1 Stream distance and vegetation structure are among the major factors

2 affecting various groups of arthropods in non-riparian chestnut forests

- 3
- 4 Sergio Albacete^a, Ralph Mac Nally^{b,c}, Miguel Carles-Tolrá^d, Marc Domènech^{ag}, Eduard
- 5 Vives^e, Xavier Espadaler^f, Juli Pujadé-Villar^a, Antoni Serra^{ah}, Alberto Maceda-Veiga^{ag*}
- 6
- 7 ^aDepartment of Evolutionary Biology, Ecology and Environmental Sciences, University
- 8 of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- 9 ^bInstitute for Applied Ecology, University of Canberra, Bruce ACT, Australia
- 10 ^cSchool of BioSciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville VIC, Australia
- 11 ^dAvda. Príncipe de Asturias, 30, Barcelona, Spain
- 12 ^eMuseu de Ciències Naturals de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- 13 ^fCREAF, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, Spain
- 14 ^{*g}</sup>Institute of Research in Biodiversity, IRBio, University of Barcelona, Spain*</sup>
- 15 ^hCentre de Recursos de Biodiversitat Animal, CRBA-UB, Barcelona, Spain
- 16
- 17

18

- 19 ^{*}corresponding author:
- 20 Alberto Maceda-Veiga
- 21 Email: albertomaceda@gmail.com
- 22 Department of Evolutionary Biology, Ecology and Environmental Sciences
- 23 Avda. Diagonal, 643
- 24 08028 Barcelona
- 25 Spain

26

27 Abstract

Streams are likely to be increasingly important for the conservation of non-riparian 28 29 forest diversity with increased aridity due to climate change in many parts of the world. 30 However, the importance of streams as promoters of non-riparian forest diversity has not been explored in detail. Given the likely stronger effect of surrounding habitats on 31 open forests, we examined chestnut woodlands in northern Spain (n = 32) to explore the 32 contribution of streams to variation in arthropod measures. We captured 5,490 33 arthropods (21 orders and 63 families) from which we calculated total abundance and 34 35 richness and the abundance of trophic guilds. Vegetation structure at the tree and understory levels often made the largest independent contributions to explained 36 37 variation in arthropod numbers and effects suggested alterations in arthropods' foodweb. Negative effects of stream-distance on taxon richness and the abundance of 38 39 predators, omnivores and phytophages seemed to be largely mediated by vegetation structure. The exception was a strong univariate inverse association between the 40 41 abundance of aerial predators and stream distance, possibly because wasps might be exploiting riverine habitats. Overall, effects of stream-distance were weaker for ground 42 43 than for aerial arthropod groups. Moreover, arthropod numbers were greater at sites 44 with low tree species richness and tall and species-rich understories, raising concerns 45 for the ecological consequences of the abandonment of traditional forest practices in these woodlands. Gains in arthropod diversity and ecosystem services (e.g. pest control, 46 nutrient cycling, pollination) might be had if non-riparian forests are managed in a way 47 48 that depends on stream-distance. Inferences may improve with a more complete knowledge of the biology of poorly studied groups, such as flies. 49 50

51 Keywords: arthropods; trophic guilds; rural abandonment; tree richness; understory
52 development; leaf litter; streams; woodlands; old-growth trees;

53

54 1. Introduction

Climate, geomorphology and human activities determine the structure of extant 55 forests around the world (Ellis, 2015; Ghazoul and Chazdon, 2017), and temperate 56 deciduous forests are among the most human altered (Gilliam, 2016). Logging and land 57 clearing for agriculture have degraded these forests for centuries, but relatively recent 58 59 human movements from rural areas to cities has led to forest regeneration in parts of Europe and North America (Malavasi et al., 2018). Not only have forests increased in 60 61 area in Europe (Navarro and Pereira, 2015), but what have been open forests have 62 become denser and structurally more complex, with high tree densities and well-63 developed understories (Spitzer et al., 2008; Malavasi et al., 2018). Although structural complexity often promotes biodiversity (Paillet et al., 2010), shading in older or dense 64 forests may reduce understory diversity (Kovac et al., 2018). Therefore, the 65 66 chronosequences of forests with different structural complexity provides an opportunity 67 to identify the main promoters and modulators of biodiversity (Vesk et al., 2008).

68 Temperate deciduous forests often are in regions with warm, moist summers and cool winters (Gilliam, 2016), so that the maintenance of moisture during mild seasons 69 70 might be an important factor for the conservation of their biodiversity (Fig. 1). Moisture 71 in forests depends on the ability of trees to maintain humidity and to channel water from rain and fog to the soil, all of which are associated with canopy and tree density 72 73 (Barbier et al., 2009). High leaf-litter biomass and well-developed understories retain soil moisture and humidity (Gilliam, 2007). Streams provide terrestrial ecosystems with 74 75 water and other benefits, including more habitat diversity and being corridors for fauna (Ramey and Richardson, 2017; Selwood et al., 2017). However, the importance of 76 77 streams as promoters of biodiversity has been studied mostly in riparian habitats (e.g. 78 Maceda-Veiga et al., 2016; Paredes et al., 2017; Suri et al., 2017). Terrestrial and 79 aquatic systems exchange nutrients, energy and biota (Marczak et al., 2007; Ramey and Richardson, 2017). Distance from streams is often used as covariate in studies on 80 81 terrestrial species (e.g. Paredes et al., 2017). However, the relative contribution of streams to the diversity of non-riparian forests or woodlands has not been explored in 82 83 detail, which limits our ability to assess the potential of streams to mitigate increased 84 aridity on terrestrial ecosystems due to climate change (Garcia et al., 2014). 85 Studies addressing trophic guilds can provide useful insights into this question

because forest-vegetation structure and streams may affect basal resources available to
consumers (Likens and Bormann, 1974; Blondel, 2003). Changes in vegetation structure

and stream distance also can alter forest microclimate (e.g. moisture, temperature) 88 89 thereby influencing ecosystem processes (e.g. the organic matter cycle, Gilliam et al., 2014). Changes in forest conditions therefore can directly or indirectly affect many 90 forest organisms (Allen, 2016), but effects of alterations in trophic resources are 91 expected to be small for omnivores or decomposers due to their wide trophic spectrum 92 (Setäla et al., 2005). While predators can be generalist consumers, they may be 93 particularly affected because of dependence on the structure of the entire food-web 94 (Duffy, 2003; Tews et al., 2004). Nonetheless, many factors can affect the trophic guild 95 96 structure of consumers, including the complexity of food-webs (Setäla et al., 2005) and 97 consumers' mobility, with highly mobile animals probably less affected than more 98 sedentary taxa.

