

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna  
Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Stream diatom biodiversity in islands and continents—A global perspective on effects of area, isolation and environment

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

*Published Version:*

Jamoneau A., Soininen J., Tison-Rosebery J., Boutry S., Budnick W.R., He S., et al. (2022). Stream diatom biodiversity in islands and continents—A global perspective on effects of area, isolation and environment. JOURNAL OF BIOGEOGRAPHY, 49(12), 2156-2168 [10.1111/jbi.14482].

*Availability:*

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/904161> since: 2022-11-19

*Published:*

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1111/jbi.14482>

*Terms of use:*

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).  
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

**Jamoneau, A., Soininen, J., Tison-Rosebery, J., Boutry, S., Budnick, W.R., He, S., Marquié, J., Jyrkänkallio-Mikkola, J., Pajunen, V., Teittinen, A., Tupola, V., Wang, B., Wang, J., Blanco, S., Borrini, A., Cantonati, M., Valente, A.C., Delgado, C., Dörflinger, G., Gonçalves, V., Kennedy, B., Marques, H., Papatheodoulou, A., Raposeiro, P.M., Ritter, C., Serafim, A., Van de Vijver, B., Passy, S.I. Stream diatom biodiversity in islands and continents—A global perspective on effects of area, isolation and environment (2022) *Journal of Biogeography*, 49 (12), pp. 2156-2168**

The final published version is available online at  
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jbi.14482>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

*This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)*

***When citing, please refer to the published version.***

1 **Stream diatom biodiversity in islands and continents – a global**  
2 **perspective on effects of area, isolation and environment**

3

4 **Short running title: Diatom in islands and continents**

5

6 Aurélien Jamoneau<sup>1†\*</sup>, Janne Soininen<sup>2†</sup>, Juliette Tison-Rosebery<sup>1</sup>, Sébastien Boutry<sup>1</sup>,  
7 William R. Budnick<sup>3</sup>, Siwen He<sup>2,4</sup>, Julien Marquié<sup>1</sup>, Jenny Jyrkänkallio-Mikkola<sup>2</sup>, Virpi  
8 Pajunen<sup>2</sup>, Anette Teittinen<sup>2</sup>, Vilja Tupola<sup>2</sup>, Beixin Wang<sup>4</sup>, Jianjun Wang<sup>5,6</sup>, Saúl Blanco<sup>7</sup>,  
9 Alex Borrini<sup>8</sup>, Marco Cantonati<sup>9</sup>, Adelaide Clode Valente<sup>10</sup>, Cristina Delgado<sup>11</sup>, Gerald  
10 Dörflinger<sup>12</sup>, Vítor Gonçalves<sup>13,14</sup>, Bryan Kennedy<sup>15</sup>, Helena Marques<sup>13</sup>, Athina  
11 Papatheodoulou<sup>16</sup>, Pedro Miguel Raposeiro<sup>13</sup>, Catarina Ritter<sup>13</sup>, António Serafim<sup>17</sup>, Bart  
12 Van de Vijver<sup>18,19</sup> and Sophia I. Passy<sup>20</sup>.

13

14 <sup>1</sup> INRAE, EABX, 33612 Cestas, France.

15 <sup>2</sup> Department of Geosciences and Geography, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, FIN-  
16 00014, Finland.

17 <sup>3</sup> Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI  
18 48824, USA.

19 <sup>4</sup> Laboratory of Aquatic Insects and Stream Ecology, Department of Entomology,  
20 Nanjing Agricultural University, Nanjing, China.

- 21 <sup>5</sup> State Key Laboratory of Lake Science and Environment, Nanjing Institute of  
22 Geography and Limnology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Nanjing 210008, China.
- 23 <sup>6</sup> University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China.
- 24 <sup>7</sup> Department of Biodiversity and Environment Management, University of León, Spain.
- 25 <sup>8</sup> ERSE soc. coop. s.t.p. (Ecological Research and Services for the Environment),  
26 Viareggio, Italy.
- 27 <sup>9</sup> BIOME Lab, Department of Biological, Geological and Environmental Sciences, Alma  
28 Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.
- 29 <sup>10</sup> Secretaria Regional de Ambiente, Recursos Naturais e Alterações Climáticas - Governo  
30 Regional da Madeira, Funchal, Portugal.
- 31 <sup>11</sup> Department of Ecology and Animal Biology, Faculty of Science, University of Vigo,  
32 36200 Vigo, Pontevedra, Spain.
- 33 <sup>12</sup> Water Development Department, 1646 Nicosia, Cyprus
- 34 <sup>13</sup> Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Rede de Investigação  
35 em Biodiversidade e Biologia Evolutiva – Laboratório Associado, 9500-321 Ponta  
36 Delgada, Portugal.
- 37 <sup>14</sup> Faculty of Sciences and Technology, University of the Azores, 9500-321 Ponta  
38 Delgada, Portugal.
- 39 <sup>15</sup> Environmental Protection Agency, Castlebar, Co. Mayo, Ireland F23KT91.
- 40 <sup>16</sup> I.A.CO Environmental & Water Consultants Ltd, Nicosia 2035, Cyprus.

41 <sup>17</sup> AS.AMBI, Consultoria Ambiental, 7005-480 Évora, Portugal.

42 <sup>18</sup> Meise Botanic Garden, Meise, Belgium.

43 <sup>19</sup> Department of Biology, ECOSPHERE, University of Antwerp, Wilrijk, Belgium

44 <sup>20</sup> Department of Biology, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX 76019, USA

45 <sup>†</sup> equal contribution

46 \* Corresponding author: Aurélien Jamoneau

47 **Email: [aurelien.jamoneau@inrae.fr](mailto:aurelien.jamoneau@inrae.fr)**

48

## 49 **Acknowledgments**

50 We thank OFB (Office Français Biodiversité), all French Water Agencies and Asconit for  
51 data contribution and financial support and Anna Astorga and Riku Paavola for collecting  
52 the diatom data in New Zealand. We thank Hilaire Drouineau and Michel Coste for  
53 statistical and taxonomic discussion respectively. We thank colleagues at the Laboratory  
54 of Aquatic Insects and Stream Ecology of Nanjing Agricultural University for assistance  
55 with diatom sampling and processing in China. We thank Feiyan Pan, Han Xiao and Qing  
56 Liu for the field trip in Iceland. JJ. Wang was supported by National Natural Science  
57 Foundation of China (91851117, 41871048), CAS Key Research Program of Frontier  
58 Sciences (QYZDB-SSW-DQC043), and The National Key Research and Development  
59 Program of China (2019YFA0607100). We greatly thanks the Water Development  
60 Department of the Republic of Cyprus for providing data from Cyprus. We are grateful to  
61 RAS - Direzione generale Agenzia regionale del Distretto Idrografico della Sardegna

62 Servizio tutela e gestione delle risorse idriche, vigilanza sui servizi idrici e gestione delle  
63 siccità (STGRI) and to ARPAS - Agenzia Regionale per la Protezione dell'Ambiente  
64 della Sardegna for making available physical and chemical data collected during the  
65 institutional monitoring of surface waters for the streams in Sardinia. We thank the EPA  
66 (Environmental Protection Agency) for providing data from Ireland.

67 **Abstract**

68 **Aim.** The species-area relationship (SAR) is one of the most distinctive biogeographic  
69 patterns, but global comparisons of the SARs between island and mainland are lacking  
70 for microbial taxa. Here, we explore whether the form of the SAR and the drivers of  
71 species richness, including area, environmental heterogeneity, climate and  
72 physicochemistry, differ between islands and similarly sized areas on mainland, referred  
73 to as continental area equivalents (CAEs).

