**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2019

The future of complementarity: disentangling causes from consequences

Barry, Kathryn E ; Mommer, Liesje ; van Ruijven, Jasper ; Wirth, Christian ; Wright, Alexandra J ;
Bai, Yongfei ; Connolly, John ; De Deyn, Gerlinde B ; de Kroon, Hans ; Isbell, Forest ; Milcu,
Alexandru ; Roscher, Christiane ; Scherer-Lorenzen, Michael ; Schmid, Bernhard ; Weigelt, Alexandra

Abstract: Evidence suggests that biodiversity supports ecosystem functioning. Yet, the mechanisms driving this relationship remain unclear. Complementarity is one common explanation for these positive biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationships. Yet, complementarity is often indirectly quantified as overperformance in mixture relative to monoculture (e.g., ‘complementarity effect’). This overperformance is then attributed to the intuitive idea of complementarity or, more specifically, to species resource partitioning. Locally, however, several unassociated causes may drive this overperformance. Here, we differentiate complementarity into three types of species differences that may cause enhanced ecosystem functioning in more diverse ecosystems: (i) resource partitioning, (ii) abiotic facilitation, and (iii) biotic feedbacks. We argue that disentangling these three causes is crucial for predicting the response of ecosystems to future biodiversity loss.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.10.013>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-161527>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) License.

Originally published at:

Barry, Kathryn E; Mommer, Liesje; van Ruijven, Jasper; Wirth, Christian; Wright, Alexandra J; Bai, Yongfei; Connolly, John; De Deyn, Gerlinde B; de Kroon, Hans; Isbell, Forest; Milcu, Alexandru; Roscher, Christiane; Scherer-Lorenzen, Michael; Schmid, Bernhard; Weigelt, Alexandra (2019). The future of complementarity: disentangling causes from consequences. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 34(2):167-180.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.10.013>

Title: The future of complementarity: Disentangling causes from consequences

Authors: Kathryn E. Barry^{1,2}, Liesje Mommer³, Jasper van Ruijven⁴, Christian Wirth^{1,2,4},
Alexandra J. Wright⁵, Yongfei Bai⁶, John Connolly⁷, Gerlinde B. De Deyn⁸, Hans de Kroon⁹,
Forest Isbell¹⁰, Alexandru Milcu^{11,12}, Christiane Roscher^{13,3}, Michael Scherer-Lorenzen¹⁴,
Bernhard Schmid¹⁵, and Alexandra Weigelt^{1,2}

Affiliations

¹Systematic Botany and Functional Biodiversity, Institute of Biology, Leipzig University;
Johannisallee 21-23, 04103 Leipzig, Germany.

²German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig; Deutscher
Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany.

³Plant Ecology and Nature Conservation Group, Wageningen University; PO box 47, NL-6700
AA Wageningen, the Netherlands.

³German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig; Deutscher
Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany.

⁴Fellowship Group Functional Biogeography, Max-Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Hans-
Knöll-Str. 10, 07745 Jena, Germany

⁵Department of Biological Sciences, California State University – Los Angeles. 5151 State
University Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90032-8201

⁶State Key Laboratory of Vegetation and Environmental Change, Plant Ecology Centre, Institute
of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, No.20 Nanxincun, Xiangshan, Beijing 100093,
China

23 ⁷School of Mathematics and Statistics, Ecological and Environmental Modelling Group,
24 University College Dublin, Dublin 4, Ireland

25 ⁸Soil Biology and Biological Soil Quality Group, Wageningen University; PO box 47, NL-6700
26 AA Wageningen, the Netherlands.

27 ⁹Department of Experimental Plant Ecology, Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Radboud
28 University; Heyendaalseweg 135, NL-6525 AJ Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

29 ¹⁰Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN
30 55108, USA

31 ¹¹CNRS, Ecotron (UPS-3248), Montferrier-sur-Lez, France

32 ¹²Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, CEFÉ-CNRS, UMR 5175, Université de
33 Montpellier, Université Paul Valéry, EPHE, IRD, Montpellier Cedex 5, France

34 ¹³Department of Physiological Diversity, UFZ - Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research,
35 04318 Leipzig, Permoserstrasse 15, Germany.

36 ¹⁴Faculty of Biology, Geobotany, University of Freiburg; Schänzlestrasse 1, 79104 Freiburg,
37 Germany

38 ¹⁵Department of Geography, University of Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

39

40 **Correspondence: kathryn.barry@idiv.de (K.E. Barry)**

41 **Abstract**

42 Evidence suggests that biodiversity supports ecosystem functioning. Yet, the mechanisms
43 driving this relationship remain unclear. Complementarity is one common explanation for these
44 positive biodiversity-ecosystem functioning relationships. Yet, complementarity is often
45 indirectly quantified as overperformance in mixture relative to monoculture (*e.g.*,
46 ‘complementarity effect’). This overperformance is then attributed to the intuitive idea of
47 complementarity or more specifically to species resource partitioning. However, locally, several
48 unassociated causes may drive this overperformance. Here, we differentiate complementarity
49 into three types of species differences that may cause enhanced ecosystem functioning in more
50 diverse ecosystems: 1. resource partitioning, 2. abiotic facilitation, and 3. biotic feedbacks. We
51 argue that disentangling these three causes is crucial for predicting the response of ecosystems to
52 future biodiversity loss.

The confusion over complementarity

Global biodiversity is declining at unprecedented rates [1,2]. Yet, biodiversity is crucial for maintaining **ecosystem functioning** (see glossary) and ecosystems' ability to deliver goods and services (reviewed by [3,4]). Complementarity is often invoked to explain this enhanced ecosystem functioning in diverse plant communities [5,6]. The intuitive idea behind this concept is that plant species are complementary if they fit together like puzzle pieces. Each species (puzzle piece) adds, at least partially, to total community functioning.

Yet, complementarity is currently used as both a cause of enhanced ecosystem functioning in diverse communities and a consequence of some community process (Figure 1,[7]). For example, in biodiversity–ecosystem functioning research, it is common to calculate measures of overproduction such as the '**complementarity effect**'. These measures of overproduction are statistical measures that demonstrate whether the performance of plant species mixtures exceeds their expected performance based on the monocultures of their component species [8]. These measures (Figure 1, right side) answer the question: do mixtures perform better than monocultures? The complementarity effect and other measures of overproduction of mixtures document the consequence (i.e enhanced ecosystem functioning) but not the underlying mechanistic cause [7]. Yet, these measures of overproduction in mixture are often interpreted as evidence for complementarity in the colloquial sense as a cause or more specifically for **resource partitioning**. In a review of 137 studies that calculated a complementarity effect (see Table 1 for search terms and methods), we found that 63% of studies conflated the complementarity effect (consequence) with complementarity (cause) already in the abstracts of the papers. Often, this interpretation is further misconstrued as evidence that species partition resources (*e.g.*, [3,6,7,9]). Indeed, 30% of studies that conflated complementarity with

the complementarity effect explicitly interpreted the complementarity effect as evidence that species partitioned resources in the abstract. This use of complementarity obscures the contribution of other causes that are not linked with the colloquial definition of complementarity and overemphasizes the contribution of resource partitioning to enhanced ecosystem functioning in more diverse mixtures.