Arthropods are key taxa for exploring the ecological effects of alterations in 99 100 forest-vegetation structure because they are species rich and have diverse ecological 101 strategies (e.g. flying, detritivores, predators) (Stork, 2018; Yang and Gratton, 2014). 102 Moreover, arthropods' life-history, and so the ecosystem processes where they act (e.g. 103 leaf-litter breakdown, Setäla et al., 2005), are sensitive to changes in microclimatic 104 conditions (A'Bear et al., 2014; Dray et al., 2014). As far as we are aware, no study has 105 explored how changes in vegetation structure and stream distance affect taxon richness 106 and the trophic guild structure of non-riparian arthropod assemblages. However, these 107 arthropod measures are likely to be suitable for assessing the links between non-riparian 108 forests and streams because arthropods are sensitive to changes in forest-vegetation 109 structure and microclimate (e.g. Jabin et al., 2004; Dauber et al., 2005; Allen, 2016; 110 Maceda-Veiga et al., 2016).

We trapped several groups of arthropods in northwestern Spain to explore the 111 112 links between streams and non-riparian chestnut (*Castanea sativa* Miller, 1768) forests. 113 Streams shape many temperate forests and woodlands around the world (Likens and Bormann, 1974; Mills, 1980) and forests in this region are no exception (García et al., 114 115 2014). The focal chestnut woodlands are typical examples of rural abandonment and 116 fragmentation, two threats affecting other temperate deciduous woodlands especially in Europe and North America (Miklín and Čížek, 2014; Gilliam, 2016; Sebek et al., 2016). 117 118 We expected stream distance to be an important factor in forest management if there are 119 clear associations with arthropods after accounting for the effects of other determinants of forest diversity (Table 1). If so, we expected stream effects to be particularly 120 121 important in open chestnut forests compared to more close ones because low structural

- vegetation development should provide fewer resources for arthropods (Fig. 1).
- 123 Moreover, structural vegetation development should be negatively associated with
- arthropods if arthropods benefit from the conditions promoted by rural abandonment.
- 125

126 **2. Materials and methods**

127 *2.1. Study area*

128 We surveyed 32 chestnut forest patches near to the Sites of Community Importance 'SCI ES1120016 Río Cabe' and 'ES1120001 Ancares-Courel' in 129 130 northwestern Spain (Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC, Fig. 2). Located in the municipality of O Incio, the study area (19 km²) is sparsely populated (c. 300 inhabitants), is far from 131 132 industries (>30 km) and has little ranching (c. 80 head of cattle). Air quality is good 133 gauging from the structure of epiphytic lichen assemblages (Maceda-Veiga and Gómez-134 Bolea, 2017). The climate is temperate oceanic sub-Mediterranean (Rivas-Martínez, 135 2004): fog is frequent, there is abundant rain (800-1800 mm annual), and the average annual temperature is 16°C, but summers can be dry and warm (<60mm; >27°C). 136

137 The management of chestnut forests consists of pruning trees in winter and an annual manual clear of the undergrowth at summer's end to facilitate harvesting 138 139 chestnuts in autumn. All sampling sites were on individually managed private 140 properties, which has led to a wide variation in forest structures depending on the 141 degree of 'abandonment' (Fig. 1, Appendix S1). The dominant forest species in the 142 study area are chestnuts followed by native oaks (Quercus robur and Q. pyrenaica). Open lands consist of grasslands, shrublands and seldom small orchards. Streams 143 (Strahler number = 1-2) and secondary roads with little traffic (e.g. 1 car/5 h) cross the 144 study area. The water quality in streams is good (Conductivity = $102-304 \mu$ S/cm, pH = 145 146 7.5-8, $NH_4 < 0.2 \text{ mg/l}$; A.M.V. unpublished data).

147

148 2.2. Forest patch characteristics: stream distance, vegetation and covariates

We measured the distance to the nearest stream for each sampling site and other 25 predictors and covariates that might affect arthropod assemblages. Arthropod traps (see the description in section 2.3.) were placed in the centre of 32 forest patches, from which we obtained the 26 measurements described in Appendix S2 in detail and that are outlined briefly below.

Structural development of vegetation was characterized for the tree (i.e. 154 measures of tree density, tree species richness, tree size and number of standing dead 155 156 trees) and understory levels (understory cover, understory species richness and 157 understory height). Dead litter biomass and deadwood cover were other indicators of 158 vegetation development in each sampling site, while the C and N stable isotope ratios was used as measures of litter quality and degree of decomposition. All predictors can 159 be regarded as informing *forest-microclimatic conditions*, although we measured light 160 intensity, temperature and litter moisture in all sampling sites (Appendix S2). 161

162 The covariates in our study were the spatial distribution of sampling sites (i.e. spatial correlations), the size and shape of forest patches and the type of vegetation 163 164 around each private property. We included the distance from each sampling site to the 165 centroid (median of all UTM-X and UTM-Y), elevation (m.a.s.l.) and slope in analyses. 166 Patch shape was calculated using the shape index = $p/2^*(\pi \cdot a)$ (Lang and Blaschke, 2007), where p is the perimeter and a is the area of each sampling site as indicated in 167 168 the Spanish record of forest properties (the 'Sigpac' visor). The surrounding vegetation 169 was estimated within 500 m of each arthropod trap by recording the percentage of the 170 surface with chestnut forest, other deciduous trees, pines, grasslands, shrublands, urban 171 areas, secondary roads and other land uses (e.g. orchards). Other radii (100 and 1000 m) 172 were less informative than 500 m in the study area (see Appendix S3).

173 2.3. Arthropod sampling

We set two types of pitfall traps from the 2nd to the 19th August 2017 (18 days in 174 175 the boreal summer) to improve the likelihood of capture of arthropods with different 176 mobilities and feeding strategies. Crawling arthropods were captured using ground pitfall traps, which mostly capture ground predators (Sabu et al., 2011). We placed a 177 500-ml polyethylene container (10 cm diameter) with a funnel, filled with concentrated 178 179 sea salt solution as the preservation agent as described in Maceda-Veiga et al. (2016). 180 Several groups of flying insects were caught using a modified version of the widely 181 used beer trap (Dvorák et al., 2010; Manko et al., 2018); we placed a 200-ml polyethylene container (5 cm diameter) with a funnel, filled with Estrella Galicia[®] beer, 182 vinegar, and sugar as a bait (Carles-Tolrá et al., 2017). The container had a lid with a U-183 shape to prevent rain from entering the trap. We hung the traps on a tree branch at c. 1.5 184 185 m from the ground and at c. 40 m from the trunk. In our pilot study we found that this bait attracted some predators (e.g. social and parasitic wasps, scorpion flies) and several 186

groups of decomposers and fermented liquid feeders (e.g. Nitidulidae, Staphylinidae, 187 Heleomyzidae, Muscidae, Drosophilidae, Sarcophagidae; A.M.V. & M.C.T. 188 unpublished data). Therefore, this trap was suitable for exploring how changes in forest-189 190 microclimatic conditions may have affected the microbial-driven process of 191 fermentation, and hence, the dependent insects (e.g. Becher et al., 2012). Our bait trap 192 was not occluded by similar food items in the focal forests during the surveys (e.g. decaying fruits or mushrooms). We emulated the presence of ephemeral and patchy 193 resources as do dung and carrion traps for insects (Braack, 1987; Gibbs and Stanton, 194 195 2001).