74 **Location.** Global.

75 **Major taxa studied.** Stream benthic diatoms.

76 **Methods.** We generated CAEs on six continental datasets and examined the SARs of  
77 CAEs and islands (ISAR). Then, we compared CAEs and islands in terms of total  
78 richness and richness of different ecological guilds. We tested the factors contributing to  
79 richness in islands and CAEs with regressions. We used structural equation models to  
80 determine the effects of area vs. environmental heterogeneity, climate and local  
81 conditions on species richness.

82 **Results.** We found a non-significant ISAR, but a significant positive SAR in CAEs.  
83 Richness in islands was related to productivity. Richness in CAEs was mainly dependent  
84 on area and climate, but not directly on environmental heterogeneity. Species richness  
85 within guilds exhibited inconsistent relationships with island isolation and area.

86 **Main conclusions.** Ecological and evolutionary processes shaping diatom island  
87 biogeography do not depend on area at the worldwide scale probably due to the presence  
88 of distinct species pool across islands. Conversely, area was an important driver of

89 diatom richness in continents, and this effect could be attributed to dispersal. Continents  
90 had greater richness than islands, but this was a consequence of differences in  
91 environmental conditions such as specific island climatic conditions. We stress the need  
92 for more island data on benthic diatoms, particularly from archipelagos, to better  
93 understand the biogeography of this most speciose group of algae.

94

95 **Keywords**

96 ecological guilds, freshwater diatoms, island biogeography, macroecology, species-area  
97 relationship, streams



98 **Main Text**

99 **Introduction**

100 A fundamental ecological law that describes how the number of species increases with  
101 area is the species-area relationship (SAR, Arrhenius, 1921). The SAR belongs to a few,  
102 truly robust generalizations in ecology detected in a wide range of ecosystems and taxa  
103 (Connor & McCoy, 1979; Rosenzweig, 1995; Drakare et al., 2006). Islands represent  
104 perhaps the most straightforward study setting to explore the SAR because of their well-  
105 defined area. Unlike most mainland habitat patches, islands are surrounded by an  
106 inhospitable matrix for continental taxa, which cannot be colonized and, consequently,  
107 cannot serve as a source of immigrants. This peculiar feature of islands inspired  
108 MacArthur & Wilson to develop the theory of island biogeography (MacArthur &  
109 Wilson, 1967), which has contributed enormously to modern biodiversity theory (Chase  
110 & Leibold, 2003), metapopulation biology (Hanski & Gaggiotti, 2004), community  
111 ecology (Mittelbach & McGill, 2019), landscape ecology (Farina, 2008) and biodiversity  
112 conservation (Prugh et al., 2008).

113 Island biogeography investigates how species richness on islands varies spatially and  
114 through time (Whittaker & Fernandez-Palacios, 2007). It postulates that larger and less  
115 isolated islands host more species than small and remote islands because larger area  
116 decreases extinction and proximity to mainland increases immigration. Larger islands  
117 may also encompass more species because they provide a larger target for immigration,  
118 higher habitat diversity (Lack, 1976) and have higher speciation rates (Whittaker &  
119 Fernandez-Palacios, 2007). Lastly, since island age affects diversification and erosion, it

120 may also determine species richness, which tends to be the highest in islands of  
121 intermediate age according to the general dynamic model (Whittaker et al., 2008, 2017).

122 In the light of this knowledge, Chase et al. (2019) recently presented a framework for the  
123 ecological mechanisms underlying the island SAR (ISAR). They suggested that passive  
124 sampling (i.e. larger islands passively sample more individuals and species from the  
125 regional pool than smaller islands), disproportionate effects (e.g. different colonization  
126 and extinction rates in larger vs. smaller islands) and habitat heterogeneity (greater in  
127 large islands) would be the main drivers of ISAR. Nevertheless, the major patterns and  
128 drivers of island vs. mainland SAR are still poorly understood, particularly for the species  
129 rich microorganisms.

130 Given the importance of environmental heterogeneity and dispersal on the SAR (Chase et  
131 al., 2019), functional groups varying in resource utilization and dispersal can have  
132 different SARs (Lomolino & Weiser, 2001; Báldi, 2008; Schrader et al., 2020). For  
133 example, the SAR slope was steeper for specialist than for generalist bird species  
134 (Matthews et al., 2014) and functional traits related to dispersal explained the SAR  
135 variation in plant communities (Schrader et al., 2020). Thus, evaluating the SAR of  
136 different ecological guilds may improve the knowledge of the niche- vs. dispersal-related  
137 processes behind the SAR patterns. As functional diversity may have a distinct  
138 (Jamoneau et al., 2018; Schrader et al., 2020) and even stronger response to  
139 environmental variation than species diversity (Krause et al., 2014; Abonyi et al., 2018),  
140 the SAR for different functional groups may elucidate how community assembly  
141 processes operate through space and time (Tilman et al., 1997).

142 The ISAR has been tested with larger-bodied organisms, including terrestrial arthropods  
143 (Simberloff & Wilson, 1969) and reptiles (Algar & Losos, 2011), birds (Kalmar &  
144 Currie, 2006, 2007), vascular plants (Kreft et al., 2008), and fish (Sandin et al., 2008).  
145 However, ISAR patterns are still poorly understood for microorganisms. Earlier  
146 microbial field studies that used microcosms (Smith et al., 2005), lakes (Reche et al.,  
147 2005), trees (Bell et al., 2005; Peay et al., 2007) or spring ecosystems (Teittinen &  
148 Soininen, 2015) as surrogates of islands, reported significantly positive ISARs in almost  
149 all systems (but see Teittinen & Soininen, 2015). However, investigations on  
150 microorganismal diversity in real islands at a global scale are, to our knowledge, still  
151 missing.

152 Rosenzweig (1995) hypothesized that islands should have lower local and regional  
153 species richness than similarly sized continental regions due to isolation (lower mass- and  
154 rescue effect), but steeper SAR slopes. This is because area tends to be a more critical  
155 factor for biota on islands than on continents due to its stronger effects on extinction and  
156 colonization (Kreft et al., 2008). However, in an extensive meta-analysis, Drakare et al.  
157 (2006) did not find evidence for steeper SARs on islands (ISARs) than on mainland  
158 across multiple species groups. The SAR patterns are typically explored within  
159 archipelagos due to the presence of a common species pool, allowing assessment of the  
160 pure area effect. However, there are also more general models for the SAR at the global  
161 scale, searching for broader influences on the SAR (Kalmar & Currie, 2006; Kreft et al.,  
162 2008; Triantis et al., 2015), including differences in evolutionary history (Rosenzweig,  
163 1995).

164

Here, we adopted a similar perspective and investigated freshwater diatom SAR at a worldwide scale, given that diatoms have large distributions (Finlay, 2002) and are strongly controlled by environmental conditions (Soininen et al., 2016). We compared SARs, total species richness, and species richness drivers between islands and corresponding areas on five continents, referred to as continental area equivalents (CAEs). For this comparison, we devised a novel method based on island-mainland pairs (Fig. 1), assuming that terrestrial area is a good surrogate for area of freshwater habitat (see Appendix S1 in Supporting Information). The CAEs corresponded to the sampling area of 18 islands. We then examined (1) if SAR slopes differed between islands (ISAR) and continents, (2) whether islands showed overall lower diatom species richness than CAEs, (3) if species richness of island was related to environment, spatial isolation or island age, and (4) whether habitat diversity, passive sampling or disproportionate effects explained the SAR. We investigated these research questions separately for total diatom species richness and species richness of ecological guilds, differing in dispersal capacity and tolerance to nutrient limitation and disturbance (Passy, 2007, 2016), all expected to influence the SAR (Matthews et al., 2014; Schrader et al., 2020).

