	372.6 \pm 60.8	495.2 \pm 143.3	189.9 \pm 25.2	421.1 \pm 40.6	317.0 \pm 45.0	480.0 \pm 128.4	147.2 \pm 37.5	310.9 \pm 42.1	305.9 \pm 23.6	275.8 \pm 42.0	174.2 \pm 19.1
SLA ($\text{m}^2\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$)	18.2 \pm 1.5	24.1 \pm 5.0	23.4 \pm 3.8	16.8 \pm 2.2	17.6 \pm 2.6	10.6 \pm 2.2	30.4 \pm 5.6	38.5 \pm 10.6	18.2 \pm 2.3	22.5 \pm 4.4	31.3 \pm 5.0	18.6 \pm 2.9

Notes: Erep *E. repens*; Asto *A. stolonifera*; Hmol *H. mollis*; Rrep *R. repens*; Bpin *B. pinnatum*; Frub *F. rubra*; Aten *A. tenuis*; Anob *A. nobilis*; Lper *L. perenne*; Dglo *D. glomerata*; Hlan *H. lanatus*; Cnig *C. nigra*.

Table 3. Significant relationships between species clonal and foliar traits. Spearman's rank correlations were performed in all 12 species between each of the traits; the species name, and correlation parameters are indicated to provide only significant correlations (in brackets: the correlation coefficient and P-value). No significant correlations were detected between traits in *A. tenuis*, *C. nigra* and *R. repens*.

Traits	Number of connections	Maximal length of connection	Proportion of caespitose ramets	LDMC	SLA
Connection number					
Maximal connection length	Lper (0.84 ^{**})				
Proportion of caespitose ramets	Frub (-0.86 ^{**}) Lper (-0.82 ^{**})	Lper (-0.95 ^{***})			
LDMC	Bpin (0.74 [*]) Hlan (0.64 [*])	Erep (-0.73 [*])	Erep (0.81 ^{**}) Hmol (0.69 [*])		
SLA	Asto (0.70 [*])	-	Frub (-0.73 [*]) Hmol (-0.83 ^{**})	Anob (-0.92 ^{**}) Dglo (-0.94 ^{***}) Hlan (-0.71 [*]) Hmol (-0.70 [*]) Lper (-0.84 ^{**})	

Notes: Erep *E. repens*; Asto *A. stolonifera*; Hmol *H. mollis*; Bpin *B. pinnatum*; Frub *F. rubra*; Anob *A. nobilis*; Lper *L. perenne*; Dglo *D. glomerata*; Hlan *H. lanatus*. Asterisks indicate the level of significance of correlations: * P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001.

Relationships between community specific aboveground net primary productivity (SANPP) and the aggregated values of clonal or foliar traits

The mean SANPP of different communities varied from 18.53 g.kg⁻¹.d⁻¹ (± 0.77) (guerilla community composed of four species) to 21.43 g.kg⁻¹.d⁻¹ (± 1.23) (phalanx / caespitose community composed of eight species) (Table 4). This constitutes a sufficient range of SANPP values to assess a relationship with clonal and foliar traits.

The relationships tested between clonal and foliar traits, and community SANPP were significant (Table 5). SANPP was strongly and negatively correlated with connection number (Fig. 1a). This trait accounted for 44% of the SANPP variance. Maximal connection length and proportion of caespitose ramets were respectively negatively and positively correlated with community SANPP (Figs.

1b, c). These two traits accounted for a lower part of the SANPP variance than connection number, which nevertheless exceeded 35%.

Foliar traits were either negatively (LDMC) or positively (SLA) correlated with community SANPP (Figs. 1d, e). LDMC and SLA accounted respectively for 31% and only 6% of SANPP variance.

Relationships between individual relative growth rate and clonal or foliar traits

Individual RGR was significantly correlated with individual clonal traits and SLA but not LDMC (Table 6). The proportion of caespitose ramets was negatively correlated with individual RGR accounting for its highest proportion of variance (39%). The relationships between connection number and maximal connection length to individual RGR were both significantly positive and respectively explained 31% and 20% of the RGR

Table 4. Characterization of seven experimental community types: values (mean \pm SD) of ANPP, SANPP, and species relative abundance. Species relative abundance corresponds to its percent cover divided by the sum of percent cover of all species in the community. ANPP and SANPP were calculated based on a year (see Materials and Methods).

Community	ANPP ($\text{g}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$)	SANPP ($\text{g}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$)	Relative abundance per species													
			Erep	Asto	Hmol	Rrep	Bpin	Frub	Aten	Anob	Lper	Dglo	Hlan	Cnig		
Phalanx	2.10 ± 0.84	19.62 ± 1.18	-	-	-	-	0.47 ± 0.10	0.21 ± 0.04	0.26 ± 0.09	0.07 ± 0.08	-	-	-	-	-	-
Guerilla	1.41 ± 0.39	18.53 ± 0.77	0.45 ± 0.09	0.40 ± 0.13	0.13 ± 0.09	0.02 ± 0.02	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caespitose	2.71 ± 0.82	20.46 ± 0.96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.01 ± 0.02	0.30 ± 0.08	0.40 ± 0.06	0.29 ± 0.08	-
Phalanx and Guerilla	1.67 ± 0.18	19.12 ± 0.32	0.23 ± 0.10	0.38 ± 0.12	0.09 ± 0.04	0.07 ± 0.05	0.13 ± 0.06	0.07 ± 0.04	0.02 ± 0.01	0.02 ± 0.04	-	-	-	-	-	-
Phalanx and Caespitose	3.82 ± 1.37	21.43 ± 1.23	-	-	-	-	0.07 ± 0.03	0.06 ± 0.03	0.03 ± 0.03	0.04 ± 0.03	0.02 ± 0.02	0.02 ± 0.02	0.29 ± 0.08	0.24 ± 0.07	0.25 ± 0.07	-
Guerilla and Caespitose	2.97 ± 0.90	20.74 ± 0.95	0.12 ± 0.04	0.12 ± 0.05	0.00 ± 0.00	0.01 ± 0.01	-	-	-	-	-	0.00 ± 0.00	0.26 ± 0.06	0.25 ± 0.04	0.23 ± 0.04	-
Phalanx and Guerilla and Caespitose	2.06 ± 0.30	19.73 ± 0.45	0.11 ± 0.04	0.12 ± 0.07	0.02 ± 0.02	0.02 ± 0.01	0.04 ± 0.03	0.04 ± 0.03	0.00 ± 0.00	0.02 ± 0.02	0.02 ± 0.02	0.01 ± 0.01	0.21 ± 0.04	0.25 ± 0.05	0.16 ± 0.07	-

Notes: - not planted in the experimental community. Erep *E. repens*; Asto *A. stolonifera*; Hmol *H. mollis*; Rrep *R. repens*; Bpin *B. pinnatum*; Frub *F. rubra*; Aten *A. tenuis*; Anob *A. nobilis*; Lper *L. perenne*; Dglo *D. glomerata*; Hlan *H. lanatus*; Cnig *C. nigra*.

variance. The individual RGR was significantly positively correlated with SLA, accounting for 15% of the variance. In the absence of competition, a high

number and connection length, and a low proportion of caespitose ramets enhanced individual RGR.

Table 5. Univariate relationships between community SANPP, and clonal and foliar traits; values were aggregated at the community level to include relative abundance of different species. Parameters represent the regression slope, the slope significance (*P*-value) and the proportion of variance accounted for by the regression (*R*²). *N* = 70.

Aggregated trait values	Regression		
	Slope	R ²	<i>P</i> -value
Clonal traits			
Connection number	-0.05	0.44	< 0.001
Maximal connection length	-0.04	0.39	< 0.001
Proportion of caespitose ramets	4.00	0.41	< 0.001
Foliar traits			
LDMC	-0.01	0.31	< 0.001
SLA	0.19	0.06	0.02

Table 6. Relationship between individual RGR, and clonal or foliar traits in the combined species set. Parameters represent the regression slope, the slope significance (*P*-value) and the proportion of variance accounted for by the regression (*R*²). *N* = 117.

Aggregated trait values	Regression		
	Slope	R ²	<i>P</i> -value
Clonal traits			
Connection number	9.08.10 ⁻⁵	0.31	< 0.001
Maximal connection length	2.14.10 ⁻⁴	0.20	< 0.001
Proportion of caespitose ramets	-0.02	0.39	< 0.001
Foliar traits			
LDMC	-3.53.10 ⁻⁶	0.01	ns
SLA	6.20.10 ⁻⁴	0.15	< 0.001

Discussion

Are clonal traits better predictors of production function than foliar traits at the community scale?

Relationships between community SANPP, and the three clonal traits were highly significant, demonstrating the number and maximal connection length, and proportion of caespitose ramets should be considered effect traits for ecosystem production. The three traits accounted for a

higher proportion of community SANPP variance than foliar traits. These results were independent of potential relationships between species clonal and foliar traits in ten of the twelve study species: correlations between clonal and foliar traits were either not significant, or correlated traits did not exhibit concordant effects on SANPP. In *B. pinnatum* and *H. lanatus*, the connection number was positively correlated with LDMC. However, this relationship alone does not explain the effect of the connection number on

SANPP at the community level, given mean relative abundance of *B. pinnatum* and *H. lanatus* in the different community types.

Clonal traits have an earlier influence than foliar traits in plant foraging strategies by determining ramet positioning (de Kroon and Hutchings, 1995; Huber et al., 1999). These traits subsequently affect foliar trait efficiency in resource acquisition, eliciting longer-term effects on community productivity. Optimal positioning of resource acquiring structures is indeed an important determinant for species success in grassland communities, as vegetation is organized in a single stratum resulting in intense competition for light. Ramet positioning away from competitors allows for maximizing resource acquisition, and enhancing ramet growth and survival, since asymmetric competition always favors taller individuals (Goldberg and Landa, 1991; Huber and Wiggerman, 1997).

In addition, the three clonal traits accounted for similar proportions of SANPP variance. Results indicated the two processes characterized by these traits, namely spatial exploration and local consolidation, are equally involved in plant foraging strategies and community productivity.

Consistency of the relationship between clonal traits and biomass production at different ecological scales

The relationship between clonal traits and biomass production were significant at each ecological scale we evaluated. However, the relationship sign was inverted between the individual and community levels. Individual RGR was

indeed enhanced by a high connection number, high maximal connection length, and low proportion of caespitose ramets. However, an inverse relationship was observed in clonal traits values, which maximized community SANPP. The relationship sign between SANPP and clonal traits therefore provides information on the modifications in the resource acquisition processes due to competitive interactions. Indeed, optimal positioning of resource acquiring structures differs in the presence or absence of competitors because of the trade-off between space colonization and resistance to competitors faced by horizontal growth. In unoccupied areas, clonal individuals that exhibit a dispersed growth form (many connections of long length) increase their biomass more rapidly than those with an aggregated growth form (high proportion of caespitose ramets) (Humphrey and Pike, 1998; Cheplick and Gutierrez, 2000). Indeed, dispersed architecture decreases intraclonal competition, and maximizes spatial exploration. Alternatively, an aggregated growth form increases biomass production under competitive conditions, because it increases local resource acquisition (Schmid, 1990; Cheplick, 1997), and favors local exclusion of competitors (de Kroon and Schieving, 1990).

Using clonal traits in functional ecology

Our study demonstrated that clonal traits (i) influence more the production function than foliar traits, and (ii) provide information on competitive interactions mediated by resource acquisition processes. Therefore, clonal traits are of interest in functional ecology to link community structure and function, particularly because clonality is shared by

70% of temperate grassland species (van Groenendael and de Kroon, 1990; Stöcklin and Winkler, 2004). A simple way to proceed would be to use clonal traits from databases. However, these remain scarce (but see CLO-PLA3, Klimeš and Klimešová, 1999), which emphasizes the necessity to invest additional research to develop clonal trait databases.

Clonal trait values displayed by species would depend on the competitive filters occurring within a plant community (Marcuvitz and Turkington, 2000; Callaway et al., 2003). Further study should include the intraspecific trait variability due to plasticity. Jung et al. (2010) provided evidence that intraspecific trait variability in foliar traits increased detection of habitat filtering, and niche differentiation processes. If the methodology is applied to clonal traits, the resulting information on clonal trait value distribution in different communities may be used as a competition intensity indicator among individuals (Mc Gill et al., 2006).

Acknowledgements

The authors thank D. Goldberg and T. Herben for interesting discussions on this study; J. Schultz for English review; N. Renaud, F. Nassur and G. Bouger for assistance with data collection. This project benefited from a grant ANR-08-SYSC-012 from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (France).

~ Chapitre 4 ~

Application à la mise en place des bandes enherbées dans
les paysages agricoles

	Préface	... page 185
Article I	– Field margin plant communities: importance of the occurring clonal growth strategies for water quality preservation	... page 189

PREFACE

1. OBJECTIFS DU CHAPITRE 4

Ce travail de thèse a porté sur (i) l'étude des mécanismes de structuration spatiale des communautés végétales de prairie et sur (ii) la relation entre les traits caractérisant la colonisation spatiale des espèces et la fonction de production de ces communautés. Dans ce dernier chapitre, l'objectif est d'étudier la relation entre traits et fonction dans le cadre appliqué de la mise en place d'un système prairial particulier *i.e.* la bande enherbée.

En effet, en réponse au déclin actuel de la qualité de l'environnement (*e.g.* perte de qualité des eaux, érosion de la biodiversité) notamment lié à l'intensification de l'agriculture (de Snoo, 1999), la Politique Agricole Commune impose aux agriculteurs de laisser des bandes enherbées d'une largeur de 5 m minimum, en marge de leurs parcelles cultivées, le long des cours d'eau (Burel & Baudry, 1999; Marshall & Moonen, 2002). Mises en place dans un objectif d'amélioration de la qualité de l'eau en régions agricoles, ces bandes enherbées remplissent un rôle de limitation de la quantité de polluants se déversant dans les cours d'eau, en limitant le ruissellement de surface et en prélevant les ressources nutritives en excès. Ces bandes enherbées se sont également avérées bénéfiques pour la préservation de la biodiversité en constituant des corridors écologiques ou des habitats refuges pour un grand nombre d'espèces animales ou végétales (Davis et al., 1994 ; Lowrance et al., 1997 ; Lagerlöf et al., 1992). La capacité des bandes enherbées à remplir ces fonctions dépendrait de la composition de leur couvert végétal. Pourtant, les agriculteurs ne disposent pas de recommandations de semis leur permettant de maximiser la qualité des fonctions remplies par les bandes enherbées.

La préservation de la qualité de l'eau passe par la limitation des écoulements de surface et par la prise en nutriments du sol par les plantes. L'efficacité de la communauté des bandes enherbées à remplir cette fonction dépendrait donc de la capacité des espèces à exploiter la ressource et de l'arrangement spatial, en particulier de la densité, de leurs individus déterminant leur effet mécanique sur les flux d'eau. Chez une majorité d'espèces prairiales (van Groenendael & de Kroon, 1990), ces paramètres dépendent essentiellement de leurs stratégies de colonisation spatiale par croissance clonale. Nous faisons donc

l'hypothèse que ces stratégies interviennent dans l'efficacité de la bande enherbée à soutenir la fonction de préservation de la qualité de l'eau au sein des paysages agricoles.

Ce chapitre vise à établir :

- ✓ Quelle est la part des espèces clonales et de leurs stratégies de colonisation dans la composition des bandes enherbées *in situ* ? (Article VII)
- ✓ Quel type de semis des bandes enherbées serait optimal pour maximiser leur efficacité à soutenir la fonction de préservation de la qualité de l'eau ? (Article VII)

2. DEMARCHES MISES EN ŒUVRE

Les travaux présentés dans ce chapitre reposent sur deux approches complémentaires : l'exploitation d'une base de données de relevés floristiques effectués sur les bandes enherbées de la Zone Atelier Armorique (Bretagne, Ouest de la France) et une approche expérimentale visant à tester l'efficacité de plusieurs assemblages d'espèces pour les fonctions de ces bandes enherbées, notamment pour les paramètres associés à la préservation de la qualité de l'eau.

La composition des bandes enherbées intégrées à la Zone Atelier Armorique (*cf.* partie 4. de la Méthodologie) a été déterminée en 2007 au sein de neuf quadrats rectangulaires ($2 \times 0.5 \text{ m}^2$) disposés en trois transects transversaux à la bande enherbée. L'occurrence de chaque espèce au sein de ces quadrats a été notée. Ces espèces ont ensuite été classées selon leur cycle de vie et pour les espèces clonales selon leurs stratégies de croissance.

Les données issues de ces relevés *in situ* ont permis d'établir la composition de six communautés expérimentales cultivées en mésocosmes (dispositif présenté en 2.1. partie Méthodologie). Ces communautés diffèrent par le nombre et la nature des stratégies de croissance clonales en présence (guérilla et/ou cespiteuse) et par le nombre d'espèces représentant ces stratégies (une ou quatre). L'aptitude de ces communautés à soutenir la fonction de préservation de la qualité de l'eau a été évaluée au travers de trois paramètres

(limitation du ruissellement de surface, prélèvement des nutriments du sol et quantité de nutriments encore présents dans le sol), eux-mêmes caractérisés par plusieurs indicateurs.

3. PRINCIPAUX RESULTATS

Nos résultats démontrent qu'*in situ*, la composition des communautés est homogène entre toutes les bandes enherbées échantillonnées. Les espèces clonales sont largement dominantes puisqu'elles représentent en moyenne 80% des espèces observées. Les espèces à stratégies de croissance guérilla et cespiteuse sont les plus largement représentées.