196 Owners allowed us to set only one trap for flying insects and one for ground 197 arthropods at the centre of each private property. In the pilot study, we set three pitfall 198 traps spaced 20 m apart in four of the studied sites and mean±SD arthropod richness and 199 abundance were 17 ± 2.5 and 75 ± 25 , respectively (Appendix S4). Moreover, we 200 measured patch features for each trap location, calculated estimated species richness and 201 included patch size as covariate (see section 2.4.). All arthropods from each trap were preserved in a single pot with 70% ethanol and were identified in the laboratory to the 202 203 lowest taxonomic possible level (Appendix S5). The proportions of individuals 204 identified to species level were similar among sites (e.g. mean \pm SD = 0.38 \pm 0.09). All 205 individuals of families identified by taxonomic experts were identified to species level 206 and assigned to an adult trophic guild based on literature, mouth morphology, and 207 authors' personal observations (Appendix S5). For taxa not identified to species level, 208 we recorded the family as an additional 'species' in richness measures if no other 209 individuals classified to species level was from that family in a sample.

210 2.4. Statistical analyses

211 The associations with vegetation structure and stream distance were assessed 212 separately for soil and flying arthropods. The response variables were abundance and 213 observed and estimated species richness. We used the Chao1 species-richness estimator 214 to explore the possible effects of the incompleteness of species inventories based on 215 how species detection varied as function of differences in arthropod captures across 216 sampling sites (Walther and Moore, 2005). For greater analytical sensitivity, gradients 217 of variation in forest-patch characteristics were used in analyses rather than categorizing 218 forest patches (e.g. more or less abandoned).

219

220 2.4.1. Data transformations and dealing with collinearity among predictors

All analyses were conducted in R (R Core Team, 2018) using the functions 221 222 outlined below. The distributions of all predictors were visually inspected and, where 223 necessary, transformations were made to make the predictors more normally distributed 224 (e.g. log for all continuous variables). Understory cover was transformed into a 225 categorical variable with three levels (0%, 1-75%, and >75%) and deadwood into presence or absence data because the usual recommended transformations for this type 226 of data were ineffective. Predictors were standardized using the R function scale to be 227 228 expressed on units of standard deviation of the respective predictors.

Collinearity causes instability in parameter estimation in linear models (Harrell, 2015). Therefore, the 26 predictors were examined for shared variance using the function *vif* in the package *usdm* (Naimi, 2015) using a threshold of \leq 3, a value recommended by Zuur et al. (2010). Spearman-rank correlation coefficients among omitted and selected variables according to VIF are shown in appendices S1 and S6 and a rationale for each retained predictor is provided in Table 1.

235 2.4.2. General linear models and hierarchical partitioning

Inspection of the distributions of the response variables (for ground and aerial
traps separately) indicated that abundance had a log-Gaussian distribution and that
richness had a Poisson distribution.

239 Variation in arthropod measures as function of forest-patch characteristics was examined using generalized lineal models (GLMs) and analyses of hierarchical 240 241 partitioning (HP). Standardized regression coefficients of GLMs (the R function glm in 242 the package MASS, Ripley et al., 2013) indicated the direction and magnitude of the 243 associations between forest patches and arthropods. HP analysis (the R function 244 *hier.part* in the package *hier.part*, Walsh and Mac Nally, 2015) was used to compute 245 the independent explained variances by individual predictors and covariates in GLMs 246 while accounting for residual collinearity among predictors (Mac Nally, 2000).

The initial GLM for all response variables and arthropod groups accounted for the effects of stream distance and all predictors related to structural vegetation development, forest microclimatic conditions and covariates from Appendix S6. Initial GLMs also included the interactions of stream distance with litter biomass, tree density, understory height and understory cover to explore whether the effects of stream distance depended on structural vegetation development. The most relevant predictors among all 253 possible combinations in GLMs explaining variation in response variables were identified using the function *dredge* in the package *MuMin* (Barton, 2018). A summary 254 255 model based on model averaged coefficients of the 'best' models (Akaike Information Criterion corrected for small sample sizes, AICc ≤ 2) was computed using the R 256 257 function *model.avg* in the package *MuMIn*. Overall fit for the averaged model was calculated as: [null deviance-residual deviance]/null deviance (i.e. % explained 258 deviance) (Mac Nally et al., 2018). Diagnostic plots of model residuals showed that the 259 statistical assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variances and the presence of 260 261 unduly observations were met (Zuur et al., 2010).

There would be support for the expectation that streams might be important for explaining variation in non-riparian arthropod data if the final GLMs included additive or interactive effects for stream distance and their effect sizes (± 95% confidence intervals, CI) excluded zero. The individual importance of the predictors identified by GLMs was also assessed using HP analyses and statistical significance was gauged based on the upper 95% confidence interval using permutation tests with 999 permutations (the R function *rand.hp*, Walsh and Mac Nally, 2015).

269

270 **3. Results**

The 32 forest properties spanned spatial gradients of structural development of vegetation and stream distance (Appendix S1). Stream distance was poorly correlated with measures of structural development of vegetation (understory height Spearman's ρ = 0.03; understory cover, ρ = 0.15; litter biomass, ρ = 0.03; tree density, ρ = 0.15; *P* > 0.05), so that their interactive effects with stream distance could be explored. Tree density was negatively associated with tree perimeter (ρ = 0.60; P < 0.05) and was positively associated with understory height (ρ = 0.48; P < 0.05), reflecting the vertical

- 278 development of vegetation in unmanaged chestnut woodlands.
- 279

Ground traps captured 1,666 individuals from 6 classes and 16 orders, while aerial traps
snared 3,824 specimens from 5 orders and 40 families (Table 2, Appendix S5). Ground
arthropods belonged to four adult trophic guilds and aerial captures were from three
trophic guilds (Appendix S5). Ground traps mostly captured predators and omnivores,
while aerial traps mostly trapped omnivores. However, omnivory differed among trap

285 methods; omnivores were floral visitors and fermented-liquid feeders (e.g. decomposed

vegetables or animals) for aerial traps and hunters, occasionally frugivores anddecomposers of carrion or dead plants for ground traps.

