

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Tolonen, Kimmo; Cai, Yongjiu; Vilmi, Annika; Karjalainen, Satu Maaria; Sutela, Tapio; Heino, Jani

Title: Environmental filtering and spatial effects on metacommunity organisation differ among littoral macroinvertebrate groups deconstructed by biological traits

Year: 2018

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © Springer Science+Business Media B.V., part of Springer Nature 2018

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

Please cite the original version:

Tolonen, K., Cai, Y., Vilmi, A., Karjalainen, S. M., Sutela, T., & Heino, J. (2018). Environmental filtering and spatial effects on metacommunity organisation differ among littoral macroinvertebrate groups deconstructed by biological traits. *Aquatic Ecology*, 52(1), 119-131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10452-018-9649-4>

1 **Environmental filtering and spatial effects on metacommunity**
2 **organisation differ among littoral macroinvertebrate groups**
3 **deconstructed by biological traits**

4
5 **Kimmo T. Tolonen • Yongjiu Cai • Annika Vilmi • Satu Maaria Karjalainen • Tapio Sutela •**
6 **Jani Heino**

7
8 Kimmo T. Tolonen

9 Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Jyväskylä, P.O. Box 35, FI-40014

10 Jyväskylä, Finland

11 e-mail: kimmo.t.tolonen@jyu.fi

12 Yongjiu Cai

13 Key Laboratory of Watershed Geographic Sciences, Nanjing Institute of Geography and Limnology, Chinese

14 Academy of Sciences, 73 East Beijing Road, Nanjing 210008, China

15 Annika Vilmi · Satu Maaria Karjalainen

16 Finnish Environment Institute, Freshwater Centre, P.O. Box 413, FI-90014 Oulu, Finland

17 Tapio Sutela

18 Natural Resources Institute Finland, P.O. Box 413, FI-90014 Oulu, Finland

19 Jani Heino

20 Finnish Environment Institute, Biodiversity Centre, P.O. Box 413, FI-90014 Oulu, Finland

21
22 **Abstract**

23 We examined spatial and environmental effects on the deconstructed assemblages of littoral macroinvertebrates
24 within a large lake. We deconstructed assemblages by three biological trait groups: body size, dispersal mode
25 and oviposition behaviour. We expected that spatial effects on assemblage structuring decrease and
26 environmental effects increase with increasing body size. We also expected stronger environmental filtering
27 and weaker spatial effect on the assemblages of flying species compared with assemblages of non-flying
28 species. Stronger effect of environmental filtering was expected on the assemblages with species attaching eggs
29 compared with assemblages of species with free eggs. We used redundancy analysis with variation partitioning
30 to examine spatial and environmental effects on the deconstructed assemblages. As expected, the importance of
31 environmental filtering increased and that of spatial effects decreased with increasing body size. Opposite to
32 our expectations, assemblages of non-flying species were more affected by environmental conditions compared
33 to assemblages of flying species. Concurring with our expectations, the importance of environmental filtering
34 was higher in structuring assemblages of species attaching eggs than in structuring those with freely-laid eggs.
35 The amount of unexplained variation was higher for assemblages with small-sized to medium-sized species,
36 flying species and species with free eggs than those with large-sized species, non-flying species and species
37 with attached eggs. Our observations of decreasing spatial and increasing environmental effects with increasing
38 body size of assemblages deviated from the results of previous studies. These results suggest differing
39 metacommunity dynamics between within-lake and among-lake levels and between studies covering
40 contrasting taxonomic groups and body size ranges.

41 **Keywords** Metacommunity organisation · Niche width · Biological traits · Large lakes

42 **Abstract**

43 We examined spatial and environmental effects on the deconstructed assemblages of littoral
44 macroinvertebrates within a large lake. We deconstructed assemblages by three biological trait groups: body
45 size, dispersal mode and oviposition behaviour. We expected that spatial effects on assemblage structuring
46 decrease and environmental effects increase with increasing body size. We also expected stronger
47 environmental filtering and weaker spatial effect on the assemblages of flying species compared with
48 assemblages of non-flying species. Stronger effects of environmental filtering were expected for the
49 assemblages with species attaching eggs compared with assemblages of species with free eggs. We used
50 redundancy analysis with variation partitioning to examine spatial and environmental effects on the
51 deconstructed assemblages. As expected, the importance of environmental filtering increased and that of
52 spatial effects decreased with increasing body size. Opposite to our expectations, assemblages of non-flying
53 species were more affected by environmental conditions compared to assemblages of flying species.
54 Concurring with our expectations, the importance of environmental filtering was higher in structuring
55 assemblages of species attaching eggs than in structuring those with freely-laid eggs. The amount of
56 unexplained variation was higher for assemblages with small-sized to medium-sized species, flying species
57 and species with free eggs than those with large-sized species, non-flying species and species with attached
58 eggs. Our observations of decreasing spatial and increasing environmental effects with increasing body size
59 of assemblages deviated from the results of previous studies. These results suggest differing metacommunity
60 dynamics between within-lake and among-lake levels and between studies covering contrasting taxonomic
61 groups and body size ranges.

62

63 **Introduction**

64 According to the metacommunity perspective, local communities are structured by the interplay between
65 local environmental conditions and regional processes (Leibold et al. 2004), such as the intensity of dispersal
66 between habitat patches and possible barriers for dispersal (Logue et al. 2011; Heino et al. 2015). Recently,
67 metacommunity theory has become the dominant framework through which ecologists examine the
68 structuring of biological communities (Brown et al. 2017). The four major paradigms of metacommunity

69 ecology, i.e. species sorting through the process of environmental filtering (Leibold 1998), mass effects
70 (Mouquet and Loreau 2002; 2003), neutrality (Hubbell 2001) and patch dynamics (Tilman 1994), are
71 examples emphasizing some of the controlling factors of metacommunity dynamics (Logue et al. 2011;
72 Brown et al. 2017). However, these paradigms fail to recognize the continuous and multidimensional nature
73 of metacommunity dynamics (Brown et al. 2017). More recent views of metacommunity dynamics
74 recognize, however, that dispersal and environmental filtering are not mutually exclusive (Gravel et al. 2006;
75 Logue et al. 2011), and emphasize that dispersal and local environmental conditions simultaneously affect
76 the structure of local communities. For example, adequate amount of dispersal is needed to enable species
77 sorting through environmental filtering, whereas low dispersal rates result in increased effect of dispersal
78 limitation on community assembly and high dispersal rates to the dominance of mass effects (Winegardner et
79 al. 2012; Heino et al. 2015; Brown et al. 2017).