## **Materials and Methods**

### *Biological and environmental datasets*

In total, we included 18 island datasets (Corsica, Cyprus, Guadeloupe, Iceland, Ireland, Kauai, La Réunion, Martinique, Madeira, Majorca, Mayotte, New Caledonia, North New Zealand, Oahu, Possession, São Miguel, Sardinia and South New Zealand) and six continental datasets (China, Finland, France, French Guiana, Kenya and USA) in our study (see Appendix S2). Diatoms were sampled from hard substrates (typically stones)

188 or macrophytes, generally during the low flow period (see Appendix S2 for details).  
189 Although diatoms in some datasets were collected over several years, we did not expect a  
190 substantial effect of interannual variation in our study, because we were interested in  
191 regional diversity patterns and included environmental variables to account for this  
192 potential variation.

193 Diatoms were cleaned with acid or hydrogen peroxide. A total of 400-700 diatom valves  
194 were counted for each sampling site, which is sufficient for reliable estimates of total  
195 diversity (Heino & Soininen, 2005). As the number of counted valves varied somewhat  
196 among the samples, we studied if this would affect our richness estimates. We estimated  
197 species richness with 300 valves and tested the correlation with the observed species  
198 richness. We observed a very strong relationship between the estimated and the observed  
199 species richness ( $R^2_{aj} = 0.98$ ). Also, valve counts did not differ significantly between  
200 islands and continents (Cliff test difference for large dataset,  $\Delta = -0.15$ ). We thus  
201 believe that the number of counted valves has only marginal impact on our richness  
202 results.

203 Diatoms were generally identified up to species level, except in some rare case where  
204 some of the valves were identified only to genus level (representing less than 5% of the  
205 entire dataset). Homogenization of the taxonomy among regions was performed using the  
206 OMNIDIA database (Lecointe et al., 1993, updated in November 2020). To ensure that  
207 we have a proper estimate of the diversity, we i) evaluated the proportion of observed  
208 species compared to the size of the species-pool in each region using basic Chao equation  
209 (Chao, 1987) and calculated a ‘corrected’ species richness according to this ratio (i.e. the  
210 observed species richness was increased relative to the proportion of missing species

211 estimated from the species pool) and ii) calculated a genus-based richness assuming that  
212 genus level identification varies much less among diatomists than species identification.  
213 We then ran analyses with observed species richness, corrected species richness and  
214 genus richness (see Data analyses section). In total, our datasets comprised 1967 taxa,  
215 further classified into four ecological guilds: low profile (species of short stature), high  
216 profile (species of tall stature, typically filamentous, colonial or branched), motile  
217 (species moving freely in the biofilm) and planktonic species (species not innate to the  
218 benthos but originating from planktonic sedimentation) (Passy, 2007; Rimet & Bouchez,  
219 2012; Soininen et al., 2016). Contrary to motile and high-profile species, low-profile  
220 species are tolerant to nutrient limitation and disturbance and exhibit wider distributions  
221 (Passy, 2016), suggesting potentially higher dispersal capabilities (Heino & Soininen,  
222 2006). Planktonic species may indicate important features of the sites such as low current  
223 velocity and large rivers.

224 Physico-chemical data of each sampling site included pH, conductivity ( $\mu\text{S.cm}^{-1}$ ), total  
225 phosphorus ( $\text{mg.l}^{-1}$ ) and water temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), with the exception of Finland and  
226 Possession island (with no water temperature data) and Ireland, Kenya and New Zealand  
227 (with no total phosphorus data). Physico-chemical data were collected up to two months  
228 before the diatom sampling. Climate data were obtained from WorldClim database at 0.5  
229 minutes resolution (Hijmans et al., 2005), including annual precipitation (mm),  
230 seasonality in precipitation (%), annual temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), and temperature seasonality  
231 (standard deviation of monthly mean temperatures). For each sampling site, we also  
232 extracted elevation from the Global Multi-resolution Terrain Elevation Data 2010  
233 (Danielson & Gesch, 2011) and computed terrain slope as a proxy for current velocity.

234 For islands, we determined age of formation from the literature (see Appendix S2) and  
 235 isolation using the isolation index of Dahl (Dahl, 1991, Gillespie et al., 2008). This index  
 236 (equation 1) is based on the sum of square root distances to the nearest equivalent or  
 237 larger island ( $d_i$ ), the nearest island group or archipelago ( $d_a$ ), and the nearest continent  
 238 ( $d_c$ ).

$$239 \text{ Isolation index} = \sqrt{d_i} + \sqrt{d_a} + \sqrt{d_c} \quad (1)$$

#### 240 *Creation of continental area equivalents (CAEs)*

241 For a reliable comparison of species-area relationships between islands and continents,  
 242 which are vastly different in size, we generated CAEs, comparable in size to the islands  
 243 by taking subsets of the continental data (see Algar & Losos, 2011) for a related  
 244 approach). The method used to create these CAEs (Fig. 1) was as follows.

245 We first computed the geographical centroid of each island and calculated  $D_{c-i}$ , a vector  
 246 representing the Euclidean distance between the centroid and each island sample site  $i$ .  
 247 Second, for each continent, we calculated  $D_{jj}$  the Euclidean distance matrix between  
 248 sample sites  $j$ . All Euclidean distances were calculated from geographical coordinates  
 249 expressed in a projected geographical system adapted for each region (see Appendix S2).  
 250 Third, we treated all continental sites as candidate CAE centroids and calculated  $D_{v-j}$   
 251 representing the Euclidean distance between the candidate CAE centroid  $v$  and all other  $j$   
 252 continental sites. We then computed a matrix  $DD_{v-j, c-j}$  (equation 2), which represented the  
 253 absolute difference between i) the distance between a candidate CAE centroid and all  
 254 other sites in the focal continent ( $D_{v-j}$ , i.e. row of the matrix  $D_{jj}$ ) and ii) the distance  
 255 between the island centroid and all other sites in the focal island ( $D_{c-i}$ ).

256  $DD_{v-j,c-i} = |D_{v-j} - D_{c-i}|$  (2)

257 Note that the minimum value of  $DD_{v-j,c-i}$  is theoretically 0, indicating that the distance  
 258 between a centroid and an island site  $i$  is identical to the distance between a CAE centroid  
 259 and a continent site  $j$ . Thus, smaller  $DD_{v-j,c-i}$  equates to similar distances between an island  
 260 centroid and island sites and the distances between a candidate CAE centroid and  
 261 continental sites. We then assigned for each centroid-island site distance a unique  
 262 corresponding CAE centroid-continent site distance ( $\Delta_{c-i,v-j}$ , i.e. the minimum value of the  
 263 column of  $DD_{v-j,c-i}$ , equation 3).