In fact, several causes drive overproduction in mixture including resource partitioning, **abiotic facilitation**, and **biotic feedbacks** (Figure 1, left side, [8,10]). Here, we formally integrate these three sets of species differences into complementarity. We review the evidence that these causes may drive enhanced ecosystem functioning in more diverse mixtures. Further, we argue that disentangling the causes of complementarity helps us to predict how ecosystems will respond to future biodiversity loss.

A revised view of complementarity: from cause to consequence

We define complementarity as differences between species, functional groups, or genotypes that may (but need not) enhance ecosystem functioning. For simplicity, we refer throughout to ‘species’ but other taxonomic levels may be equally relevant. In keeping with this definition, species in any given community can differ from one another in three ways: 1. Species differ in the **resources** that they use (resource partitioning). 2. Species differ in their ability to alter their environment to benefit other species (abiotic facilitation). 3. Species differ in their biotic interactions with other trophic levels (biotic feedbacks). Species in any given community can differ in more than one of these ways. These differences form our preconditions for local plant diversity to enhance ecosystem functioning. Furthermore, these differences only enhance ecosystem functioning if — on average — they increase the performance of mixtures relative to

the performance of monocultures (Box 1). Below, we review the current research on resource partitioning, abiotic facilitation, and biotic feedbacks, and the evidence that they enhance ecosystem functioning in plant communities (Table 1). We also discuss classic examples which may be the result of several of these causes combined such as nitrogen fixation by legumes (Box 2).

Resource partitioning

Resource partitioning occurs when species use different portions of the available resource pool (cause). The result of resource partitioning is that the existing resource pool is more completely used in higher-diversity communities compared to monocultures (consequence, Figure 2.A, yellow line). In plant communities, resource partitioning happens across space (*e.g.* rooting depth, [11]), time (*e.g.* phenology of nutrient uptake, [12]), chemical form (*i.e.* Nitrate(NO_3^-); Ammonium(NH_4^+) and organic Nitrogen (N), [13]), or all of these combined [14].

Spatial partitioning

Quantifying spatial resource partitioning between plants generally relies on two approaches: 1) documenting space filling above- or belowground or 2) measuring resource uptake from different areas within the canopy or the rooting zone. Several studies demonstrate that plants more fully utilize vertical aboveground space with increasing diversity [15–20]. Belowground, this **pattern** is less clear. Indeed, several studies [21,22] found that plants allocate belowground biomass to deeper layers with increasing diversity. Yet others [23–26] found that plants are more likely to aggregate biomass in the topsoil with increasing diversity.

Belowground, isotope tracers may provide better evidence of spatial resource partitioning than root distribution [25,27–29]. However, like studies of belowground biomass allocation, resource tracer studies show mixed [12,25] and largely non-significant [25,27,28] evidence for spatial resource partitioning of common soil resources in space.

Temporal partitioning

Communities composed of groups of plants with distinct phenology often have enhanced ecosystem functioning relative to communities composed of species with similar phenology, *e.g.* if early- and late-season species are present. For example, Kahmen *et al.* [12] found that the uptake of nitrogen by different plant species varied across time (indicating the potential for resource partitioning), but that this variation was not associated with increased total N uptake. Alternatively, Jesch *et al.* [28] found no evidence that plant species partition water, nitrogen, or potassium across the growing season (also demonstrated by [14,30]).

Chemical form

Ashton *et al.* [13] found strong evidence that grassland species partitioned forms of nitrogen when in **competition** with a dominant species which took up the most available chemical form of nitrogen. von Felten *et al.* [25] also found evidence that species partitioned different forms of nitrogen (cause). However, increased partitioning of nitrogen forms was not associated with enhanced ecosystem functioning (consequence).

Overall, even when there is some evidence that species differ in their spatial or temporal use of resources [21,25], studies often fail to correlate this evidence of resource partitioning

(cause) with enhanced ecosystem functioning (consequence,[21,22]). Thus, these studies provide only limited support for the role of resource partitioning in complementarity — evidence tying the cause to the consequence of enhanced ecosystem functioning in grasslands is limited (but see [21,22] where evidence of spatial resource partitioning is linked to enhanced ecosystem functioning in mixture).

Abiotic facilitation

Abiotic facilitation occurs when a plant species benefits another plant species via changes to the abiotic properties of the environment, such as its microclimate, soil chemical properties, or soil physical properties (reviewed by [31,32], [33] for arid environments, [34] for agricultural systems). Abiotic facilitation may cause enhanced ecosystem functioning when species receive a benefit from being in high-diversity systems relative to low-diversity systems (Figure 2.B, blue line). Here, we limit abiotic facilitation to plant–plant interactions. Thus, we exclude nitrogen fixation (and similar cases) from this category, because non-plant interaction partners mediate both the nitrogen fixation and the transfer of this nitrogen to other members of the community (for the role of nitrogen-fixation in biodiversity–ecosystem functioning see Box 2). There are two non-mutually-exclusive ways in which plants likely facilitate each other: 1) plants may enrich the resource pool for neighboring plants, or 2) plants may mediate physical **stress**

Resource enrichment

Some plants make resources available to the community which were previously unavailable. We call this abiotic facilitation via resource enrichment. Abiotic facilitation via resource enrichment differs from resource partitioning in that specific plant traits *enlarge the*

168 *resource pool* for the whole plant community. In contrast to resource partitioning where different
169 plant species together *use the available resource pool* more completely.

170 For example, some plant species exude enzymes or organic acids that promote mineral
171 weathering and thereby enlarge the existing resource pool of plant-available soil nutrients
172 (cause). Other members of the plant community may benefit from this increased availability of
173 nutrients as well [34–36]. Another example where plants may enrich the local environment is
174 through hydraulic lift. Plants with deep roots may draw water up from a depth where it was
175 previously inaccessible [37]. These species then make the water available to plants with shallow
176 roots. Hydraulic lift occurs in both woody [38] and herbaceous [39] communities (cause), but
177 this has not yet been connected to enhanced growth of shallow rooted neighbors in biodiversity–
178 ecosystem functioning experiments in grasslands [40](consequence).

179 *Physical stress buffering*

180 Plants may provide a barrier against physical stress for other members of their
181 community. For example, Steudel *et al.* [41] found that high temperatures were better buffered in
182 high-diversity communities. Plant species may ameliorate the microclimate for other members of
183 their community by physically mediating wind, heat, or photoinhibition [32]. Milcu *et al.* [42]
184 demonstrated that this was likely in higher-diversity systems which had proportionally lower
185 evaporation and sensible heat flux (see also [43] for natural grasslands).

186
187
188 Overall, plants can enrich local resource availability and provide a buffer to physical
189 stress simultaneously across diversity gradients [32,44]. However, evidence to date does not

190 directly relate these effects to enhanced ecosystem functioning with higher diversity in grassland
191 plant species (consequence, but see [45] for non-vascular plant species).