Les cultures menées en mésocosmes révèlent que la quantité de nutriments dans le sol n'est pas dépendante de la communauté végétale sus-jacente, à l'inverse de la limitation du flux de surface et de l'absorption des nutriments du sol. Ces deux paramètres sont influencés par la richesse spécifique de la communauté et par sa composition en termes de stratégies de croissance clonale. Sur la base des paramètres considérés dans cette étude, il semble que la communauté végétale la mieux adaptée à la préservation de la qualité de l'eau corresponde à l'assemblage d'espèces guérillas et cespiteuses le plus riche (huit espèces) permettant des phénomènes de complémentarités fonctionnelles entre espèces.

Cette étude pourrait être approfondie par des travaux associant plusieurs fonctions, notamment afin de prendre en compte les éventuelles incompatibilités entre elles. Il s'agirait également de prendre en compte le positionnement spatial des bandes enherbées au sein des paysages agricoles car il semble que celui-ci ne soit pas optimal pour permettre de recevoir les eaux de ruissellement des parcelles (Deschamps, unpublished). Une approche spatiale complémentaire pourrait ainsi permettre de calculer l'efficacité d'une bande enherbée à préserver la qualité de l'eau. Cette fonction pouvant présenter des incompatibilités avec d'autres fonctions telle que la conservation de la biodiversité (un couvert composé d'espèces clonales est peu propice à la germination de propagules extérieures par exemple), il s'agira alors de détecter les risques locaux les plus importants afin de conseiller les agriculteurs sur les modalités de mise en place de leurs bandes enherbées maximisant leur efficacité.

Field margin plant communities: importance of the occurring clonal growth strategies for water quality preservation

A.-K. Bittebiere¹, C. Mony¹, A. Ernoult¹, B. Clément¹

¹UMR 6553 Ecobio, CNRS - University of Rennes 1, Av. du Général Leclerc, 35042 Rennes Cedex, France

Article Informations	Abstract
<p><i>Article history:</i></p> <p>In prep.</p> <hr/> <p><i>Keywords:</i></p> <p>Field margin sampling</p> <p>Mesocosm experiment</p> <p>Nutrient uptake</p> <p>Surface water flow</p>	<p>In the current context of environmental quality erosion, the common agricultural policy imposed the set-up of field margins between cultures and adjacent rivers on farmers. These can indeed buffer movements of pollutants and thus help to preserve water quality. This function relies on the functioning of their plant community, which may depend on their specific composition. However, farmers do not dispose of any recommendations on the initial sowing to use. Water quality preservation relies both on surface water flow limitation and plant nutrient uptake, which are related to the spatial arrangement and density of stems. These are determined by the plant clonal growth strategies. We thus hypothesized that clonal growth strategies occurring on field margins are involved in their ability to preserve water quality. We first characterized the composition of field margins in terms of clonal growth strategies in the LTER Armorique site. Second, we tested the ability of six clonal plant assemblages cultivated in mesocosms to preserve water quality using a combination of indicators. We demonstrated that in situ, field margin communities were homogeneous and largely dominated by clonal plant species displaying guerilla or caespitose strategies. Experimental cultures showed that the community composition in terms of clonal plant strategies influenced surface water flow limitation and the nutrient uptake. On the basis of these two parameters, water quality preservation was enhanced by the presence of a species rich community with a combination of guerilla and caespitose species allowing for functional complementarities. This study emphasized the need of considering plant traits to compose the initial sowing, which would potentially enhance field margin functions.</p>

Introduction

Nature declines on many aspects (biodiversity erosion, water quality loss...) with no exception within cultivable areas mainly because of the intensification of agricultural operations (de Snoo, 1999). To recover some environmental quality, the common agricultural policy of 2005 at first, imposed to farmers the creation of linear grassy structures along crops. These agri-environmental measures have been enhanced in the following directive on

water quality. These field margins have to be of a minimum width of five meters and are mostly composed of herbaceous species. They have been settled because of their positive effects on nature (Burel & Baudry, 1999) especially on water quality (Davis et al., 1994). Others secondary functions are associated to these new systems such as limiting soil erosion (Lowrance et al., 1997; Sovell et al., 2000), preserving biodiversity (Barr et al., 1993; Verboom & Huitema, 1997; Vickery & Fuller, 1998) or ensuring biological

connectivity of semi-natural systems for organism dispersal (Hinsley & Bellamy, 2000). However, managers (i.e. farmers) only have little information on the initial sowing to use, although it has been largely demonstrated that the species composition of an ecosystem has substantial effects on its functioning (Hooper & Vitousek, 1997; 1998; Symstad et al., 1998).

Water preservation may be promoted by different processes such as the limitation of the surface water flow, the microbiological activity in the soil and the nutrient uptake by plants during their growth (van Beek et al., 2007). Despite a lack in a global study taking into account all these parameters, field margins have been shown to be of primary importance on some aspects of these processes. For instance, Borin & Bigon (2002) showed that field margins are responsible for nitrate abatement in surface waters so that nitrate quantity at the exit never exceeded 2 ppm. The impact of the vegetation composition have been little studied and authors generally opposed woody field margins to herbaceous ones (Lowrance & Sheridan, 2005). However, in most agricultural areas, newly set-up field margins are herbaceous and we argue that their species composition should be determinant for their functioning.

The efficiency of the field margin plant community to support the function of water quality preservation depends partly on its ability to limit the surface water flow and to deplete soil nutrients through biomass production (Borin & Bigon, 2002; Hefting & de Klein, 1998). Both may depend on the density of stems which may have a mechanic impact on water flow and on their spatial arrangement determining

the positioning of nutrient acquiring structures (density and relative positioning of roots). Herbaceous species in temperate plant communities are mostly clonal (van Groenendael & de Kroon, 1990) presenting a network structure whose architecture depends on the species growth strategy (Lovett Doust, 1981). These strategies determine the species ability to locally exploit resources and to cover soil. Space colonization is enhanced by a loose horizontal architecture with long connections characterizing the guerilla strategy. By contrasts, the caespitose strategy promotes the local exploitation of resources through an aggregated clonal network (highly branched with short interramet distances) (Schmidt, 1985; Cheplick, 1997). We thus argue that clonal growth strategies occurring within the community may determine the field margin efficiency for water preservation.

Through two complementary approaches of field survey and experimentation, this study aims at determining practical recommendations for the setting-up of field margins, independently of species composition but rather founded on their biological traits. We first characterized field margin vegetation cover in the LTER Armorique site to estimate the part of clonal species and their growth strategies. These data were used to establish six types of clonal species assemblages cultivated in mesocosms. These were evaluated and compared on the basis of three processes that are (i) the limitation of surface water flow, (ii) the ability to take nutrient, and (iii) the resulting nutrient quantity in the soil.

Field margin communities

Field margins sampling

In 2007, i.e. two years after their setting-up, 48 field margins located within the LTER Armorique site (48° 36' N, 1° 32' W, Brittany, Western France) were studied. Vegetation cover composition was assessed within $2 \times 0.5 \text{ m}^2$ rectangular quadrates disposed along three transects, of three quadrates each. These transects were positioned at 50 m from each others, transversally to the field margin. The occurrence of each species was recorded within all quadrates (presence/absence data) to assess species abundance on the field margin (i.e. number of quadrates within the field margin where the species is present). The species total number of occurrence was calculated as the sum of its occurrences on all sampled field margins.

Characterization of field margin communities

Plant communities were similar between all sampled field margins (Correspondence Factorial Analysis, results not shown; [Ernault et al., rev.](#)) with a main species richness per field margin of 9.04 (± 2.05). Thirteen species occurred on at least 50% of the sampled field margins (Table 1).

We first classified all occurring species according to their lifetime (annual vs. clonal species) and then sub-classified all clonal species on the basis of their clonal growth organs (CGO) to separate those with a network growth form and stem-derived organs with a plagiotropic growth (CGO 9, 10, 11) from others. Biannual species were considered as clonal. To assess the clonal strategy of the species, we used the annual lateral spread which is categorized into: $< 0.01 \text{ m.y}^{-1}$ for

Table 1. List of species occurring on at least 50% (i.e. 24) of the sampled field margins.

Species	Number of FM where observed	Total number of occurrence
<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>	42	208
<i>Calystegia sepium</i>	37	152
<i>Dactylis glomerata</i>	38	157
<i>Hedera helix</i>	24	45
<i>Holcus lanatus</i>	45	238
<i>Lolium multiflorum</i>	34	178
<i>Lolium perenne</i>	44	259
<i>Poa trivialis</i>	40	201
<i>Ranunculus repens</i>	44	219
<i>Rubus fruticosus</i>	36	67
<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	33	91
<i>Trifolium repens</i>	43	215
<i>Urtica dioïca</i>	34	73

Notes: FM field margin.

caespitose, 0.01-0.25 m.y⁻¹ for phalanx, > 0.25 m.y⁻¹ for guerilla. Information about species CGO or annual lateral spread was derived from the clonal trait database CLO-PLA (Klimeš & Klimešová, 1999).

Experimental evaluation of field margin covers

This experiment aims at evaluating the ability of different plant communities to support the field margin function of water quality preservation.

Experimental set-up

- Plant material

Guerilla and caespitose species were largely dominant on field margins in situ. We thus focus on these two strategies and selected four species to represent them, among the most commonly occurring ones (Table 1). Each clonal strategy included one dicotyledon, and three monocotyledons. When necessary, species that were not represented on 50% of the sampled field margins were used: *Centaurea nigra*, *Elytrigia repens* and *Holcus mollis*. *C. nigra* was the only caespitose dicotyledonous species observed and *E. repens* and *H. mollis* were locally abundant in situ. Individuals were sampled from field margins of the LTER Armorique site in April 2009 and were of standardized size and structure. In guerilla species, clonal individuals were composed

of a ramet (one node, its leaves, and axillary buds) with one internode of connection (Huber et al., 1999; Stuefer & Huber, 1999); three joined ramets forming a tuft were used in caespitose species.

- Experimental design

Six types of community were tested, composed of caespitose species, guerilla species, or both in combination (C, G, GC) with two level of species richness (“1” one species per strategy or “2” four species). These communities were cultivated in experimental mesocosms set up in the experimental garden of the University of Rennes (France) in May 2009. Ten replicates of each community type were randomly positioned in the experimental design, comprising 60 square 1.30 × 1.30 × 0.25 m³ mesocosms. In each mesocosm, 48 clonal individuals were planted on a substrate composed of 20% sand and 80% ground soil, following a hexagonal pattern (Birch et al., 2007). A mineral fertilizer (NPK 20/5/10) was added at the beginning of the experiment to homogenize nutrient conditions within and among all mesocosms. The individuals were equally distributed among co-occurring species, and the position of each species on the plantation pattern was randomized.

The above-ground vegetation of all communities was mown and harvested once per year at the end of the summer. All culture units were watered only during the dry periods, and weeds were manually

Table 2. Species representing each clonal growth strategy.

	Guerilla (G)	Caespitose (C)
Monocotyledon	<i>Elytrigia repens</i> L. <i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> L. <i>Holcus mollis</i> L.	<i>Lolium perenne</i> L. <i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L. <i>Holcus lanatus</i> L.
Dicotyledon	<i>Ranunculus repens</i> L.	<i>Centaurea nigra</i> L.

removed. Flowers were cut-off to avoid seed dispersal and thus species contaminations between adjacent mesocosms.

Evaluation of plant communities through simple functional indicators linked with water preservation

The six types of community were compared on the basis of their ability to support the field margin function of water quality preservation. This function was evaluated through easily measurable indicators in early fall 2010, right before the beginning of the maximal rainfall period, during which risks of nitrate and phosphate leaching are the highest. Field and experimentation data were collected at comparable community maturation stages (i.e. 1.5 to 2 years after the initial sowing). For all indicator measurements, the outermost 10 cm of mesocosms were excluded to avoid edge effects.

- Limitation of surface water flow

To measure the capacity of the six types of community to limit surface water flow, which may participate to pollutant movement, we recorded two indicators: the time needed to reach cover saturation and the percentage of bare soil in October 2010. We assumed that the field margin had the highest efficiency when time for soil covering was short and the percentage of remaining bare soil was low. To assess the time needed to reach cover saturation, the percentage of species cover was recorded each week and we considered it saturated when it reaches 90%. The number of days since the date of individual plantation was then calculated. The percentage of bare soil corresponded to the soil part where no individuals rooted i.e.

any consideration of the canopy covering since it is not involved in the limitation of the surface water flow.

- Nutrient uptake

Biomass production can be used as an indirect measurement of plant nutrient uptake: the greater the biomass production, the higher the nutrient uptake, especially in prairie plant species (Crick & Grime, 1987). In October 2010, we mowed the aboveground vegetation of each mesocosm and weighed it to measure fresh mass. A subsample was immediately collected and weighed before and after drying at 65°C for 48h to determine vegetation dry mass.

- Soil nutrient quantity

To evaluate the ability of the six types of community to improve water quality, the quantities of soil nitrates (NO_3^-) and phosphates (PO_4^{2-}) were measured in all mesocosms at two dates: in November 2010 (t_1) and in March 2011 (t_2). At each date, five soil samples were collected per mesocosm and mixed together to obtain a single homogeneous sample. The 60 soil samples were then sieved at 2 mm to eliminate larger soil particles and organism fragments. Nitrates and phosphates were respectively extracted with a KCl and a NaHCO_3 solution and their quantities were measured by colorimetric determination. Within each mesocosm, nitrate quantity was finally corrected by the soil humidity rate determined by weighing a fraction of each soil sample before and after drying at 105°C. Because quantities of soil nitrate and phosphate are highly variable, we calculated the mean values of t_1 and t_2 and used these means in our data analyses. We assumed that the field margin had the highest efficiency when quantities of remaining soil nutrients were low.

Data analysis

To evaluate the proportion of clonal vs. annual plant species, and of clonal plant growth strategies, we used Chisquare tests comparing field percentages with a theoretical equal distribution of values. These field percentages were calculated as proportions of the number of occurring species (specific richness) and of the total number of occurrences (species abundance).

Second, effects of the type of community (1C, 1G, 1GC, 2C, 2G, 2GC) on field margin function indicators were assessed by ANOVA using linear (LM) procedures in R 2.10.0. When ANOVA assumptions (homoscedasticity and normality of the model residuals) were not satisfied, data were log transformed or Kruskal Wallis tests were performed. If a significant effect of the type of community was detected, differences in mean indicator values were determined using Tukey HSD post-hoc tests except when non-parametric. Mann-Whitney tests were then used with a Bonferroni correction to control for multiple comparisons.

Results

Clonal composition of field margin communities in situ

Field margin communities were highly dominated by clonal species compared to annuals in terms of both species number ($\chi^2 = 15.47$, $df = 1$, $P\text{-value} = 8.37.10^{-5}$) and abundance ($\chi^2 = 22.34$, $df = 1$, $P\text{-value} = 2.28.10^{-6}$). Significant differences between clonal growth strategies

were also found when considering either species number ($\chi^2 = 41.47$, $df = 3$, $P\text{-value} = 5.19.10^{-9}$) and abundance ($\chi^2 = 44.80$, $df = 3$, $P\text{-value} = 1.02.10^{-9}$). Clonal species mostly displayed a network form with stem-derived organs and for these, guerilla and caespitose growth strategies were largely dominant (Table 3).

Experimental evaluation of the ability of different communities to preserve water quality

The type of community had a significant effect on the bare soil and the delay to reach cover saturation (Table 4). Bare soil was maximal in the caespitose communities 1C and 2C (Fig. 1a). The delay for cover saturation was the longest in community 1G with *Elymus repens* and the shortest in communities 2C and 2GC (Fig. 1b). The biomass production also depends on the type of community. Communities 2C and 2GC were the most productive whereas community 1C with *Lolium perenne* had the weakest biomass production (Fig. 1f). No effect of the type of community was found on the nitrate and phosphate quantities.


Comparing the six types of community on the basis of their ability to support the function of water quality preservation, community 2GC, which was the most diverse and comprising both guerilla and caespitose species, appeared the optimal one (Table 5). Communities 1C and 1G with only one species respectively caespitose or guerilla were the less efficient in supporting the focal function.

Table 3. Clonal characteristics of field margin communities in situ either in terms of species number (specific richness) or total number of occurrences (abundance). Network form characterized species with plagiotropic stems whereas others forms included species with clonal organs derived from roots or with bulbs or tubers. Rare species that never occur more than three times on a field margin were not considered here.


	Annual sp.	Clonal sp.	Network form			Others forms
			Guerilla sp.	Phalanx sp.	Caespitose sp.	
Sp. number						
9.04 (± 2.05)	17.03% (± 11.34)	80.02 % (± 13.12)	45.43 % (± 10.88)	5.86 % (± 8.27)	46.66 % (± 10.54)	3.07 % (± 6.27)
Tot. nb. of occurrences						
48.90 (± 12.71)	12.92% (± 9.78)	87.08 % (± 9.78)	42.05 % (± 13.49)	5.29 % (± 8.13)	50.44 % (± 13.38)	2.22 % (± 5.45)

Notes: sp. species; tot. total; nb: number.

Limitation of surface water flow



Nutrient uptake



Soil nutrient quantity




Figure 1. Mean (+ SD) indicators of the water quality preservation function supported by the six types of community: (a) bare soil, (b) delay to reach cover saturation, (c) biomass production, (d) phosphate quantity, (e) nitrate quantity. Different letters above the bars indicate significant differences in trait means between community types (Tukey HSD and Mann-Whitney post-hoc tests).