264  $\Delta_{c-i,v-j} = \min(DD_{.,c-i})$  (3)

265 Then, we considered that the CAE centroid could be considered as the centroid of a CAE  
 266 only if at least  $N=15$  of the selected CAE centroid-continent site distances  $\Delta_{c-i,v-j}$  were  
 267 below a threshold value ( $\theta$ ) set to 5 km. Thus, theoretically, the number of sites in each  
 268 CAE could vary between 15 and the total number of sites in each island. Note that  
 269 because Kauai and Possession islands have less than 15 sites,  $N$  was set to 10 for the  
 270 creation of their CAEs. Finally, to avoid pseudoreplication within the sites of CAEs, we  
 271 selected for each continent-island pair only CAE separated by a distance of at least twice  
 272 the mean distance between centroids and their corresponding sites. Due to this procedure,  
 273 the size of CAEs could be, in some rare case, much smaller than the corresponding island  
 274 size.

275 The CAEs, corresponding to the sampling area of an island, were successfully created in  
 276 all continents (see appendix S3). Kenya was an exception because we were unable to  
 277 create CAEs corresponding to Corsica, Iceland, Ireland, New Caledonia, Sardinia, North



278 and South New Zealand, which were larger in size. Also, following our methodology, it  
279 was not possible to create CAEs corresponding to the island of Mayotte in USA and  
280 Finland, the island of São Miguel in Finland and USA and Possession Island in China and  
281 USA because their continental sites were more spread out than the island sites.  
282 Consequently, the total number of continent-island pairs for creating CAEs was 96.

283 *Randomization procedure for calculation of species richness and other environmental*  
284 *variables*

285 For each continent-island pair, we randomly selected 15 sites within the CAEs and 15  
286 sites within each island (10 sites for Kauai and Possession and their respective CAEs; 20  
287 iterations) to achieve comparable sampling effort for islands and CAEs. For each random  
288 subset, we calculated species richness as the total number of species observed among the  
289 15 sites, and area from the convex hull around these 15 sites. We found that the areas in  
290 islands estimated using convex hulls were good surrogates for whole island areas (see  
291 appendix S4). We also calculated median values for each environmental variable for the  
292 15 sites in the CAEs and islands and computed their environmental heterogeneity as the  
293 multivariate dispersion of all environmental variables using the average distance of all  
294 samples to the sample centroid in the multivariate space with the *betadisper* function in  
295 the *vegan* package. Environmental variables used in the analyses and computation of  
296 environmental heterogeneity were selected because they are known to be important for  
297 stream diatom distributions (Soininen, 2007; Soininen et al., 2016). For the computation  
298 of environmental heterogeneity in the Kenya and Ireland dataset, we respectively used  
299 total nitrogen and orthophosphate concentrations instead due to the lack of total

phosphorus data (none of the nutrient concentration was used in the computation of heterogeneity for New Zealand and Possession islands due to missing data).

### *Data analyses*

We conducted separate analyses for CAEs and islands to examine the relationship between species richness and area (SAR). We used linear mixed models (LMMs) for CAEs to account for continental influences that may underlie differences in species pools and the potential lack of independence among CAEs, given that multiple CAEs were created within a continent (i.e. continents were included as random factors). We performed traditional linear models for islands. We tested SAR with three commonly used models (DeMalach et al., 2019), including power (Arrhenius model), logarithmic (Gleason model) and Michaelis-Menten, and selected the best model based on the lowest Akaike Information Criterion. We also tested relationships between area and the ‘corrected’ species richness (according to the size of the species pool) and genus richness to ensure that the sampling effort or the taxonomic resolution did not influence our results.

To test for passive sampling, we estimated species richness from rarefaction curves based on species occurrence. For each CAE and island, we pulled at random 15 sites and randomly selected 130 species occurrences without replacement, thus ensuring that the maximum occurrence of each species did not exceed 15. Species richness was then estimated from the 130 occurrences and used to generate the SAR, which was fit with mixed models for CAEs and traditional linear models for islands. According to Chase et al. (2019), failure to detect SAR using this estimation of species richness would suggest that SAR is caused by passive sampling only. However, the reverse is not true, and

323 significant SAR observed with this estimation of species richness does not necessarily  
 324 prove the absence of passive sampling (Chase et al., 2019).

325 Then, to test for the effect of area on species richness after controlling for environmental  
 326 variation, we first computed global LMMs for total and guild species richness and eight  
 327 environmental variables (pH, conductivity, elevation, annual temperature, annual  
 328 precipitation, temperature seasonality, precipitation seasonality and environmental  
 329 heterogeneity). Models were constructed using the median values of species richness as  
 330 the response variable and median environmental variables obtained from the subsampling  
 331 procedure as explanatory variables ( $N = 851$ , i.e. one value for each 833 CAEs and each  
 332 18 island). Prior to analyses, explanatory variables were log-transformed to improve  
 333 normality when necessary and standardized, but we did not treat for multicollinearity  
 334 here, as this does not affect the fit of the model. Second, residuals from these regressions  
 335 were regressed against log-transformed area with LMMs for CAEs and simple linear  
 336 models for islands.

337 The number of islands in our study is comparable to the number of islands in many other  
 338 SAR studies (see data used in Matthews et al., 2019) but admittedly not very high ( $N=18$ )  
 339 for a study at the worldwide scale (Kalmar & Currie, 2006). Therefore, we performed a  
 340 sensitivity test with our continental datasets to determine the number of CAEs required  
 341 for observing a significant SAR, acknowledging that the number of islands and CAEs  
 342 necessary to detect a SAR may be different. We used the median values of the species  
 343 richness and area obtained from the randomization procedure for each continent-island  
 344 pair ( $N=96$ ), and randomly sampled (1000 times)  $K$  continent-island pairs. Each time we  
 345 fit the SAR with the best SAR model (logarithmic) and extracted the probability ( $P$ ) of

346 observing a significant SAR, as well as the median values of model coefficients. We  
347 varied K from 11 to 96, i.e. the total number of continent-island pairs available in our  
348 dataset. We then identified the minimum number of ‘islands’ needed to observe a  
349 significant SAR with our data ( $P > 95\%$ ). We performed these analyses with both  
350 traditional linear models and LMMs (e.g. assuming a common species pool).

351 We compared species richness of islands and species richness of their corresponding  
352 CAEs with Cliff’s non-parametric effect size statistic (Romano et al., 2006; Tecchio et  
353 al., 2016), due to the large number of data points resulting from the randomization  
354 procedure (i.e., decreasing variance around the mean). We also used Cliff’s tests to  
355 compare the species richness of each ecological guild between CAEs and islands.

356 To compare species richness of CAEs and islands after removing the effect of  
357 environment, we computed LMMs as above but also included all the values of random  
358 subsampling (x20, N=17020). We therefore used a nested design in the random factors of  
359 the models, so that subsampling values are nested within each continent/island. Residual  
360 richness values were then extracted from the models and compared between CAEs and  
361 islands with Cliff’s tests.

362 We used linear mixed models for CAEs and traditional linear models for islands to  
363 examine the relationship between species richness, environmental heterogeneity, the  
364 median of all environmental variables and the median values of latitude and longitude.  
365 Environmental explanatory variables were log-transformed to improve normality when  
366 necessary and we run separate regression models with each environmental factor and  
367 species richness to avoid multicollinearity. We also tested for non-linear relationships  
368 separately with all environmental variables with the same procedure.