193 *Biotic feedbacks from other trophic levels*

194 Increasing plant diversity may alter the strength of interactions between plants and other
195 trophic levels (reviewed by [46]). We refer to these interactions as biotic feedbacks from other
196 trophic levels. Biotic feedbacks from other trophic levels may enhance ecosystem functioning in
197 two ways: 1) species differ in their enemies (consumers/herbivores, pests and pathogens). The
198 negative interactions between plant and enemy may create strong conspecific negative **density**
199 **dependence**. This negative density dependence leads to reduced plant performance at low
200 diversity relative to high diversity (Figure 2.A, pink line, [47]). 2) Species differ in their
201 mutualists, these mutualists may also benefit other species (positive biotic feedbacks, Figure 2.B,
202 blue line). If the benefit of mutualists increases with increasing diversity (cause), then ecosystem
203 functioning increases with diversity (consequence, reviewed in [46]).

205 *Negative biotic feedbacks*

206 Plant species differ in both above- and belowground enemies (cause). When enemies are
207 sufficiently species-specific, plants are suppressed when they occur among members of their
208 own species in a negative density-dependent manner [48,49]. This monoculture suppression
209 means that ecosystem functioning of diverse communities is enhanced relative to these poorly
210 performing monocultures (consequence). Several studies now demonstrate that enemies in
211 grassland ecosystems can be species-specific and that their damage decreases with increasing
212 diversity (reviewed in [50,51]). Belowground, plant–soil feedback experiments (reviewed in

[52,53]) often find that negative feedback from soil enemies (cause) through negative density dependence contributes to enhanced ecosystem functioning (consequence) [54–56]. For example, Hendriks *et al.* [57] found that soil inoculated with species-specific soil biota caused monocultures to underperform relative to mixtures. Seabloom *et al.* [58] found that removing aboveground enemies (cause) increased overall biomass production by a constant proportion across a biodiversity gradient, leading to a greater increase in aboveground biomass production in higher-diversity communities (consequence).

Positive biotic feedbacks

If the positive effect of other non-plant species increases with increasing diversity, positive biotic feedbacks between plants and other species (including their mutualists) may also enhance ecosystem functioning (reviewed belowground in [46,53], above and belowground in [59]). However, few studies have linked non-resource related mutualists to ecosystem functioning. We include these resource-related mutualists such as mycorrhizae and rhizobia in the overlap between resource partitioning, abiotic facilitation, and biotic feedbacks (see Box 2). However, aboveground, Ebeling *et al.* [60] demonstrated that pollinator communities increased in diversity with increasing plant diversity and that this increased the stability of plant flowering.

Overall, there is strong evidence that the release of negative biotic feedbacks with increasing plant diversity (cause) enhances ecosystem functioning (consequence)[55]. However, there is little evidence that positive biotic feedbacks enhance ecosystem functioning alone (but see Box 2).

The future of complementarity

Many studies report the presence of resource partitioning, abiotic facilitation, or biotic feedbacks. Yet, few quantify the contribution of these causes to enhanced ecosystem functioning (but see [21,22,25,28]). Quantifying how each of these causes individually contributes to ecosystem functioning may allow us to better predict the consequences of biodiversity loss in three ways. First, the consequences of biodiversity loss for ecosystem functioning may differ between these causes. Second, the relative importance of these causes likely changes with ecological context. Third, biodiversity may be more important for ecosystem functioning when several causes combine (Figure 2).

The ecological consequences of understanding underlying causes

If resource partitioning between species enhances ecosystem functioning, then species loss may have no effect on overall ecosystem functioning or may decline proportionally to the contribution of the species lost. That is, the amount of functioning lost is the contribution of the species lost to functioning. This change in ecosystem functioning likely depends on the ability of the other species in a community to compensate for the functioning of the species lost via adjustments to their resource partition via plasticity [61]. For example, if species partition resources by depth and the deepest rooting species goes extinct, another species may compensate for the lost species by growing deeper roots and the community overall resource uptake will stay the same [62]. If the remaining species are unable to compensate for the lost species then the lost species' ecosystem functioning contribution is lost [61].

Alternatively, if abiotic facilitation between species enhances ecosystem functioning then the loss of facilitators may disproportionately decrease ecosystem functioning. That is, if a facilitator is lost, their contribution to ecosystem functioning is lost as is the amount that other

species over-perform because of their presence. Under extreme circumstances, if the whole community depends on a single facilitator then the community may collapse [61]. In less extreme cases, the extinction of a facilitator reduces the abundance and performance of other species because they were dependent upon the resources or stress amelioration provided by the facilitator [61]. Even in this less extreme case, over several generations, facilitator loss can accelerate species loss in addition to reducing ecosystem functioning.

If feedbacks from biotic interaction partners enhance ecosystem functioning then the loss of individual plant species depends on the type of interaction and whether the interaction is lost or only the species [63]. For example, if the species lost contributes a species-specific enemy then the loss to ecosystem functioning will likely equal the contribution of the species lost. Alternatively, removing the enemies may increase overall ecosystem functioning, especially in terms of total biomass production [58]. If a system loses a species-specific herbivore, total biomass production may increase as species are released from herbivore pressure [58,64]. However, this increase in productivity may be accompanied by plant species loss. Less competitive species may be outcompeted by species that are now released from enemy pressure. This competition accelerates species loss even while dominant species maintain productivity [65]. Alternatively, if the plant species that is lost contributes an important mutualist, the species' contribution is lost as is the amount that the population overperformed as a result of the species. [63,66]. For example, if a legume that provides nitrogen to the surrounding plants via its rhizobia is lost, the contribution of the legume is lost as is the amount that ecosystem functioning was increased due to the rhizobia's contribution to the local resource pool (Box 2).

Ecological context matters

Resource partitioning, abiotic facilitation, and biotic feedbacks are likely most relevant in different ecological contexts. These differences in relevance may contribute to variation in biodiversity-ecosystem functioning relationships across landscapes and between ecosystems. In a meta-analysis of forest and grassland biodiversity experiments, Guerrero-Ramirez *et al.* [67] found that forests and grasslands had variable biodiversity–productivity relationships that depended on environmental factors. In one grassland, reduced monoculture performance over time drove biodiversity–productivity relationships suggesting that abiotic facilitation via stress amelioration or negative biotic feedbacks caused enhanced ecosystem functioning. In six other grasslands increased mixture performance over time drove biodiversity–productivity relationships suggesting that abiotic facilitation via resource enrichment, positive biotic feedbacks, or resource partitioning caused enhanced ecosystem functioning. Further, soil characteristics such as soil organic carbon content, soil pH, sand and clay content, soil bulk density, cation exchange capacity, and volumetric water content at wilting point explained over 40% of these differences between sites. This context dependence suggests that not all causes are equally likely in all ecological contexts (see also [68]). In particular, three **ecological gradients** may influence the likelihood and relative importance of these different causes: resource availability, abiotic stress, and enemy abundance/specificity.

Resource availability may change plant community reliance on abiotic facilitation via resource addition and resource partitioning. When resources are severely limiting, abiotic facilitation via resource addition is likely to enhance ecosystem functioning. Without resource limitation, plants are unlikely to profit from the enhanced resource availability from abiotic facilitation via resource addition with increasing diversity. Further, unless plants are not in

competition for resources, resource partitioning is likely to be more beneficial when resources are limiting [69].