Table 4. Comparison of indicator values between the six types of community. When significant differences were detected, Tukey HSD post-hoc tests were performed (Fig. 1).

Indicator	Test	Type of community		
		df	F or χ^2	P-value
Limitation of surface water flow				
Bare soil	Kruskal Wallis	5	$\chi^2 = 46.30$	***
Delay to reach cover saturation †	ANOVA	5	F = 40.41	***
Nutrient uptake				
Biomass production †	ANOVA	5	F = 20.21	***
Soil nutrient quantity				
Nitrate quantity	ANOVA	5	F = 1.30	ns
Phosphate quantity	ANOVA	5	F = 0.69	ns

Notes: † log transformation. asterisks indicate significant difference: * P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; ns not significant.

Table 5. Evaluation of the different types of community on the basis of the three parameters characterizing the function of water quality preservation. The marks relied on the results of the post-hoc tests given on Fig. 1. Efficiency levels: 3 highest efficiency; 2: intermediate efficiency; 1: lowest efficiency; ns no significant difference between the types of community for the indicator.

Parameter	Indicator	1C	1G	1GC	2C	2G	2GC
Limitation of surface water flow	Bare soil	2	3	3	2	3	3
	Delay to reach cover saturation	2.5	1	2	3	2	3
Nutrient uptake	Biomass production	1	2	2	3	2	3
Soil nutrient quantity	Nitrate quantity	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
	Phosphate quantity	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

Discussion

Composition of field margin communities in situ

As grasslands (van Groenendael & de Kroon, 1990), field margin communities of the LTER Armorique site were largely dominated by clonal species. These mostly displayed either a guerilla or a caespitose growth strategy, phalanx being poorly represented. This observation may support the hypothesis that plant coexistence may be favored in presence of species with contrasted vegetative mobility (Schmid &

Harper, 1985; Herben et al., 1994b; Moora et al., 2009). Guerilla species are highly mobile, colonizing space rapidly. Nevertheless, in the long term, their ramet mortality creates available patches for the growth of caespitose species with a slow radial expansion but a high local persistence (Wildová et al., 2007). Guerilla species maximize their probability of meeting a competitor with lower competitive ability through their high mobility. For phalanx species however, their spread is too slow to colonize space efficiently and their ramets are not packed enough to defend their clonal territory

from guerilla species intrusions, which may lead to their progressive exclusion from the community. Within the guerilla species however, undesirable species such as *Rubus fruticosus* and *Urtica dioica* were noticed. Their growth strategy enabled them to colonize field margins from the edge and the management of these systems is a source of disturbance that creates available patches for their propagation. This highlights that plant clonal growth is also involved in the function of resistance against weed species, which has to be taken into account. This is a key element for the management of these systems which are set up for five to ten years as temporary grasslands. Plant community composition should be stable over time to limit management efforts.

Efficiency of the different types of community to preserve water quality

Our results demonstrated that the plant community composition and especially the colonization traits of the species in mixture are determinant for its ability to support two out of the three parameters characterizing the water quality preservation function. The nutrient uptake characterized by the biomass production was overall higher in more diverse communities as suggested already by the work of [Tilman et al. \(2001\)](#) but with also a strong importance of the strategy. Indeed, in more diverse communities, probabilities of having species, of which resource requirements are distributed in time, are enhanced ([Tilman et al., 2001](#)). Moreover species may display different rooting systems which can vary in length or structure, allowing them to explore and to exploit different soil layers. The nutrient uptake was also enhanced by the presence

of caespitose species, which are particularly efficient in locally exploiting resources ([Lovett Doust, 1981](#); [Humphrey & Pike, 1998](#)). Indeed, they mostly invest in the development of resource acquiring organs and there are particularly efficient to retain available nutrients ([Derner & Briske, 1999](#)). Nevertheless, most productive communities do not correspond to those which best occupy space. The delay to reach cover saturation (i.e. full development of the canopy) was longer in communities with only guerilla species. This may be explained by their highest investment in connection structures at the expense of ramet production compared to caespitose species. However their space colonization is more efficient and drastically limits the presence of bare soil. Surprisingly, the soil nutrient quantity was not affected by the plant community composition although species are known to differ in their aptitudes to take soil nutrients ([Weigelt et al., 2005](#); [Miller et al., 2007](#)). Complementary analyses with more regular sampling of soil nutrient concentrations and on a longer term may be necessary.

The most efficient community in supporting the function of water quality preservation included both guerilla and caespitose species and was the most diverse (height species). Because different species were able to support different parameters of water quality preservation, having them all suppress compromises. Guerilla species ensure the maintenance of community cover, limiting surface water flow, while caespitose species efficiently exploit resources. Considering that in situ field margin composition is close from this one, we can assume that they should be theoretically efficient in preserving water quality within agricultural landscapes.

Nevertheless, field margin functions that have not been considered here, such as the conservation of plant species biodiversity, may be incompatible with the preservation of water quality. Indeed, sowing a field margin with perennials only, will suppress available sites for external seed germination (Winkler & Stöcklin, 2002; Stöcklin & Winkler, 2004) and increase competition, resulting in poor offspring survival especially in annual species (Winkler & Fisher, 2002). These are nevertheless particularly important to preserve biodiversity, in particular insect populations. This suggests that little adjustments in the community composition are needed to conciliate water quality and biodiversity preservation.

Optimizing field margin management

The theoretical efficiency of field margins to support the preservation of water quality, depends on the surrounding landscape characteristics, in particular those of the catchment basin they belong to. Indeed, volumes of leaching water and the orientation of their flow are under the influence of landscape features such as the presence of hedgerows or permanent pastures, the soil nature, the topography and the presence of urban elements (e.g. road, building). Moreover, previous study showed that field margins may not be efficient unless its hydrology regime allows suitable environment for denitrification or plant uptake (Leeds-Harrison et al., 1999) suggesting that its position within the basin is fundamental.

All these features should be then included in a risk diagnosis to help managers to optimize the composition of their field margins and their positions within the basin to increase their efficiency (Correll, 2005).

Management practices may also have substantial effects on the function of water quality preservation supported by field margins either directly (e.g. mown biomass exportation prevents nutrient return in soil) or indirectly, through their influence on plant community dynamics (Zobel et al., 1996; Collins et al., 1998) or clonal growth (Sammul et al., 2004). Optimizing management practices should thus also help to maximize field margin functions. An experiment involving managers (i.e. farmers) is currently running within the LTER Armorique site to determine how the mixture we design will evolve in real landscapes with a late mowing (occurring at the end of summer). Involving managers may also help to raise their awareness of the importance of management practices for the efficiency of the field margin and make a bridge between theoretical research and its application.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank N. Renaud, P. François and A. Deschamps for assistance with data collection. This research project was supported by the LTER Armorique site and benefited from a grant ANR-08-SYSC-012 from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (France).

~ Discussion Générale ~

Du clone à l'écosystème

La clonalité : un mécanisme clé de formation des patrons spatiaux	... page 205
Des composantes de l'architecture clonale sous influence de la compétition	... page 207
Les traits clonaux : des traits d'effet	... page 211
Des communautés végétales au paysage	... page 213
Conclusion et perspectives	... page 214

Cette thèse porte sur l'étude de la dynamique des communautés végétales d'espèces à croissance clonale en se focalisant sur les règles d'assemblage spatial des espèces.

En réponse aux objectifs de travail définis en introduction (partie I.2.) :

- (i) nous avons établi comment la clonalité influence la dynamique des communautés de plantes au travers de la formation des patrons spatiaux
- (ii) nous avons déterminé comment les caractéristiques de l'environnement compétitif influencent la réponse plastique de la plante clonale et quels traits de la plante déterminent son efficacité.
- (iii) nous avons mis en évidence une relation entre les traits clonaux et la fonction de production au sein des communautés végétales justifiant que ceux-ci puissent être utilisés comme traits d'effet en écologie fonctionnelle.
- (iv) ces connaissances théoriques ont été réinvesties dans le cadre appliqué de la mise en place des bandes enherbées dans le paysage agricole.

Les résultats détaillés dans les différents chapitres permettent d'établir des liens entre des processus opérant à l'échelle du clone (interactions compétitives, acquisition des ressources, foraging...) et les phénomènes observés à des niveaux d'intégration biologique supérieurs (communauté, écosystème). Ils soulèvent également de nouvelles perspectives de travail sur la dynamique et le fonctionnement des communautés de plantes à croissance clonale. Ces principaux résultats sont présentés par la Figure 1.




Figure 1. Articulation des principaux résultats de la thèse. [1] chapitre ; [II] article.

1. LA CLONALITE : UN MECANISME CLE DE FORMATION DES PATRONS SPATIAUX

1.1. Importance des stratégies de croissance clonale

Considérant l'importance de la structuration spatiale des communautés végétales pour leur dynamique (Silvertown et al., 1992 ; Bolker & Pacala, 1997 ; Stoll & Prati, 2001), déterminer comment s'opère la formation des patrons spatiaux constitue probablement l'un des éléments essentiels pour la compréhension de leurs règles d'assemblage (Herben & Hara, 2003). Pourtant, après plus d'un demi-siècle depuis les travaux fondateurs de Watt (1947) (*Pattern and process in the plant community*), il n'existe toujours pas de consensus concernant la nature des processus conduisant à la formation de ces patrons spatiaux. Il est néanmoins suggéré que les processus de dispersion et en particulier la croissance clonale, pourraient agréger les individus à échelle fine (Herben & Hara, 2003), bien qu'il n'y ait encore que peu de littérature disponible sur ce sujet.

Notre étude, menée à l'échelle des interactions entre modules, a permis de valider cette hypothèse. Au sein d'un système où les individus étaient initialement positionnés de façon aléatoire et leur production de graines supprimée, la croissance clonale seule a été à l'origine de la mise en place d'une structuration de la communauté végétale. Les résultats démontrent, en dépit d'un effet espèce marqué, que les stratégies de croissance clonale des individus déterminent la structure de la communauté à échelle fine (de l'ordre de quelques centimètres), générant une diversité de patrons spatiaux (Article II).

Les stratégies de croissance clonale des espèces étant définies sur la base de leurs traits clonaux (Lovett Doust, 1981 ; Schmid & Harper, 1985), il apparaît que ces traits pourraient être utilisés comme des indicateurs des patrons spatiaux permettant (i) d'établir un lien entre les caractéristiques architecturales et les patrons spatiaux (Bell, 1984 ; Herben & Hara, 2003) et (ii) d'identifier les processus influençant les patrons spatiaux au travers de ceux déterminant les valeurs des traits clonaux. Il n'existe encore que très peu de travaux étudiant comment la plasticité, impliquée dans la croissance clonale, pourrait affecter la structure et la dynamique de la communauté végétale (Zobel et al., 2010).

Ainsi, si les hiérarchies des patrons spatiaux en fonction de la stratégie de croissance clonale de l'espèce sont conservées, les caractéristiques de ces patrons sont

modulées par l'environnement compétitif et plus précisément par les stratégies de croissance clonale des compétiteurs ([Article II](#)). Ce résultat suggère un rôle important de la plasticité clonale pour la formation des patrons spatiaux des espèces.

En complément de ce travail, une étude est actuellement en cours, visant à déterminer si la coexistence locale est également liée aux stratégies de croissance des espèces en présence, celles-ci pouvant s'agréger ou se ségréger par rapport à leurs voisins en fonction de leur stratégie de croissance clonale. Notre hypothèse est qu'il pourrait y avoir des phénomènes de complémentarités spatiales favorisant la coexistence locale d'espèces à stratégies contrastées. Cette hypothèse a été testée sur sept types de communautés végétales expérimentales (dispositif présenté en 2.1. partie Méthodologie), comprenant des espèces phalanges, guérillas et cespiteuses. Les positions relatives des espèces ont été établies par cartographie de ces communautés. L'analyse de ces données via une méthode de type « point pattern », similaire à celle présentée dans l'[Article II](#), est actuellement en cours.

L'originalité de cette thèse a été d'étudier l'influence de l'hétérogénéité générée par la végétation elle-même sur la structure de la communauté végétale. L'hétérogénéité intrinsèque de l'environnement est connue pour être un facteur intervenant de façon directe dans la formation des patrons spatiaux ([Kershaw et al., 1963](#) ; [Herben et al., 1993a](#) ; [Herben & Hara, 2003](#)) mais elle pourrait également intervenir de façon indirecte en modifiant les stratégies de croissance clonale des espèces ([de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995](#)) ou en favorisant l'abondance d'une stratégie par rapport à une autre. Ainsi, un système hétérogène est plus favorable à une stratégie de type guérilla ([Lovett Doust, 1981](#) ; [Humphrey & Pike, 1998](#)) dont le patron spatial est caractérisé par une faible agrégation et une forte coexistence locale avec d'autres espèces ([Article II](#)).

En conclusion, la clonalité est un mécanisme intervenant directement ou indirectement dans la formation des patrons spatiaux au sein des communautés végétales et ne peut donc pas être négligée dans les études de leur dynamique, considérant l'importance de la structuration spatiale pour les interactions biotiques ([Silvertown et al., 1992](#) ; [Stoll & Prati, 2001](#)).

1.2. Dynamique temporelle des patrons spatiaux

Sur le long terme, les hiérarchies compétitives entre espèces présentant différentes stratégies de croissance clonale ([Article II](#)) pourraient être bouleversées, modifiant la structure de la communauté végétale. Dans notre système expérimental, les espèces guérillas sont dominantes ce qui est cohérent pour une communauté dont la maturation est encore peu avancée ([Humphrey & Pike, 1998](#)). Cependant, d'après la littérature ([Gough et al., 2002](#)) et nos observations récentes, les espèces phalanges jusque là peu compétitives, devraient progresser. Cette dimension temporelle est difficile à appréhender expérimentalement car elle suppose des études sur le long terme. Nous proposons donc d'utiliser une approche de modélisation basée sur le modèle PRAIRIE, permettant de tester facilement nos hypothèses sur un grand nombre d'assemblages d'espèces. Le modèle dans sa version actuelle ne permet pas de modéliser la croissance des plantes sur plusieurs saisons. Un travail de réflexion sur la modélisation d'un effet année est donc actuellement en cours afin de permettre ce type d'étude.

2. DES COMPOSANTES DE L'ARCHITECTURE CLONALE SOUS INFLUENCE DE LA COMPETITION

2.1. Une stratégie de foraging dépendante de l'identité du compétiteur

De façon à limiter les effets négatifs de la compétition sur leurs performances ([Goldberg & Fleetwood, 1987](#) ; [Goldberg & Landa, 1991](#)), les plantes clonales ont la capacité de positionner leurs modules de façon sélective au sein des patchs les plus favorables, c'est-à-dire les moins peuplés. Ce comportement assimilé à du foraging par analogie avec des observations menées sur les animaux ([Slade & Hutchings, 1987](#) ; [de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995](#) ; [Oborny & Cain, 1997](#)), s'accompagne de modifications plastiques de l'architecture du réseau clonal. Chez les plantes, cette réponse plastique est déclenchée par des stimuli environnementaux de types abiotique (*e.g.* disponibilité en nutriments, ombrage ou changement du R : FR ratio des radiations lumineuses) ([de Kroon & Hutchings, 1995](#) ; [Huber & Stuefer, 1997](#)) ou biotique (*e.g.* perception de systèmes racinaires voisins) ([Huber-Sannwald et al., 1997](#)).

Nous avons montré que les caractéristiques de l'environnement compétitif sont déterminantes pour la mise en place de cette réponse plastique chez les plantes clonales. En particulier, l'identité du compétiteur (*i.e.* l'espèce à laquelle il appartient) module l'amplitude de la réponse des traits clonaux à la compétition, notamment ceux caractérisant le comportement d'exploration du clone (le nombre et la longueur des branches) (Article IV).

Cette adaptation précise du comportement de foraging des plantes suppose que celles-ci sont capables d'acquérir et d'intégrer des informations sur leur environnement. Nous avons montré qu'elles utilisent comme informations la qualité et la variabilité de la ressource, évaluées par échantillonnage successif des différents modules connectés (Article III). En situation de compétition, ces informations sont équivalentes respectivement à l'intensité et à l'hétérogénéité de la compétition puisqu'il existe une corrélation entre la répartition spatiale de la ressource et des compétiteurs (Jackson & Caldwell, 1993; Herben et al., 2000). Ces valeurs d'intensité et d'hétérogénéité de la compétition sont sous l'influence de l'identité du compétiteur expliquant les possibilités de réponses spécifiques de la plante focale. Les premiers travaux sur le sujet, menés par Turkington et al. (1991) sur *Trifolium repens*, avaient montré que le comportement de cette espèce en cultures expérimentales avec différentes herbacées compétitrices, dépendait de l'espèce avec laquelle les clones avaient été auparavant associés *in situ*. La construction d'une expérience compétitive, sur la base de l'intensité et de l'hétérogénéité de la compétition précédemment ressentie par les modules, pourrait expliquer ces observations. En effet, nos travaux démontrent que les décisions comportementales prises au niveau des jeunes modules sont déterminées relativement à l'expérience du clone construite d'après les informations de qualité et de variabilité de l'environnement (Article III).