Finally, to disentangle the possible drivers of the SAR for continents, we implemented piecewise structural equation modeling (SEM, Lefcheck, 2016) using linear mixed models with continental dataset as a random factor. We could not implement such models for islands due to an insufficient number of data points. We assumed an *a priori* model (Fig. 2) predicting species richness as directly influenced by area, environmental heterogeneity (as defined above), local environmental conditions and climatic conditions. We used conductivity and elevation as predictors of local conditions, temperature seasonality and annual precipitations as predictors of climate, as they were significant predictors of species richness in global LMMs and exhibited low collinearity in pairwise correlations tests (see Appendix S5). We assumed that the effect of area on species richness could also be indirect through environmental heterogeneity, according to the habitat diversity hypothesis (Lack, 1976). Finally, we also assumed that temperature seasonality and precipitation are directly influenced by elevation. We included a correlation between temperature seasonality and precipitation as well as between conductivity and precipitation (see Appendix S5). We used the Fisher's *C* statistic to test the consistency of the theoretical model with the data. All analyses were run for total richness and separately for richness of each ecological guild.

All analyses were conducted with R (R Core Team, 2019) using packages 'vegan' (Oksanen et al., 2019), 'spatstat' (Baddeley et al., 2015), 'raster' (Hijmans, 2019), 'sf' (Pebesma, 2018), 'lmerTest' (Kuznetsova et al., 2017), 'lme4' (Bates et al., 2015), 'effsize' (Torchiano, 2020) and 'piecewiseSEM' (Lefcheck, 2016).

## Results

391 *SAR patterns*

392 We found a significant positive SAR for total species richness in CAEs, but not in islands  
393 (Fig. 3a). The best model describing the SAR in CAEs was the logarithmic model (see  
394 Appendix S6). The observed  $R^2$  values were relatively low compared to values usually  
395 observed for islands but comparable to those found in continental areas (Kreft et al.,  
396 2008). Similar results emerged with rarefied richness (see Appendix S7), ‘corrected’  
397 species richness given the size of the species pool (see Appendix S8), genus richness (see  
398 Appendix S9) and also after removing the effect of environmental variation (see  
399 Appendix S10).

400 The sensitivity analysis revealed that a minimum of 52 continent-islands pairs is needed  
401 to observe a significant SAR with our data. This number dropped to 16 when using mixed  
402 models with continent (a surrogate for the species pool) as a random effect (see Appendix  
403 S11).

404 About half of the 1967 identified species belonged to the motile guild (see Appendix  
405 S12), followed by the high profile and low-profile guilds. Planktonic species and species  
406 with variable guilds represented a minor part of the communities. Species richness within  
407 all guilds was significantly and positively related to area in CAEs (Fig. 3b-e) and this  
408 relationship persisted for all but the high-profile guild after controlling for the  
409 environment (see Appendix S10).

410 *Comparison of species richness of islands and CAEs*

411 Overall, species richness was significantly lower in the islands than in the respective  
412 CAEs for more than 50% of all continent-island pairs ( $N = 96$ ) (Fig. 5a). Similar results

emerged for the guilds, especially for the planktonic guild, where over 70% of the comparisons had significantly higher species richness in CAEs. The only exception was the low-profile guild whose species richness tended to be higher in islands (ca. 60%). Importantly, however, when environmental variation was accounted for, the species richness differences between CAEs and islands disappeared in more than 80% of cases (Fig. 5b).

#### *Ecological variables driving species richness*

In islands, we found significant relationships between species richness and isolation for total, low profile species richness (U-shaped pattern) and planktonic guild (negative linear pattern and a weak non-linear pattern) (Fig. 4, see Appendix S13). There was no relationship between richness and age of island for the total community or any of the ecological guilds (see Appendix S13). Apart from isolation, total species richness in islands was significantly related only to phosphorus concentration. Species richness of guilds was also significantly related to some other environmental variables depending on the guild considered (see Appendix S13).

Total species richness in CAEs was significantly related to environmental heterogeneity, pH, conductivity, phosphorus concentration, all climatic variables and longitude (see Appendix S13). The piecewise SEM models (Lefcheck, 2016) disentangled the effects of the influencing factors and demonstrated that diatom species richness in CAEs was related to area, habitat heterogeneity, physicochemistry, elevation, and climate. The data fitted well the *a priori* model (Fig. 6) for total species richness and species richness of all ecological guilds. The marginal  $R^2$  (variance explained by the fixed effects only) for total species richness was 0.71 and varied between 0.14 (for low-profile species) to 0.59 (for

motile species). In the SEMs, area explained species richness independently, without any indirect effect through environmental heterogeneity, except for the motile species richness where the effect of environmental heterogeneity was negative. Indeed, total species richness and richness of the motile guild were mainly driven by area and temperature seasonality (Fig. 6a, d). Low-profile species richness was only explained by area and precipitation (Fig. 6b). High-profile species richness was mainly explained by area, elevation and conductivity, while climate had no direct effect (Fig. 6c). Finally, planktonic species richness was solely determined by elevation and was thus the only group without a significant relationship with area.

## Discussion

Here, we conducted the first comparative analysis of island vs. mainland species-area relationship for microbes, providing insight into the roles of area, environmental heterogeneity, isolation and island age on species richness patterns. We showed for freshwater diatoms that: (i) there was a significant SAR in continents but not in islands (except for high profile), (ii) regional species richness was higher in continents than in islands, but this difference was explained entirely by environmental conditions (iii) the effect of isolation varied among diatom guilds and (iv) area and median environmental conditions but not environmental heterogeneity were significant predictors of diatom richness. Next, we will discuss the main findings in more detail and highlight our major conclusions about total community and guild richness.

### *Drivers of species richness in islands*

The lack of a significant SAR in islands may be due to low sample size ( $N = 18$ ) or may represent a real biogeographical pattern. Sensitivity analyses performed for CAEs



revealed that 16 islands are needed to detect a SAR given a common species pool. This result is consistent with numerous studies on other organisms, reporting ISAR for a relatively small number of islands within archipelagos (Matthews et al., 2019). However, at a global scale, a much higher number of islands (N=52, Appendix S11) may be required for detection of diatom ISAR.

The absence of diatom ISAR may have evolutionary and ecological causes. First, diatoms may have distinct species pools across the globe (Soininen et al., 2016) and differences in island area may not be sufficient to predict richness on islands that differ greatly in species pool. As the size of the species pool influences the shape of the SAR (Catano et al., 2021), future analyses on archipelagos will be essential for determining whether ISAR exists for diatoms (but see Jüttner et al., 2018). Second, environmental heterogeneity, which increased with island size (Fig. 3, and see Appendix S5) and is recognized as an important driver of SAR (Lack, 1976; Chase et al., 2019), had no direct impact on island species richness. Third, island richness was related only to total phosphorus, suggesting that productivity is a key factor explaining island diatom species richness at this scale. Note however, that due to data availability, only phosphorus concentration was considered as a resource factor for explaining species richness. The consideration of other nutrient resources, known to influence diatom diversity (e.g. nitrogen, iron, Passy, 2007, Soininen, 2007), may improve the understanding of diatoms species richness in islands.

We found that isolation might have some effect on species richness in islands. Two of the most isolated islands (Oahu and New Caledonia) actually showed high species richness, resulting in a U-shaped relationship between species richness and isolation for total and

low-profile species richness. Oahu and New Caledonia still had the highest species richness when the latter is corrected by species pool but the U-shaped relationship is only marginally significant ( $p = 0.09$ , see Appendix S8). Greater speciation in the most isolated islands, which have many endemic species, e.g. New Caledonia has been dubbed “Galapagos of diatoms” (Moser et al., 1998), may explain their higher richness considering that endemic and total species richness are typically correlated (Kallimanis et al., 2010). We could, however, not exclude the fact that some other unmeasured environmental factors, particularly related to islands conditions, may also be responsible for this pattern. Finally, our finding further suggests that the biogeographical drivers of diatom richness on real islands are trait dependent.