80

81 Biological traits are characteristics that relate to the environmental responses, dispersal and competitive
82 abilities of species (McGill et al. 2006). Therefore, biological traits are keys to understand metapopulation
83 and metacommunity dynamics, i.e. the responses of individual species and entire biotic communities to
84 spatial processes and local environmental conditions (De Bie et al. 2012; Heino 2013). A suitable model
85 group for examining trait-environment relationships by community deconstruction are littoral
86 macroinvertebrates. This is because littoral macroinvertebrates show a diverse suite of biological traits
87 related to feeding mode, substrate attachment, oviposition behaviour, body size, dispersal mode and dispersal
88 abilities (Hanna 1961; Pinder 1995; Tolonen et al. 2003; Heino 2008; Heino and Tolonen 2017; Tolonen et
89 al. 2017). For example, body size has been recognized as one of the key traits that may determine
90 metacommunity structure because it is expected to be related to dispersal ability (De Bie et al. 2012).
91 Generally, in larger spatial scale and among-lake studies, the effect of spatial processes in structuring
92 communities increases and effect of local environmental conditions decreases with increasing body size of
93 organisms (De Bie et al. 2012; Soininen 2016). However, these expectations of metacommunity structuring-
94 species traits relationships may be different in highly-connected systems, such as a single large lake, and
95 within a single ecological group, such as littoral macroinvertebrates. The dispersal mode of organisms has a
96 key role in determining how species are spatially distributed and how they are interacting with their

97 environment (Cottenie 2005). Passive dispersers (e.g. worms, clams and mussels) are dispersed by water
98 currents or by larger animals (Bilton et al. 2001; Vanschoenwinkel et al. 2008), and they may have limited
99 ability to actively select their habitats (Vanschoenwinkel et al. 2008). Active dispersers (e.g. flying insects)
100 can actively select their habitats and oviposition sites to ensure favourable environmental condition for their
101 offspring (Berendonk 1999; Resetarits 2001). Aerial dispersal is generally the most important mode of
102 dispersal among lake littoral macroinvertebrates, and often the majority of species and individuals in
103 macroinvertebrate communities consist of aquatic insects with flying adults (e.g. 56-61 % of abundance in
104 Tolonen et al. 2001; Tolonen and Hämäläinen 2010). In addition to dispersal modes, divergent oviposition
105 behaviours of freshwater macroinvertebrate species constitute important life history strategies (Verberk et al.
106 2008) that may also be related to community assembly (Heino and Peckarsky 2014). Many
107 macroinvertebrate species attach their eggs selectively on solid substrates, such as on aquatic plants or on
108 stones below water surface. Another common oviposition strategy is to lay eggs freely on water surface
109 (Hanna 1961; Pinder 1995). Therefore, water currents within a lake may have important effects on the
110 dispersal of some aquatic insect taxa (e.g. non-biting midges) due to the planktonic behaviour of their eggs
111 (laid freely to the water surface) and first instar larvae (Davies 1976; Pinder 1995).

112
113 In this study, we examined the effects of local environmental conditions and spatial processes on the
114 metacommunity organisation of littoral macroinvertebrates in a large lake system through deconstructing
115 entire assemblages by biological trait groups. These traits included: (1) body size (small-, medium-, and
116 large-sized), (2) dispersal mode (non-flying and flying), and (3) oviposition behaviour (free oviposition on
117 water surface and selective oviposition on solid surfaces). Earlier across-taxonomic group, among-lake (De
118 Bie et al. 2012) and larger spatial-scale studies (Soininen 2014; 2016) have indicated that spatial effects
119 increase and environmental effects decrease with increasing body size of species in biotic assemblages.
120 Opposite to these studies, we expected that, with increasing macroinvertebrate body size, the importance of
121 environmental filtering increases and spatial processes decreases within a single lake system (Table 1). This
122 is because the dispersal capacity of active dispersers has been observed to be positively correlated with body
123 size (Jenkins et al. 2007) and, among flying aquatic insects, large species are generally stronger flyers than
124 small ones (Compton 2002; Hoffsten 2004). Large-sized flying species are considered stronger dispersers

125 and may be more able to move in an optimal (desired) direction in windy pelagic zones of large lakes (see
126 Compton 2002; Rundle et al. 2007). Therefore, large species may be more effective in selecting oviposition
127 sites and, hence, finding optimal habitats for their offspring when compared to small-sized species.
128

129 Dispersal mode is also considered to be one of the chief factors affecting metacommunity dynamics
130 (Cottenie 2005; De Bie et al. 2012). The examinations of multiple taxonomic groups across large spatial
131 scales have indicated that passive dispersers are mainly controlled by environmental conditions with minor
132 effects of spatial processes, whereas the assemblages of actively flying dispersers are more equally structured
133 by environmental and spatial effects (Cottenie 2005; De Bie et al. 2012). However, among-lake studies
134 comparing flying and passive dispersers with approximately equal sizes indicated that flying dispersers may
135 be relatively more controlled by local environmental conditions than passive dispersers, whereas spatial
136 effects may be stronger on passive dispersers with aquatic adult stages than on flying dispersers (De Bie
137 2012; Heino 2013). Therefore, we expected that the effects of spatial processes are stronger on non-flying
138 (passive dispersers) than on flying species (active dispersers) in our highly-connected large lake system
139 (Table 1). An opposite relationship is expected for the effect of local environmental conditions on the
140 assemblage structure of dispersal mode groups, with there being a stronger effect on assemblages of flying
141 species than on those of non-flying species.
142

143 Finally, oviposition mode (free or attached eggs) may also be among the key factors determining the
144 organisation of lake macroinvertebrate metacommunities. Slowly sinking, drifting eggs and egg masses laid
145 freely on the water surface may disperse long distances with water currents (Davies 1976). Directions of
146 surface water currents in lakes are changing with changes in wind directions (Huttula et al. 1996; Ji et al.
147 2002; Schernewski et al. 2005; Wu et al. 2016), and water currents have been observed to influence the
148 distribution patterns of planktonic organisms in lakes (Ji et al. 2002; Schernewski et al. 2005). Therefore,
149 relatively larger roles of random effects (unexplained variation) can be expected in the assemblages laying
150 their eggs freely compared to the assemblages attaching their eggs (Table 1). We also expected that attaching
151 eggs selectively on solid substrates should increase the importance of environmental filtering when
152 compared to the oviposition behaviour with eggs laid freely on the water surface.