Abiotic stress likely magnifies the contribution of abiotic facilitation via stress amelioration to enhanced ecosystem functioning [44,70,71]. The stress-gradient hypothesis suggests that as environments become more stressful, abiotic facilitation via stress amelioration becomes more important. In the biodiversity–ecosystem functioning context, this increased reliance on abiotic facilitation via stress amelioration means that high-diversity communities will suffer less in stressful conditions. There is some evidence that species can ameliorate the abiotic stress of flooding [72], heavy-metal contamination [73], and drought [45]. Under less stressful conditions resource partitioning may contribute more than abiotic facilitation to enhanced ecosystem functioning. Similarly, positive feedback from biotic interaction partners is likely to be more beneficial under resource limitation and stress.

An enemy abundance/specificity gradient will likely amplify the contribution of negative biotic feedbacks to biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationships. Plant–soil feedback experiments and aboveground enemy removals elucidate a strong and consistent contribution of enemies to enhanced ecosystem functioning [55–58]. A gradient of enemy types (specialist to generalist) or enemy abundance is likely to similarly provide evidence that species-specific enemies reduce monoculture performance. This gradient may be particularly relevant across latitude where changes in the strength and abundance of biotic interactions may contribute to latitudinal gradients in diversity [74]. This continental gradient in enemies may alter biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationships across continental scales [75,76].

When causes combine to enhance ecosystem functioning

When biodiversity enhances ecosystem functioning, it need not occur via any one mechanism alone. Rather, it may be more realistic to assume that resource partitioning, abiotic facilitation, and biotic feedbacks occur simultaneously in many systems. As a consequence, ecosystem functioning represents the **net response** of the ecosystem to combinations of these causes, and the individual effects of the causes are masked. Several studies now implicate multiple causes simultaneously. For example, Seabloom *et al.* [58] experimentally removed insects, foliar fungi, and soil fungi from plots at Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve. The biodiversity–productivity relationship changed as a result of this removal but was still present. This result implies that enemies are not the only cause of enhanced ecosystem functioning at this site. Similarly, Guerrero-Ramirez *et al.* [67] found that both enhanced functioning in mixture and reduced functioning in monoculture over time drove biodiversity–productivity relationships simultaneously at three grassland sites. This pattern again suggests that several causes are responsible. We hypothesize that when any cause that reduces the average performance of species in monoculture combines with any cause that increases their average performance in mixture, the slope of the biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationship will increase (Figure 2). This increase in slope means that diversity may be proportionally more important for ecosystem functioning under these circumstances.

Concluding remarks and future perspectives

For plant communities, complementarity is one of the most commonly invoked drivers behind enhanced ecosystem functioning with increasing biodiversity. Yet, its current usage obscures the individual contributions of resource partitioning, biotic feedbacks, and abiotic facilitation to enhanced ecosystem functioning. The extent to which these different causes

350 contribute to enhanced ecosystem functioning in higher-diversity systems is unclear.

351 Disentangling these components is essential to predicting biodiversity–ecosystem functioning
352 relationships across ecological contexts and under predicted accelerating species loss.

353 We suggest that there are several avenues via which biodiversity ecosystem functioning
354 research should begin to disentangle these components (see also Outstanding Questions). First,
355 improved theoretical work that incorporates more than one cause of enhanced ecosystem
356 functioning simultaneously will help to refine predictions for how these different causes may
357 interact. Theoretical work on biodiversity-ecosystem functioning relationships has focused
358 primarily on complementarity causes in isolation (*e.g.*, [55,77,78]). Theoretical models that
359 incorporate multiple complementarity causes simultaneously are necessary to refine predictions
360 for how the different causes of complementarity may interact.

361 Second, we suggest that combining ecological gradients across resources, stress, and
362 enemies will enhance differences between resource partitioning, abiotic facilitation, and biotic
363 feedbacks and allow them to be more easily quantified (after [79]). For example, monocultures
364 may perform more poorly than mixtures due to negative feedback from species-specific pests
365 and pathogens (biotic feedback) or because other species mediate environmental stress (abiotic
366 facilitation). Along a diversity gradient without species-specific enemies (enemy gradient) under
367 stress (stress gradient) but with ample resources (resource availability gradient), if plants perform
368 more poorly in monoculture than in mixture the most likely driver is abiotic facilitation via stress
369 amelioration. Experimental work that utilizes these gradients will help to elucidate how these
370 three sets of species differences interact to enhance ecosystem functioning across ecological
371 contexts.

Finally, further synthesis work from long-term grassland biodiversity experiments may also contribute to a better understanding of the causes of complementarity. Many BEF experiments have now been established for over a decade. These long-term datasets provide particular power to determine whether monocultures are declining or mixtures performing better (*e.g.*, [67]). Further, these long-term datasets span natural climatic and resource gradients (*e.g.*, [3,80]). Long-term data from these experiments of measures like leaf area index [81], resource uptake [28], or soil porosity [72] combined with the natural climatic variation inherent in time series data may be particularly useful. For example, during a drought, if monocultures perform more poorly than the mean performance over time and this effect is linked to a lower leaf area index in these monocultures then abiotic facilitation via stress amelioration likely enhances ecosystem functioning under these circumstances.

Acknowledgements: This work was catalyzed by a workshop funded by the German Research Foundation (Grant #: FOR 1451) to LM and AW with support from the Jena Experiment. The authors are also grateful to three anonymous reviewers whose feedback greatly improved the quality of this manuscript and to EPIC Graphic Design for their help with developing the figures for this manuscript.

Glossary

Abiotic facilitation — occurs when an increase in the abundance of one species increases the relative performance of a different species via changes to the abiotic environment.

Biotic feedbacks — here narrowly defined as the amplifying (positive feedback) or dampening (negative feedback) effect on the performance of a plant species or community caused by another trophic level in response to changes in plant diversity.

Competition — occurs when an increase in the performance of one species decreases the performance of a different species.

Complementarity effect — the performance of mixtures relative to the performance of the component monocultures [8].

Density dependence — a process that increases in strength when a species becomes more abundant in a given area. For example, negative density dependent effects occur when the relative performance of a species is reduced with increasing abundance.

Ecosystem functioning — sizes of pools of materials or energy (pools of carbon, nitrogen or biomass) and rates of processes (fluxes of materials or energy among pools). High or low values are not inherently good or bad [5].

Ecological gradient — a gradient across which a specific environmental factor or ecological context varies (*e.g.*, a gradient of abiotic stress, a gradient of pathogen specificity).

Net response — the combined effect of two or more complementarity causes (does not refer to the statistical “net biodiversity effect” used by the additive partitioning method).

Pattern — a set of circumstances created by a process (*i.e.* the effect in a cause–effect relationship).

Resources — limiting factors that decrease in availability as the total abundance of species in a community increases (*e.g.*, nitrogen,[79])

Resource complementarity — the theory that posits that the addition of species to a community increases average relative performance of species because each species specializes on different resources and thus the whole community more thoroughly utilizes the available resources [77].