Following Rosenzweig (1995), we hypothesized that islands would harbour lower species richness than continents due to diminished dispersal and rescue effects. While species richness was indeed lower in islands compared to continents, this difference disappeared when we accounted for environmental differences. Thus, annual precipitation, higher in islands than continents, was associated with lower species richness (see Appendix S10), likely because of its positive effect on current velocity, and subsequently, shear stress (Heino & Soininen, 2007).

#### *Drivers of species richness in continents*

We tested whether SARs in continents could result from passive sampling and environmental heterogeneity, which are major drivers of the SAR (Lack, 1976; Rosenzweig, 1995; Stein et al., 2014; Chase et al., 2019). Surprisingly, species richness in continents was not directly explained by environmental heterogeneity in the SEM.

504 Although area was strongly related to environmental heterogeneity (but poorly related to  
505 other environmental variables, see Appendix S5), none of the SEM models showed a  
506 direct effect of habitat heterogeneity on either total or guild species richness, except for  
507 motile species. For the latter, the direct effect of habitat heterogeneity was negative,  
508 contrary to the results observed in univariate regressions (see Appendix 13) due to the  
509 strong collinearity between area and heterogeneity. Given that we still observed a  
510 significant SAR with species richness estimated from the rarefaction curves, passive  
511 sampling cannot be completely ruled out (Chase et al., 2019). However, the impact of  
512 area on richness in continents might also be due to disproportionate effects, including  
513 dispersal, extinction and speciation. While extinction and speciation have been less  
514 studied in diatoms, dispersal and mass effects (whereby species maintain their presence  
515 in unfavorable conditions via immigration, Shmida & Wilson, 1985) were shown to have  
516 a notable influence on regional to subcontinental diatom communities (Soininen, 2007;  
517 Jamoneau et al., 2018; Leboucher et al., 2020). For continental diatoms, larger areas may  
518 thus increase the probability of immigration from the surrounding landscape, particularly  
519 for species with high dispersal capabilities (mass-effect species), thereby increasing  
520 CAE's diversity.

521 Environmental factors, such as nutrients, climate and elevation, were also important  
522 predictors of total and guild species richness. Total species richness decreased with  
523 temperature seasonality, as did the species richness of motile species, which represented  
524 ca. 50% of the whole community (see Appendix S12). As motile species are generally  
525 warm-water species (Pound et al., 2021) and high seasonality occurs in colder areas, it is  
526 possible that motile guild richness was limited by unfavorable temperatures. Species


richness of the high profile and planktonic guilds was the lowest at high elevation. For high-profile species, high elevation is stressful due to increased current velocity and probability for dislodgement. For planktonic species, high elevations do not provide sufficient habitat, given that these species require large water bodies. Species richness of the low-profile guild is positively influenced by annual precipitation probably because this guild is tolerant to physical disturbance (Passy, 2007), which should increase its richness in the community.

## **Conclusions**


We examined diatom ISARs and compared them with the SARs of similarly sized continental area equivalent across five continents. Contrary to most previous studies, we did not find significant ISAR for total species richness but detected significant relationships of richness with total phosphorus. These results imply that diatom richness in islands is not related to area but is controlled by productivity. However, the lack of ISAR may be due to distinct species pool across islands in our study. Species richness was typically higher in continental areas than in similarly sized islands, most probably due to differences in climate and related environmental conditions, such as current velocity. The significant SAR for continents may originate from disproportionate effects, such as mass effect, but not from environmental heterogeneity. Isolation influenced the richness of the whole community and some diatom guilds in islands. These finding indicate that there are important differences in richness responses to island properties among ecological guilds and between the community level and the functional level. Finally, the proposed new method for species-area comparisons between islands and continental area equivalents will advance research on biogeography of islands vs.

550 mainland. We advocate obtaining global diatom data, particularly from archipelagos to  
551 better understand the drivers of island species diversity.

552 **Figures legend**



554 **Figure 1: Descriptive diagram of the methods.** Diagram describing the methodological  
 555 process used for creation of continental area equivalents (CAE) and subsampling of both  
 556 islands and CAEs.




558 **Figure 2. A priori model explaining diatom species richness.** Species richness is  
 559 modeled as a function of area, environmental heterogeneity, local environmental  
 560 conditions (purple) and climate (orange).






**Figure 3. Species-area relationships for continents and islands.** Species-area relationships for continental area equivalents (CAE) (in green, N=96) and islands (in blue, N=18) for total species richness (a), and richness of low profile (b), high profile (c), motile (d) and (e) planktonic species. Green regression lines represent significant linear fits in mixed models for CAEs: richness =  $8.44x + 72.24$ ,  $R^2_m = 0.22$  for total species richness,  $1.09x + 10.69$ ,  $R^2_m = 0.13$  for low-profile species,  $1.74x + 13.61$ ,  $R^2_m = 0.11$  for high-profile species,  $3.94x + 38.36$ ,  $R^2_m = 0.11$  for motile species and  $0.50x + 2.69$ ,  $R^2_m = 0.05$  for planktonic species, where  $x = \log(\text{area})$ . The blue regression line represents significant linear fit for high-profile species of islands:  $1.93x + 6.95$ ,  $R^2_{aj} = 0.23$ . Dot sizes are proportional to environmental heterogeneity (in log) for all taxa (a) and proportional to total species richness for functional groups (b-e). Error bars represent standard deviation estimated from the subsampling procedure. Text in dots indicate the dataset used for computing species richness and area. For example, ‘fr\_my’ indicates the position of Mayotte CAE in France. Continental datasets are indicated by ‘fr’ for France, ‘us’ for US, ‘fi’ for Finland, ‘ch’ for China, ‘ke’ for Kenya and ‘gy’ for French Guiana and islands indicated by ‘ic’ for Iceland, ‘co’ for Corsica, ‘gu’ for Guadeloupe, ‘ma’ for Martinique, ‘re’ for La Réunion, ‘my’ for Mayotte, ‘nz’ for North New Zealand, ‘sz’ for South New Zealand, ‘nc’ for New Caledonia, ‘ka’ for Kauai, ‘oa’ for Oahu, ‘po’ for Possession, ‘cy’ for Cyprus, ‘ir’ for Ireland, ‘md’ for Madeira, ‘mj’ for Majorca, ‘sm’ for São Miguel and ‘sa’ for Sardinia.




583 **Figure 4. Relationships between island species richness and isolation.** Relationship  
 584 between total species richness (a) and species richness of each ecological guild (b-e) with  
 585 island isolation for islands ( $N = 18$ ). Significant linear and quadratic relationships  
 586 ( $p < 0.05$ ) are shown by regression fits (only the fit with the lower AIC is shown if both  
 587 are significant, see Appendix S13):  $0.03x^2 - 3.79x + 212.32$ ,  $R^2_{aj} = 0.26$  for total richness,  
 588  $0.01x^2 - 0.96x + 50.44$ ,  $R^2_{aj} = 0.32$  for low-profile and  $-0.04x + 5.12$ ,  $R^2_{aj} = 0.34$  for  
 589 planktonic species. For island names, see Fig. 1. Isolation is based on index defined by  
 590 Dahl (Dahl, 1991).



