

Diversity–productivity relationships: Initial effects, long-term patterns, and underlying mechanisms

Jasper van Ruijven* and Frank Berendse

Nature Conservation and Plant Ecology Group, Wageningen University and Research Centre, Bornsesteeg 69, 6708 PD Wageningen, The Netherlands

Edited by G. David Tilman, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN, and approved November 30, 2004 (received for review October 11, 2004)

A common pattern emerging from studies on the relationship between plant diversity and ecosystem functioning is that productivity increases with diversity. Most of these studies have been carried out in perennial grasslands, but many lasted only two growing seasons or reported data from a single year. Especially for perennial plant communities, however, the long-term effects of diversity are important. The question whether interactions between few species or among many species lead to increased productivity remained largely unanswered. So far, the main mechanism addressed is the increased input of nitrogen by nitrogen-fixing legumes. We report that other mechanisms can also generate strong increases of productivity with diversity. Results from 4 consecutive years of a plant diversity experiment without legumes show that a positive relationship between plant species richness and productivity emerged in the second year and strengthened with time. We show that increased nutrient use efficiency at high species richness is an important underlying mechanism. This mechanism had not been discussed in earlier studies. Furthermore, our results suggest that complementary nutrient uptake in space and time is important. Together, these mechanisms sustain consistently high productivity at high diversity.

biodiversity | niche complementarity | nitrogen use efficiency | ecosystem functioning

The notion that the current loss of biodiversity may be detrimental to ecosystem functioning has led to major experiments in the last decade. Studies investigating the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem functioning focused on the effects of losses of plant diversity on productivity (as a measure of ecosystem functioning) in grasslands. In these studies, productivity often declined with diversity loss (1), although several different patterns have been reported, including no response and idiosyncratic differences as plant diversity decreases (see ref. 2 for a review).

Both the patterns and the underlying mechanisms have been hotly debated (3–5, †, ‡). A positive relationship between diversity and productivity could arise through causal mechanisms such as facilitation or complementary resource use (6, 7). However, the same relationship between productivity and diversity could also be generated by chance, through a sampling or selection effect. More diverse plant communities have a higher chance of including a highly productive species that dominates the community (3, 4, 7). Complementarity and sampling effects may operate simultaneously, but can be separated by using the additive partitioning equation (8).

A positive effect of diversity on productivity was reported by several experiments, but most of these studies have been short term (<3 years) or reported results from a single growing season (9–18). In perennial grasslands, interactions between species occur over multiple years, but only three experiments reported results from a period >3 years. They showed that the positive effects of diversity increased several years after the start of the experiment. However, these experiments included legumes, which played an important role in overyielding (19–22). Apart from the effects of legumes, complementarity appeared to be important (20–22).

Resource partitioning may occur in time, space, and resource type (23–25). Facilitation may also be important: direct positive interactions have been demonstrated in many experiments (26). However, the main mechanism addressed in biodiversity–productivity experiments so far is nutrient enrichment by nitrogen fixers (27). Assessing the performance of individual species is crucial for understanding which mechanisms are responsible for the positive effect of diversity on productivity. Interspecific interactions like niche differentiation, facilitation, and frequency-dependent growth may promote high diversity by increasing the performance of rare species (28, 29). Under these mechanisms, a range of species (including rare ones) may show increased performance with increasing diversity, thus increasing total productivity (30, 31). However, few studies have determined the performance of individual species within long-term diversity–ecosystem functioning experiments (22, 32). We investigated overyielding among eight plant species. These species include two functional types: grasses and dicots. Legumes were not included. If a single resource, like nitrogen, is limiting productivity and species are complementary in nutrient use because differences in phenology, rooting depth, and other functional characteristics, then total plant nitrogen should be greater in mixtures (9). In the search for underlying mechanisms, we focused on differences between species in nutrient uptake and nutrient use at different levels of species richness and their contribution to the relationship between productivity and species richness over time.