288

289 *3.1. Models for total abundance and taxon richness*

290 The explained variances of the best-fitting GLMs for ground-trap data were from 0.47 to 0.62 and model fits for aerial-trap data were from 0.43 to 0.73 (Table 3). GLMs for 291 Chao-estimated richness in aerial and ground arthropods had the best model fits. GLMs 292 and HP models consistently showed that tree richness and density made the largest 293 294 individual contributions to explaining variation in ground-arthropod measures. For 295 aerial captures, understory height, litter biomass, stream distance and the type of land 296 uses surrounding the focal forest patches individually explained substantial variation in 297 HP analyses. However, the interactive effects between stream distance and some 298 vegetation variables (litter biomass and understory height or cover) were important for 299 the Chao-estimated richness in ground captures and for the three measures (abundance, 300 observed and Chao-estimated richness) in aerial captures (Table 3).

301 Overall, numbers of arthropods were associated positively with understory 302 height or cover, litter biomass or quality and tree abundance (Table 3, Fig. 3). However, 303 associations between arthropods and tree richness or stream distance were negative 304 (Table 3, Fig. 3). The association between stream distance and ground captures changed 305 from negative to positive with greater litter biomass (Fig. 4). Taller understories appeared to reduce the negative association of stream distance with aerial captures (Fig. 306 307 5). Conversely, the inverse association between stream distance and aerial captures was 308 accentuated by greater litter biomass (Fig. 4).

309

310 *3.2. Models for the abundance of trophic guilds*

The explained variances of GLMs for the trophic guilds of ground arthropods were from 0.32 to 0.68 and model fits for flying insects were from 0.13 to 0.38 (Table 4). The best model fits were for the abundance of ground phytophages and aerial predators (excluding parasitoids). Overall, the trophic guilds for ground arthropods were more sensitive to forest-patch characteristics than those for flying insects (Table 4). Stream distance was more influential in explaining variation in aerial arthropods (negative association) than for ground arthropods.

318 Variation in the abundance of ground predators was due mostly to a negative319 association with tree species richness and a positive association with the amount of open

320 space due to secondary roads. Variation in the abundance of aerial predators (excluding 321 parasitoids) largely was due to a negative association with stream distance (Table 4). 322 However, tall understory height was the most important factor in explaining the 323 abundance of parasitoids (Table 4). While statistically weak, the abundance of aerial 324 omnivores was negatively associated with stream distance and was positively related to 325 litter biomass (Table 4). Conversely, the abundance of ground omnivores was significantly negatively associated with tree richness and positively associated with tree 326 327 density (Table 4). Decomposers, which were only from ground traps, had a marked 328 positive association with litter moisture (Table 4). Variation in the abundance of 329 phytophages, also only from ground traps, was mostly positive associated with 330 understory cover (Table 4).

331 The interactive effects between stream distance and tree density or understory 332 height were important for phytophages, omnivores and predators (Table 4). The 333 negative association between the abundance of phytophages and stream distance was 334 accentuated by lower vegetation heights or greater tree densities (Appendix S7). The 335 inverse association between litter biomass and the abundance of aerial omnivores was 336 accentuated by greater stream distances. Last, greater understory heights seemed to 337 partially offset the negative effects of stream distance on the abundance of aerial predators (Appendix S7). 338

339

340 **4. Discussion**

Our study provides insights into how the abundance and diversity of several groups of arthropods might benefit from different vegetation structures in non-riparian forests conditional on stream distance. The links between streams and non-riparian forests are largely unexplored compared to the many reports of links (e.g. exchanges of energy and biota) between streams and riparian habitats (Standford, 1998; Sabo and Power, 2002; Ramey and Richardson, 2017).

347 Stream distance was negatively associated with 66% of total arthropod 348 measures, being the strongest effects for aerial captures in general, and with omnivores 349 and predators (excluding parasitoids) in particular. However, these associations were 350 reversed at sites with greater structural development of vegetation, probably due to less 351 severe microclimates and the availability of more resources for arthropods. Chestnut 352 woodlands further from streams probably are less humid and our results may have been 353 exacerbated by surveys having been conducted in the summer of a particularly dry year

(33% less rain than the regional annual mean of $1,408.3 \text{ l/m}^2$). However, this amount of 354 drying may be common in future (Rodríguez-Puebla and Nieto, 2010; Garcia et al., 355 2014), so the results are probably highly informative. Species of the most-recorded fly 356 357 families (e.g. Heleomyzidae, Lauxaniidae, Fanniidae, Drosophilidae) feed on decaying 358 plant and fungi (Hövemeyer, 2000; Krivosheina, 2008), and decomposition is accelerated under humid conditions. Understory development is associated with forest 359 patches maintaining moister conditions (Gilliam, 2007; Parker et al., 2012). Therefore, 360 measures of vegetation structure might have reflected better the microclimatic regime 361 362 that arthropods experience than snap-shot measures of forest environmental conditions 363 (e.g. temperature, lighting). The positive association between understory height and 364 plant species richness suggested that inferences from microclimate may be partially 365 occluded by a greater diversity of resources for arthropods, which occur at sites with 366 high plant richness (e.g. shelter, food; Lawton, 1983; Haddad et al., 2009). If greater understory height or cover increased the abundance of prey, the observed increases in 367 368 predator abundance then are to be expected.

369 Alongside indirect effects, the inverse association between stream distance and 370 aerial captures may be due to insects directly exploiting riverine habitats. The distance 371 between streams and focal forest patches ranged from 4 to 620 m, which is within the 372 flight range of many insects (e.g. Dew and Michener, 1978; Roitberg et al., 1984; Stanfield and Hunter, 2009). Riparian habitats often had dead trunks with fungi (A.M.V. 373 374 observation), which are a foraging resource to often recorded omnivorous flies (e.g. 375 Drosophiliidae, *Phaonia pallida* (Fabricius, 1787); Papp, 2002; Chandler, 2010). Diets 376 of aerial predators (vespids and hornets) include chewed wood fibers and arthropods 377 occurring in riparian habitats (e.g. flies, spiders) (Harris, 1991; Beggs et al., 2011). Hornets (e.g. Vespa crabro Linnaeus 1758) also might be able to build their nests in 378 379 chestnuts close to streams because humidity increases bark thickness (Stahl et al., 380 2010). Last, captured flies and wasps might be using riparian corridors as flight paths; 381 forest roads ≤ 15 m are used by hoverflies in this way (Gittings et al., 2006), but this 382 question has not been investigated for dipterans and wasps in rivers.