592 **Figure 5. Comparison of species richness between continental area equivalents**  
593 **(CAEs) and islands.** Percentage of significant and non-significant tests ( $N = 96$   
594 continent-island pairs) between CAEs and islands for species richness (a) and species

614 richness residuals (b). Tests were performed for total and guild species richness. Species  
615 richness residuals were estimated from linear mixed models with species richness as the  
616 dependent variable, and pH, conductivity, elevation, mean annual temperature and  
617 precipitation, temperature and precipitation seasonality and environmental heterogeneity  
618 as explanatory variables and continent as a random factor. Comparisons of values (i.e.,  
619 species richness or residuals of species richness) were performed with Cliff's test,  
620 whereby tests with  $\delta > 0.33$  indicated significant differences (Romano et al., 2006).

621



623 **Figure 6. Structural equation models explaining species richness in continental area**  
624 **equivalents (CAEs).** Structural equation models for total species richness (a), low profile  
625 (b), high profile (c), motile (d) and planktonic (e) species richness in continents (N = 96  
626 CAEs). Green and red arrows represent significant positive and negative relationships,  
627 respectively, whereas gray-dashed arrows represent non-significant relationships. Arrow  
628 widths are proportional to the standardized regression coefficients and  $R^2_m$  values  
629 represent marginal  $R^2$  from a linear mixed model. All models fitted well the *a priori*  
630 model, i.e. the model including all shown causal relationships (Fisher's C = 14.99, df =  
631 14, p = 0.38 for all models).

632 **Data Availability Statement**

633 Data are available under the following link: <https://doi.org/10.57745/ZPBSLT>

634

635 **References**

- Abonyi, A., Horváth, Z., & Ptacnik, R. (2018). Functional richness outperforms taxonomic richness in predicting ecosystem functioning in natural phytoplankton communities. *Freshwater Biology*, 63(2), 178–186.
- Algar, A. C., & Losos, J. B. (2011). Evolutionary assembly of island faunas reverses the classic island–mainland richness difference in *Anolis* lizards. *Journal of Biogeography*, 38(6), 1125–1137.
- Arrhenius, O. (1921). Species and area. *The Journal of Ecology*, 95–99.
- Baddeley, A., Rubak, E., & Turner, R. (2015). *Spatial Point Patterns: Methodology and Applications with R*. Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.
- Báldi, A. (2008). Habitat heterogeneity overrides the species–area relationship. *Journal of Biogeography*, 35(4), 675–681.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., Christensen, R. H. B., Singmann, H., Dai, B., & Grothendieck, G. (2015). *lme4: Linear Mixed-Effects Models using “Eigen” and S4* (1.1-8) [Computer software].
- Bell, T., Ager, D., Song, J.-I., Newman, J. A., Thompson, I. P., Lilley, A. K., & Gast, C. J. van der. (2005). Larger Islands House More Bacterial Taxa. *Science*, 308(5730), 1884–1884.
- Catano, C. P., Grman, E., Behrens, E., & Brudvig, L. A. (2021). Species pool size alters species–area relationships during experimental community assembly. *Ecology*, 102(1), e03231.

- Chao, A. (1987). Estimating the Population Size for Capture-Recapture Data with Unequal Catchability. *Biometrics*, 43(4), 783–791.
- Chase, J. M., Gooriah, L., & May, F. (2019). A framework for disentangling ecological mechanisms underlying the island species–area. *Frontiers of Biogeography*.
- Chase, J. M., & Leibold, M. A. (2003). *Ecological Niches: Linking Classical and Contemporary Approaches*. University of Chicago Press.
- Connor, E. F., & McCoy, E. D. (1979). The Statistics and Biology of the Species-Area Relationship. *The American Naturalist*, 113(6), 791–833.
- Dahl, A. L. (1991). *Island Directory* (UNEP Regional Seas Directories and Bibliographies No. 35; p. 573). UNEP.
- Danielson, J. J., & Gesch, D. B. (2011). *Global multi-resolution terrain elevation data 2010 (GMTED2010)* (U.S. Geo - Logical Survey Open-File Report No. 2011–1073; p. 26).
- DeMalach, N., Saiz, H., Zaady, E., & Maestre, F. T. (2019). Plant species–area relationships are determined by evenness, cover and aggregation in drylands worldwide. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 28(3), 290–299.
- Drakare, S., Lennon, J. J., & Hillebrand, H. (2006). The imprint of the geographical, evolutionary and ecological context on species–area relationships. *Ecology Letters*, 9(2), 215–227.
- Farina, A. (2008). *Principles and Methods in Landscape Ecology: Towards a Science of the Landscape*. Springer.
- Finlay, B. J. (2002). Global Dispersal of Free-Living Microbial Eukaryote Species. *Science*, 296(5570), 1061–1063.
- Gillespie, R. G., Claridge, E. M., & Roderick, G. K. (2008). Biodiversity dynamics in isolated island communities: Interaction between natural and human-mediated processes. *Molecular Ecology*, 17(1), 45–57.

- Hanski, I. A., & Gaggiotti, O. E. (2004). *Ecology, Genetics and Evolution of Metapopulations*. Elsevier Academic Press.
- Heino, J., & Soininen, J. (2005). Assembly rules and community models for unicellular organisms: Patterns in diatoms of boreal streams. *Freshwater Biology*, 50(4), 567–577.
- Heino, J., & Soininen, J. (2006). Regional occupancy in unicellular eukaryotes: A reflection of niche breadth, habitat availability or size-related dispersal capacity? *Freshwater Biology*, 51(4), 672–685.
- Heino, J., & Soininen, J. (2007). Are higher taxa adequate surrogates for species-level assemblage patterns and species richness in stream organisms? *Biological Conservation*, 137(1), 78–89.
- Hijmans, R. J. (2019). *raster: Geographic Data Analysis and Modeling*.
- Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G., & Jarvis, A. (2005). Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 25(15), 1965–1978.
- Jamoneau, A., Passy, S. I., Soininen, J., Leboucher, T., & Tison-Rosebery, J. (2018). Beta diversity of diatom species and ecological guilds: Response to environmental and spatial mechanisms along the stream watercourse. *Freshwater Biology*, 63(1), 62–73.
- Jüttner, I., Vijver, B. V. de, Williams, D. M., Lange-Bertalot, H., & Ector, L. (2018). The genus *Eunotia* (Bacillariophyta) in the Falkland Islands and species-area relationships in sub-Antarctic islands. *Diatom Research*, 33(4), 413–452.
- Kallimanis, A. S., Bergmeier, E., Panitsa, M., Georghiou, K., Delipetrou, P., & Dimopoulos, P. (2010). Biogeographical determinants for total and endemic species richness in a continental archipelago. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 19(5), 1225–1235.