Methods

Plots were established on an arable field in Wageningen, The Netherlands, in early spring 2000. In each plot, the topsoil was removed to a depth of 45 cm. At this depth, the mineral sand layer below the arable soil was reached. Wooden frames measuring 1 × 1 × 0.5 m (length × width × height) were placed in each hole and filled with a mixture of pure sand and soil from an old field (3:1). Seeds were laid to germinate in the greenhouse, and seedlings were planted after 3 weeks. In total, 144 seedlings were planted per plot in a substitutive design (i.e., each plot had the same total seedling density). During the first 3 months, plots were watered regularly to avoid desiccation of the seedlings. The experiment constituted 102 plots of 1 m² distributed over six replicated blocks. Distance between plots was 1 m, and blocks were 2 m apart. Each block contained monocultures of all species, four mixtures of two and four species, and an eight-species mixture. The mixtures of two and four species were assembled by constrained random selection from the species pool. Selecting a certain composition twice was not allowed in

This paper was submitted directly (Track II) to the PNAS office.

Abbreviations: RYT, relative yield total; NUE, nitrogen use efficiency.

*To whom correspondence should be sent at the present address: Ecology and Evolution section, Department of Biological Sciences, Silwood Park Campus, Imperial College London, Ascot Berkshire SL5 7PY, United Kingdom. E-mail: j.vanruijven@imperial.ac.uk.

†Huston, M. A., Aarssen, L. W., Austin, M. P., Cade, B. S., Fridley, J. D., Garnier, E., Grime, J. P., Lauenroth, W. K., Thompson, K. & Wardle, D. A. (2000) *Science* **289**, 1255a (abstr.).

‡Hector, A., Schmid, B., Beierkuhnlein, C., Caldeira, M. C., Diemer, B., Dimitrakopoulos, P. G., Finn, J. A., Freitas, H., Giller, P. S., Good, J., et al. (2000) *Science* **289**, 1255a (abstr.).

© 2005 by The National Academy of Sciences of the USA




Fig. 2. Results of different measures of complementarity from 2000 to 2003. (a) RYT increased with species richness in 2001, 2002, and 2003 and increased with time at each level of species richness ($P < 0.05$). (b) The net effect increased with species richness in 2002 and 2003, and increased with time at each level of species richness ($P < 0.05$). (c) The complementarity effect increased with species richness in 2001 and 2002, and increased with time at each level of species richness ($P < 0.05$). (d) The selection effect decreased with species richness in 2001 ($P < 0.05$). Asterisks indicate significant difference from one (RYT) or zero. ***, $P < 0.001$; **, $P < 0.01$; *, $P < 0.05$. Data show means \pm SE.

richness level (Fig. 2a). The net effect and the complementarity effect, calculated by using the additive partition method, showed similar patterns as RYT. The net effect increased with species richness in 2001, 2002, and 2003, and the complementarity effect

increased with species richness in 2001 and 2002. Both effects increased with time at each species richness level (Fig. 2 b and c). This observation already indicates that the complementarity effect prevailed. Selection effects were generally small. A positive selection effect occurred in four and eight species mixtures in 2000, whereas the same mixtures showed a negative selection effect in 2001. The selection effect decreased with species richness in 2001. No relationship with time could be detected (Fig. 2d).

The net effects per species strongly shifted with time. In 2000, only one species (*Holcus*) performed better than expected at the highest level of species richness, whereas four species (*Agrostis*, *Anthoxanthum*, *Centaurea*, and *Festuca*) performed worse. However, the contribution of *Holcus* declined with time and turned negative in the last 2 years. Simultaneously, all species, except *Leucanthemum*, increased their contribution. In 2003, five species contributed significantly more to mixture biomass than expected based on their monoculture performance (Fig. 3).

The ratio of nitrogen (N) to phosphorus (P) in aboveground biomass is considered a useful predictor of N or P limitation. Values of $N/P < 14$ are generally considered to indicate N limitation (39, 40). In 2002, N/P ratios ranged from 3.54 ± 0.09 (*Leucanthemum*) to 6.05 ± 0.15 for *Rumex* in our experiment. Considering these low values, plants are assumed to be N limited. Therefore, we focus on nitrogen in our analysis. Total aboveground nitrogen showed patterns similar to plant biomass in 2002: *Centaurea* and *Plantago* showed a log-linear increase of total aboveground N with species richness ($P < 0.05$ and $P < 0.001$, respectively), whereas *Holcus* showed a log-linear decrease ($P < 0.01$). The other species showed no relationship between aboveground N and species richness. As a result, the total amount of aboveground nitrogen per plot increased with species richness ($P < 0.01$). This was confirmed by applying the RYT approach to aboveground amounts of N. At each level of species richness, RYT-N values were significantly ($P < 0.05$) higher than one.