Plus précisément, nous faisons l'hypothèse qu'au-delà de l'identité spécifique du compétiteur, c'est sa stratégie de croissance clonale qui serait ici pertinente puisqu'elle détermine le positionnement spatial de ses modules et donc les valeurs locales d'intensité et d'hétérogénéité de la compétition. Les résultats déjà obtenus vont dans ce sens : *T. repens* présente en effet une réponse architecturale similaire en présence des deux espèces guérillas utilisées dans nos travaux (*Agrostis stolonifera* et *Elytrigia repens*) (Article IV). Cette hypothèse reste néanmoins à confirmer par une expérience testant la réponse d'une espèce focale à différents compétiteurs présentant des stratégies de

croissance similaires ou en manipulant les valeurs d'intensité et d'hétérogénéité de la compétition au sein d'environnements compétitifs caractérisés par la même identité de compétiteur. Notre hypothèse permettrait de faire le lien entre les processus de foraging opérant au niveau du clone ([Article IV](#)) et les variations de patrons spatiaux observées au niveau de la communauté en fonction des stratégies de croissance clonale des compétiteurs ([Article II](#)) (Figure 2). Ce travail apporte donc de nouveaux éléments alimentant le débat sur l'importance des processus « bottom-up » pour les processus opérant au niveau de la communauté ([Hairston et al. 1960](#); [Bukovinszky et al. 2008](#); [Turkington 2009](#)). Il s'insère dans la lignée de la littérature récente, soulignant l'importance des interactions et des comportements observés aux niveaux de l'individu ou de l'organe, pour les processus opérant aux niveaux de la population ou de la communauté (*e.g.* [Callaway et al., 2003](#) ; [Novoplansky, 2009](#) ; [Herben & Novoplansky, 2010](#)).




Figure 2. Variations des patrons spatiaux en réponse aux stratégies de croissance des compétiteurs : un phénomène s'expliquant par les modifications plastiques d'architecture du clone.

Afin d'approfondir notre étude, la réponse plastique des plantes clonales à des mélanges de plusieurs compétiteurs d'identités différentes, a été testée. En effet, l'importance de la richesse spécifique de la communauté végétale pour le comportement de foraging de ces plantes est mal connue. L'expérimentation a été menée sur deux espèces présentant des stratégies de croissance clonale contrastées, cultivées au sein de cinq environnements compétitifs définissant un gradient de richesse spécifique (de zéro à sept espèces compétitrices). La réponse des espèces a ensuite été mesurée au travers de leurs traits clonaux architecturaux (*e.g.* longueur d'entre-nœud, nombre de branches, nombre de modules cespiteux). Les résultats préliminaires semblent indiquer une modification progressive des traits clonaux le long du gradient de richesse spécifique imposé.

La capacité d'adaptation des plantes clonales en fonction de la composition de leur communauté présente des implications majeures pour la coexistence entre espèces (Callaway et al., 2003). En effet, un développement plastique permettrait aux espèces moins compétitives de se maintenir par réduction des interactions de compétition avec leurs voisins. Ceci permettrait d'expliquer la diversité spécifique particulièrement élevée, observée à échelle fine en prairie (Klimeš, 1999).

2.2. Influence de la compétition sur l'architecture clonale

La compétition influence l'architecture clonale au travers de ses trois composantes : le structural blue-print, l'ontogénie et la plasticité (Huber et al., 1999). Elle agit comme un filtre environnemental, sélectionnant localement les espèces présentant les traits leur permettant de se maintenir dans les conditions qu'elle génère (Lavorel & Garnier, 2002).

Notre étude montre que les performances des clones en situation de compétition dépend (i) du structural blue-print, la compétition sélectionnant des espèces caractérisées par une croissance sympodiale et une faible dominance apicale, mais aussi (ii) de traits réduisant l'importance des processus ontogéniques pour la mise en place de l'architecture de l'individu (Article V). Le caractère adaptatif de la réponse plastique des clones consistant à modifier leur croissance en direction des zones de moindres interférences, dépend de l'intensité de la compétition ; elle n'est avantageuse que pour des densités en compétiteurs peu élevées. De plus, son efficacité est sous la dépendance des mêmes traits que ceux favorisant le succès du clone en situation de compétition. Ce comportement

plastique de réponse conduit à des architectures différentes selon l'intensité de la compétition. A faible densité en compétiteurs, le comportement d'évitement conduit par exemple à une architecture favorisant l'exploration de l'espace, tandis qu'à des densités plus fortes, c'est la résistance à la compétition qui est favorisée, par une architecture permettant l'agrégation des modules ([Article V](#)). Ce phénomène d'agrégation a également été observé à la suite d'un comportement de confrontation ([Herben & Novoplansky, 2010](#)).

Au niveau de l'individu, d'autres facteurs, comme la discrimination de soi *versus* le non-soi ([Herben & Novoplansky, 2008](#)) ou encore l'intégration physiologique ([Herben, 2004](#)), influencent l'architecture clonale. Cependant, ils présentent des implications différentes pour la communauté végétale ([Herben & Novoplansky, 2010](#)). Alors que les comportements de réponse à la compétition favorisent la coexistence d'un nombre plus important de clones, le phénomène de discrimination des modules parents déplace la compétition du niveau des modules à celui des clones, ce qui en retour augmente fortement leur taux d'extinction ([Herben & Novoplansky, 2008 ; 2010](#)).

3. LES TRAITS CLONAUX : DES TRAITS D'EFFETS

Le contexte actuel de changements globaux souligne le besoin urgent d'établir des liens généraux entre la structure et la composition de la communauté et les processus de l'écosystème ([Lavorel & Garnier, 2002 ; Mc Gill et al., 2006](#)). [Lavorel & Garnier \(2002\)](#) ont alors suggéré une approche basée sur les traits d'effets dont l'utilisation s'est ensuite généralisée ([Garnier et al., 2004 ; 2007 ; Vile et al., 2006 ; Pontes et al., 2007](#)).

Conformément à notre hypothèse, les traits clonaux sont de bons indicateurs de la fonction de production au sein des communautés végétales ([Article VI](#)). En déterminant le placement des modules portant les organes foliaires et racinaires, les traits clonaux conditionnent sur le long terme l'efficacité de la plante à prélever les ressources de son habitat. Ils interviennent en amont des traits foliaires dans ce processus d'acquisition des ressources, expliquant que leurs effets soient plus importants ([Article VI](#)). Cependant, nous avons montré que les signes des relations liant les différents traits clonaux et la fonction de production s'inversent entre le niveau de l'individu et celui de la communauté. Les valeurs

des traits clonaux témoignent donc des modifications des processus d'acquisition des ressources liées aux interactions de compétition.

La clonalité, façonnant les patrons spatiaux des communautés végétales (Herben & Hara, 2003 ; Article II), les traits clonaux pourraient constituer des traits d'effet pour les fonctions qui leur sont associées. Ces fonctions sont diverses, comme les cycles de nutriments (Whitford, 2002 ; Maestre et al., 2005), les flux d'eau (Aguiar & Sala, 1999) ou encore la pollinisation par les insectes (Charpentier, 2002). Au sein des systèmes arides, il est par exemple commun de trouver des îlots de fertilité associés à des plantes herbacées cespitueuses (Garcia-Moya & Mc Kell, 1970 ; Aguiar & Sala, 1999). De même, Thompson (2001) rapporte que, dans le cas de *Jasminum fruticans*, l'attraction des pollinisateurs dépend de sa croissance clonale : le nombre d'insectes visitant une tige focale étant positivement corrélé au nombre de fleurs dans le patch probablement généré par un genet unique. Ces observations ouvrent de larges perspectives de travail quant à l'utilisation des traits clonaux en écologie fonctionnelle.

En effet, la large occurrence de la clonalité (jusqu'à 70% des espèces en milieux tempérés) conjuguée aux effets potentiels des traits clonaux sur une vaste gamme de fonctions écosystémiques, impose qu'une plus grande attention soit apportée à l'intégration des traits clonaux en écologie fonctionnelle. Dans leur publication recensant les traits les plus fondamentaux à utiliser en écologie fonctionnelle, Weiher et al. (1999) avaient déjà intégré les traits clonaux. Cependant, ne trouvant pas de méthode simple pour quantifier la clonalité, ils avaient proposé d'utiliser une classification reposant sur un trait binaire : « clonal » ou « non-clonal » qui est incompatible avec l'approche de Lavorel & Garnier (2002). Le manque d'études sur la clonalité s'explique ainsi par la difficulté de mesurer les traits clonaux *in situ* qui nécessite pour beaucoup d'espèces de mettre à jour les connexions souterraines (Sammul et al., 2003) ou de faire des suivis sur le long terme (*e.g.* durée de vie des connexions ou des modules) (Klimeš et al., 1997). Néanmoins, de plus en plus de bases de données de traits clonaux sont mises à notre disposition, notamment la base CLO-PLA3 (Klimešová & Klimeš, 2008) qui recense environ 2900 espèces européennes. L'utilisation de ces bases de données pourrait permettre de mener un nombre plus important d'études en écologie fonctionnelle intégrant les traits clonaux.

4. DES COMMUNAUTÉS VÉGÉTALES AU PAYSAGE

Les plantes clonales présentent généralement une reproduction mixte, colonisant l'espace à deux échelles (Eriksson, 1992). En conséquence, si la croissance clonale détermine principalement la dynamique locale de la communauté (Stöcklin & Winkler, 2004), la reproduction sexuée l'influence à plus large échelle (de quelques mètres à plusieurs centaines de kilomètres) (Zobel et al., 2010). Celle-ci permet aux espèces d'exploiter l'hétérogénéité grossière de l'environnement (échelle du paysage), en leur donnant la possibilité d'atteindre des habitats libres (Winkler & Stöcklin, 2002 ; Stöcklin & Winkler, 2004), et de connecter leurs patchs de populations isolés si le paysage est fragmenté (Husband & Barrett, 1996).

Dans nos travaux, nous nous sommes jusqu'ici focalisés sur les mécanismes influençant la dynamique spatiale de la communauté, liés à la clonalité (suppression de la reproduction sexuée des espèces plantées et des plantules issues de propagules extérieures). Néanmoins, une étude *in situ* de bandes enherbées expérimentales est actuellement en cours (dispositif présenté dans la partie 4.2. de la Méthodologie). La communauté végétale semée sur ces bandes correspond à un assemblage d'espèces clonales à stratégies de croissance contrastées (guérilla, phalange et cespiteuse), complété par quelques espèces annuelles (dicotylédone) pour favoriser la présence des insectes pollinisateurs. En remplaçant la communauté végétale au sein d'un paysage (ici agricole), cette expérimentation va permettre de prendre en compte dans sa dynamique, les effets liés à la reproduction sexuée des espèces semées mais également ceux liés à l'arrivée de propagules extérieures ou déjà présentes dans la banque de graines du sol. De plus, ces espèces potentiellement clonales, pourraient présenter des formes de croissance différentes de celles étudiées par ailleurs dans cette thèse, *i.e.* dérivées d'organes racinaires ou de tiges modifiées de type bulbe ou tubercule (Klimeš et al., 1997 ; Klimeš & Klimešová, 1999). Leur propriété clonale principale étant le stockage de réserves qui augmente leur potentiel compétitif (Grime, 2001 ; Watson, 2008), la présence de ces espèces pourrait impliquer des modifications de la dynamique de la communauté. Cette expérimentation permet donc de généraliser nos travaux à des communautés comprenant toutes les formes de croissance clonale et de tester si les relations établies en conditions contrôlées entre composition initiale de la communauté végétale et fonctions des bandes enherbées (Article VII), se vérifient *in situ*.

Une gestion adaptée des couverts des bandes enherbées (fauche après maturation des graines), leur permettrait de remplir la fonction de réservoirs de biodiversité végétale. Les populations localement entretenues par la reproduction clonale fourniraient les propagules nécessaires à la colonisation de nouveaux habitats (Stöcklin & Winkler, 2004). Ceci favoriserait un grand nombre d'espèces actuellement en déclin au sein des paysages agricoles, leur permettant de retrouver une dynamique positive. Il s'agit donc d'approfondir les connaissances actuelles sur les modalités de gestion permettant de maximiser l'efficacité des bandes enherbées notamment pour la conservation de la biodiversité, ceci en vue de fournir des recommandations aux gestionnaires locaux (*i.e.* les agriculteurs).

5. CONCLUSION ET PERSPECTIVES

La croissance clonale est un phénomène complexe, conférant aux plantes des propriétés particulières impliquées à plusieurs niveaux d'intégration biologique dans les processus de dynamique et de fonctionnement des communautés végétales, ce qui les rend si difficiles à appréhender. Cette étude a apporté de nouveaux éléments d'explication quant au rôle de la clonalité dans ces processus mais a elle-même ouvert de nouvelles perspectives à explorer.

Le champ d'investigations reste donc encore vaste et pourrait même dépasser le cadre des communautés végétales et des interactions biotiques plante-plante. Au cours de mon post-doctorat, je vais ainsi m'intéresser plus particulièrement (i) à l'impact indirect des stratégies clonales, via les patrons spatiaux qu'elles génèrent, sur d'autres interactions biotiques à savoir les associations mycorhiziennes et (ii) à l'effet réciproque de la composition en microorganismes du sol sur la colonisation spatiale des espèces végétales. En effet, les transferts de nutriments au sein des communautés impliquent fréquemment des champignons arbusculaires mycorhiziens (Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi – AMF –). Les conséquences de la présence de ces AMF pourraient être multiples pour la dynamique et le fonctionnement des communautés végétales en particulier clonales. En favorisant l'accès des espèces moins compétitives aux nutriments (Hart et al., 2003), les AMF pourraient indirectement favoriser la coexistence des espèces végétales et donc la productivité du système. De plus, des travaux récents ont montré que ces champignons

peuvent influencer la croissance clonale des plantes. Des modifications de performances, en termes de biomasse et de production de nouveaux modules, mais aussi de traits clonaux (nombre et longueurs des connexions) ont été attribuées aux effets de la symbiose des plantes avec différentes espèces d'AMF (Sudová & Vosátka, 2008 ; Sudová, 2009). Cette symbiose mycorhizienne concernant un grand nombre d'espèces clonales (Watson et al., 2002), elle présente des implications majeures pour les processus dans lesquels la clonalité est impliquée.

~ Références ~

- Aguiar, M. R. & Sala, O. E. (1999) Patch structure, dynamics and implications for the functioning of arid ecosystems. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **14**, 273-277.
- Alpert, P. & Simms, E. L. (2002) The relative advantages of plasticity and fixity in different environments: when is it good for a plant to adjust? *Evolutionary Ecology*, **16**, 285-297.
- Alpert, P. & Stuefer, J. F. (1997) Division of labour in clonal plants. *The ecology and evolution of clonal plants* (eds. H. de Kroon & J. van Groenendael), pp. 137-154. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden.
- Alpert, P. (1999) Clonal integration in *Fragaria chiloensis* differs between populations: ramets from grassland are selfish. *Oecologia*, **120**, 69-76.
- Alpert, P., Holzapfel, C. & Slominski, C. (2003) Differences in performance between genotypes of *Fragaria chiloensis* with different degrees of resource sharing. *Journal of Ecology*, **91**, 27-35.
- Alpi, A., Amrhein, N., Bertl, A., Blatt, M. R., Blumwald, E., Cervone, F., Dainty, J., De Michelis, M. I., Epstein, E., Galston, A. W., Goldsmith, M. H., Hawes, C., Hell, R., Hetherington, A., Hofte, H., Juergens, G., Leaver, C. J., Moroni, A., Murphy, A., Oparka, K., Perata, P., Quader, H., Rausch, T., Ritzenthaler, C., Rivetta, A., Robinson, D. G., Sanders, D., Scheres, B., Schumacher, K., Sentenac, H., Slayman, C. L., Sloave, C., Somerville, C., Taiz, L., Thiel, G. & Wagner, R. (2007) Plant neurobiology: no brain, no gain? *Trends Plant Science*, **12**, 135-136.
- Amarasekare, P. (2003) Competitive coexistence in spatially structured environments: a synthesis. *Ecology Letters*, **6**, 1109-1122.
- Anderson, D. P. (2004) BOINC: a system for public-resource computing and storage. *Proceedings of the 5th IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Grid Computing*, pp. 1-7. Pittsburgh, USA.
- Bacon, I., Hurly, T. A. & Healy, S. D. (2011) Hummingbirds choose not to rely on good taste: information use during foraging. *Behavioral Ecology*, **22**, 471-477.
- Ballaré, C. L., Scopel, A. L. & Sánchez, R. A. (1990) Far-red radiation reflected from adjacent leaves: an early signal of competition in plant canopies. *Science*, **247**, 329-332.
- Barr, C. J., Bunce, R. G. H., Clarke, R. T., Fuller, R. M., Furse, M. T., Gillespie, M. K., Groom, G. B., Hallam, C. J., Hornung, M., Howard, D. C., Ness, M. J. (1993) *Countryside survey 1990. Main Report*. UK Department of the Environment, London.