Resource partition – multidimensional measure of the share of the total resource pool that a species uses [82,83] (roughly synonymous to a resource niche)

Fundamental resource partition — Species' resource partition when growing alone (similar to the fundamental resource niche).

Realized resource partition – Species' resource partition when growing with other species (similar to the realized resource niche).

Resource partitioning — occurs when species use different portions of the available resource pool (cause). The result of resource partitioning is that the existing resource pool is more completely used in higher-diversity communities compared to monocultures

Stress — limiting factors that are abundance independent (*e.g.*, temperature, [79]).

429 **References**

- 430 1 (2006) *Millenium Ecosystem Assessment Ecosystem and human well-being: synthesis*,
- 431 2 Ceballos, G. *et al.* (2015) Accelerated modern human–induced species losses: Entering the
- 432 sixth mass extinction. *Sci. Adv.* 1, e1400253
- 433 3 Weisser, W.W. *et al.* (2017) Biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning in a 15-year
- 434 grassland experiment: Patterns, mechanisms, and open questions. *Basic Appl. Ecol.* 23, 1–73
- 435 4 Isbell, F. *et al.* (2017) Linking the influence and dependence of people on biodiversity across
- 436 scales. *Nature* 546, 65
- 437 5 Hooper, D.U. *et al.* (2005) Effects of Biodiversity on Ecosystem Functioning: A Consensus
- 438 of Current Knowledge. *Ecol. Monogr.* 75, 3–35
- 439 6 Cardinale, B.J. *et al.* (2007) Impacts of plant diversity on biomass production increase
- 440 through time because of species complementarity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 104, 18123–18128
- 441 7 Petchey, O.L. (2003) Integrating methods that investigate how complementarity influences
- 442 ecosystem functioning. *Oikos* 101, 323–330
- 443 8 Loreau, M. and Hector, A. (2001) Partitioning selection and complementarity in biodiversity
- 444 experiments. *Nature* 412, 72–76
- 445 9 Hooper, D.U. and Dukes, J.S. (2004) Overyielding among plant functional groups in a long-
- 446 term experiment. *Ecol. Lett.* 7, 95–105
- 447 10 Tilman, D. *et al.* (1997) The influence of functional diversity and composition on ecosystem
- 448 processes. *Science* 277, 1300–1302
- 449 11 Mamolos, A.P. *et al.* (1995) Depth of root activity of coexisting grassland species in relation
- 450 to N and P additions, measured using nonradioactive tracers. *J. Ecol.*

- 451 12 Kahmen, A. *et al.* (2006) Niche complementarity for nitrogen: an explanation for the
452 biodiversity and ecosystem functioning relationship? *Ecology* 87, 1244–1255
- 453 13 Ashton, I.W. *et al.* (2010) Niche complementarity due to plasticity in resource use: plant
454 partitioning of chemical N forms. *Ecology* 91, 3252–3260
- 455 14 McKane, R.B. *et al.* (2002) Resource-based niches provide a basis for plant species diversity
456 and dominance in arctic tundra. *Nature* 415, 68–71
- 457 15 Spehn, E.M. *et al.* (2002) The role of legumes as a component of biodiversity in a cross-
458 European study of grassland biomass nitrogen. *Oikos* 98, 205–218
- 459 16 Lorentzen, S. *et al.* (2008) Species richness and identity affect the use of aboveground space
460 in experimental grasslands. *Perspect. Plant Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 10, 73–87
- 461 17 Isbell, F.I. and Wilsey, B.J. (2011) Rapid biodiversity declines in both ungrazed and
462 intensely grazed exotic grasslands. *Plant Ecol.* 212, 1663–1674
- 463 18 Jucker, T. *et al.* (2015) Crown plasticity enables trees to optimize canopy packing in mixed-
464 species forests. *Funct. Ecol.* 29, 1078–1086
- 465 19 Niklaus, P.A. *et al.* (2017) Can niche plasticity promote biodiversity–productivity
466 relationships through increased complementarity? *Ecology* 98, 1104–1116
- 467 20 Williams, L.J. *et al.* (2017) Spatial complementarity in tree crowns explains overyielding in
468 species mixtures. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 1, 0063
- 469 21 Mueller, K.E. *et al.* (2013) Root depth distribution and the diversity–productivity
470 relationship in a long-term grassland experiment. *Ecology* 94, 787–793
- 471 22 Oram, N.J. *et al.* (2018) Below-ground complementarity effects in a grassland biodiversity
472 experiment are related to deep-rooting species. *J. Ecol.* 106, 265–277

473 23 Ravenek, J.M. *et al.* (2014) Long-term study of root biomass in a biodiversity experiment
474 reveals shifts in diversity effects over time. *Oikos* 123, 1528–1536

475 24 Mommer, L. *et al.* (2010) Unveiling below-ground species abundance in a biodiversity
476 experiment: a test of vertical niche differentiation among grassland species. *J. Ecol.* 98,
477 1117–1127

478 25 von Felten, S. *et al.* (2009) Belowground nitrogen partitioning in experimental grassland
479 plant communities of varying species richness. *Ecology* 90, 1389–1399

480 26 Wardle, D.A. and Peltzer, D.A. (2003) Interspecific interactions and biomass allocation
481 among grassland plant species. *Oikos* 100, 497–506

482 27 Bachmann, D. *et al.* (2015) No evidence of complementary water use along a plant species
483 richness gradient in temperate experimental grasslands. *PloS One* 10, e0116367

484 28 Jesch, A. *et al.* (2018) Below-ground resource partitioning alone cannot explain the
485 biodiversity–ecosystem function relationship: A field test using multiple tracers. *J. Ecol.*
486 106, 2002–2018

487 29 Guderle, M. *et al.* (2018) Dynamic niche partitioning in root water uptake facilitates efficient
488 water use in more diverse grassland plant communities. *Funct. Ecol.* 32, 214–227

489 30 Verheyen, K. *et al.* (2008) Can complementarity in water use help to explain diversity–
490 productivity relationships in experimental grassland plots? *Oecologia* 156, 351–361

491 31 Brooker, R.W. *et al.* (2008) Facilitation in plant communities: the past, the present, and the
492 future. *J. Ecol.* 96, 18–34

493 32 Wright, A.J. *et al.* (2017) The Overlooked Role of Facilitation in Biodiversity Experiments.
494 *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 32, 383–390

495 33 Michalet, R. and Pugnaire, F.I. (2016) Facilitation in communities: underlying mechanisms,
496 community and ecosystem implications. *Funct. Ecol.* 30, 3–9

497 34 Li, M. *et al.* (2014) A Review of Remote Sensing Image Classification Techniques: the Role
498 of Spatio-contextual Information. *Eur. J. Remote Sens.* 47, 389–411

499 35 Hacker, N. *et al.* (2015) Plant diversity shapes microbe-rhizosphere effects on P mobilisation
500 from organic matter in soil. *Ecol. Lett.* 18, 1356–1365

501 36 Li, L. *et al.* (2007) Diversity enhances agricultural productivity via rhizosphere phosphorus
502 facilitation on phosphorus-deficient soils. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 104, 11192–11196