383 Stream distance had the largest independent contribution to explained variation 384 in the abundance of aerial predators, but the individual contributions of tree or 385 understory features were more important for the other arthropod measures. For ground 386 arthropods, tree richness had the strongest (negative) association, notwithstanding high 387 plant richness often is associated with high arthropod diversity (Dinnage et al., 2012; 388 Sobek et al., 2009). However, tree richness in our study was a measure of poor chestnut-389 woodland condition. Other native trees (e.g. Quercus robur, Prunus avium) grow in 390 unmanaged chestnut forests (Conedera et al., 2016), so that our study may add various 391 groups of arthropods to the list of taxa that benefits from the maintenance of open old-392 growth chestnut woodlands (Guitián et al., 2012). Plantations of apple trees and poplar *Populus* spp., found in the focal forests with tree richness > 3, seemed to be particularly 393 detrimental for ground arthropods, which is consistent with how sensitive ground 394 arthropods are to alterations in the resources trees provide to soils (e.g. physical habitat, 395 396 food) (Vehviläinen et al., 2008; Tedersoo et al., 2016). Increased tree density, which 397 was mainly due to young chestnut trees, was associated positively with the abundance 398 of ground omnivores. The most likely explanation for this finding is the preference of 399 the most-recorded omnivores, wood crickets Nemobious sylvestris (Bosc, 1792), for 400 open canopies (Brouwers and Newton, 2009), which are typical of young forests.

401 Understory development was particularly important for explaining variation in 402 the abundance of aerial parasitoids and ground phytophages. Results for parasitoids 403 support the broad evidence that diverse and tall understories promote insects important 404 for natural pest control in agriculture and forestry (e.g. Ichneumonidae, Braconidae; 405 Bugg and Waddington, 1994; Smith et al., 2015). Outcomes for ground phytophages 406 showed the expected positive association with vegetation cover (Lawton, 1983), albeit 407 the association was negative with understory height. The fern Pteridium aquilinum was 408 common at sites with tall understories (1 m height) but is not palatable for many phytophages (Cooper-Driver, 1990). The negative association between phytophages and 409 410 tall understories also might reflect that *P. aquilinum* prevents the development of other plants (Gliessman and Muller, 1978). Litter moisture content was the most influential 411 412 individual predictor for ground decomposers and, to a lesser extent, for ground 413 predators. Effects of moisture on decomposers were expected given the diet of these animals and their sensitivity to desiccation (e.g. isopods) (Paris, 1963; Purchart et al., 414 415 2013). The positive association of litter moisture with ground predators probably 416 indicated the moisture requirements of prey; carabids often feed on earthworms and 417 snails (Jelaska et al., 2014). Moreover, greater captures of predators at moist sites 418 suggested that predators are promoted in mature woodlands. Old-growth forest stands 419 often are moister and provide more resources to consumers than those younger (Schowalter, 1995; Siitonen et al., 2000), thereby enabling more predators (Duffy, 2003; 420 421 Tews et al., 2004).

Although our study shows some clear associations between forest-patch 422 423 characteristics and arthropod assemblage composition and abundances, our conclusions 424 are from only 21 orders and 63 families of a highly diverse phyla in the Iberian 425 Peninsula with 115 families of dipterans alone (Carles-Tolrá, 2002). Our trophic guild 426 approach could be improved by using more advanced methods, such as trophic tracers 427 (e.g. nitrogen stable isotopes, McNabb et al., 2001; Thompson et al., 2005), given that 428 the exact trophic positions of captured arthropod taxa were uncertain. Moreover, arthropods were sampled using pitfall traps, whose captures depend on arthropod 429 430 mobility, habitat structure, weather conditions, the number of traps used and content, 431 particularly bait traps (Melbourne, 1999; Sabu and Shiju, 2010; Manko et al., 2018). 432 However, the use of the same sampling design for the whole study area makes our 433 results comparable. The density of vegetation was unlikely to have much affected 434 ground traps because crawling arthropods were not only statistically associated with 435 understory height but were positively correlated with understory cover. Among the 436 captured flying insects, there were forest specialists (e.g. P. pallida) and 'wanderers' 437 (e.g. vespids, other flies), which may transfer microbes and affect ecological flows 438 among forests and other habitats, including rivers. Our results should be interpreted 439 such that the environmental conditions in the focal forests are suitable for the captured 440 flying insects if food is available. However, long-term data are necessary to understand the complex dynamics of insects in general and of fermented-liquid feeders in 441 particular, including the relatively understudied dipterans. 442

443

444 **5.** Conclusions

The focal chestnut forest patches exemplified one of the major biodiversity 445 446 challenges in temperate regions, namely, the conservation of open old-growth 447 woodlands (Gondard et al., 2001; Lindenmayer et al., 2010; Miklín and Čížek, 2014; Sebek et al., 2016). Given the high influence of surrounding habitats on open forests 448 449 (Murcia, 1995; Wright et al., 2010), chestnut woodlands are an exemplar to explore the 450 influence of streams in the complex dynamics of non-riparian arthropods. Effects of 451 stream distance on taxon richness and the abundance of arthropod guilds seemed to be 452 mediated mostly by vegetation structure. The exception was the strong association of 453 stream distance and the abundance of aerial predators, possibly because predators' home ranges might include riparian habitats. Overall, various groups of arthropods were 454 455 positively associated with indicators of the presence of forest management (i.e. tall and

- 456 species-rich understories and low tree-species richness). Gains in the diversity and
- 457 abundance of arthropods with different food requirements might be had if the structural
- 458 development of vegetation is managed in a way that depends on stream distance.
- 459 Invertivores and ecosystem processes (e.g. nutrient cycling, pest control, pollination)
- 460 are likely to benefit from such a management strategy in chestnut woodlands and
- 461 systems of patches of other kinds of open temperate deciduous forests around the world.

462 Acknowledgements

- S.A. and A.M.V. contributed equally to this study. We are grateful to two anonymous
 reviewers and the handling editor María Elena Fernández for their useful suggestions.
- 465 AMV dedicated this work to his uncle Bautista Veiga ("Braulio") who passed away
- shortly before the surveys of this study began. We thank all forest owners and the
- 467 family of AMV for helping with the logistics of the field surveys. We also thank the
- 468 taxonomical assistance of F. Mestres (*Drosophila suzukii*), A.C. Pont (Muscidae), X.
- 469 Font (plants), I. Soriano (plants) and L.C. Crespo (spiders). This study sets the
- 470 foundations of the future 'Centro de Investigaciones Agro-Fluviales O Incio'.
- 471