- Bauer, S., Berger, U., Hildenbrandt, H. & Grimm, V. (2002) Cyclic dynamics in simulated plant populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **269**, 2443-2450.
- Bazzaz, F. A. (1996) *Plants in changing environments: linking physiological, population, and community ecology*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Begon, M., Harper, J. L. & Townsend, C. R. (1996) *Ecology*. Blackwell Science, Oxford.
- Bell, A. D. (1984) Dynamic morphology: a contribution to plant population ecology. *Perspectives in Plant Population Ecology*, (eds. R. Dirzo & J. Sarukh'an), pp. 48-65. Sinauer, Sunderland.
- Bell, A. D. (1991) *Plant form. An illustrated guide to flowering plant morphology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Benot, M.-L., Bonis, A. & Mony, C. (2010) Do spatial patterns of clonal fragments and architectural responses to defoliation depend on the structural blue-print? An experimental test with two rhizomatous Cyperaceae. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **24**, 1475-1487.
- Benot, M.-L., Mony, C., Puijalón, S., Mohammad-Esmaeili, M., van Alphen, J. M., Bouzillé, J.-B. & Bonis, A. (2009) Responses of clonal architecture to experimental defoliation: a comparative study between ten grassland species. *Plant Ecology*, **201**, 257-266.
- Benson, E. J. & Hartnett, D. C. (2006) The role of seed and vegetative reproduction in plant recruitment and demography in tallgrass prairie. *Plant Ecology*, **187**, 163-178.
- Berendse, F. & Elberse, W. T. (1990) Competition and nutrient availability in heathland and grassland ecosystems. *Perspectives on plant competition* (eds. J. Grace & D. Tilman), pp. 93-115. Academic Press, Orlando.
- Bergelson, J. (1990) Spatial patterning in plants: opposing effects of herbivory and competition. *Journal of Ecology*, **78**, 937-948.
- Berger, U. & Hildenbrandt, H. (2000) A new approach to spatially explicit modeling of forest dynamics: spacing, ageing and neighborhood competition of mangrove trees. *Ecological Modelling*, **132**, 287-302.
- Berger, U., Piou, C., Schiffers, K. & Grimm, V. (2008) Competition among plants: concepts, individual-based modelling approaches, and a proposal for a future research strategy. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, **9**, 121-135.
- Bertness, M. D. & Ellison, A. M. (1987) Determinants of pattern in a New England salt marsh plant community. *Ecological Monographs*, **57**, 129-147.

- Birch, C. P. D. & Hutchings, M. J. (1994) Exploitation of patchily distributed soil resources by the clonal herb *Glechoma hederacea*. *The Journal of Ecology*, **82**, 653-664.
- Birch, C. P. D., Oom, S. P. & Beecham, J. A. (2007) Rectangular and hexagonal grids used for observation, experiment and simulation in ecology. *Ecological Modelling*, **206**, 347-359.
- Bithell, M. & Macmillan, W. (2007) Escape from the cell: spatially explicit modelling with and without grids. *Ecological Modelling*, **200**, 59-78.
- Bolker, B. & Pacala S. W. (1997) Using moment equations to understand stochastically driven spatial pattern formation in ecological systems. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **52**, 179-197.
- Bolker, B. M. & Pacala, S. W. (1999) Spatial moment equations for plant competition: understanding spatial strategies and the advantages of short dispersal. *The American Naturalist*, **153**, 575-602.
- Bolker, B. M., Brooks, M. E., Clark, C. J., Geange, J. R. Poulsen, M. H. H. Stevens & White, J.-S. S. (2009) Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **24**, 127-135.
- Bolker, B. M., Pacala, S. W. & Neuhauser, C. (2003) Spatial dynamics in model plant communities: what do we really know? *The American Naturalist*, **162**, 135-148.
- Borin, M. & Bigon, E. (2002) Abatement of NO₃-N concentration in agricultural waters by narrow buffer strips. *Environmental Pollution*, **117**, 165-168.
- Bradshaw, A. D. (1965) Evolutionary significance of phenotypic plasticity in plants. *Advances in Genetics*, **13**, 115-155.
- Briske, D. D. & Derner, J. D. (1998) Clonal biology of caespitose grasses. *Population biology of grasses* (ed. G. P. Cheplick). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bukovinszky, T., van Veen, F. J. F., Jongema, Y. & Dicke, M. (2008) Direct and indirect effects of resource quality on food web structure. *Science*, **319**, 804-807.
- Burel, F. & Baudry, J. (1999) *Écologie du paysage: concepts, méthodes et applications*. TEC & DOC, Paris.
- Burel, F., Baudry, J., Butet, A., Clergeau, P., Delettre, Y., Le Coeur, D., Dubs, F., Morvan, N., Paillat, G., Petit, S., Thenail, C., Brunel, E. & Lefeuvre, J.-C. (1998) Comparative biodiversity along a gradient of agricultural landscapes. *Acta Oecologica*, **19**, 47-60.

- Cain, M. L. (1994) Consequences of foraging in clonal plant species. *Ecology*, **75**, 933-944.
- Cain, M. L., Dudle, D. A. & Evans, J. P. (1996) Spatial models of foraging in clonal plant species. *American Journal of Botany*, **83**, 76-85.
- Callaway, R., Pennings, S. C. & Richards, C. (2003) Phenotypic plasticity and interactions among plants: trait plasticity and community dynamics. *Ecology*, **84**, 1115-1128.
- Caraco, T. & Kelly, C. K. (1991) On the adaptive value of physiological integration in clonal plants. *Ecology*, **72**, 81-93.
- Castro-Diez, P., Puyravaud, J.P., Cornelissen, J.H.C. & Villar-Salvador, P. (1998) Stem anatomy and relative growth rate in seedlings of a wide range of woody plant species and types. *Oecologia*, **116**, 57-66.
- Chapin III, F.S., Zavaleta, E.S., Eviner, V.T., Naylor, R.L., Vitousek, P.M., Reynolds, H.L., Hooper, D.U., Lavorel, S., Sala, O.E., Hobbie, S.E., Mack, M.C. & Diaz, S. (2000) Consequences of changing biodiversity. *Nature*, **405**, 234-242.
- Chapman, D. F., Robson, M. J. & Snaydon, R. W. (1992) Physiological integration in the clonal perennial herb *Trifolium repens* L. *Oecologia*, **89**, 338-347.
- Charnov, E. (1976) Optimal foraging, the marginal value theorem. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **9**, 129-136.
- Charpentier, A. & Stuefer, J. F. (1999) Functional specialization of ramets in *Scirpus maritimus* – Splitting the tasks of sexual reproduction, vegetative growth, and resource storage. *Plant Ecology*, **141**, 129-136.
- Charpentier, A. (2002) Consequences of clonal growth for plant mating. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 521-530.
- Chazdon, R. L., Williams, K., Field, C. B. (1988) Interactions between crown structure and light environment in five rain forest piper species. *American Journal of Botany*, **75**, 1459-1471.
- Cheplick, G. P. & Gutierrez, C. M. (2000) Clonal growth and storage in relation to competition in genets of the rhizomatous perennial *Amphibromus scabrivalvis*. *Canadian Journal of Botany*, **78**, 537-546.
- Cheplick, G. P. (1997) Responses to severe competitive stress in a clonal plant: differences between genotypes. *Oikos*, **79**, 581-591.
- Chesson, P. (2000) General theory of competitive coexistence in spatially-varying environments. *Theoretical Population Biology*, **58**, 211-237.

- Choler, P., Michalet, R. & Callaway, R. M. (2001) Facilitation and competition on gradients in alpine plant communities. *Ecology*, **82**, 3295-3308.
- Colasanti, R., Hunt, R., Watrud, L. (2007) A simple cellular automaton model for high-level vegetation dynamics. *Ecological Modelling*, **203**, 363-374.
- Collins, S.L., Knapp, A. K., Briggs, J. M., Blair, J. M. & Steinauer, E. M. (1998) Modulation of diversity by grazing and mowing in native tallgrass prairie. *Science*, **280**, 745 -747.
- Condit, R., Ashton, P. S., Baker, P., Bunyavejchewin, S., Gunatilleke, S., Gunatilleke, N., Hubbell, S. P., Foster, R. B., Itoh, A., La Frankie, J. V., Lee, H. S., Losos, E., Manokaran, N., Sukumar, R., & Yamakura, T. (2000) Spatial patterns in the distribution of tropical tree species. *Science*, **288**, 1414-1418.
- Cook, R. E. (1985) Growth and development in clonal plant populations. *Population biology and evolution of clonal organisms* (eds. J. B. C. Jackson, L. W. Buss, L.W. & R. E. Cook), pp. 259-296. Yale University Press, Newhaven.
- Cornelissen, J. H. C., Lavorel, S. & Garnier, E. (2003) A handbook of protocols for standardised and easy measurement of plant functional traits worldwide. *Australian Journal of Botany*, **51**, 335-380.
- Correll, D. L. (2005) Principles of planning and establishment of buffer zones. *Ecological Engineering*, **24**, 433-439.
- Craine, J. M., Tilman, D., Wedin, D., Reich, P., Tjoelker, M. & Knops, J. (2002) Functional traits, productivity and effects on nitrogen cycling of 33 grassland species. *Functional Ecology*, **16**, 563-574.
- Crawley, M. J. (2007) *The R book*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Crick, J. C. & Grime, J. P. (1987) Morphological plasticity and mineral nutrient capture in two herbaceous species of contrasted ecology. *New Phytologist*, **107**, 403-414.
- D'Hertefeldt, T. & Jónsdóttir, I. S. (1994) Effects of resource availability on integration and clonal growth in *Maianthemum bifolium*. *Folia Geobotanica*, **29**, 167-179.
- Danchin, E., Giraldeau, L.-A. & Cezilly, F. C. (2008) Behavioural ecology. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Davis, B. N. K., Brown, M. J., Frost, A. J., Yates, T. J. & Plant, R. A. (1994) The effects of hedges on spray deposition and on the biological impact of pesticide spray drift. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*, **27**, 281-293.

- de Kroon, H, Visser, E. J. W., Huber, H., Mommer, L. & Hutchings, M. J. (2009) A modular concept of plant foraging behaviour: the interplay between local responses and systemic control. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **32**, 704-712.
- de Kroon, H. & Hutchings, M. J. (1995) Morphological plasticity in clonal plants: the foraging concept reconsidered. *Journal of Ecology*, **83**, 143-152.
- de Kroon, H. & Knops, J. (1990) Habitat exploration through morphological plasticity in two chalk grassland perennials. *Oikos*, **59**, 39-49.
- de Kroon, H. & Schieving, F. (1990) Resource partitioning in relation to clonal growth strategy. *Clonal growth in plants: regulation and function* (eds. J. van Groenendael & H. de Kroon), pp. 113-130. SPB Academic Publishing, The Hague.
- de Kroon, H., Huber, H., Stuefer, J. F. & van Groenendael J. M. (2005) A modular concept of phenotypic plasticity in plants. *New Phytologist*, **166**, 73-82.
- de Kroon, H., Stuefer, J. F., Dong, M. & During, H. J. (1994) On plastic and non-plastic variation in clonal plant morphology and its ecological significance. *Folia Geobotanica*, **29**, 123-138.
- de Snoo, G.R. (1999) Unsprayed field margins: effects on environment, biodiversity and agricultural practice. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, **46**, 151-160.
- DeAngelis, D. L., Rose, K. A. & Huston, M. A. (1994) Individual oriented approaches to modeling ecological populations and communities. *Frontiers in Mathematical Biology* (ed. S. A. Levin) pp. 390-410. Springer, Berlin.
- Derner, J. D. & Briske, D. D. (1999) Intraclonal regulation in a perennial caespitose grass: a field evaluation of above- and below-ground resource availability. *Journal of Ecology*, **87**, 737-747.
- Diaz, S. & Cabido, M. (2001) Vive la différence: plant functional diversity matters to ecosystem processes. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **16**, 646-655.
- Díaz, S., Cabido, M., Zak, M., Martinez Carretero, E. & Aranibar, J. (1999) Plant functional traits, ecosystem structure and land-use history along a climatic gradient in Central-Western Argentina. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **10**, 651-660.
- Díaz, S., Lavorel, S., de Bello, F., Quétier, F., Grigulis, K. & Robson, T.M. (2007) Incorporating plant functional diversity effects in ecosystem service assessments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 20684 -20689.
- Dieckmann, U., Law, R. & Metz, J. A. J. (2000) *The geometry of ecological interactions: simplifying spatial complexity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dong, M. & de Kroon, H (1994) Plasticity in morphology and biomass allocation in

- Cynodon dactylon*, a grass species forming stolons and rhizomes. *Oikos*, **70**, 99-106.
- Dong, M. (1993) Morphological plasticity of the clonal herb *Lamiastrum galeobdolon* (L.) Ehrend. & Polatschek in response to partial shading. *New Phytologist*, **124**, 291-300.
- Dong, M. (1994) Foraging through morphological plasticity in clonal herbs. Ph.D. Thesis, Utrecht University, Utrecht.
- Dong, M. (1995) Morphological responses to local light conditions in clonal herbs from contrasting habitats, and their modification due to physiological integration. *Oecologia*, **101**, 282-288.
- Eckert, C. G. & Barrett, S. C. H. (1993) Clonal reproduction and pattern of genotypic diversity in *Decodon verticillatus*. *American Journal of Botany*, **80**, 1175-1182.
- Eckert, C. G. (1999) Clonal plant research: proliferation, integration, but not much evolution. *American Journal of Botany*, **86**, 1649-1654.
- Eissenstat, D.M. (1991) On the relationship between specific root length and the rate of root proliferation: a field study using citrus rootstocks. *New Phytologist*, **118**, 63-68.
- Elgersma, A., Schlepers, H. & Nassiri, M. (2000) Interactions between perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.) and white clover (*Trifolium repens* L.) under contrasting nitrogen availability: productivity, seasonal patterns of species composition, N₂ fixation, N transfer and N recovery. *Plant and Soil*, **221**, 281-299.
- Eliassen, S., Jørgensen, C., Mangel, M. & Giske, J. (2009) Quantifying the adaptive value of learning in foraging behavior. *The American Naturalist*, **174**, 478-489.
- Ellenberg, H., Weber, H. E., Düll, R., Wirth, V. & Werner, W. (1992) *Zeigerwerte von pflanzen in Mitteleuropa*. Goltze, Goettingen.
- Emlen, J. M. (1966) The role of time and energy in food preference. *The American Naturalist*, **100**, 611.
- Eriksson, O. & Jerling, L. (1990) Hierarchical selection and risk spreading in clonal plants. *Clonal growth in plants: regulation and function* (eds. J. van Groenendael & H. de Kroon), pp. 79-94. SPB Academic Publishing, The Hague.
- Eriksson, O. (1986a) Mobility and space capture in the stoloniferous plant *Potentilla anserina*. *Oikos*, **46**, 82-87.
- Eriksson, O. (1986b) Survivorship, reproduction and dynamics of ramets of *Potentilla anserina* on a Baltic seashore meadow. *Plant Ecology*, **67**, 17-25.
- Eriksson, O. (1988) Ramet behaviour and population growth in the clonal herb *Potentilla anserina*. *Journal of Ecology*, **76**, 522-536.

- Eriksson, O. (1989) Seedling dynamics and life histories in clonal plants. *Oikos*, **55**, 231-238.
- Eriksson, O. (1992) Evolution of seed dispersal and recruitment in clonal plants. *Oikos*, **63**, 439-448.
- Eriksson, O. (1996) Regional dynamics of plants: a review of evidence for remnant, source sink and metapopulations. *Oikos*, **77**, 248-258.
- Eriksson, O. (1997) Clonal life histories and the evolution of seed recruitment. *The ecology and evolution of clonal plants* (eds. H. de Kroon & J. van Groenendael J), pp. 211-226. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden.
- Eviner, V.T. & Chapin, F.S. (2003) Functional matrix: a conceptual framework for predicting multiple plant effects on ecosystem processes. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, **34**, 455-485.
- Eviner, V.T. (2004) Plant traits that influence ecosystem processes vary independently among species. *Ecology*, **8**, 2215-2229.
- Fahrig, L., Coffin, D. P., Lauenroth, W. K. & Shugart, H. H. (1994) The advantage of long-distance spreading in highly disturbed habitats. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **8**, 172-187.
- Firbank, L. G. & Watkinson, A. R. (1987) On the analysis of competition at the level of the individual plant. *Oecologia*, **71**, 308-317.
- Fischer, M. & van Kleunen, M. (2002) On the evolution of clonal plant life histories. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 565-582.
- Fischer, M., van Kleunen, M. & Schmid, B. (2004) Experimental life-history evolution: selection on growth form and its plasticity in a clonal plant. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **17**, 331-341.
- Fischer, M., Winkler, E. & Schmid, B. (2008) Simulating the evolution of a clonal trait in plants with sexual and vegetative reproduction. *Journal of Plant Ecology*, **1**, 161-171.
- García-Moya, E. & McKell, C. M. (1970) Contributions of shrubs to the nitrogen economy of a desert wash plant community. *Ecology*, **51**, 81-88.
- Garnier, E., Cortez, J., Bille, G., Navas, M.-L., Roumet, C., Debussche, M., Laurent, G., Blanchard, A., Aubry, D., Bellmann, A., Neill, C. & Toussaint, J.-P. (2004) Plant functional markers capture ecosystem properties during secondary succession. *Ecology*, **85**, 2630-2637.