503 37 Emerman, S.H. and Dawson, T.E. (1996) Hydraulic lift and its influence on the water
504 content of the rhizosphere: an example from sugar maple, *Acer saccharum*. *Oecologia* 108,
505 273–278

506 38 Dawson, T.E. (1993) Hydraulic lift and water use by plants: implications for water balance,
507 performance and plant-plant interactions. *Oecologia* 95, 565–574

508 39 Sekiya, N. and Yano, K. (2004) Do pigeon pea and sesbania supply groundwater to
509 intercropped maize through hydraulic lift?—Hydrogen stable isotope investigation of xylem
510 waters. *Field Crops Res.* 86, 167–173

511 40 Ludwig, F. *et al.* (2004) Below-ground competition between trees and grasses may
512 overwhelm the facilitative effects of hydraulic lift. *Ecol. Lett.* 7, 623–631

513 41 Steudel, B. *et al.* (2012) Biodiversity effects on ecosystem functioning change along
514 environmental stress gradients. *Ecol. Lett.* 15, 1397–1405

515 42 Milcu, A. *et al.* (2016) Plant functional diversity increases grassland productivity-related
516 water vapor fluxes: an Ecotron and modeling approach. *Ecology* 97, 2044–2054

517 43 Klaus, V.H. *et al.* (2016) Plant diversity moderates drought stress in grasslands: Implications
 518 from a large real-world study on ¹³C natural abundances. *Sci. Total Environ.* 566–567, 215–
 519 222

520 44 Pugnaire, F.I. *et al.* (1996) Facilitation between Higher Plant Species in a Semiarid
 521 Environment. *Ecology* 77, 1420–1426

522 45 Mulder, C.P.H. *et al.* (2001) Physical stress and diversity-productivity relationships: The role
 523 of positive interactions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 98, 6704–6708

524 46 Eisenhauer, N. (2012) Aboveground–belowground interactions as a source of
 525 complementarity effects in biodiversity experiments. *Plant Soil* 351, 1–22

526 47 Rottstock, T. *et al.* (2014) Higher plant diversity promotes higher diversity of fungal
 527 pathogens, while it decreases pathogen infection per plant. *Ecology* 95, 1907–1917

528 48 Janzen, D.H. (1970) Herbivores and the number of tree species in tropical forests. *Am. Nat.*

529 49 Connell, J.H. (1971) On the role of natural enemies in preventing competitive exclusion in
 530 some marine animals and in rain forest trees. *Dyn. Popul.* 298, 312

531 50 Jactel, H. and Brockerhoff, E.G. (2007) Tree diversity reduces herbivory by forest insects.
 532 *Ecol. Lett.* 10, 835–848

533 51 Duffy, J.E. *et al.* (2007) The functional role of biodiversity in ecosystems: incorporating
 534 trophic complexity. *Ecol. Lett.* 10, 522–538

535 52 Bever, J.D. (2003) Soil community feedback and the coexistence of competitors: conceptual
 536 frameworks and empirical tests. *New Phytol.* 157, 465–473

537 53 Kulmatiski, A. *et al.* (2008) Plant-soil feedbacks: a meta-analytical review. *Ecol. Lett.* 11,
 538 980–992

539 54 Petermann, J.S. *et al.* (2008) Janzen-Connell effects are widespread and strong enough to
540 maintain diversity in grasslands. *Ecology* 89, 2399–2406

541 55 Schnitzer, S.A. *et al.* (2011) Soil microbes drive the classic plant diversity-productivity
542 pattern. *Ecology* 92, 296–303

543 56 Maron, J.L. *et al.* (2011) Soil fungal pathogens and the relationship between plant diversity
544 and productivity. *Ecol. Lett.* 14, 36–41

545 57 Hendriks, M. *et al.* (2013) Independent variations of plant and soil mixtures reveal soil
546 feedback effects on plant community overyielding. *J. Ecol.* 101, 287–297

547 58 Seabloom, E.W. *et al.* (2017) Food webs obscure the strength of plant diversity effects on
548 primary productivity. *Ecol. Lett.* 20, 505–512

549 59 Morris, W.F. *et al.* (2007) Direct and Interactive Effects of Enemies and Mutualists on Plant
550 Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Ecology* 88, 1021–1029

551 60 Ebeling, A. *et al.* (2008) How does plant richness affect pollinator richness and temporal
552 stability of flower visits? *Oikos* 117, 1808–1815

553 61 Gross, K. and Cardinale, B.J. (2005) The functional consequences of random vs. ordered
554 species extinctions. *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 409–418

555 62 Dimitrakopoulos, P.G. and Schmid, B. (2004) Biodiversity effects increase linearly with
556 biotope space. *Ecol. Lett.* 7, 574–583

557 63 Iii, F.S.C. *et al.* 11-May-(2000) , Consequences of changing biodiversity. , *Nature*.

558 64 Duffy, J.E. (2003) Biodiversity loss, trophic skew and ecosystem functioning. *Ecol. Lett.* 6,
559 680–687

560 65 Smith, M.D. and Knapp, A.K. (2003) Dominant species maintain ecosystem function with
561 non-random species loss. *Ecol. Lett.* 6, 509–517

562 66 Kaiser-Bunbury, C.N. *et al.* (2010) The robustness of pollination networks to the loss of
563 species and interactions: a quantitative approach incorporating pollinator behaviour. *Ecol.*
564 *Lett.* 13, 442–452

565 67 Guerrero-Ramírez, N.R. *et al.* (2017) Diversity-dependent temporal divergence of ecosystem
566 functioning in experimental ecosystems. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 1, 1639–1642

567 68 Ratcliffe, S. and *et al.* (2017) Biodiversity and ecosystem function relations in European
568 forests depend on environmental context. *Ecol. Lett.*

569 69 Harpole, W.S. *et al.* (2016) Addition of multiple limiting resources reduces grassland
570 diversity. *Nature* 537, 93–96

571 70 Bertness, M.D. and Callaway, R. (1994) Positive interactions in communities. *Trends Ecol.*
572 *Evol.* 9, 191–193

573 71 Callaway, R.M. *et al.* (2002) Positive interactions among alpine plants increase with stress.
574 *Nature* 417, 844–848

575 72 Wright, A.J. *et al.* (2017) Plants are less negatively affected by flooding when growing in
576 species-rich plant communities. *New Phytol.* 213, 645–656

577 73 Fernandes, I. *et al.* (2011) Intraspecific traits change biodiversity effects on ecosystem
578 functioning under metal stress. *Oecologia* 166, 1019–1028

579 74 Schemske, D.W. *et al.* (2009) Is There a Latitudinal Gradient in the Importance of Biotic
580 Interactions? *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 40, 245–269

581 75 Paquette, A. and Messier, C. (2011) The effect of biodiversity on tree productivity: from
582 temperate to boreal forests. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* 20, 170–180

583 76 Liang, J. *et al.* (2016) Positive biodiversity-productivity relationship predominant in global
584 forests. *Science* 354, aaf8957

585 77 Tilman, D. *et al.* (1997) Plant diversity and ecosystem productivity: theoretical
586 considerations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 94, 1857–1861

587 78 Michalet, R. *et al.* (2006) Do biotic interactions shape both sides of the humped-back model
588 of species richness in plant communities? *Ecol. Lett.* 9, 767–773

589 79 Chase, J.M. and Leibold, M.A. (2003) *Ecological Niches: Linking classical and*
590 *contemporary approaches*, University of Chicago Press.