153

154 **Material and methods**

155 Sampling and identification of macroinvertebrates

156 In September 2013, littoral macroinvertebrates were sampled at 70 stony bottom sites, which covered all sub-
157 basins and were located evenly around the entire perimeter of the Kitkajärvi lake system (surface area 305
158 km²) in northeastern Finland (centered on 66°10'N, 028°39'E) (Fig. 1). Macroinvertebrates were sampled
159 using a kick-net with 0.5 mm mesh-size. At each site, a pooled sample of six kicks, each along a 1-m stretch
160 for 30 s, were taken at 20 to 50 cm depth. This represented 6 m and 3 minutes sample size in total. When
161 taking each of the 30 second subsample, the field worker moved backwards and simultaneously kicked the
162 substrate, and moved the net from side-to-side close to the bottom. Samples were sieved using 0.5 mm mesh
163 and preserved in ethanol in the field. In the laboratory, the samples were sorted and animals were counted
164 and identified usually to species or genus, including the species-rich family Chironomidae. However, for the
165 Oligochaeta, only a few common taxa were identified to species level. Water mites (Hydracarina) were not
166 identified to lower taxonomic levels. All the work phases in field and laboratory were conducted by the same
167 persons.

168

169 Measurements of local environmental variables

170 Wind fetch (m) of each site was calculated using ArcGIS-based analysis tool (Rohweder et al. 2008). Bottom
171 slope (%) was calculated between the depths of 0.5 and 2 metres based on the site-specific distance
172 measurements. Coverage (%) of substratum particle sizes was visually assessed following modified
173 Wentworth classes: organic substratum (mud and leaf litter), fine inorganic sediment (≤ 2 mm), gravel (2-
174 16 mm), pebble (16-64 mm), cobble (64-256 mm), boulders (256-1024 mm), large boulders (> 1024 mm)
175 and bedrock. The mean substratum particle size (SPS) was calculated as a weighted mean of the midpoints of
176 the substratum size categories (e.g. 160 mm for the cobble 64-256 mm). Substratum particle diversity (SPD)
177 was calculated using Shannon diversity index (Shannon 1948). Samples for physical and chemical properties
178 of water were taken and analysed according to national standard methods (Finnish Standards Association

179 SFS), which are consistent with the pan-European standards (CEN, the European Committee for
180 Standardization). Altogether 35 water chemistry variables were analysed from water samples taken at each
181 sampling site (Supplementary Material Table S1).
182
183 Epilithic algal biomass (ELA BM) ($\text{chl-}a \mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$) was measured using *in vivo* fluorescence measurements
184 by BenthosTorch portable benthic algae analyser (www.bbe-moldaenke.de/chlorophyll/benthosTorch). Ten
185 randomly selected stones were collected from the depth of 40 cm for BenthosTorch measurements at each
186 site. Total surface area of the algal measurements was 9.6 cm^2 . At each site, fish biomass was estimated by
187 electrofishing without escape nets. Fish were sampled once from 100 m^2 area at each site (Sutela et al. 2016).
188 Percentage (%) coverage of macrophytes was estimated from six $1 \text{ m} \times 1 \text{ m}$ plots positioned randomly to the
189 depths of 0-2 m along the transect perpendicular to the shoreline.

190
191 Many of the environmental variables measured were strongly correlated ($r > 0.6$). Therefore, to avoid
192 interpretation problems related to multicollinearity, we selected only one variable (considered to be
193 ecologically most influential) among each set of correlated parameters to be used in subsequent statistical
194 analyses. This selection procedure resulted in a set of 17 uncorrelated environmental explanatory variables
195 (Table 2).

196

197 Spatial variables

198 Principal coordinates of neighbour matrix analysis (PCNM, Borcard and Legendre 2002) was conducted to
199 produce spatial eigenvectors for the analyses of spatial structures in the littoral macroinvertebrate species
200 composition. PCNM uses geographic (x and y) coordinates taking into account complex spatial structures,
201 including those that are nonlinear and occur at multiple spatial scales (Borcard and Legendre 2002). PCNM
202 analysis was conducted using the R package PCNM (Legendre et al. 2013). The analysis using coordinates
203 of the 70 sampling sites resulted in 27 PCNM eigenvectors showing positive spatial autocorrelation. These
204 eigenvectors were used as explanatory spatial variables in further analyses. First (V1, V2, V3, etc.) spatial
205 variables represented large-scale and last (V27, V26, V25, etc.) small-scale spatial relationships among the

206 sampling sites. Current nomenclature connects PCNM analysis to the framework of Moran's eigenvector
207 maps, and PCNM eigenvectors are thus nowadays also called distance-based Moran's eigenvector maps
208 (dbMEM) (Dray et al. 2012).

209

210 Classification of biological traits

211 Singletons, i.e. species found only in one sampling site, were excluded from the biological trait
212 classifications and further statistical analyses, since biological trait classifications were missing for many of
213 these rare species. After removing singletons, 112 species remained for statistical analyses. Biological trait
214 groups studied were body size, dispersal mode and oviposition behaviour. Body size of each species was
215 calculated based on length-weight relationships obtained from the literature, and were reported as a mean
216 potential maximum size of aquatic stages (see Tolonen et al. 2017). Species were then ranked from the
217 smallest to the largest, and divided into three groups with approximately equal number of species in each:
218 small-sized, medium-sized and large-sized species. Species were also classified into the groups of active
219 dispersers of flying insects and passive dispersers of non-flying species. Furthermore, species were classified
220 into two groups based on their oviposition behaviour: species laying slowly sinking "planktonic" eggs on the
221 water surface (free eggs), and species laying and attaching their eggs selectively on solid surfaces (e.g.
222 macrophytes and benthic substrates). Species-specific classifications of biological traits with their literature
223 references are given in the Supplementary Material Table S2.

224

225 Modelling variation in assemblage structure

226 First, to examine overall dissimilarity within each deconstructed assemblage i.e. assemblage variation based
227 on abundance data, we calculated Bray-Curtis dissimilarities among the sampling sites using the R package
228 BiodiversityR (Kindt 2017). We plotted the pairwise dissimilarities for each trait group as boxplots for visual
229 inspection.

230

231 Second, to identify significant variables ($\alpha = 0.05$, 1000 permutations) structuring deconstructed assemblages
232 within each biological trait group (see above), we conducted redundancy analyses (RDA) with a conservative

233 forward selection method (Blanchet et al. 2008) for two different explanatory variable groups separately:
234 environmental or spatial variables. In the RDA-analysis, we used Hellinger-transformed abundance data
235 (Legendre and Gallagher 2001) of each deconstructed assemblage. Forward selection was carried out only if
236 the global test including all explanatory variables of a variable group was significant. Forward selection was
237 conducted with two stopping rules: (1) $p > 0.05$ or (2) the adjusted R^2 of the reduced model exceeded that of
238 the global model. RDAs with variable selection were conducted using the `ordiR2step` function in the R
239 package `vegan` (Oksanen et al. 2013). Finally, for each biological species trait group separately, we
240 conducted variation partitioning in RDA between environmental and spatial predictors using the `varpart`
241 function in the R package `vegan` (Oksanen et al. 2013). Adjusted coefficients of determination (Adj. R^2) are
242 reported for all RDAs and associated variation partitioning (Peres-Neto et al. 2006).