472 **References**

- A'Bear, A. D., Jones, T. H., Boddy, L., 2014. Potential impacts of climate change on
 interactions among saprotrophic cord-forming fungal mycelia and grazing soil
 invertebrates. Fungal Ecol. 10, 34-43.
- Allen, D.C., 2016. Microclimate modification by riparian vegetation affects the structure and
 resource limitation of arthropod communities. Ecosphere 7
 https://doi.org/10.1002/ecs2.1200
- Barbier, S., Balandier, P., Gosselin, F. 2009. Influence of several tree traits on rainfall
 partitioning in temperate and boreal forests: A review. Ann. Forest Sci. 66, 602-613.
- 481 https://doi.org/10.1051/forest/2009041
- Barton, K., 2018. Package "MuMIn": Multi-Model Inference. R Software Package. Cran R.
 Version 1.42.1
- Beggs, J. R., Brockerhoff, E. G., Corley, J. C., Kenis, M., Masciocchi, M., Muller, F. et al.
 2011. Ecological effects and management of invasive alien Vespidae. BioControl 56, 505526.
- 487 Blondel, J. 2003. Guilds or functional groups: does it matter? Oikos 100, 223-231.
- 488 Brouwers, N.C., Newton, A.C., 2009. The influence of habitat availability and landscape
- 489 structure on the distribution of wood cricket (*Nemobius sylvestris*) on the Isle of Wight,

- 490 UK. Landsc. Ecol. 24, 199–212. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-008-9298-4
- Bugg, R. L., Waddington, C. 1994. Using cover crops to manage arthropod pests of orchards: a
 review. Agricul. Ecosyst. Environ. 50, 11-28.
- 493 Carles-Tolrá, M., Albacete, S., Maceda-Veiga, A. 2017. Tres especies nuevas de dípteros para
 494 España (Diptera: Lauxaniidae, Periscelididae, Fanniidae). Arquiv. Entomolox. 19, 167495 168.
- Chandler PJ. 2010. Associations with fungi and Mycetozoa. In: A Dipterist's handbook. 2nd ed.
 Chandler P, editor. Orpington (England): The Amateur Entomologists' Society. The
 Amateur Entomologist 15, 417–441.
- Conedera, M., Tinner, W., Krebs, P., de Rigo, D., Caudullo, G. 2016. *Castanea sativa* in
 Europe: distribution, habitat, usage and threats. European Atlas of Forest Tree Species (pp. 78-79)
- 502 Cooper-Driver, G. A. 1990. Defense strategies in bracken, *Pterididum aquilinum* (L.) Khun.
 503 Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 77, 281-286.
- Dauber, J., Purtauf, T., Allspach, A., Frisch, J., Voigtländer, K., Wolters, V., 2005. Local vs.
 landscape controls on diversity: a test using surface-dwelling soil macroinvertebrates of
 differing mobility. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 14, 213–221. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466822X.2005.00150.x
- 508 Dew, H. E., Michener, C. D. 1978. Foraging flights of two species of *Polistes* wasps
 509 (Hymenoptera: Vespidae). J Kansas Entomol. Soc. 380-385.
- 510 Dinnage, R., Cadotte, M.W., Haddad, N.M., Crutsinger, G.M., Tilman, D., 2012. Diversity of
 511 plant evolutionary lineages promotes arthropod diversity. Ecol. Lett. 15, 1308–1317.

512 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01854.x

- 513 Dray, M.W., Crowther, T.W., Thomas, S.M., A'Bear, A.D., Godbold, D.L., Ormerod, S.J.,
 514 Hartley, S.E., Jones, T.H., 2014. Effects of elevated CO2 on litter chemistry and
- subsequent invertebrate detritivore feeding responses. PLoS One 9, e86246.
- 516 http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0086246.
- 517 Duffy, J. E. 2003. Biodiversity loss, trophic skew and ecosystem functioning. Ecol. Lett. 6, 680-518 687.
- 519 Dvorák, L., Budrys, E., Cetkovic, A, Springate, S. 2010. Assemblages of social wasps in forests
 520 and open land across Europe an ALARM-FSN Study. In Chapter 2 Atlas of Biodiversity
 521 Risk pp. 50-51.
- 522 Ellis, E.C., 2015. Ecology in an anthropogenic biosphere. Ecol. Monogr. 85, 287–331.
 523 https://doi.org/10.1890/14-2274.1@10.1002/(ISSN)1557-7015.
- García, L., Pardo, I., Richardson, J. S. 2014a. A cross-continental comparison of stream
 invertebrate community assembly to assess convergence in forested headwater
 streams. Aquat. Sci. 76, 29-40.

- 527 Garcia, R. A., Cabeza, M., Rahbek, C., Araújo, M. B. 2014b. Multiple dimensions of climate
 528 change and their implications for biodiversity. Science 344(6183), 1247579.
- Ghazoul, J., Chazdon, R., 2017. Degradation and Recovery in Changing Forest Landscapes: A
 Multiscale Conceptual Framework. Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 42, 161–188.
 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurey-environ-102016-060736
- Gibbs, J.P., Stanton, E. 2001. Habitat fragmentation and arthropod community change: carrion
 beetles, phoretic mites and flies. Ecol. Appl. 11, 79-85.
- Gilliam, F.S. 2007. The ecological significance of the herbaceous layer in temperate forest
 ecosystems. BioScience 57, 845-858.
- Gilliam, F. S., Hédl, R., Chudomelová, M., McCulley, R. L., Nelson, J. A. 2014. Variation in
 vegetation and microbial linkages with slope aspect in a montane temperate hardwood
 forest. Ecosphere 5, 1-17.
- Gilliam, F.S., 2016. Forest ecosystems of temperate climatic regions: from ancient use to
 climate change. New Phytol. 212, 871–887. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.14255
- Gittings, T., O'Halloran, J., Kelly, T., Giller, P. S. 2006. The contribution of open spaces to the
 maintenance of hoverfly (Diptera, Syrphidae) biodiversity in Irish plantation
 forests. Forest Ecol. and Manag. 237, 290-300.
- Gliessman, S.R. and Muller, C.H., 1978. The allelopathic mechanisms of dominance in bracken
 (*Pteridium aquilinum*) in southern California. J. Chem. Ecol. 4, 337-362.
- Gondard, H., Romane, F., Grandjanny, M., Li, J., Aronson, J. 2001. Plant species diversity
 changes in abandoned chestnut (*Castanea sativa*) groves in southern France. Biodiv.
 Conserv. 10, 189-207.
- Guitián, J., Guitián, P., Munilla, I., Guitián, J., Garrido, J., Penín, L. et al. 2012. Biodiversity in
 Chestnut Woodlots: Management Regimen vs Woodlot Size. Open J. Forest. 2, 200.
- Haddad, N. M., Crutsinger, G. M., Gross, K., Haarstad, J., Knops, J. M., Tilman, D. 2009. Plant
 species loss decreases arthropod diversity and shifts trophic structure. Ecol. Let. 12, 10291039.
- Harrell, F.E., 2015. Regression modeling strategies : with applications to linear models, logistic
 and ordinal regression, and survival analysis.
- Harris, R. J. 1991. Diet of the wasps *Vespula vulgaris* and *V. germanica* in honeydew beech
 forest of the South Island, New Zealand. New Zeal. J. Zool. 18, 159-169.
- Hövemeyer, K. 2000. Ecology of Diptera. L. Papp, B. Darvas (Eds), Contributions to a manual
 of Paleartic Diptera, vol. 1, Science Herald, Budapest. pp 437-490.
- Jabin, M., Mohr, D., Kappes, H., Topp, W., 2004. Influence of deadwood on density of soil
 macro-arthropods in a managed oak-beech forest. For. Ecol. Manage. 194, 61–69.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FORECO.2004.01.053
- 563 Kovac, M., Hladnik, D., Kutnar, L., 2018. Biodiversity in (the Natura 2000) forest habitats is