- Garnier, E., Lavorel, S., Ansquer, P., Castro, H., Cruz, P., Dolezal, J., Eriksson, O., Fortunel, C., Freitas, H., Golodets, C., Grigulis, K., Jouany, C., Kazakou, E., Kigel, J., Kleyer, M., Lehsten, V., Lepš, J., Meier, T., Pakeman, R., Papadimitriou, M., Papanastasis, V.P., Quested, H., Quétier, F., Robson, M., Roumet, C., Rusch, G., Skarpe, C., Sternberg, M., Theau, J.-P., Thébault, A., Vile, D. & Zarovali, M.P. (2007) Assessing the effects of land-use change on plant traits, communities and ecosystem functioning in grasslands: a standardized methodology and lessons from an application to 11 European sites. *Annals of Botany*, **99**, 967-985.
- Geber, M. A., Watson, M. A. & Furnish, R. (1992) Genetic differences in the clonal demography in *Eichhornia crassipes*. *Journal of Ecology*, **80**, 329-341.
- Gersani, M., Brown, J. S., O'Brien, E. E., Maina, G. M. & Abramsky, Z. (2001) Tragedy of the commons as a result of root competition. *Journal of Ecology*, **89**, 660-669.
- Gibson, D. J., Connolly, J., Hartnett, D. C. & Weidenhamer, J. D. (1999) Designs for greenhouse studies of interactions between plants. *Journal of Ecology*, **87**, 1-16.
- Giraldeau, L.-A. (2008) Solitary foraging strategies. *Behavioural Ecology* (eds. E. Danchin, L.-A. Giraldeau & F. Cézilly), pp. 234-255. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gleason, H. A. (1976) Delving into the history of American ecology. *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, **56**, 7-10.
- Goldberg, D. E. & Barton, A. M. (1992) Patterns and consequences of interspecific competition in natural communities: a review of field experiments with plants. *The American Naturalist*, **139**, 771-801.
- Goldberg, D. E. & Fleetwood, L. (1987) Competitive effect and response in four annual plants. *Journal of Ecology*, **75**, 1131-1143.
- Goldberg, D. E. & Landa, K. (1991) Competitive effect and response: hierarchies and correlated traits in the early stages of competition. *Journal of Ecology*, **79**, 1013-1030.
- Goldberg, D. E. (1990) Components of resource competition in plant communities. *Perspectives on Plant Competition* (eds. J. B. Grace & D. Tilman), pp. 27-49. Academic Press, New York.
- Goldberg, D. E. (1987) Neighborhood competition in an old-field plant community. *Ecology*, **68**, 1211-1223.
- Gómez, S. & Stuefer, J. (2006) Members only: induced systemic resistance to herbivory in a clonal plant network. *Oecologia*, **147**, 461-468.

- Gough, L., Goldberg, D. E., Hershock, C., Pauliukonis, N. & Petru, M. (2002) Investigating the community consequences of competition among clonal plants. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 547-563.
- Ernault, A., Vialatte, A., Butet, A., Michel, N., Rantier, Y., Jambon, O. & Burel, F. (in revision) Grassy strips in their landscape context, their role as new habitat for biodiversity. *Agriculture, Ecosystem and Environment*.
- Grime, J. P. (2001) *Plant strategies, vegetation processes, and ecosystem properties*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Grime, J.P. (1998) Benefits of plant diversity to ecosystems: immediate, filter and founder effects. *Journal of Ecology*, **86**, 902-910.
- Grimm, V. & Railsback, S. F. (2005) *Individual-based modeling and ecology*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Grimm, V. 1999. Ten years of individual-based modelling in ecology: what we have learned and what could we learn in the future? *Ecological Modelling*, **115**, 129-148.
- Gross, K. L., Pregitzer, K. S. & Burton A. J. (1995) Spatial variation in nitrogen availability in three successional plant communities. *Journal of Ecology*, **83**, 357-367.
- Hairston, N. G., Smith, F. E. & Slobodkin, L. B. (1960) Community structure, population control, and competition. *The American Naturalist*, **44**, 421-425.
- Harada, Y. & Iwasa, Y. (1996) Analyses of spatial patterns and population processes of clonal plants. *Researches on Population Ecology*, **38**, 153-164.
- Harper J. L. (1977) *Population Biology of Plants*, Academic Press, New York.
- Harper, J. L. & White, J. (1974) The demography of plants. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **5**, 419-463.
- Harper, J. L. (1965) The nature and consequences of the interference amongst plants. *Proceedings of the XIth International Conference on Genetics*, **11**, 465-481.
- Harper, J. L. (1981) The concept of population in modular organisms. *Theoretical ecology: principles and application* (ed. R. M. May), pp. 53-77. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford.
- Hart, M. M., Reader, R. J. & Klironomos, J. N. (2003) Plant coexistence mediated by arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **18**, 418-423.
- Hartnett, D. C. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1985) The integration of neighbourhood effects by clonal genets in *Solidago Canadensis*. *Journal of Ecology*, **73**, 415-427.
- Hastie, T. H. (2011) gam: Generalized Additive Models. R package version 1.04.

- <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=gam>.
- Hastie, T. J. & Tibshirani, R. J. (1990) *Generalized Additive Models*. Chapman and Hall Ltd, New York.
- Hay, M. J. M., Newton, P. C. D., Robin, C. & Cresswell, A. (2001) Branching responses of a plagiotropic clonal herb to localized incidence of light simulating that reflected from vegetation. *Oecologia*, **127**, 185-190.
- Hector, A. (1998) The effect of diversity on productivity: detecting the role of species complementarity. *Oikos*, **82**, 597-599.
- Hector, A., Schmid, B., Beierkuhnlein, C., Caldeira, M.C., Diemer, M., Dimitrakopoulos, P.G., Finn, J.A., Freitas, H., Giller, P.S., Good, J., Harris, R., Högberg, P., Huss-Danell, K., Joshi, J., Jumpponen, A., Körner, C., Leadley, P.W., Loreau, M., Minns, A., Mulder, C.P.H., O'Donovan, G., Otway, S.J., Pereira, J.S., Prinz, A., Read, D.J., Scherer-Lorenzen, M., Schulze, E.-D., Siamantziouras, A.-S.D., Spehn, E.M., Terry, A.C., Troumbis, A.Y., Woodward, F.I., Yachi, S. & Lawton, J.H. (1999) Plant diversity and productivity experiments in European grasslands. *Science*, **286**, 1123-1127.
- Hefting, M. M. & de Klein, J. J. M. (1998) Nitrogen removal in buffer strips along a lowland stream in the Netherlands: a pilot study. *Environmental Pollution*, **102**, 521-526.
- Herben, T. (1996) Founder and dominance control: neglected concepts in the community dynamics of plants. *Abstracta Botanica*, **19**, 3-11.
- Herben, T. & Hara, T. (1997) Competition and spatial dynamics of clonal plants. *The ecology and evolution of clonal plants* (eds. H. de Kroon & J. van Groenendael), pp. 331-358. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden.
- Herben, T. & Hara, T. (2003) Spatial pattern formation in plant communities. *Morphogenesis and pattern formation in biological systems—experiments and models* (eds. T. Sekimura, S. Noji, N. Ueno & P. K. Maini), pp. 223–235. Springer Verlag, Berlin.
- Herben, T. & Novoplansky, A. (2008) Implications of self/non-self discrimination for spatial patterning of clonal plants. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **22**, 337-350.
- Herben, T. & Novoplansky, A. (2010) Fight or flight: plastic behavior under self-generated heterogeneity. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **24**, 1521-1536.

- Herben, T. & Suzuki, J. (2002) A simulation study of the effects of architectural constraints and resource translocation on population structure and competition in clonal plants. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 403-423.
- Herben, T., 2004. Physiological integration affects growth form and competitive ability in clonal plants. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **18**, 493-520.
- Herben, T., Dalling, H. J. & Law, R. (2000) Spatio-temporal patterns in grassland communities. *The geometry of ecological interactions: simplifying spatial complexity* (eds. U. Dieckmann, R. Law & J. A. J. Metz), pp. 48-64. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Herben, T., Hara, T., Marshall, C. & Soukupová, L. (1994a) Plant clonality: biology and diversity. *Folia Geobotanica and Phytotaxonomica*, **29**, 113-122.
- Herben, T., Krahulec, F., Hadincová, V. & Skàlovà, H. (1993a) Small-scale variability as a mechanism for large-scale stability in mountain grasslands. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **4**, 163-170.
- Herben, T., Krahulec, F., Hadincová, V. & Kovářová, M. (1993b) Small-scale spatial dynamics of plant species in a grassland community over six years. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **4**, 171-178.
- Herben, T., Krahulec, F., Hadincová, V. & Pecháčová, S. (1994b) Is a grassland community composed of coexisting species with low and high spatial mobility? *Folia Geobotanica*, **29**, 459-468.
- Hinsley, S. & Bellamy, P. (2000) The influence of hedge structure, management and landscape context on the value of hedgerows to birds: a review. *Journal of Environmental Management*, **60**, 33-49.
- Holliday, R. (1960) Plant population and crop yield. *Nature*, **186**, 22-24.
- Honnay, O. & Bossuyt, B. (2005) Prolonged clonal growth: escape route or route to extinction? *Oikos*, **108**, 427-432.
- Hooper, D. U. & Vitousek, P. M. (1997) The effects of plant composition and diversity on ecosystem processes. *Science*, **277**, 1302.
- Hooper, D. U. & Vitousek, P. M. (1998) Effects of plant composition and diversity on nutrient cycling. *Ecological Monographs*, **68**, 121-149.
- Hooper, D.U., Chapin, F.S., Ewel, J.J., Hector, A., Inchausti, P., Lavorel, S., Lawton, J.H., Lodge, D.M., Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Schmid, B., Setälä, H., Symstad, A.J., Vandermeer, J. & Wardle, D.A. (2005) Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. *Ecological Monographs*, **75**, 3-35.

- Hubbell, S. P. (1979) Tree dispersion, abundance, and diversity in a tropical dry forest. *Science*, **203**, 1299 -1309.
- Huber, H. & Hutchings, M. J. (1997) Differential response to shading in orthotropic and plagiotropic shoots of the clonal herb *Glechoma hirsuta*. *Oecologia*, **112**, 485-491.
- Huber, H. & Stuefer, J. F. (1997) Shade-induced changes in the branching pattern of a stoloniferous herb: functional response or allometric effect? *Oecologia*, **110**, 478-486.
- Huber, H. & Wiggerman, L. (1997) Shade avoidance in the clonal herb *Trifolium fragiferum*: a field study with experimentally manipulated vegetation height. *Plant Ecology*, **130**, 53-62.
- Huber, H. (1996) Plasticity of internodes and petioles in prostrate and erect *Potentilla* species. *Functional Ecology*, **10**, 401-409.
- Huber, H. (1997) Architectural plasticity of stoloniferous and erect herbs in response to light climate. Ph.D. Thesis, Utrecht University, Utrecht.
- Huber, H., Fijan, A. & During, H. J. (1998) A comparative study of spacer plasticity in erect and stoloniferous herbs. *Oikos*, **81**, 576-586.
- Huber, H., Kane, N. C., Heschel, M. S., von Wettberg, E. J., Banta, J., Leuck, A. M. & Schmitt, J. (2004) Frequency and microenvironmental pattern of selection on plastic shade-avoidance traits in a natural population of *Impatiens capensis*. *The American Naturalist*, **163**, 548-563.
- Huber, H., Lukács, S. & Watson, M. A. (1999) Spatial structure of stoloniferous herbs: an interplay between structural blue-print, ontogeny and phenotypic plasticity. *Plant Ecology*, **141**, 107-115.
- Huber-Sannwald, E., Pyke, D. A. & Caldwell, M. M. (1997) Perception of neighbouring plants by rhizomes and roots: morphological manifestations of a clonal plant. *Canadian Journal of Botany*, **75**, 2146-2157.
- Humphrey, L. & Pyke, D., 2001. Ramet spacing of *Elymus lanceolatus* (thickspike wheatgrass) in response to neighbour density. *Canadian Journal of Botany*, **79**, 1122-1126.
- Humphrey, L. D. & Pike, D. A. (1998) Demographic and growth responses of a guerrilla and a phalanx perennial grass in competitive mixtures. *Journal of Ecology*, **86**, 854-865.
- Husband, B. C. & Barrett S. C. H. (1996) A metapopulation perspective in plant population biology. *Journal of Ecology*, **84**, 461-469.

- Hutchings M. J. & de Kroon, H. (1994) Foraging in plants: the role of morphological plasticity in resource acquisition. *Advances in Ecological Research*, **25**, 159-238.
- Hutchings, M. (1999) Clonal plants as cooperative systems: benefits in heterogeneous environments. *Plant Species Biology*, **14**, 1-10.
- Hutchings, M. J. & Wijesinghe, D. K. (1997) Patchy habitats, division of labour and growth dividends in clonal plants. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **12**, 390-394.
- Hutchings, M. J. & Wijesinghe, D. K. (2008) Performance of a clonal species in patchy environments: effects of environmental context on yield at local and whole-plant scales. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **22**, 313-324.
- Hutchings, M. J., Turkington, R., Carey, P. & Klein, E. (1997) Morphological plasticity in *Trifolium repens* L.: the effects of clone genotype, soil nutrient level, and the genotype of conspecific neighbours. *Canadian Journal of Botany*, **75**, 1382-1393.
- Jackson, R. B. & Caldwell, M. M. (1993) The scale of nutrient heterogeneity around individual plants and its quantification with geostatistics. *Ecology*, **74**, 612-614.
- Jasiński, M. & Bazzaz, F. A. (1999) The fallacy of ratios and the testability of models in biology. *Oikos*, **84**, 321-326.
- Judson, O. P. (1994) The rise of the individual-based model in ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **9**, 9-14.
- Jung, V., Violle, C., Mondy, C., Hoffman L. & Muller, S. (2010) Intraspecific variability and trait-based community assembly. *Journal of Ecology*, **98**, 1134-1140.
- Kahmen, A., Perner, J., Audorff, V., Weisser, W. & Buchmann, N. (2005) Effects of plant diversity, community composition and environmental parameters on productivity in montane European grasslands. *Oecologia*, **142**, 606-615.
- Karban, R. (2008) Plant behaviour and communication. *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 727-739.
- Keddy, P. A. (1992) A pragmatic approach to functional ecology. *Functional Ecology*, **6**, 621-626.
- Keddy, P. A., Twolan-Strutt, L. & Wisheu, I. C. (1994) Competitive effect and response rankings in 20 wetland plants: are they consistent across three environments? *Journal of Ecology*, **82**, 635-643.
- Kelly, C. K. (1990) Plant foraging: a marginal value model and coiling response in *Cuscuta subinclusa*. *Ecology*, **71**, 1916-1925.
- Kelly, C. K. (1995) Thoughts on clonal integration: facing the evolutionary context. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **9**, 575-585.
- Kershaw, K. A. (1963) Pattern in vegetation and its causality. *Ecology*, **44**, 377-388.

- Kikvidze, Z., Pugnaire, F. I., Brooker, R. W., Choler, P., Lortie, C. J., Michalet, R. & Callaway, R. (2005) Linking patterns and processes in alpine plant communities: a global study. *Ecology*, **86**, 1395-1400.
- Kleijn, D. & van Groenendael, J. M. (1999) The exploitation of heterogeneity by a clonal plant in habitats with contrasting productivity levels. *Journal of Ecology*, **87**, 873-884.
- Klimeš, L. & Klimešová, J. (1999) CLO-PLA2 – a database of clonal plants in central Europe. *Plant Ecology*, **141**, 9-19.
- Klimeš, L. (1999) Small-scale plant mobility in a species-rich grassland. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **10**, 209-218.
- Klimeš, L., Klimešová, J., Hendricks, R. & van Groenendael, J. (1997) Clonal plant architecture: a comparative analysis of form and function. *The ecology and evolution of clonal plants* (eds. H. de Kroon & J. van Groenendael), pp. 1-29. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden.
- Klimešová, J. & Klimeš, L. (2008) Clonal growth diversity and bud banks of plants in the Czech flora: an evaluation using the CLO-PLA3 database. *Preslia*, **80**, 255-275.
- Kremen, C. (2005) Managing ecosystem services: what do we need to know about their ecology? *Ecology Letters*, **8**, 468-479.
- Kun, Á. & Oborny, B. (2003) Survival and competition of clonal plant populations in spatially and temporally heterogeneous habitats. *Community Ecology*, **4**, 1-20.
- Kurashige, N. S. & Agrawal, A. A. (2005) Phenotypic plasticity to light competition and herbivory in *Chenopodium album* (Chenopodiaceae). *American Journal of Botany*, **92**, 21-26.
- Lagerlöf, J., Stark, J. & Svensson, B. (1992) Margins of agricultural fields as habitats for pollinating insects. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **40**, 117-124.
- Landa, K., Benner, B., Watson, M. A. & Gartner, J. (1992) Physiological integration for carbon in Mayapple (*Podophyllum peltatum*), a clonal perennial herb. *Oikos*, **63**, 348-356.
- Lavorel, S. & Garnier, E. (2002) Predicting changes in community composition and ecosystem functioning from plant traits: revisiting the Holy Grail. *Functional Ecology*, **16**, 545-556.
- Law, R. & Dieckmann, U. (2000) A dynamical system for neighborhoods in plant communities. *Ecology*, **81**, 2137-2148.