591 80 Isbell, F. *et al.* (2015) Biodiversity increases the resistance of ecosystem productivity to
592 climate extremes. *Nature*.

593 81 Lange, M. *et al.* (2015) Plant diversity increases soil microbial activity and soil carbon
594 storage. *Nat. Commun.* 6, 6707

595 82 Schoener, T.W. (1974) Resource Partitioning in Ecological Communities. *Science* 185, 27–
596 39

597 83 Finke, D.L. and Snyder, W.E. (2008) Niche partitioning increases resource exploitation by
598 diverse communities. *Science* 321, 1488–1490

599 84 Wagg, C. *et al.* (2015) Complementarity in both plant and mycorrhizal fungal communities
600 are not necessarily increased by diversity in the other. *J. Ecol.* 103, 1233–1244

601 85 Craven, D. *et al.* (2016) Plant diversity effects on grassland productivity are robust to both
602 nutrient enrichment and drought. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B* 371,

603 86 Marquard, E. *et al.* (2009) Plant species richness and functional composition drive
604 overyielding in a six-year grassland experiment. *Ecology* 90, 3290–3302

605 87 Roscher, C. *et al.* (2007) Detecting the role of individual species for overyielding in
606 experimental grassland communities composed of potentially dominant species. *Oecologia*
607 154, 535–549

608 88 Fargione, J. *et al.* (2007) From selection to complementarity: shifts in the causes of
609 biodiversity–productivity relationships in a long-term biodiversity experiment. *Proc. R. Soc.*
610 *Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 274, 871–876

611 89 Temperton, V.M. *et al.* (2007) Positive interactions between nitrogen-fixing legumes and
612 four different neighbouring species in a biodiversity experiment. *Oecologia* 151, 190–205

613 90 Gubsch, M. *et al.* (2011) Foliar and soil $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values reveal increased nitrogen partitioning
614 among species in diverse grassland communities. *Plant Cell Environ.* 34, 895–908

615 91 Tilman, D. (2001) Diversity and Productivity in a Long-Term Grassland Experiment.
616 *Science* 294, 843

617 92 Roscher, C. *et al.* (2011) N_2 fixation and performance of 12 legume species in a 6-year
618 grassland biodiversity experiment. *Plant Soil* 341, 333–348

619 93 Van der Heijden, M.G. *et al.* (1998) Mycorrhizal fungal diversity determines plant
620 biodiversity, ecosystem variability and productivity. *Nature* 396, 69–72

621 94 Wagg, C. *et al.* (2011) Belowground biodiversity effects of plant symbionts support
622 aboveground productivity. *Ecol. Lett.* 14, 1001–1009

623 95 Walder, F. *et al.* (2012) Mycorrhizal Networks: Common Goods of Plants Shared under
624 Unequal Terms of Trade. *Plant Physiol.* 159, 789–797

625 96 Hättenschwiler, S. and Gasser, P. (2005) Soil animals alter plant litter diversity effects on
626 decomposition. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 102, 1519–1524

627 97 Chen, H. *et al.* (2017) Plant species richness negatively affects root decomposition in
628 grasslands. *J. Ecol.* 105, 209–218

629 98 Chen, H. *et al.* (2017) Root chemistry and soil fauna, but not soil abiotic conditions explain
630 the effects of plant diversity on root decomposition. *Oecologia* 185, 499–511

631 99 Eisenhauer, N. *et al.* (2010) Plant diversity effects on soil microorganisms support the
632 singular hypothesis. *Ecology* 91, 485–496
633 100 Cong, W.-F. *et al.* (2014) Plant species richness promotes soil carbon and nitrogen stocks
634 in grasslands without legumes. *J. Ecol.* 102, 1163–1170
635 101 Fox, J.W. (2005) Interpreting the ‘selection effect’ of biodiversity on ecosystem function.
636 *Ecol. Lett.* 8, 846–856
637

Figure 1. Looking inside the black box of complementarity. We found that in the biodiversity–ecosystem functioning literature, uses for the term complementarity generally fall into two categories: complementarity causes (see left), and complementarity consequences (see right) of the coupling between diversity and ecosystem functioning. On the left, we list potential causes that, historically, are credited with driving complementarity. On the right, we list consequences that have historically been derived from species being complementary in some fashion. Some studies use complementarity as both a cause and a consequence. When complementarity is used by itself, which is common, it is often unclear whether the intended definition falls under a specific usage (on either the causes or consequences side) or rather as the center portrays. We believe that the multitude of uses of complementarity on both sides of this model and in the center, without explicitly stating which perspective is taken, often leads to misinterpretation and confusion in communicating.

Figure 2. Proposed framework for ‘complementarity’ in the biodiversity-ecosystem functioning literature with predictions for enhanced ecosystem functioning.

Resource partitioning (yellow), biotic feedbacks (red), and abiotic facilitation (blue) can each lead to enhanced ecosystem functioning. In many ecosystems, these three will occur at the same time. Thus, enhanced ecosystem functioning, when it occurs, is the net response of these different causes in this system. Here, we assume that when two or more processes are present, they are roughly the same magnitude. Inlaid plots (A-D) are our predictions for each complementarity cause and their combined effects on any generic ecosystem function (consequence, y-axis) with increasing diversity (x-axis). These predictions are general predictions for the slope and the intercept relative to the average ecosystem functioning (grey midline) when biodiversity enhances ecosystem functioning. These three causes can enhance ecosystem functioning via reduced performance in monoculture or via enhanced performance in mixture or both as indicated here by the intercept. That is, if the intercept is below the midline it indicates that performance is reduced in monoculture. The slope describes the strength of the increase in functioning. We do not intend to predict the magnitude of the differences between the intercepts of different causes. Furthermore, we depict these relationships as linear for simplicity though they take a variety of forms depending on the function measured. Finally, we combine positive feedbacks and abiotic facilitation via nutrient addition for the purposes of these plots.

If enemies are species-specific then negative biotic feedbacks reduce performance of species in monoculture (A, C, and D - pink lines,[57]). In contrast, resource partitioning (A, B, and D - yellow lines, [25]) and abiotic facilitation via resource addition or positive feedback from biota (B, C, and D – blue lines, [32], [84]) will enhance ecosystem functioning when diversity is high.

We expect that when negative biotic feedbacks and resource partitioning act simultaneously, the slope of the biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationship will increase as enemies suppress functioning in monoculture and resource partitioning enhances functioning in mixture (A – orange line, see [58] for general increase in biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationship with multiple potential causes likely).