243

244 Third, we also examined covariations among species of the studied biological traits using non-parametric
245 Mann-Whitney U test to compare, 1) if body sizes are different between non-flying and flying species, or 2)
246 between the species with free and attached eggs. We also tested the tendency of non-flying and flying
247 species to lay free eggs or attach their eggs to solid substrates using cross-tabulation and Pearson's chi-
248 square test based on relative proportions (%) of species.

249

250 **Results**

251 Overall variation in deconstructed assemblages

252 Assemblage variation measured by Bray-Curtis dissimilarities differed among body size groups, although the
253 differences were not very strong. Assemblage variation decreased from the group of small-sized to medium-
254 sized and to large-sized macroinvertebrates (Fig. 2). Assemblage variation also differed between the
255 dispersal and oviposition modes. Bray-Curtis dissimilarities were clearly higher for flying than for non-
256 flying assemblages, as well as higher for assemblages with species laying their eggs freely than for the group
257 of species attaching their eggs (Fig. 2).

258

259 Effects of environmental and spatial variables on the deconstructed assemblages

260 Unique spatial effects on assemblage structure decreased with increasing macroinvertebrate body size (Fig.
261 3A, Table 3). Unique and spatially-structured (shared) effects of local environmental conditions accounted
262 for a larger share of variation in the assemblage structure of medium-sized and large-sized species than that
263 of small-sized macroinvertebrates. Unexplained variation was larger for small- and medium-sized than for
264 large-sized species. Large and small spatial scale variables accounted for the variation in the assemblage
265 structure of small-sized species (Fig. 3B), whereas the assemblage structure of medium-sized and large-sized
266 macroinvertebrates were best associated with large to intermediate spatial scale variables. Significant
267 environmental variables explaining variation in the assemblages deconstructed by biological traits are given
268 in the Supplementary Material Tables S3-9.

269

270 Spatial variables accounted for an equal unique proportion of variation in assemblage structure of flying and
271 non-flying species (Fig. 4A, Table 3). Unique environmental and spatially-structured environmental
272 variation accounted for a larger proportion of variation in the assemblage structure of non-flying than that of
273 flying species. The contribution of unexplained variation was larger for flying than for non-flying
274 assemblages. Spatial variation in the assemblage structure of flying species was mostly associated with large-
275 scale spatial variables (Fig. 4B). On the other hand, the corresponding model of non-flying taxa included
276 variables related to large, intermediate and small spatial scales.

277

278 Spatial variables uniquely accounted for an equal proportion of variation in the assemblage structure of the
279 species laying their eggs freely to the water and that in the assemblage structure of the species attaching their
280 eggs to various substrates (Fig. 5A, Table 3). The contribution of unexplained variation was clearly larger for
281 taxa laying their eggs freely to the water than for species attaching their eggs to substrates. Local
282 environmental conditions explained a larger proportion of variation in the assemblage structure of the species
283 with attached eggs than those with free oviposition. The spatial model of the species with free eggs was
284 related to large spatial scale variables, whereas a corresponding model of species with attached eggs included
285 variables related large and intermediate spatial scales (Fig. 5B).

286

287 We found moderate covariation between the studied biological traits. Non-flying species were on average
288 slightly larger than flying ones (Fig. S1a), although this difference was not statistically significant (Mann-
289 Whitney test, $U = 718$, $P = 0.126$). The species attaching their eggs tended to be larger than those with free
290 eggs (Fig. S1b) (Mann-Whitney test, $U = 1180$, $P = 0.081$). Non-flying species had a stronger tendency to
291 attach their eggs (85 % of species) compared to flying species (58 % of species, Table S10) ($\chi^2 = 5.26$, $df = 1$,
292 $P = 0.022$).

293

294 **Discussion**

295 Relative roles of environmental conditions and regional processes affecting metacommunity structuring have
296 been shown to vary depending on various factors, including niche breadth (Pandit et al. 2009; Székely and
297 Langenheder 2014), biological traits (Cottenie 2005; De Bie et al. 2012), taxonomic group (Vilmi et al.
298 2016), habitat type (Cottenie 2005), successional stage of the habitat (Allen et al. 2011) and spatial scale
299 (Verleyen et al. 2009). We observed similarly to previous studies (De Bie et al. 2012; Heino 2013) that
300 species traits are important in shaping the contributions of environmental conditions and spatial processes to
301 metacommunity organisation. Our observations supported the importance of all studied traits, i.e. body size,
302 dispersal mode and oviposition behaviour, for the processes affecting metacommunity organisation. Our
303 results of the spatial and environmental effects on the structuring of assemblages with differing body sizes
304 mainly supported the *a priori* expectations (Table 1). Interestingly, the unique contribution of spatial effects
305 decreased with increasing macroinvertebrate body size in our study. This finding is in contrast with the
306 previous observations at comparable within-system (Padiál et al. 2014) and among-lake (De Bie et al. 2012)
307 levels that have indicated positive relationships between organisms' body size and contribution of spatial
308 processes to metacommunity organisation. The above-mentioned studies have, however, included multiple
309 taxonomic groups from microorganisms, such as bacteria and unicellular algae, to macroorganisms, such as
310 macrophytes and fish, whereas we examined the effect of body size within one ecological group of
311 organisms. Therefore, our results suggest that, within a single ecological group and at a rather small spatial
312 scale, the importance of spatial processes may decrease with increasing body size, whereas environmental

313 filtering may be a more important process for medium-sized to large-sized compared to small-sized species.
314 This pattern may also result from the domination of flying dispersers in our data, since dispersal capacity is
315 observed to associate positively with body size (Jenkins et al. 2007). Observations on caddisflies also suggest
316 that an increase in body size increases species dispersal ability across terrestrial landscapes (Hoffsten 2004).
317 Therefore, large-sized flying species may be effective dispersers and less prone to wind effects in often
318 windy conditions of large lakes when compared to weaker flying small species. This may enable more
319 effective habitat selection by large-sized species and, therefore, a stronger effect of local environmental
320 conditions on large-sized than on small-sized species assemblages. We also observed higher amounts of
321 unexplained and total community variation in small-sized assemblages than in large-sized assemblages,
322 which may relate to an increase of wind and water current effects with decreasing body size of species (see
323 Compton 2002; Schernewski et al. 2005; Rundle et al. 2007). In addition to these contrasting body size
324 effects on metacommunity organisation in our present and some earlier studies (De Bie 2012; Padial et al.
325 2014), Algarte et al. (2014) did not observe any consistent effects of cell size on the contributions of local
326 environment and spatial processes to the structuring of periphyton assemblages.