- Law, R., Cook, R. E. D. & Manlove, R. J. (1983) The ecology of flower and bulbil production in *Polygonum viviparum*. *Nordic Journal of Botany*, **3**, 559-565.
- Law, R., Herben, T. & Dieckmann, U. (1997) Non-manipulative estimates of competition coefficients in a montane grassland community. *Journal of Ecology*, **85**, 505-517.
- Law, R., Illian, J., Burslem, D., Gratzler, G., Gunatilleke, C.V.S. & Gunatilleke, I. (2009) Ecological information from spatial patterns of plants: insights from point process theory. *Journal of Ecology*, **97**, 616-628.
- Law, R., Purves, D. W., Murrell, D. J. & Dieckmann, U. (2002) Causes and effects of small-scale spatial structure in plant populations. Interim Report of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis. Laxenburg, Austria.
- Leeds-Harrison, P. B., Quinton, J. N., Walker, M. J., Sanders, C. L. & Harrod, T. (1999) Grassed buffer strips for the control of nitrate leaching to surface waters in headwater catchments. *Ecological Engineering*, **12**, 299-313.
- Leeftang, L. (1999) Are stoloniferous plants able to avoid neighbours in response to low R:FR ratios in reflected light? *Plant Ecology*, **141**, 59-65.
- Leeftang, L. (2000) Response of *Trifolium repens* to a mosaic of bare and vegetated patches. *Plant Species Biology*, **15**, 59-65.
- Lehman, C. L. & Tilman, D. (1997) Competition in spatial habitats. *Spatial ecology. The role in population dynamics and interspecific interactions* (eds. D. Tilman & P. Kareiva), pp. 185-203. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Lenssen, J. P. M., Hershock, C., Speek, T., During, H. & de Kroon, H. (2005) Experimental ramet aggregation in the clonal plant *Agrostis stolonifera* reduces its competitive ability. *Ecology*, **86**, 1358-1365.
- Lepš, J. & Kindlmann, P. (1987) Models of the development of spatial pattern of an even-aged plant population over time. *Ecological Modelling*, **39**, 45-57.
- Li, L. & Wang, G. (2006) The ideal free distribution of clonal plant's ramets among patches in a heterogeneous environment. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, **68**, 1837-1850.
- Łomnicki, A. (1988) Introduction: basic models of population ecology and intrapopulation variability. *Population Ecology of Individuals* (ed. A. Łomnicki), pp. 1-19. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Louâpre, P., van Alphen, J. J. M. & Pierre, J.-S. (2010) Humans and insects decide in similar ways. *PLoS ONE*, **5**, e14251.
- Louâpre, P., van Baaren, J., Pierre, J.-S. & van Alphen, J. J. M. (2011) Information gleaned

- and former patch quality determine foraging behavior of parasitic wasps. *Behavioral Ecology*, **22**, 1064-1069.
- Lovett-Doust, L. (1981) Population dynamics and local specialization in a clonal perennial (*Ranunculus repens*). I. The dynamics of ramets in contrasting habitats. *Journal of Ecology*, **69**, 743-755.
- Lowrance, R. & Sheridan J. M. (2005) Surface runoff water quality in a managed three zone riparian buffer. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, **34**, 1851-1859.
- Lowrance, R., Altier, L. S., Newbold, J. D. & Schnabel, R. R. (1997) Water quality functions of riparian forest buffers in Chesapeake Bay watersheds. *Environmental Management*, **21**, 687-712.
- MacArthur, R. H. & Pianka, E. R. (1966) On optimal use of a patchy environment. *The American Naturalist*, **100**, 603.
- Macdonald, S. E. & Lieffers, V. J. (1993) Rhizome plasticity and clonal foraging of *Calamagrostis canadensis* in response to habitat heterogeneity. *Journal of Ecology*, **81**, 769-776.
- Mack, R. N. & Harper, J. L. (1977) Interference in dune annuals: spatial pattern and neighbourhood effects. *Journal of Ecology*, **65**, 345-363.
- Maestre, F. T., Escudero, A., Martinez, I., Guerrero, C. & Rubio, I. (2005) Does spatial pattern matter to ecosystem functioning? Insights from biological soil crusts. *Functional Ecology*, **19**, 566-573.
- Mágori, K., Oborny, B., Dieckmann, U. & Meszéna, G. (2003) Cooperation and competition in heterogeneous environments: the evolution of resource sharing in clonal plants. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **5**, 1-31.
- Magyar, G., Kun, Á., Oborny, B. & Stuefer, J. F. (2007) Importance of plasticity and decision-making strategies for plant resource acquisition in spatio-temporally variable environments. *New Phytologist*, **174**, 182-193.
- Marcovitz, S. & Turkington, R. (2000) Differential effects of light quality, provided by different grass neighbours, on the growth and morphology of *Trifolium repens* L. (white clover). *Oecologia*, **125**, 293-300.
- Marshall, C. (1990) Source-sink relations of interconnected ramets. *Clonal growth in plants: regulation and function* (eds. J. van Groenendael & H. de Kroon), pp. 23-41. SPB Academic Publishing, The Hague.

- Marshall, E. J. P. & Moonen, A. C. (2002) Field margins in northern Europe: their functions and interactions with agriculture. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **89**, 5-21.
- McGill, B.J., Enquist, B.J., Weiher, E. & Westoby, M. (2006) Rebuilding community ecology from functional traits. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **21**, 178-185.
- McNamara, J. M., Green, R. F. & Olsson, O. (2006) Bayes' theorem and its applications in animal behaviour. *Oikos*, **112**, 243-251.
- McNickle, G. G. & Cahill, J. F. (2009) Plant root growth and the marginal value theorem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **106**, 4747-4751.
- McNickle, G. G., St. Clair, C. C. & Cahill, J. F. (2009) Focusing the metaphor: plant root foraging behaviour. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **24**, 419-426.
- Meron, E., Gilad, E., von Hardenberg, J., Shachak, M. & Zarmi, Y. (2004) Vegetation patterns along a rainfall gradient. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, **19**, 367-376.
- Miller, A. E., Bowman, W. D. & Suding, K. N. (2007) Plant uptake of inorganic and organic nitrogen: neighbor identity matters. *Ecology*, **88**, 1832-1840.
- Montoya, D., Purves, D. W., Urbieto, I. R. & Zavala, M. A. (2009) Do species distribution models explain spatial structure within tree species ranges? *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **18**, 662-673
- Mony, C., Garbey, M., Smaoui, M. & Benot, M.-L. (2011) Large scale parameter study of an individual-based model of clonal plant with volunteer computing. *Ecological Modelling*, **222**, 935-946.
- Moora, M., Öpik, M., Zobel, K. & Zobel, M. (2009) Understorey plant diversity is related to higher variability of vegetative mobility of coexisting species. *Oecologia*, **159**, 355-361.
- Murphy, G. P. & Dudley, S. A. (2007) Above- and below-ground competition cues elicit independent responses. *Journal of Ecology*, **95**, 261-272.
- Murrell, D. J., Purves, D. W. & Law, R. (2001) Uniting pattern and process in plant ecology. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **16**, 529-530.
- Novoplansky, A. (2009) Picking battles wisely: plant behaviour under competition. *Plant, Cell and Environment*, **32**, 726-741.
- Novoplansky, A., Cohen, D. & Sachs, T. (1990) How *Portulaca* seedlings avoid their neighbors. *Oecologia*, **82**, 490-493.
- Oaten, A. (1977) Optimal foraging in patches - case for stochasticity. *Theoretical*

- Population Biology*, **12**, 263-285.
- Oborny, B. & Cain, M. L. (1997) Models of spatial spread and foraging in clonal plants. *The ecology and evolution of clonal plants* (eds. H. de Kroon & J. van Groenendael), pp. 1-29. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden.
- Oborny, B. & Kun, Á. (2002) Fragmentation of clones: how does it influence dispersal and competitive ability? *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 319-346.
- Oborny, B. (1994a) Growth rules in clonal plants and environmental predictability: a simulation study. *Journal of Ecology*, **82**, 341-351.
- Oborny, B. (1994b) Spacer length in clonal plants and the efficiency of resource capture in heterogeneous environments – a Monte-Carlo simulation. *Folia Geobotanica & Phytotaxonomica*, **29**, 139-158.
- Oborny, B. (2004) External and internal control in plant development. *Complexity*, **9**, 22-28.
- Oborny, B., Czárán, T. & Kun, Á. (2001) Exploration and exploitation of resource patches by clonal growth: a spatial model on the effect of transport between modules. *Ecological Modelling*, **141**, 151-169.
- Oborny, B., Kun, Á., Czárán, T. & Bokros, S. (2000) The effect of clonal integration on plant competition for mosaic habitat space. *Ecology*, **81**, 3291-3304.
- Otsus, M. & Zobel, M. (2002) Small-scale turnover in a calcareous grassland, its pattern and components. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **13**, 199-206.
- Pacala, S. W. & Deutschman, D. H. (1995) Details that matter: the spatial distribution of individual trees maintains forest ecosystem function. *Oikos*, **74**, 357-365.
- Pan, J. J. & Price, J. S. (2002) Fitness and evolution in clonal plants: the impact of clonal growth. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 583-600.
- Piquot, Y., Petit, D., Valero, M., Cuguen, J., de Laguerie, P. & Vernet, P. (1998) Variation in sexual and asexual reproduction among young and old populations of the perennial macrophyte *Sparganium erectum*. *Oikos*, **82**, 139-148.
- Pitelka, L. F. & Ashmun, J. W. (1985) Physiology and integration of ramets in clonal plants. *Population biology and evolution of clonal organisms* (eds. J. B. C. Jackson, L. W. Buss & R. E. Cook), pp. 399-436. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Pontes, L.D. S., Soussana, J.-F., Louault, F., Andueza, D. & Carrère, P. (2007) Leaf traits affect the above-ground productivity and quality of pasture grasses. *Functional Ecology*, **21**, 844-853.

- Price, E. A. C. & Hutchings, M. J. (1996) The effects of competition on growth and form in *Glechoma hederacea*. *Oikos*, **75**, 279-290.
- Price, E. A. C. & Marshall, C. (1999) Clonal plants and environmental heterogeneity – an introduction to the proceedings. *Plant Ecology*, **141**, 3-7.
- Purves, D. W. & Law, R. (2002) Fine-scale spatial structure in a grassland community: quantifying the plant's-eye view. *Journal of Ecology*, **90**, 121-129.
- R Development Core Team (2008) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna.
- Raventós, J., Wiegand, T. & De Luis, M. (2010) Evidence for the spatial segregation hypothesis: a test with nine-year survivorship data in a Mediterranean shrubland. *Ecology*, **91**, 2110-2120.
- Rees, M., Grubb, P. J. & Kelly, D. (1996) Quantifying the impact of competition and spatial heterogeneity on the structure and dynamics of a four-species guild of winter annuals. *The American Naturalist*, **147**, 1-32.
- Réjou-Méchain, M., Flores, O., Bourland, N., Doucet, J. L., Fétéké, R. F., Pasquier, A. & Hardy, O. J. (2011) Spatial aggregation of tropical trees at multiple spatial scales. *Journal of Ecology*, **99**, 1373-1381
- Richards, M. L. A., Aitkenhead, M. J. & McDonald, A. J. S. (2010) Improving the effectiveness of angular dispersion in plant neighbourhood models. *Ecological Modelling*, **221**, 1649-1654.
- Ross, M. A. & Harper, J. L. (1972) Occupation of biological space during seedling establishment. *Journal of Ecology*, **60**, 77-88.
- Sachs, T. (2001) Developmental processes and the evolution of plant clonality. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 485-500.
- Sammul, M., Kull, K. & Tamm, A. (2003) Clonal growth in a species-rich grassland: results of a 20-year fertilization experiment. *Folia Geobotanica*, **38**, 1-20.
- Sammul, M., Kull, K., Niitla, T. & Möls, T. (2004) A comparison of plant communities on the basis of their clonal growth patterns. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **18**, 443-467.
- Schmid, B. & Harper, J. L. (1985) Clonal growth in grassland perennials: I. Density and pattern-dependent competition between plants with different growth forms. *Journal of Ecology*, **73**, 793-808.
- Schmid, B. (1985) Clonal growth in grassland perennials: III. Genetic variation and plasticity between and within populations of *Bellis perennis* and *Prunella vulgaris*. *Journal of Ecology*, **73**, 819-830.

- Schmid, B. (1986) Spatial dynamics and integration within clones of grassland perennials with different growth form. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B*, **228**, 173-186.
- Schmid, B. (1990) Some ecological and evolutionary consequences of modular organization and clonal growth in plants. *Evolutionary Trends in Plants*, **4**, 25-34.
- Schweitzer, J.A., Bailey, J.K., Rehills, B.J., Martinsen, G.D., Hart, S.C., Lindroth, R.L., Keim, P. & Whitham, T.G. (2004) Genetically based trait in a dominant tree affects ecosystem processes. *Ecology Letters*, **7**, 127-134.
- Seabloom, E. W., Bjørnstad, O.N., Bolker, B. M. & Reichman, O.J. (2005) Spatial signature of environmental heterogeneity, dispersal, and competition in successional grasslands. *Ecological Monographs*, **75**, 199-214
- Seidler, T. G. & Plotkin, J. B. (2006) Seed dispersal and spatial pattern in tropical trees. *PLoS Biology*, **4**, p.e344.
- Silander, J. A. & Pacala, S. W. (1985) Neighborhood predictors of plant performance. *Oecologia*, **66**, 256-263.
- Silvertown, J., Holtier, S., Johnson, J. & Dale, P. (1992) Cellular automaton models of interspecific competition for space – the effect of pattern on process. *Journal of Ecology*, **80**, 527-533.
- Slade, A. J. & Hutchings, M. J. (1987) The effects of light intensity on foraging in the clonal herb *Glechoma hederacea*. *Journal of Ecology*, **75**, 639-650.
- Smaoui-Feki, M., Nguyen, V. H. & Garbey, M. (2009) Parallel genetic algorithm implementation for BOINC. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Computing*. Lyon, France.
- Smith, A. P. & Palmer, J. A. (1976) Vegetative reproduction and close packing in a successional plant species. *Nature*, **261**, 232-233.
- Song, M., Dong, M. & Jiang, G. (2002) Importance of clonal plants and plant species diversity in the Northeast China Transect. *Ecological Research*, **17**, 705-716.
- Sovell, L. A., Vondracek, B., Frost, J. A. & Mumford, K. G. (2000) Impacts of rotational grazing and riparian buffers on physicochemical and biological characteristics of southeastern Minnesota, USA, streams. *Environmental Management*, **26**, 629-641.
- Stearns, S. C. (1976) Life-history tactics: a review of the ideas. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, **51**, 3-47.

- Stöcklin, J. & Winkler, E. (2004) Optimum reproduction and dispersal strategies of a clonal plant in a metapopulation: a simulation study with *Hieracium pilosella*. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **18**, 563-584.
- Stoll, P. & Prati, D. (2001) Intraspecific aggregation alters competitive interactions in experimental plant communities. *Ecology*, **82**, 319-327.
- Stuefer, J. F. & Huber, H. (1998.) Differential effects of light quantity and spectral light quality on growth, morphology and development of two stoloniferous *Potentilla* species. *Oecologia*, **117**, 1-8.
- Stuefer, J. F. & Huber, H. (1999) The role of stolon internodes for ramet survival after clone fragmentation in *Potentilla anserina*. *Ecology Letters*, **2**, 135-139.
- Stuefer, J. F. & Hutchings, M. J. (1994) Environmental heterogeneity and clonal growth: a study of the capacity for reciprocal translocation in *Glechoma hederacea* L. *Oecologia*, **100**, 302-308.
- Stuefer, J. F., During, H. J. & de Kroon, H. (1994) High benefits of clonal intergation in two stoloniferous species, in response to heterogeneous light environments. *Journal of Ecology*, **82**, 511-518.
- Stuefer, J. F., van Hulzen, J. B. & During, H. J. (2002) A genotypic trade-off between the number and size of clonal offspring in the stoloniferous herb *Potentilla reptans*. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **15**, 880-884.
- Suding, K. N., Lavorel, S., Chapin III, F. S., Cornelissen, J. H. C., Díaz, S., Garnier, E., Goldberg, D., Hooper, D. U., Jackson, S. T. & Navas, M.-L. (2008) Scaling environmental change through the community-level: a trait-based response-and-effect framework for plants. *Global Change Biology*, **14**, 1125-1140.
- Sudová, R. & Vosátka, M. (2008) Effects of inoculation with native arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi on clonal growth of *Potentilla reptans* and *Fragaria moschata* (Rosaceae). *Plant Soil*, **308**, 55-67.
- Sudová, R. (2009) Different growth response of five co-existing stoloniferous plant species to inoculation with native arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Plant Ecology*, **204**, 135-143.
- Sultan, S. E. 1995. Phenotypic plasticity and plant adaptation. *Acta Botanica Neerlandica*, **44**, 363-383
- Sutherland, W. J. & Stillman, R. A. (1988) The foraging tactics of plants. *Oikos*, **52**, 239-244.