- not static: its conservation calls for an active management approach. J. Nat. Conserv. 43,
- 565 250–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JNC.2017.07.004
- 566 Krivosheina, N.P., 2008. Macromycete fruit bodies as a habitat for dipterans (Insecta, Diptera).
 567 Entomol. Rev. 88, 778–792. https://doi.org/10.1134/S0013873808070038
- Lacasella, F., Gratton, C., De Felici, S., Isaia, M., Zapparoli, M., Marta, S., Sbordoni, V., 2015.
- 569Asymmetrical responses of forest and "beyond edge" arthropod communities across a
- 570 forest–grassland ecotone. Biodivers. Conserv. 24, 447–465.
- 571 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-014-0825-0
- 572 Lang, S., Blaschke, T. 2007. Landschaftsanalyse mit GIS. Stuttgart: Ulmer.
- Lawton, J. H. 1983. Plant architecture and the diversity of phytophagous insects. Ann. Rev.
 Entom. 28, 23-39.
- Likens, G. E., Bormann, F. H. 1974. Linkages between terrestrial and aquatic
 ecosystems. BioScience 24, 447-456.
- Lindenmayer, D.B., Bennett, A.F., Hobbs, R.J. (eds.). 2010. Temperate woodland conservation
 and management. CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne, Vic.
- Mac Nally, R., 2000. Regression and model-building in conservation biology, biogeography and
 ecology: The distinction between and reconciliation of 'predictive' and 'explanatory'
 models. Biodivers. Conserv. 9, 655–671. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008985925162
- Mac Nally, R., Duncan, R.P., Thomson, J.R., Yen, J.D.L., 2018. Model selection using
 information criteria, but is the "best" model any good? J. Appl. Ecol. 55, 1441–1444.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13060
- Maceda-Veiga, A., Basas, H., Lanzaco, G., Sala, M., de Sostoa, A., Serra, A., 2016. Impacts of
 the invader giant reed (*Arundo donax*) on riparian habitats and ground arthropod
- 587 communities. Biol. Invasions 18, 731–749. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-015-1044-7
- Maceda-Veiga, A., Gómez-Bolea, A., 2017. Small, fragmented native oak forests have better
 preserved epiphytic lichen communities than tree plantations in a temperate sub-oceanic
 Mediterranean climate region. Bryologist 120, 191–201. https://doi.org/10.1639/0007-
- **591** 2745-120.2.191
- Malavasi, M., Carranza, M.L., Moravec, D., Cutini, M., 2018. Reforestation dynamics after land
 abandonment: a trajectory analysis in Mediterranean mountain landscapes. Reg. Environ.
- 594
 Chang. 18, 2459–2469. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-018-1368-9</u>
- Manko, P., Demková, L., Kohútová, M., Oboña, J., 2018. Efficiency of traps in collecting
 selected Diptera families according to the used bait: comparison of baits and mixtures in a
 field experiment. European J. Ecol. 4, 92-99.
- Marczak, L. B., Thompson, R. M., Richardson, J. S. 2007. Meta-analysis: trophic level, habitat,
 and productivity shape the food web effects of resource subsidies. Ecology 88, 140-148.
- 600 McNabb, D. M., Halaj, J., Wise, D. H. 2001. Inferring trophic positions of generalist predators

- and their linkage to the detrital food web in agroecosystems: a stable isotope
- analysis. Pedobiologia 45, 289-297.
- Mills, D. H. 1980. The Management of Forest Streams, Forestry Commission Leaflet, 78,
 HMSO, London.
- Miklín, J., Čížek, L. 2014. Erasing a European biodiversity hot-spot: open woodlands, veteran
 trees and mature forests succumb to forestry intensification, succession, and logging in a
 UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. J. Nat. Conserv. 22, 35-41.
- Murcia, C., 1995. Edge effects in fragmented forests: implications for conservation. Trends
 Ecol. Evolut. 10, 58-62.
- 610 Naimi, B., 2015. Uncertainty analysis for species distribution models. R Software Package.611 Cran R.
- Navarro, L.M., Pereira, H.M., 2015. Rewilding Abandoned Landscapes in Europe, in:
 Rewilding European Landscapes. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 3–23.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12039-3 1
- Paillet, Y., Bergès, L., Hjältén, J., Ódor, P., Avon, C. et al. 2010. Biodiversity differences
 between managed and unmanaged forests: meta-analysis of species richness in Europe.
 Conserv. Biol. 24, 101–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01399.x
- Papp, L. 2002. Dipterous guilds of small-sized feeding sources in forests of Hungary. Acta
 Zool. Acad. Sci. H. 48, 197-213.
- Paredes, O.S.L., Norris, D., Oliveira, T.G. de, Michalski, F., 2017. Water availability not
 fruitfall modulates the dry season distribution of frugivorous terrestrial vertebrates in a
- 622 lowland Amazon forest. PLoS One 12, e0174049.
- 623 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174049
- Parker, W.C., Pitt, D.G., Morneault, A.E., 2012. Influence of herbaceous and woody vegetation
 control on seedling microclimate, leaf gas exchange, water status, and nutrient relations of
 Pinus strobus L. seedlings planted in a shelterwood. Forest Ecol. Manag. 271, 04-114.
- 627 Paris, O. H. 1963. The ecology of *Armadillidium vulgare* (Isopoda: Oniscoidea) in California

628 grassland: food, enemies, and weather. Ecol. Monogr. 33, 1-22.

- Purchart, L., Tuf, I. H., Hula, V., Suchomel, J. 2013. Arthropod assemblages in Norway spruce
 monocultures during a forest cycle–A multi-taxa approach. Forest Ecol. Manag. 306, 4251.
- **USI** J1
- 632 Ramey, T.L. and Richardson, J.S., 2017. Terrestrial invertebrates in the riparian zone:

633 mechanisms underlying their unique diversity. BioScience 67, 808-819.

- R Core Team., 2018. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2012. URL http://www. R-project. org.
- 636 Ripley, B., Venables, B., Bates, D. M., Hornik, K., Gebhardt, A., Firth, D., & Ripley, M. B.,
- 637 2013. Package 'mass'. R Software Package. Cran R.