We used the amount of aboveground biomass produced per unit aboveground nitrogen as a measure of nitrogen use efficiency (NUE). Interestingly, this measure also increased with species richness for several species. All dicot species and one grass species (*Agrostis*) showed this pattern. The other three grass species showed a neutral relationship between the amount of biomass per unit nitrogen and species richness (Fig. 4). Phosphorus and potassium budgets showed similar patterns, although less pronounced.

We used the expected values for aboveground biomass, total nitrogen, and NUE based on the monocultures to partition the net effect of each species in the eight-species mixtures (see Fig. 3) into the effects of increased NUE and those of complementarity (i.e., increased amounts of aboveground nitrogen). The contribution of increased NUE was calculated as $Y_{O_i} - (N_{O_i} \times NUE_{M_i})$, where Y_{O_i} and N_{O_i} are the biomass and the total amount of nitrogen of species i in the mixture, respectively, and NUE_{M_i} is the NUE of the species in monoculture. Similarly, the contribution of complementarity is calculated as $(N_{O_i} - N_{M_i}/n) \times NUE_{M_i}$, where N_{M_i} is the amount of nitrogen of species i in monoculture, and n is the number of species in the mixture. Summed over all species, complementarity accounted for 58% of the increase in productivity in eight species mixtures, and the increased NUE accounted for 42%.

Discussion

In our experiment, a positive relationship between species richness and plant productivity appeared in the second year and became increasingly positive as the experiment continued. This pattern has also been shown in the first biodiversity field experiment in Cedar Creek, which included legumes (19). Our




Fig. 3. Net effect of each species, shown for the eight species mixtures from 2000 to 2003. Asterisks indicate significant differences from zero. ***, $P < 0.001$; **, $P < 0.01$; *, $P < 0.05$. Data show means \pm SE.

results confirm that similar patterns can arise in the absence of legumes.

Different indices suggested that complementarity in resource use and/or facilitative interactions were the main driver(s) of increased productivity at higher levels of species richness. RYT values increased with species richness and with time. In 2003, two-species mixtures had an average value of 1.60. An extensive review found that >95% of two and three species mixtures without legumes had $RYT < 1.3$ (23, 43). RYT of eight-species mixtures approached unusual values of 3.0 in our experiment. Complementarity effects also increased both with species richness and time and were significantly greater than zero since 2001. Selection effects were small and often nonsignificant. In 2003, *Centaurea* dominated mixtures, but because of its high monoculture biomass, the contribution of *Centaurea* was mainly attributed to the selection effect. Still, its increase may be caused by

increased complementarity in resource use. The selection effect is not independent of complementarity: if resource partitioning also facilitates more productive species, some complementarity may be attributed to the selection effect. As such, the complementarity effect we report may be conservative as a measure of positive interactions (21, 42).

Similar to an earlier experiment (43), the importance of the individual species changed during the development of the experimental plots. In the first year, competitive exclusion dominated the interactions in the experimental plant communities. *Holcus* appeared to out-compete the other species because its high contribution to mixture biomass coincided with negative net effects of several other species. Probably, its higher growth rate (44) allowed *Holcus* to effectively forage for nutrients in large parts of the initially unoccupied soil volume, at least in the upper layer. The depletion of nutrients in the upper layer probably forced especially the dicot species to increase their rooting depth (45–47). From 2001, the biomass of *Holcus* strongly decreased, and other species became dominant. We propose that *Holcus* is gradually out-competed by species that invested in roots adapted to low nutrient availability (i.e., long-lived roots, ref. 50), because nutrient availability probably declined after plant roots had occupied and depleted most of the soil and nutrients allocated aboveground were continuously removed from the plots by harvesting aboveground biomass. It can only survive in monoculture because all other species are continuously removed from those plots.