327
328 Previous among-lake studies have suggested that dispersal mode may be one of the key factors determining
329 lake metacommunity organisation (De Bie et al. 2012; Heino 2013). At the level of a single lake, we
330 observed equal spatial and stronger environmental effects on the assemblage structure of non-flying
331 compared to flying taxa. These results contrasted with our preliminary expectations (Table 1) and the results
332 of previous studies (De Bie et al. 2012; Heino 2013). This may be due to a difference in habitat connectivity
333 between studies with contrasting spatial settings (earlier among-lake studies versus our within-lake study).
334 Contradictory results of meta-analyses have also indicated either high (Cottenie 2005) or minor (Soininen
335 2014; 2016) importance of dispersal mode in determining the contributions of environmental and spatial
336 processes to metacommunity organisation. We also observed higher amounts of assemblage variability and
337 unexplained variation in the assemblages of flying species compared to those of non-flying taxa. We can
338 only speculate whether this higher “random” or unexplained variation in flying species’ assemblages could
339 result from the wind influence on their aerial dispersal stages. Alternatively, stronger effects of
340 environmental filtering on the assemblage structure of non-flying compared to flying species may be due to

341 biological trait covariation, since a larger proportion of non-flying species attached their eggs compared to
342 flying species (Table S10). Therefore, the stronger environmental filtering effect on the assemblages of non-
343 flying species compared to the assemblages of flying species may also relate to the differences in the
344 oviposition behaviour between these dispersal modes. This is because oviposition behaviour was the
345 biological trait with the largest observed differences in the contributions of local environmental conditions to
346 metacommunity structuring (Fig. 5).

347
348 Although very rarely examined, we assumed that oviposition behaviour may be an important biological trait
349 that affects invertebrate metacommunity organisation, i.e. the contributions of environmental filtering, spatial
350 processes and stochasticity to variation in assemblage structure (see also Heino and Peckarsky 2014). We
351 expected that the species attaching their eggs are more effective in selecting suitable living conditions for
352 their offspring, and therefore, deconstructed assemblages of these species were expected to be mainly
353 controlled by local environmental conditions. On the other hand, larger contributions of stochasticity were
354 expected for the assemblage structure of species laying their eggs freely on the water surface. For example,
355 the slowly-sinking *Chironomus* egg masses that are laid freely to the lake pelagic zone have been observed to
356 distribute and drift even as fast as 20 km h⁻¹ along with the surface water currents (Davies 1976). As
357 expected, we observed that local environmental conditions were more important in explaining variation in
358 the assemblage structure of the species with attached eggs than that of the species laying their eggs freely on
359 the water surface. On the other hand, spatial variables explained equal proportions of variation in the
360 assemblage structure of the species with free and attached eggs. In addition, the amount of unexplained
361 variation was clearly larger for species laying their eggs freely than for species attaching their eggs. This
362 may indicate a higher importance of stochastic events in the metacommunity dynamics of the species laying
363 their eggs freely to the water. Water currents have been observed to influence the spatial and temporal
364 distribution of planktonic organisms (Ji et al. 2002; Schernewski et al. 2005). Eggs laid freely on the water
365 surface may drift with water currents (Davies 1976; Pinder 1995) and are, therefore, prone to wind-driven
366 changes in water currents (Huttula et al. 1996; Ji et al. 2002; Schernewski et al. 2005; Wu et al. 2016).
367 Hence, a larger proportion of unexplained variation in the assemblage structuring of species with free eggs

368 than in the assemblages of species with attached eggs may be related to unmeasured effects of water
369 currents.

370

371 We observed higher variability in the assemblage composition of small-sized and flying species, and of those
372 species laying their eggs freely to the water surface. On the contrary, smaller assemblage variation was
373 observed in the groups of species with large-size, without flying stages and attaching their eggs on the solid
374 substrates. Interestingly, the amount of explained variation was regularly higher for assemblages with
375 smaller assemblage dissimilarity (large-sized, non-flying and ‘attaching’ egg-laying behaviour) than for
376 assemblages with larger among-site variation in species composition (small-sized, flying and free oviposition
377 behaviour). We propose that one factor that may be related to the amount of unexplained variation in the
378 species composition of our deconstructed assemblages could be wind, which is also a key factor explaining
379 variation in direction water currents in large lakes prone to wind effects (Huttula et al. [1996](#); Ji et al. [2002](#);
380 Qin et al. [2007](#)). Moreover, we propose that the species with small size, those with a flying adult stage and
381 laying their eggs freely on the water surface are more prone to the combined effects of wind and surface
382 water currents than large-sized, non-flying and species with attached eggs (see also Davies [1976](#)). We also
383 suggest that, in the windy pelagic zones of large lakes, small-sized flying species may become subject to
384 unintentional dispersing effects caused by wind more easily than large-sized species that are generally
385 stronger fliers (Compton [2002](#); Hoffsten [2004](#); Rundle et al. [2007](#))

386

387 We observed that within-lake assemblage dissimilarity varied among trait groups, and this dissimilarity was
388 related to the relative proportions of explained and unexplained variation in assemblage composition.
389 Generally, less variation was explained in more dissimilar assemblages (small-sized, flying and species
390 laying their eggs freely), whereas more variation was explained in more similar assemblages (large-sized,
391 non-flying and species with attached eggs). We suggest that wind and related water currents may possibly
392 relate to these patterns observed, whereas small-sized, flying and species with free eggs could be expected to
393 be more prone to wind-water current effects than large-sized, non-flying and species attaching their eggs.
394 Our results suggest that spatial processes may be important although generally less important than
395 environmental filtering in structuring macroinvertebrate assemblages at within-lake levels. Interestingly,

396 among the studied biological traits, we observed the strongest effect of oviposition behaviour on the
397 contribution of environmental filtering to metacommunity organisation. We also observed significant
398 covariation between dispersal and oviposition modes, i.e. non-flying species tended to attach their eggs
399 rather than to lay their eggs freely. Instead, these two modes of oviposition behaviour were nearly equally
400 common among flying species. In addition, non-flying species and the species attaching their eggs tended to
401 be larger than flying species and those laying free eggs. Therefore, these results imply that covariations
402 among biological traits may affect the organisation of lake macroinvertebrate metacommunities.