- Kalmar, A., & Currie, D. J. (2006). A global model of island biogeography. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 15(1), 72–81.
- Kalmar, A., & Currie, D. J. (2007). A Unified Model of Avian Species Richness on Islands and Continents. *Ecology*, 88(5), 1309–1321.
- Krause, S., Le Roux, X., Niklaus, P. A., Van Bodegom, P. M., Lennon, J. T., Bertilsson, S., Grossart, H.-P., Philippot, L., & Bodelier, P. L. E. (2014). Trait-based approaches for understanding microbial biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 5.
- Kreft, H., Jetz, W., Mutke, J., Kier, G., & Barthlott, W. (2008). Global diversity of island floras from a macroecological perspective. *Ecology Letters*, 11(2), 116–127.
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82(1), 1–26.
- Lack, D. (1976). *Island biology: Illustrated by the land birds of Jamaica*. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, UK.
- Leboucher, T., Tison-Rosebery, J., Budnick, William. R., Jamoneau, A., Vyverman, W., Soininen, J., Boutry, S., & Passy, S. I. (2020). A new metacommunity approach for detecting species influenced by mass effect. *Journal of Applied Ecology*.
- Lecointe, C., Coste, M., & Prygiel, J. (1993). “Omnidia”: Software for taxonomy, calculation of diatom indices and inventories management. *Hydrobiologia*, 269–270(1), 509–513.
- Lefcheck, J. S. (2016). piecewiseSEM: Piecewise structural equation modelling in r for ecology, evolution, and systematics. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(5), 573–579.
- Lomolino, M. V., & Weiser, M. D. (2001). Towards a More General Species-Area Relationship: Diversity on All Islands, Great and Small. *Journal of Biogeography*, 28(4), 431–445. JSTOR.

- MacArthur, R. H., & Wilson, E. O. 1967. (1967). *The theory of island biogeography*. Princeton University Press.
- Matthews, T. J., Cottee–Jones, H. E., & Whittaker, R. J. (2014). Habitat fragmentation and the species–area relationship: A focus on total species richness obscures the impact of habitat loss on habitat specialists. *Diversity and Distributions*, 20(10), 1136–1146.
- Matthews, T. J., Rigal, F., Triantis, K. A., & Whittaker, R. J. (2019). A global model of island species–area relationships. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(25), 12337–12342.
- Mittelbach, G. G., & McGill, B. J. (2019). *Community Ecology*. Oxford University Press.
- Moser, G., Lange-Bertalot, H., & Metzeltin, D. (1998). *Insel der Endemiten. Geobotanisches Phänomen Neukaledonien—Island of Endemics. New Caledonia a geobotanical phenomenon* (J. Cramer). Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P. R., O'Hara, R. B., Simpson, G. L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M. H. H., Szoecs, E., & Wagner, H. (2019). *vegan: Community Ecology Package*.
- Passy, S. I. (2007). Diatom ecological guilds display distinct and predictable behavior along nutrient and disturbance gradients in running waters. *Aquatic Botany*, 86(2), 171–178.
- Passy, S. I. (2016). Abundance Inequality in Freshwater Communities Has an Ecological Origin. *The American Naturalist*, 187(4), 502–516.
- Peay, K. G., Bruns, T. D., Kennedy, P. G., Bergemann, S. E., & Garbelotto, M. (2007). A strong species–area relationship for eukaryotic soil microbes: Island size matters for ectomycorrhizal fungi. *Ecology Letters*, 10(6), 470–480.
- Pebesma, E. (2018). Simple Features for R: Standardized Support for Spatial Vector Data. *The R Journal*, 10(1), 439–446.

- Pound, K. L., Larson, C. A., & Passy, S. I. (2021). Current distributions and future climate-driven changes in diatoms, insects and fish in U.S. streams. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 30, 63–78.
- Prugh, L. R., Hodges, K. E., Sinclair, A. R., & Brashares, J. S. (2008). Effect of habitat area and isolation on fragmented animal populations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(52), 20770–20775.
- R Core Team. (2019). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Reche, I., Pulido-Villena, E., Morales-Baquero, R., & Casamayor, E. O. (2005). Does Ecosystem Size Determine Aquatic Bacterial Richness? *Ecology*, 86(7), 1715–1722.
- Rimet, F., & Bouchez, A. (2012). Life-forms, cell-sizes and ecological guilds of diatoms in European rivers. *Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems*, 406, 01.
- Romano, J., Kromrey, J. D., Coraggio, J., & Skowronek, J. (2006). Appropriate statistics for ordinal level data: Should we really be using t-test and Cohen's d for evaluating group differences on the NSSE and other surveys. *Annual Meeting of the Florida Association of Institutional Research*, 1–33.
- Rosenzweig, M. L. (1995). *Species diversity in space and times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandin, S. A., Vermeij, M. J. A., & Hurlbert, A. H. (2008). Island biogeography of Caribbean coral reef fish. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 17(6), 770–777.
- Schrader, J., König, C., Triantis, K. A., Trigas, P., Kreft, H., & Weigelt, P. (2020). Species–area relationships on small islands differ among plant growth forms. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 29(5), 814–829.
- Shmida, A., & Wilson, M. V. (1985). Biological determinants of species diversity. *Journal of Biogeography*, 12(1), 1–20.

- Simberloff, D. S., & Wilson, E. O. (1969). Experimental Zoogeography of Islands: The Colonization of Empty Islands. *Ecology*, 50(2), 278–296.
- Smith, V. H., Foster, B. L., Grover, J. P., Holt, R. D., Leibold, M. A., & deNoyelles, F. (2005). Phytoplankton species richness scales consistently from laboratory microcosms to the world's oceans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(12), 4393–4396.
- Soininen, J. (2007). Environmental and Spatial Control of Freshwater Diatoms—A Review. *Diatom Research*, 22(2), 473–490.
- Soininen, J., Jamoneau, A., Rosebery, J., & Passy, S. I. (2016). Global patterns and drivers of species and trait composition in diatoms. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 25(8), 940–950.
- Stein, A., Gerstner, K., & Kreft, H. (2014). Environmental heterogeneity as a universal driver of species richness across taxa, biomes and spatial scales. *Ecology Letters*, 17(7), 866–880.
- Tecchio, S., Chaalali, A., Raoux, A., Tous Rius, A., Lequesne, J., Girardin, V., Lassalle, G., Cachera, M., Riou, P., Lobry, J., Dauvin, J.-C., & Niquil, N. (2016). Evaluating ecosystem-level anthropogenic impacts in a stressed transitional environment: The case of the Seine estuary. *Ecological Indicators*, 61, Part 2, 833–845.
- Teittinen, A., & Soininen, J. (2015). Testing the theory of island biogeography for microorganisms patterns for spring diatoms. *Aquatic Microbial Ecology*, 75(3), 239–250.
- Tilman, D., Knops, J., Wedin, D., Reich, P., Ritchie, M., & Siemann, E. (1997). The Influence of Functional Diversity and Composition on Ecosystem Processes. *Science*, 277(5330), 1300–1302.
- Torchiano, M. (2020). *effsize: Efficient Effect Size Computation*.

Triantis, K. A., Economo, E. P., Guilhaumon, F., & Ricklefs, R. E. (2015). Diversity regulation at macro-scales: Species richness on oceanic archipelagos. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24(5), 594–605.

Whittaker, R. J., & Fernandez-Palacios, J. M. (2007). *Island Biogeography: Ecology, Evolution, and Conservation*. OUP Oxford.

Whittaker, R. J., Fernández-Palacios, J. M., Matthews, T. J., Borregaard, M. K., & Triantis, K. A. (2017). Island biogeography: Taking the long view of nature's laboratories. *Science*, 357(6354).

Whittaker, R. J., Triantis, K. A., & Ladle, R. J. (2008). A general dynamic theory of oceanic island biogeography. *Journal of Biogeography*, 35(6), 977–994.

636

#### 637 **Biosketch**

638 Aurélien Jamoneau is a researcher in community ecology at INRAE institute of Cestas-  
639 Gazinet in France. He is interested in aquatic community assemblages at multiple spatial  
640 and temporal scales. Janne Soininen is a professor in spatial environmental research at  
641 the University of Helsinki. He is interested in large-scale community ecology and  
642 especially in the distribution of small aquatic organisms.