- Suzuki, J. & Stuefer, J. F. (1999) On the ecological and evolutionary significance of storage in clonal plants. *Plant Species Biology*, **14**, 11-17.
- Svensson, B. M., Rydin, H., Carlsson, B. Å. (2005) Clonal plants in the community. *Vegetation Ecology* (ed. E. van der Maarel), pp. 129-146. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- Symstad, A. J., Tilman, D., Willson, J. & Knops, J. M. H. (1998) Species loss and ecosystem functioning: effects of species identity and community composition. *Oikos*, **81**, 389-397.
- Tamm, A., Kull, K. & Sammuli, M. (2002) Classifying clonal growth forms based on vegetative mobility and ramet longevity: a whole community analysis. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 383-401.
- Tentelier, C., Lacroix, M. N. & Fauvergue, X. (2009) Inflexible wasps: the aphid parasitoid *Lysiphlebus testaceipes* does not track multiple changes in habitat profitability. *Animal Behaviour*, **77**, 95-100.
- Thompson, J. D. (2001) How do visitation patterns vary among pollinators in relation to floral display and floral design in a generalist pollination system? *Oecologia*, **126**, 386-394.
- Thompson, L. (1993) The influence of natural canopy density on the growth of white clover, *Trifolium repens*. *Oikos*, **7**, 321-324.
- Thorhallsdottir, T. E. (1990) The dynamics of a grassland community: a simultaneous investigation of spatial and temporal heterogeneity at various scales. *Journal of Ecology*, **78**, 884-908.
- Tilman, D. & Kareiva, P. (1997) *Spatial Ecology: The role of space in population dynamics and interspecific interactions*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Tilman, D. (1994) Competition and biodiversity in spatially structured habitats. *Ecology*, **75**, 2.
- Tilman, D., Reich, P.B., Knops, J., Wedin, D., Mielke, T. & Lehman, C. (2001) Diversity and productivity in a long-term grassland experiment. *Science*, **294**, 843-845.
- Tilman, D., Wedin, D. & Knops, J. (1996) Productivity and sustainability influenced by biodiversity in grassland ecosystems. *Nature*, **379**, 718-720.
- Trewavas, A. (2003) Aspects of plant intelligence. *Annals of Botany*, **92**, 1-20.
- Trewavas, A. (2005b) Green plants as intelligent organisms. *Trends in Plant Science*, **10**, 413-419.
- Trewavas, A. (2005a) Plant intelligence. *Naturwissenschaften*, **92**, 401-413.

- Trewavas, A. (2006) The green plant as an intelligent organism. *Communication in Plants* (eds. F. Baluška, S. Mancuso & D. Volkmann), pp. 1-18. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Turkington, R. & Harper, J. L. (1979) The growth, distribution and neighbour relationships of *Trifolium repens* in a permanent pasture: II. Inter- and intra-specific contact. *Journal of Ecology*, **67**, 219-230.
- Turkington, R. (2009) Top-down and bottom-up forces in mammalian herbivore-vegetation systems: an essay review. *Botany*, **29**, 723-739.
- Turkington, R., Hamilton, R. S. & Gliddon, C. (1991) Within-population variation in localized and integrated responses of *Trifolium repens* to biotically patchy environments. *Oecologia*, **86**, 183-192.
- Turnbull, L. A., Coomes, D., Hector, A. & Rees, M. (2004) Seed mass and the competition/colonization trade-off: competitive interactions and spatial patterns in a guild of annual plants. *Journal of Ecology*, **92**, 97-109.
- Uchmański, J. & Grimm, V. (1996) Individual-based modelling in ecology: what makes the difference? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **11**, 437-441.
- van Beek, C. L., Heinen, M. & Clevering O. A. (2007) Reduced nitrate concentrations in shallow ground water under a non-fertilised grass buffer strip. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, **79**, 81-91.
- van Groenendael, J. M., Klimeš, L., Klimešová, J. & Hendriks, R. J. J. (1996) Comparative ecology of clonal plants. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B*, **351**, 1331-1339.
- van Groenendael, J.M. & de Kroon, H. (1990) *Clonal growth in plants: regulation and function*. SPB Academic Publishing, The Hague.
- van Kleunen, M. & Fischer, M. (2001) Adaptive evolution of plastic foraging responses in a clonal plant. *Ecology*, **82**, 3309-3319.
- van Kleunen, M. & Fischer, M. (2005) Constraints on the evolution of adaptive phenotypic plasticity in plants. *New Phytologist*, **166**, 49-60.
- van Kleunen, M. & Stuefer, J. F. (1999) Quantifying the effects of reciprocal assimilate and water translocation in a clonal plant by the use of steam-girdling. *Oikos*, **85**, 135-145.
- van Kleunen, M., Fischer, M. & Schmid, B. (2000) Clonal integration in *Ranunculus reptans*: by-product or adaptation? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **13**, 237-248.
- Vásquez, R. A., Grossi, B. & Márquez, I. N. (2006) On the value of information: studying changes in patch assessment abilities through learning. *Oikos*, **112**, 298-310.

- Verboom, B. & Huitema, H. (1997) The importance of linear landscape elements for the pipistrelle *Pipistrellus pipistrellus* and the serotine bat *Eptesicus serotinus*. *Landscape Ecology*, **12**, 117-125.
- Vickery, J. A. & Fuller, R. J. (1998) Use of cereal fields by birds: a review in relation to field margin management. *BTO Research Report*, **195**.
- Vile, D., Shipley, B. & Garnier, E. (2006) Ecosystem productivity can be predicted from potential relative growth rate and species abundance. *Ecology Letters*, **9**, 1061-1067.
- Violle, C., Navas, M.-L., Vile, D., Kazakou, E., Fortunel, C., Hummel, I. & Garnier, E. (2007) Let the concept of trait be functional! *Oikos*, **116**, 882-892.
- Waite, S. (1994) Field evidence of plastic growth responses to habitat heterogeneity in the clonal herb *Ranunculus repens*. *Ecological Research*, **9**, 311-316.
- Warren, J., Wilson, F. & Diaz, A. (2002) Competitive relationships in a fertile grassland community - does size matter? *Oecologia*, **132**, 125-130.
- Watson, M. (2008) Resource storage and the expression of clonal plant life histories. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **22**, 471-475.
- Watson, M. A., Hay, M. J. M. & Newton, P. C. D. (1997) Developmental phenology and the timing of determination of shoot bud fates: ways in which the developmental program modulates fitness in clonal plants. *The ecology and evolution of clonal plants* (eds. H. de Kroon & J. van Groenendael), pp. 31-53. Backhuys Publishers, Leiden.
- Watson, M. A., Scott, K., Griffith, J., Dieter, S., Jones, C. S. & Nanda, S. (2002) The developmental ecology of mycorrhizal associations in mayapple, *Podophyllum peltatum*, Berberidaceae. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 425-442.
- Watt, A. S. (1947) Pattern and process in the plant community. *Journal of Ecology*, **35**, 1-22.
- Weigelt, A. & Jolliffe, P. (2003) Indices of plant competition. *Journal of Ecology*, **91**, 707-720.
- Weigelt, A., Bol, R. & Bardgett, R.D. (2005) Preferential uptake of soil nitrogen forms by grassland plant species. *Ecosystem Ecology*, **142**, 627-635.
- Weigelt, A., Schumacher, J., Walther, T., Bartelheimer, M., Steinlein, T. & Beyschlag, W. (2007) Identifying mechanisms of competition in multi-species communities. *Journal of Ecology*, **95**, 53-64.
- Weigelt, A., Steinlein, T. & Beyschlag, W. (2002) Does plant competition intensity rather depend on biomass or on species identity? *Basic and Applied Ecology*, **3**, 85-94

- Weiher, E., van der Werf, A., Thompson, K., Roderick, M., Garnier, E. & Eriksson, O. (1999) Challenging Theophrastus: a common core list of plant traits for functional ecology. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **10**, 609-620.
- Weijschedé, J., Berentsen, R., de Kroon, H. & Huber, H. (2008) Variation in petiole and internode length affects plant performance in *Trifolium repens* under opposing selection regimes. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **22**, 383-397.
- Weijschedé, J., Martínková, J., de Kroon, H. & Huber, H. (2006) Shade avoidance in *Trifolium repens*: costs and benefits of plasticity in petiole length and leaf size. *New Phytologist*, **172**, 655-666.
- Weiner, J. (1982) A neighborhood model of annual-plant interference. *Ecology*, **63**, 1237-1241.
- Welker J. M. & Briske D. D (1992) Clonal biology of the temperate, caespitose, graminoid *Schizachyrium scoparium*: a synthesis with reference to climate change. *Oikos*, **63**, 357-365.
- Whitford, W. G. (2002) *Ecology of Desert Systems*. Academic Press, London.
- Wiegand, T. & Moloney, K. A. (2004) Rings, circles, and null-models for point pattern analysis in ecology. *Oikos*, **104**, 209-229.
- Wijesinghe, D. K. & Hutchings, M. J. (1997) The effects of spatial scale of environmental heterogeneity on the growth of a clonal plant: an experimental study with *Glechoma hederacea*. *Journal of Ecology*, **85**, 17-28.
- Wijesinghe, D. K. & Whigham, D. F. (2001) Nutrient foraging in woodland herbs: a comparison of three species of *Uvularia* (Liliaceae) with contrasting belowground morphologies. *American Journal of Botany*, **88**, 1071-1079.
- Wijesinghe, D.K. & Hutchings, M.J. (1999) The effects of environmental heterogeneity on the performance of *Glechoma hederacea*: the interactions between patch contrast and patch scale. *Journal of Ecology*, **87**, 860-872.
- Wikberg, S. & Svensson, B. M. (2003) Ramet demography in a ring-forming clonal sedge. *Journal of Ecology*, **91**, 847-854.
- Wild, J. & Winkler, E. (2008) Krummholz and grassland coexistence above the forest-line in the Krkonoše Mountains: grid-based model of shrub dynamics. *Ecological Modelling*, **213**, 293-307.
- Wildová, R., Gough, L., Herben, T., Hershock, C. & Goldberg, D.E. (2007) Architectural and growth traits differ in effects on performance of clonal plants: an analysis using a field-parameterized simulation model. *Oikos*, **116**, 836-852.

- Wildová, R., Wild, J. & Herben, T. (2007b) Fine-scale dynamics of rhizomes in a grassland community. *Ecography*, **30**, 264-276.
- Wilson, J.B. (1999) Guilds, functional types and ecological groups. *Oikos*, **86**, 507-522.
- Wilson, M. (2007) Measuring the components of competition along productivity gradients. *Journal of Ecology*, **95**, 301-308.
- Winkler, E. & Fischer, M. (2002) The role of vegetative spread and seed dispersal for optimal life histories of clonal plants: a simulation study. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **15**, 281-301.
- Winkler, E. & Klotz, S. (1997) Clonal plant species in a dry-grassland community: a simulation study of long-term population dynamics. *Ecological Modelling*, **96**, 125-141.
- Winkler, E. & Schmid, B. (1995) Clonal strategies of herbaceous plant species: a simulation study on population growth and competition. *Abstracta Botanica*, **19**, 17-28.
- Winkler, E. & Stöcklin, J. (2002) Sexual and vegetative reproduction of *Hieracium pilosella* L. under competition and disturbance: a grid-based simulation model. *Annals of Botany*, **89**, 525-536.
- Winkler, E., Fischer, M. & Schmid, B. (1999) Modelling the competitiveness of clonal plants by complementary analytical and simulation approaches. *Oikos*, **85**, 217-233.
- Wyszomirski, T., Wyszomirska, I. & Jarzyna, I. (1999) Simple mechanisms of size distribution dynamics in crowded and uncrowded virtual monocultures. *Ecological Modelling*, **115**, 253-273.
- Zeger, S. L. & Liang, K.-Y. (1986) Longitudinal data analysis for discrete and continuous outcomes. *Biometrics*, **42**, 121-130.
- Zhang, S., Chen, Y. & Dong, M. (2000) Clonal plasticity in response to partial neutral shading in the stoloniferous herb *Potentilla reptans* var. *sericophylla*. *Acta Botanica Sinica*, **42**, 89-94.
- Zobel, K. (2008) On the forces that govern clonality versus sexuality in plant communities. *Evolutionary Ecology*, **22**, 487-492.
- Zobel, M., Suurkask, M., Rosén, E. & Pärtel, M. (1996) The dynamics of species richness in an experimentally restored calcareous grassland. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, **7**, 203-210.

- Zobel, M., Moora, M. & Herben, T. (2010) Clonal mobility and its implications for spatio-temporal patterns of plant communities: what do we need to know next? *Oikos*, **119**, 802-806.

~ Annexes ~

ANNEXE 1.**LIST OF ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Bittebiere A.-K., Mony C., Garbey M., Smaoui M. & Clément B. (2009) Using IBM for analyzing the impact of plant clonal traits on the plant performance and ecological functions in prairial ecosystems. *9th Clonal Plant Workshop*, Leuven (Belgium).

Bittebiere A.-K., Renaud N., Clément B. & Mony C. (2010) Clonal traits response to competition: strategy or passivity? An experimental study on *T. repens*. *Plant population biology 2010: crossing borders*, Nijmegen (the Netherlands).

Bittebiere A.-K., Mony C., Clément B. & Garbey M. (2010) How to model competition between plants using an Individual Based Model? Methods and effects on clonal plants dynamic. *Workshop Modecol*, Rennes (France).

Mony C., Benot M.-L., **Bittebiere A.-K.** & Renaud N. (2010) Mapping clonal architecture through GIS systems. *Workshop Modecol*, Rennes (France).

Mony C., **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Benot M.-L., Clément B. & Garbey M. (2010) Why modeling clonal plants? The ecologist perspective – Brief synthesis of existing models. *Workshop Modecol*, Rennes (France).

Bittebiere A.-K., Mony C., Garbey M., Smaoui M. & Clément B. (2011) Effet de la compétition sur les profils de traits favorisant les performances de la prairie. *Colloque Ecoveg 7*, Lausanne (Switzerland).

Garbey M., Smaoui M., Rinsurongkawong W., **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Clément B. & Mony C. (2011) Large scale simulation of virtual prairies with volunteer computing. *IAVS Symposium*, Lyon (France).

Bittebiere A.-K., Mony C. & Clément B. (2011) Effect of clonal colonization strategy on productivity in plant communities: a wide-scale mesocosm experiment. *IAVS Symposium*, Lyon (France).

LIST OF POSTERS

Mony C., Pennings S., **Bittebiere A.-K.** & Garbey M. (2010) La guerre des clones : Utilisation du modèle Virtual Prairie pour étudier la dynamique d'assemblages de plantes clonales. *Colloque Ecologie 2010*, Montpellier (France).

Louâpre P., **Bittebiere A.-K.**, Pierre J.-S., Clément B. & Mony C. (2011) Optimal foraging in clonal plants: Experimental evidence of sampling behavior and information use. *IAVS Symposium*, Lyon (France).

VU :

Le Directeur de Thèse

Dr. Bernard CLEMENT

VU :

Le Responsable de l'École Doctorale

Pr. Yvan LAGADEUC

VU pour autorisation de soutenance

Rennes, le

Le Président de l'Université de Rennes 1

Guy CATHELINÉAU

VU après soutenance pour autorisation de publication :

Le Président de Jury

RESUME

La dispersion par croissance clonale serait un processus majeur de la structuration des communautés végétales, particulièrement en prairies où une majorité d'espèces sont clonales. Celles-ci produisent des modules génétiquement identiques organisés en réseau, dont l'agrégation dépend de la stratégie de croissance de l'espèce.

Cette thèse vise à analyser et à comprendre la dynamique des communautés végétales de prairie en se basant sur les règles d'assemblage spatial des espèces clonales et d'en déterminer les conséquences pour leur fonctionnement. Pour cela, des approches complémentaires expérimentales et de modélisation ont été utilisées.

Nos résultats montrent que les stratégies de croissance des clones déterminent la structure spatiale des communautés à échelle fine, générant un large panel de patrons. Le patron spatial d'une espèce varie selon les stratégies de croissance clonale présentes dans la communauté. Ces variations résulteraient d'une modification des traits clonaux en réponse à l'environnement biotique. Le clone est capable d'ajuster sa croissance horizontale selon l'identité de son compétiteur grâce aux informations collectées par les modules. La valeur adaptative de cette réponse plastique dans la résistance à la compétition dépend du structural blue-print de la plante mais peu de l'ontogénie. Nous montrons également que les traits clonaux ont un rôle majeur dans le fonctionnement des communautés en influençant leur productivité, probablement via les patrons spatiaux qu'ils génèrent. Ces résultats ont été utilisés dans le cadre de la mise en place des bandes enherbées, afin de définir un semis optimal par rapport à leur fonction de préservation de la qualité de l'eau.

Ce travail souligne l'importance des processus spatiaux observés à l'échelle du clone pour ceux opérant à l'échelle de la communauté ou de l'écosystème.

Mots-clés : Bande enherbée ; Mésocosmes ; Modèles Individu Centré ; Patrons spatiaux ; Plasticité ; Stratégies de croissance ; Traits clonaux.

ABSTRACT

Dispersion through clonal growth may be a major process of plant community structuring especially in grassland systems where most species are clonal. These species produce genetically identical ramets organized in a network structure, whose aggregation depends on the species clonal growth strategy.

The present thesis aims at analyzing and understanding grassland plant community dynamics based on spatial assembly rules of clonal species and determining its consequences for community functioning. To achieve these goals, we used complementary experimental and modeling approaches.

We demonstrated that clonal growth strategies determine community spatial structure at fine scale, generating a wide range of patterns. This variability was suggested to result from a modification of clonal traits in response to the biotic environment. Indeed, we demonstrated that clones are able to adjust horizontal growth based on competitor's identity. The adaptive nature of this plastic response in resistance to competition depended on plant structural blue-print and, to a lesser extent, on ontogeny. We also demonstrated that clonal traits had a major role in community functioning by influencing productivity, probably through the spatial patterns they drive. These results were applied to the establishment of herbaceous buffer strips and helped to define an optimal sowing to maximize water preservation.

The present thesis underlines the importance of spatial processes operating at the clone scale for those operating at the community or the ecosystem scale.

Keywords: Clonal traits; Growth strategies; Herbaceous buffer strips; Individual Based Models; Spatial patterns; Plasticity; Mesocosms.