403

404 In contrast to some previous studies (De Bie et al. 2012; Padial et al. 2014), we found that the effect of
405 environmental filtering on metacommunity organisation increased and that of spatial processes decreased
406 with increasing body size. These results suggest that the observed body size effects on metacommunity
407 organisation between previous among-lake studies and our present study conducted within a single large lake
408 may differ due to differences in habitat connectivity and body size ranges studied. First, the levels of
409 connectivity between this study and previous among-lake studies are clearly different. Despite the relatively
410 high connectivity between habitat patches in a single large lake, dispersal rates may vary with invertebrate
411 body size. In our highly-connected study system, environmental filtering may be the most important
412 structuring force for the large species capable of actively searching for and selecting favourable habitats. On
413 the other hand, small-sized species may be more exposed to stochastic events, and be affected by the
414 changing directions of winds and water currents (Ji et al. 2002; Qin et al. 2007). Second, our study focused
415 only on a single ecological group, i.e. benthic macroinvertebrates, with moderate variability in body size,
416 whereas previous studies have included multiple biological groups from microorganisms to vertebrates (De
417 Bie 2012; Padial et al. 2014). Thus, keeping in mind the difference in body size range studied between our
418 and the previous studies, our results make perfect sense for macroinvertebrate metacommunity organisation
419 in highly-connected systems.

420

421 **Acknowledgements** We thank Marja Manninen, Sari Latvala, Minna Kuoppala, Eeva Kosola, Mika Visuri,
422 Juha Riihimäki, Osmo Murtovaara, Riku Paavola, Jukka Leppälä, Yrjö Kivinen, Tiina Nokela and Susan

423 Kunas for their help during different stages of the study. This study was financially supported by the
424 European Regional Development Fund of the European Union and by Maj and Tor Nessling Foundation.

425

426 **References**

427 Algarte VM, Rodrigues, L, Landeiro VL, Siqueira T (2014) Variance partitioning of deconstructed
428 periphyton communities: does the use of biological traits matter? *Hydrobiologia* 722:279-290

429 Allen MR, VanDyke JN, Cáceres CE (2011) Metacommunity assembly and sorting newly formed lake
430 communities. *Ecology* 92:269-275

431 Berendonk TU (1999) Influence of fish kairomones on the oviposition behavior of *Chaoborus* imagines.
432 *Limnol Oceanogr* 44:454-458

433 Bilton DT, Freeland JR, Okamura B (2001) Dispersal in freshwater invertebrates. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst*
434 32:159-181

435 Blanchet FG, Legendre P, Borcard D (2008) Forward selection of explanatory variables. *Ecology* 89:2623-
436 2632

437 Borcard D, Legendre P (2002) All scale analysis of ecological data by means of principal coordinates of
438 neighbour matrices. *Ecol Model* 153:51-68

439 Brown BL, Sokol ER, Skelton J, Tornwall B (2017) Making sense of metacommunities: dispelling the
440 mythology of a metacommunity typology. *Oecologia* 183:643-652

441 Compton SG (2002) Sailing with the wind: dispersal by small flying insects. In: Bullock JM, Kenward RE,
442 Hails RS (eds.) *Dispersal Ecology*. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp. 113-133.

443 Cottenie K (2005) Integrating environmental and spatial processes in ecological community dynamics. *Ecol*
444 *Lett* 8:1175-1182

445 Davies BR (1976) Wind distribution of the egg masses of *Chironomus anthracinus* (Zetterstedt) (Diptera:
446 Chironomidae) in a shallow, wind-exposed lake (Loch Leven, Kinross). *Freshwater Biol* 6:421-424

447 De Bie T, De Meester L, Brendonck L, Martens K., Goddeeris B, Ercken D, Hampel H, Denys L, Vanhecke
448 L, Van der Gucht K, Van Wichelen J, Vyverman W, Declerck SAJ (2012) Body size and dispersal
449 mode as key traits determining metacommunity structure of aquatic organisms. *Ecol Lett* 15:740-747

450 Dray S, Pélissier R, Couteron P, Fortin MJ, Legendre P, Peres-Neto PR, Bellier E, Bivand R, Blanchet FG,
451 De Cáceres M, Dufour AB, Heegard E, Jombart T, Munoz F, Oksanen J, Thioulouse J, Wagner HH
452 (2012) Community ecology in the age of multivariate multiscale spatial analysis. *Ecol Monogr* 82:257-
453 275

454 Gravel D, Canham CD, Beaudet M, Messier C (2006) Reconciling niche and neutrality: the continuum
455 hypothesis. *Ecol Lett* 9:399-409

456 Hanna HM (1961) Observations on the egg-laying of some British caddis flies and on case-building by
457 newly hatched larvae. *Proc R Ent Soc Lond (A)* 36:57-62

458 Heino J (2008) Patterns of functional biodiversity and function-environment relationships in lake
459 macroinvertebrates. *Limnol Oceanogr* 53:1446-1455

460 Heino J (2013) Does dispersal ability affect the relative importance of environmental control and spatial
461 structuring of littoral macroinvertebrate communities. *Oecologia* 171:971-980

462 Heino J, Peckarsky BL (2014) Integrating behavioural, population and large-scale approaches for
463 understanding stream insect communities. *Curr Opin Insect Sci* 2:7-13

464 Heino J, Tolonen KT (2017) Untangling the assembly of littoral macroinvertebrate communities through
465 measures of functional and phylogenetic alpha diversity. *Freshwater Biol* 62:1168-1179

466 Heino J, Melo AS, Siqueira T, Soininen J, Valanko S, Bini LM (2015) Metacommunity organisation, spatial
467 extend and dispersal in aquatic systems: patterns, processes and prospects. *Freshwater Biol* 60:845-869

468 Hoffsten PO (2004) Site-occupancy in relation to flight-morphology in caddisflies. *Freshwater Biol* 49:810-
469 817

470 Hubbell SP (2001) *The unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography*. Princeton University Press

471 Huttula T, Koponen J, Lehtinen K, Wahlgren A, Niinioja R (1996) Water currents and spreading of river
472 load in Lake Pyhäselkä, Saimaa. *Hydrobiologia* 322:117-124

473 Ji R, Chen C, Budd JW, Schwab DJ, Beletsky D, Fahnenstiel GL, Johengen TH, Vanderploeg H, Eadie B,
474 Cotner J, Gardner W, Bundy M (2002) Influences of suspended sediments on the ecosystem in Lake
475 Michigan: a 3-D coupled bio-physical modeling experiment. *Ecol Model* 152:169-190

476 Kindt R (2017) Package 'BiodiversityR'. Package for community ecology and suitability analysis. Ver. 2.8-
477 4. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/BiodiversityR>

478 Legendre P, Gallagher ED (2001) Ecologically meaningful transformations for ordination of species data.
479 *Oecologia* 129: 271-280

480 Legendre P, Borcard D, Blanchet FG, Dray S (2013) MEM spatial eigenfunction and principal coordinate
481 analyses. Spatial eigenfunction analysis by principal coordinates of neighbour matrices (PCNM) and
482 principal coordinate analysis. Ver. 2.1-2. https://r-forge.r-project.org/R/?group_id=195