- Rivas-Martínez, S., 2004. Worldwide Bioclimatic Classification System, Global Bioclimatics
 (Clasificación Bioclimática de la Tierra), Phytosociological Research Center, Spain.
- Rodríguez-Puebla, C., Nieto, S. 2010. Trends of precipitation over the Iberian Peninsula and the
 North Atlantic Oscillation under climate change conditions. Int. J. Climatol. 30, 18071815.
- Roitberg, B. D., Cairl, R. S., Prokopy, R. J. 1984. Oviposition deterring pheromone influences
 dispersal distance in tephritid fruit flies. Entomol. Experiment. Appl. 35, 217-220.
- Sabo, J. L., Power, M. E. 2002. River–watershed exchange: effects of riverine subsidies on
 riparian lizards and their terrestrial prey. Ecology 83, 1860-1869.
- Sabu, T.K., Shiju, R.T., Vinod, K.V., Nithya, S. 2011. A comparison of the pitfall trap, Winkler
 extractor and Berlese funnel for sampling ground-dwelling arthropods in tropical montane
 cloud forests. J. Insect. Sci. 11, 1–19.
- Sebek, P., Vodka, S., Bogusch, P., Pech, P., Tropek, R., Weiss, M. et al. 2016. Open-grown
 trees as key habitats for arthropods in temperate woodlands: the diversity, composition,
 and conservation value of associated communities. Forest Ecol. Manag. 380, 172–181
- 653 Selwood, K.E., Clarke, R.H., McGeoch, M.A., Mac Nally, R., 2017. Green tongues into the arid
- cone: river floodplains extend the distribution of terrestrial bird species. Ecosystems 20,
 745–756. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-016-0059-y
- 656 Setälä, H., Berg, M.P., Jones, T.H., 2005. Chapter 13 Trophic structure and functional
 657 redundancy in soil communities. In Biological Diversity and Function in Soils. Editors:

Bardgett, R.D., Usher, M.B. and Hopkins, D.W. pp 236-244.

- Schowalter, T. D. 1995. Canopy arthropod communities in relation to forest age and alternative
 harvest practices in western Oregon. Forest Ecol. Manag. 78, 115-125.
- Siitonen, J., Martikainen, P., Punttila, P., Rauh, J. 2000. Coarse woody debris and stand
 characteristics in mature managed and old-growth boreal mesic forests in southern
 Finland. Forest Ecol. Manag. 128, 211-225.
- Spitzer, L., Konvicka, M., Benes, J., Tropek, R., Tuf, I.H., Tufova, J., 2008. Does closure of
 traditionally managed open woodlands threaten epigeic invertebrates? Effects of coppicing
 and high deer densities. Biol. Conserv. 141, 827-837.
- Stanford, J. A. 1998. Rivers in the landscape: introduction to the special issue on riparian and
 groundwater ecology. Freshwat. Biol. 40, 402-406.
- Stanfield, T. K., Hunter, F. F. 2009. Honeydew and nectar sugars differentially affect flight
 performance in female black flies. Canadian J. Zool. 88, 69-72.
- Jelaska, S.L., Franjevic, D., Jelaska, S.D., Symondson, W.O.C., 2014. Prey detection in carabid
 beetles (Coleoptera: Carabidae) in woodland ecosystems by PCR analysis of gut contents.
- 673 Eur. J. Entomol. 111, 631–638. https://doi.org/10.14411/eje.2014.079
- 674 Smith, I.M., Hoffmann, A.A., Thomson, L.J., 2015. Ground cover and floral resources in

675 shelterbelts increase the abundance of beneficial hymenopteran families. Agric. For.

```
676 Entomol. 17, 120–128. https://doi.org/10.1111/afe.12086
```

- Sobek, S., Tscharntke, T., Scherber, C., Schiele, S., Steffan-Dewenter, I., 2009. Canopy vs.
 understory: does tree diversity affect bee and wasp communities and their natural enemies
 across forest strata?. Forest Ecol. Manag. 258, 609-615.
- Stahl, C., Burban, B., Bompy, F., Jolin, Z. B., Sermage, J., Bonal, D. 2010. Seasonal variation
 in atmospheric relative humidity contributes to explaining seasonal variation in trunk
- 682 circumference of tropical rain-forest trees in French Guiana. J. Trop. Ecol. 26, 393-405.
- Stork, N.E., 2018. How many species of insects and other terrestrial arthropods are there on
 earth? Annu. Rev. Entomol. 63, 31–45. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-020117043348
- Suri, J., Anderson, P.M., Charles-Dominique, T., Hellard, E., Cumming, G.S., 2017. More than
 just a corridor: A suburban river catchment enhances bird functional diversity. Landsc.
 Urban Plan. 157, 331–342. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANDURBPLAN.2016.07.013
- Tedersoo, L., Bahram, M., Cajthaml, T., Põlme, S., Hiiesalu, I., Anslan, S. et al. 2016. Tree
 diversity and species identity effects on soil fungi, protists and animals are context
 dependent. The ISME journal 10, 346.
- Tews, J., Brose, U., Grimm, V., Tielborger, K., Wichmann, M.C., Schwager, M., Jeltsch, F.
 2004. Animal species diversity driven by habitat heterogeneity/diversity: the importance of
 9 keystone structures. J. Biogeo. 31, 79-92.
- Thompson, D. R., Bury, S. J., Hobson, K. A., Wassenaar, L. I., Shannon, J. P. 2005. Stable
 isotopes in ecological studies. Oecologia 144, 517-519.
- 697 Vehviläinen, H., J. Koricheva, and K. Ruohomäki. 2008. Effects of stand tree species
 698 composition and diversity on abundance of predatory arthropods. Oikos 117, 935–943.
- Vesk, P.A., Nolan, R., Thomson, J.R., Dorrough, J.W., Nally, R. Mac, 2008. Time lags in
 provision of habitat resources through revegetation. Biol. Conserv. 141, 174–186.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOCON.2007.09.010
- 702 Walsh, C., Mac Nally, R. 2015. Package 'hier. part'. R Software Package. Cran R.
- Walther, B.A., Moore, J.L., 2005. The concepts of bias, precision and accuracy, and their use in
 testing the performance of species richness estimators, with a literature review of estimator
 performance. Ecography 28, 815–829. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2005.0906-7590.04112.x
- Wright, T. E., Kasel, S., Tausz, M., Bennett, L. T. 2010. Edge microclimate of temperate
- woodlands as affected by adjoining land use. Agricul. Forest Meteorol. 150, 1138-1146.
- Yang, L.H., Gratton, C., 2014. Insects as drivers of ecosystem processes. Curr. Opin. Insect Sci.
 2, 26–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COIS.2014.06.004
- Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Elphick, C.S., 2010. A protocol for data exploration to avoid common
 statistical problems. Methods Ecol. Evol. 1, 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-

- 712 210X.2009.00001.x