We expect that resource partitioning and abiotic facilitation both enhance function at high diversity if they occur for different limiting resources. Thus, the slope of the biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationship may increase (B, dashed green line) relative to either process alone (B, blue or yellow line). Alternatively, if both resource partitioning and abiotic facilitation via nutrient addition or positive feedback from biota occur simultaneously for the same limiting resource and in the same amount, then that resource is no longer limiting and only abiotic facilitation or positive feedback will enhance ecosystem function (C – blue line, [85]). Alternatively, if the resource that plants are able to partition and provide is non-limiting, we expect a non-significant relationship between ecosystem functioning and biodiversity (C – green dashed-dotted line [85]).

Resource limitation is also an important concern for predicting the net result of combining resource partitioning, biotic feedback, and abiotic facilitation (D). Resource partitioning and abiotic facilitation both will enhance function at high diversity when they occur for different resources. Negative biotic feedback will suppress monoculture function [55]. We predict that this combination will increase the slope of the biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationship (D, dashed grey line). Similarly, abiotic facilitation may enhance ecosystem functioning at high diversity while biotic feedback suppresses monoculture function (D, dotted line). If resource partitioning and abiotic facilitation both occur for the same limiting resource,

then the net result is likely the same as the result for biotic feedback and abiotic facilitation combined (D, dotted line). Alternatively, if the resource that plants can partition and provide via abiotic facilitation is non-limiting then only the signal of biotic feedbacks may be present (D – dashed-dotted line).

We expect that the slope of the biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationship increases for many interactions between processes relative to a single process alone. That is — each species likely adds more to ecosystem functioning when causes that reduce monoculture performance (such as negative feedback from species specific enemies) and causes that enhance mixture performance (such as resource partitioning) occur together.

Box 1. Abundance, plasticity, and biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationships.

We define enhanced ecosystem functioning as the increase in the community performance of mixtures relative to monoculture. Plant populations may have altered performance in mixture relative to monoculture in two general ways: 1. via plastic changes to their individual performance (*e.g.* through growing larger or having deeper roots), or 2) via changed numbers of individuals that perform at the same level (*i.e.*, changed abundance) [86,87].

Figure I. **Illustration of how changes to density and performance both together and alone can drive enhanced ecosystem functioning in more diverse mixtures.** If the abundance or individual performance relative to monoculture does not change, then ecosystem functioning is not enhanced relative to monocultures (Figure I, **A**). The black line represents a community with low abundance/small size while the grey line represents high abundance/large size). Alternatively, if the abundance of individuals increases (Figure I,**B**), individuals perform better (Figure I, **C**), or both in mixture, then the ecosystem functioning of mixtures will increase relative to average monocultures. It should be noted that only scenario C or the combination of C and B are the result of plastic responses on the part of the plant to being in mixture. Yet, enhanced ecosystem functioning can be achieved by scenario B as well.

Box 2: Nitrogen fixation, mycorrhizal colonization, and root interaction partners

Plant roots harbor a diverse community of mutualists and interaction partners that influence the capacity of plants to take up resources and transfer those resources to their neighbors. We consider many of these interactions including nitrogen fixation and increased nutrient availability from colonization by mycorrhiza to be positive biotic feedbacks from a member of a different trophic level. These positive biotic feedbacks, however, result in both the ability of a species to potentially partition resources (one species specializes on nitrogen fixation while another must forage to find nitrogen) and the ability to confer resources to the surrounding community. The presence of nitrogen fixing plants increases the overall availability of nitrogen [88–90]. Furthermore, there is significant evidence that legumes provide a generally positive effect on the biodiversity-ecosystem function relationship [91]. This nitrogen fixation also enables facilitation and the proportion of N derived from legumes relative to non-legume sources increases with increasing plant diversity [90,92].

Similarly, mycorrhizae enable plants to take up additional resources. Thus, if resource partitioning occurs it may be enabled by mycorrhizal colonization. Alternatively, mycorrhizae may also transfer nitrogen that has been fixed by rhizobia to plants that don't harbor rhizobia thus enabling facilitation [46]. There is limited evidence that a higher diversity of mycorrhizal fungi may increase plant productivity [93,94]. Additionally, Walder *et al.* [95] suggest that plant communities that harbor different mycorrhiza perform better in mixture. However, Schnitzer *et al.* [55] found that removing the beneficial portion of soil fungi from a diversity experiment had negligible effects on the relationship between biodiversity and productivity.

In addition to crucial mutualists, plants also harbor a diverse community of non-mutualist soil biota in and around their roots. There is strong evidence that plants increase soil microbial

activity [81]. Furthermore, plant diversity alters decomposition [96–99]. These alterations to the soil community positively influence many ecosystem functions including soil carbon storage [81]. Further, this impact on the soil community also influences resource availability and thereby provides a feedback on the plant community via resource partitioning and/or abiotic facilitation [100].

Figure I Illustration of a legume. Root nodules containing nitrogen fixing rhizobia are highlighted in red.

Table 1: Quantifying complementarity uses and complementarity causes in the biodiversity ecosystem functioning literature.

In order to quantify the use of the term complementarity in the biodiversity-ecosystem functioning literature, we performed a Web of Science search of study topics using the search terms: literature citing Loreau and Hector 2001 Nature AND ecosystem function* (* indicates Web of Science search function that allows Web of Science to search for terms including function in addition to function itself, *e.g.* functioning or functions). This search returned 400 results as of August 2018. We read the abstracts of these 400 studies and determined which ones calculated a “complementarity effect” *sensu* Loreau and Hector [8] or Fox [101](137 studies). We then determined which of these 137 studies explicitly used complementarity in the colloquial sense as a mechanism driving the complementarity effect in the abstract alone (86 studies). We also determined which of these studies further conflated the “complementarity effect” with what we refer to as resource partitioning (25 out of 86 studies, ‘resource use complementarity’, ‘resource partitioning’, ‘niche complementarity’, or ‘niche differentiation’) in the abstract alone.

In order to quantify the prevalence of each of our complementarity causes in the biodiversity-ecosystem functioning literature, we performed a number of Web of Science searches of study topics. As of August 2018, resource partitioning was more prevalent in the biodiversity-ecosystem functioning literature than both abiotic facilitation and biotic feedbacks. Similarly, abiotic facilitation was more commonly invoked than biotic feedbacks. Only two studies met all of our search criteria simultaneously.

Search number	Cause	Search terms	Number of studies
1		literature citing Loreau and Hector 2001 Nature AND ecosystem function*	400

2	Resource partitioning	(“resource complementarity” OR “resource partitioning” OR “niche partitioning” OR “niche differentiation”) AND biodiversity AND ecosystem function* AND plant* AND complementarity	71
3	Abiotic facilitation	(“facilitation” OR “stress amelioration”) AND biodiversity AND ecosystem function* AND plant* AND complementarity	57
4	Biotic feedbacks	(“plant-soil feedback” OR “mutualist” OR “rhizobia” OR “pathogen” OR “enemies” OR “herbivore”) AND biodiversity AND ecosystem function* AND plant* AND complementarity	43
2 AND 3	Resource partitioning and abiotic facilitation		14
2 AND 4	Resource partitioning and biotic feedbacks		10
3 AND 4	Abiotic facilitation and biotic feedbacks		3
2 AND 3 AND 4	All three inclusive		2