483 Leibold MA (1998) Similarity and local co-existence of species in regional biotas. *Evol Ecol* 12:95-110

484 Leibold MA, Holyoak M, Mouquet N, Amarasekare P, Chase JM, Hoopes MF, Holt RD, Shurin JB, Law R,
485 Tilman D, Loreau M, Gonzalez A (2004) The metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale
486 community ecology. *Ecol Lett* 7:601-613

487 Logue JB, Mouquet N, Peter H, Hillebrand H (2011) Empirical approaches to metacommunities: a review
488 and comparison with theory. *Trends Ecol Evol* 26:482-491

489 McGill BJ, Enqvist BJ, Weiher E, Westoby M (2006) Rebuilding community ecology from functional traits.
490 *Trends Ecol Evol* 21:178-185

491 Mouquet N, Loreau M (2002) Coexistence in metacommunities: the regional similarity hypothesis. *Am Nat*
492 159:420-426

493 Mouquet N, Loreau M (2003) Community patterns in source-sink metacommunities. *Am Nat* 162:544-557

494 OECD 1982. Eutrophication of waters: monitoring, assessment and control. Final report, OECD cooperative
495 programme of monitoring inland waters (eutrophication control). Organization for Economic and Co-
496 operative Development, Paris, France

497 Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens
498 MHH, Wagner H (2013) vegan: community ecology package. R-package ver. 2.0-9. [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan)
499 [project.org/package=vegan](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan)

500 Padial AA, Ceschin F, Declerck SAJ, De Meester L, Bonecker CC, Lansac-Tôha FA, Rodrigues L,
501 Rodrigues LC, Train S, Velho LFM, Bini LM (2014) Dispersal ability determines the role of
502 environmental, spatial and temporal drivers of metacommunity structure. *PLoS ONE* 9:e111227

503 Pandit SN, Kolasa, J, Cottenie, K (2009) Contrasts between habitat generalists and specialists: an empirical
504 extension to the basic metacommunity framework. *Ecology* 90:2253-2262

505 Peres-Neto PR, Legendre P, Borcard D (2006) Variation partitioning of species data matrices: estimation and
506 comparison of fractions. *Ecology* 87:2614-2625

507 Pinder LCV (1995) Biology of the eggs and first-instar larvae. - In: Armitage PD, Cranston PS, Pinder LCV
508 (eds). *The Chironomidae: the biology and ecology of non-biting midges*. Chapman & Hall. pp 87-106

509 Qin B, Xu P, Wu Q, Luo L, Zhang Y (2007) Environmental issues of Lake Taihu, China. *Hydrobiologia*
510 581:3-14

511 Resetarits WJ (2001) Colonization under threat of predation: avoidance of fish by an aquatic beetle,
512 *Tropisternus lateralis* (Coleoptera: Hydrophilidae). *Oecologia* 129:155-160

513 Rohweder J, Rogala JD, Johnson BL, Anderson D, Clark S, Chamberlin F, Runyon K (2008) Application of
514 wind fetch and wave models for habitat rehabilitation and enhancement projects. U.S. Geological Survey
515 Open-File Report 2008-1200. 43 pp.

516 Rundle SD, Bilton DT, Foggo A (2007) By wind, wings and water: body size, dispersal and range size in
517 aquatic invertebrates. In: Hildrew AG, Raffaelli DG, Edmonds-Brown R (eds.) *Body size: the structure*
518 *and function of aquatic ecosystems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 186-209

519 Schernewski G, Podsetchine V, Huttula T (2005) Effects of the flow field on small scale phytoplankton
520 patchiness. *Hydrobiologia* 36:85-98

521 Shannon CE (1948) A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell Syst Tech J* 27:379-423

522 Soininen J (2014) A quantitative analysis of species sorting across organisms and ecosystems. *Ecology*
523 95:3284-3292

524 Soininen J (2016) Spatial structure in ecological communities - a quantitative analysis. *Oikos* 125:160-166

525 Sutela T, Vehanen T, Rask M (2016) A littoral fish index that responds to eutrophication in boreal lakes.
526 *Fish Res* 173:88-92

527 Székely AJ, Langenheder S (2014) The importance of species sorting differs between habitat generalists and
528 specialists in bacterial communities. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol* 87:102-112

529 Tilman D (1994) Competition and biodiversity in spatially structured habitats. *Ecology* 75:2-16

530 Tolonen KT, Hämäläinen H (2010) Comparison of sampling methods and habitat types for detecting impacts
531 on lake littoral macroinvertebrate assemblages along a gradient of human impact. *Fundam Appl Limnol*
532 176:43-59

533 Tolonen KT, Hämäläinen H, Holopainen IJ, Karjalainen J (2001) Influences of habitat type and
534 environmental variables on littoral macroinvertebrate communities in a large lake system. Arch Hydrobiol
535 152:39-67

536 Tolonen KT, Hämäläinen H, Holopainen IJ, Mikkonen K, Karjalainen J (2003) Body size and substrate
537 association of littoral insects in relation vegetation structure. Hydrobiologia 499:179-190

538 Tolonen KT, Vilmi A, Karjalainen SM, Hellsten S, Sutela T, Heino J (2017) Ignoring spatial effects results
539 in inadequate models for variation in littoral macroinvertebrate diversity. Oikos 126:852-862

540 Vanschoenwinkel B, Gielen S, Vandewaerde H, Seaman M, Brendonck L (2008) Relative importance of
541 different dispersal vectors for small aquatic invertebrates in a rock pool metacommunity. Ecography
542 31:567-577

543 Verberk WCEP, Siepel H, Esselink H (2008) Life-history strategies in freshwater macroinvertebrates.
544 Freshwater Biol 53:1722-1738

545 Verleyen E, Vyverman W, Sterken M, Hodgson DA, De Wever A, Juggins S, Van de Vijver B, Jones VJ,
546 Vanormelingen P, Roberts D, Flower R, Kilroy K, Souffreau C, Sabbe K (2009) The importance of
547 dispersal related and local factors in shaping the taxonomic structure of diatom metacommunities. Oikos
548 118:1239-1249

549 Vilmi A, Karjalainen SM, Nokela T, Tolonen K, Heino J (2016) Unravelling the drivers of aquatic
550 communities using disparate organismal groups and different taxonomic levels. Ecol Indic 60:108-118

551 Winegardner AK, Jones BK, Ng ISY, Siqueira T, Cottenie K (2012) The terminology of metacommunity
552 ecology. Trends Ecol Evol 27:253-254

553 Wu T, Huttula T, Boqiang Q, Zhu G, Ropponen J, Yan W (2016) *In-situ* erosion of cohesive sediment in a
554 large shallow lake experiencing long-term decline in wind speed. J Hydrol 539:254-264

Table 1 Expected and observed relative effects of spatial processes and environmental filtering on the structuring of deconstructed species groups (based on biological traits) with the shares of unexplained variation. NE = No expectations

	<i>Expectations</i>			<i>Observed</i>		
	Spatial processes	Environmental filtering	Unexplained	Spatial processes	Environmental filtering	Unexplained
<i>Body size</i>						
Small-sized	Larger	Smaller	NE	Larger	Smaller	Larger
Medium-sized	Intermediate	Intermediate	NE	Intermediate	Intermediate	Larger
Large-sized	Smaller	Larger	NE	Smaller	Larger	Smaller
<i>Dispersal mode</i>						
Flying species	Smaller	Larger	NE	Equal	Smaller	Larger
Non-flying species	Larger	Smaller	NE	Equal	Larger	Smaller
<i>Oviposition behaviour</i>						
Free eggs	NE	Smaller	Larger	Equal	Smaller	Larger
Attached eggs	NE	Larger	Smaller	Equal	Larger	Smaller

Table 2 Mean, minimum and maximum values of the 17 environmental variables used as environmental predictor variables in the statistical analyses

Variable	Mean	Min.	Max.
Conductivity ($\mu\text{S cm}^{-1}$)	41.9	20.6	63.9
Oxygen concentration (mg l^{-1})	9.5	6.9	10.7
$\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$ ($\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$)	4.0	2.5	17
$\text{NO}_2\text{+NO}_3\text{-N}$ ($\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$)	2.1	1.0	28
Total phosphorus ($\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$)	12.2	5	75
Al ($\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$)	31.0	5	306
Na (mg l^{-1})	1.2	1.0	1.5
Si (mg l^{-1})	2.0	1.4	2.5
Zn ($\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$)	6.0	5	32.1
Wind fetch (m)	853	142	2257
Slope (%)	6.0	0.5	16.8
Substratum mean particle size (mm)	155	16	401
Substratum diversity (Shannon H)	1.3	0.9	1.7
Epilithic algal biomass (Chl- <i>a</i> $\mu\text{g cm}^{-2}$)	1.4	0.5	2.4
Organic substratum coverage (%)	3	0	47
Macrophyte coverage (%)	14	0	65
Fish biomass ($\text{g } 100 \text{ m}^{-2}$)	86	0	434

Table 3 Unique and shared proportions of variations explained by local environmental variables and spatial variables in the structure of assemblages deconstructed by biological traits: body size (small-, medium- and large-sized), dispersal mode (flying and non-flying) and oviposition mode (freely laid eggs and attached eggs)

	Proportions of variations explained (Adj. R ²)			
	Local environment unique	Shared	Spatial unique	Unexplained
Body size				
<i>Small-sized</i>	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.82
<i>Medium-sized</i>	0.12	0.02	0.04	0.82
<i>Large-sized</i>	0.10	0.14	0.02	0.74
Dispersal mode				
<i>Non-flying</i>	0.12	0.09	0.04	0.75
<i>Flying</i>	0.09	0.06	0.04	0.81
Oviposition mode				
<i>Free eggs</i>	0.06	0.06	0.03	0.85
<i>Attached eggs</i>	0.13	0.09	0.03	0.75

Figure legends:

Fig. 1 Map of Lake Kitkajärvi (Tolonen et al. 2017), where total phosphorus (TP) concentrations ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) are indicated by differently coloured symbols according to the OECD trophic state classification (OECD 1982). Shown are the 70 study sites

Fig. 2 Among-site pairwise dissimilarity of the assemblages deconstructed by biological trait groups. The assemblage dissimilarities were measured using Bray-Curtis coefficient

Fig. 3 Variation in the assemblage structure of littoral macroinvertebrate species in different body size categories (small, medium and large), partitioned to the fractions accounted for by local environmental variables, spatial variables and shared proportions between these two variable sets. They are shown **a** in adjusted coefficients of variation (adj. R^2). **b** Ranks (V1-V27) and mean rank (bar) of the significant spatial variables in the RDA-models of small-sized, medium-sized and large-sized species

Fig. 4 Variation in the assemblage structure of non-flying and flying littoral macroinvertebrate species partitioned to the fractions accounted for by local environmental variables, spatial variables and shared proportions between these two variable sets. They are shown **a** in adjusted coefficients of variation (adj. R^2). **b** Ranks (V1-V27) and mean rank (bar) of the significant spatial variables in the RDA-models of non-flying and flying species

Fig. 5 Variation in the assemblage structure of littoral macroinvertebrate species laying their eggs freely to the water (free eggs) or attaching their eggs to the substrates partitioned to the fractions accounted for by local environmental variables, spatial variables and shared proportions between these two variable sets. They are shown **a** in adjusted coefficients of variation (adj. R^2). **b** Ranks (V1-V27) and mean rank (bar) of the significant spatial variables in the RDA-models of the species with free and attached eggs




Fig. 1 Map of Lake Kitkajärvi (Tolonen et al. 2017), where total phosphorus (TP) concentrations ($\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$) are indicated by differently coloured symbols according to the OECD trophic state classification (OECD 1982). Shown are the 70 study sites




Fig. 2 Among-site pairwise dissimilarity of the assemblages deconstructed by biological trait groups. The assemblage dissimilarities were measured using Bray-Curtis coefficient




Fig. 3 Variation in the assemblage structure of littoral macroinvertebrate species in different body size categories (small, medium and large), partitioned to the fractions accounted for by local environmental variables, spatial variables and shared proportions between these two variable sets. They are shown **a** in adjusted coefficients of variation (adj. R²). **b** Ranks (V1-V27) and mean rank (bar) of the significant spatial variables in the RDA-models of small-sized, medium-sized and large-sized species




Fig. 4 Variation in the assemblage structure of non-flying and flying littoral macroinvertebrate species partitioned to the fractions accounted for by local environmental variables, spatial variables and shared proportions between these two variable sets. They are shown **a** in adjusted coefficients of variation (adj. R²). **b** Ranks (V1-V27) and mean rank (bar) of the significant spatial variables in the RDA-models of non-flying and flying species




Fig. 5 Variation in the assemblage structure of littoral macroinvertebrate species laying their eggs freely to the water (free eggs) or attaching their eggs to the substrates partitioned to the fractions accounted for by local environmental variables, spatial variables and shared proportions between these two variable sets. They are shown **a** in adjusted coefficients of variation (adj. R²). **b** Ranks (V1-V27) and mean rank (bar) of the significant spatial variables in the RDA-models of the species with free and attached eggs