With the decline of *Holcus*, interspecific interactions that promote diversity became more important. This is illustrated by the percentage of species contributing to increased productivity at high species richness increasing from 12.5% in 2000 to >60% in 2003. Especially, dicot species started to show positive net effects, which may be the result of complementarity in rooting depth between the dominant grass species and these dicots (23, 24, 49). This is confirmed by the increase of aboveground N with species richness shown by two of these species (*Centaurea* and *Plantago*) and the positive RYT-N values in 2002. These positive RYT-N values are in contrast to an earlier study, which also calculated complementarity based on total nitrogen, and found no signs of increased nitrogen amounts despite significant overyielding in terms of biomass (9). This finding indicates that, in our study, plant growth is mainly nitrogen limited, whereas competition for other resources probably plays an important role in the other study system (9).

Complementarity in rooting depth is likely to be important, but temporal differences in nutrient uptake may also have significant effects (24, 50). For two species present in our experiment (*Anthoxanthum* and *Plantago*), it has been shown that they differ in rooting depth, and also in their main periods of nitrogen uptake (51). Plants may also facilitate each other (26), but we found no evidence for facilitative interactions.

Importantly, several species used nutrients more efficiently at high species richness, as shown by the increase of aboveground biomass per unit nitrogen with species richness. This is a mechanism that, to our knowledge, has not been presented in other studies. Its contribution to increased productivity at high diversity is substantial, making up >40% of the total net effect on productivity. However, this shift in NUE is difficult to explain. An earlier study on aboveground resource use in experimental grasslands showed that grass species responded to increased light competition at high diversity by investing more biomass in stems to increase in height (11). Because stems generally have a higher C/N ratio than leaves, this response may lead to an increase of the amount of aboveground biomass per unit nitrogen. This increase might explain the response shown by the grass species *Agrostis* (see Fig. 4). In contrast to the grasses, the dicot species did not show an increase in height in that experiment (11). Moreover, most dicot species that showed an increase of NUE with diversity in our experiment (Fig. 4) also




Fig. 4. Amount of aboveground biomass (gram) per gram of nitrogen, shown for each species in 2002. *Agrostis*, $F = 4.92$, $P < 0.05$; *Centaurea*, $F = 8.00$, $P < 0.01$; *Leucanthemum*, $F = 6.17$, $P < 0.05$; *Plantago*, $F = 12.31$, $P < 0.01$; *Rumex*, $F = 10.30$, $P < 0.01$; *Anthoxanthum*, *Festuca*, and *Holcus* were nonsignificant. Data show means \pm SE.

showed increased biomass and increased nutrient yields at high diversity. For these species, the availability of nutrients appears to have increased because of complementary interactions. As a response to that increase, they may have invested more biomass into stems (52). Similar to the grasses increasing in height, their aboveground C/N ratio increased as these dicots invested relatively more biomass into flowering stems and less into leaves.

Conclusions

In the year of establishment, interspecific interactions were dominated by competitive exclusion, as shown by the strong expansion of one fast-growing species and the decline of many other species. Already in the second year, however, productivity increased with species richness. Our results show that this positive relationship between species richness and productivity strengthens with time in perennial communities. The patterns observed were caused by increased niche differentiation and/or facilitation, as shown by increasing values of RYT and the complementarity effect, and the number of plant species that

contributed to increased productivity at higher levels of species richness. In our experiment, these patterns cannot be attributed to increased nitrogen input because of the presence of legumes. Detailed nutrient analysis revealed two alternative underlying mechanisms. First, complementarity in nutrient uptake probably enabled the diverse communities to acquire greater amounts of nutrients. In addition, increased nutrient-use efficiency of several species at higher levels of species richness was very important. The increase of nutrient-use efficiency probably is the result of changes in the biomass allocation patterns of species. This mechanism provides a contribution to our understanding of the mechanisms of diversity effects on ecosystem functioning.

We thank Gerlinde De Deyn, Maurits Gleichman, Eelke Jongejans, Frans Möller, Louis de Nijs, Ciska Raaijmakers, Henk van Roekel, and Jan van Walsem for practical assistance. Two anonymous reviewers gave very helpful suggestions on an earlier version of the manuscript. This work was supported by Stimulation Program Biodiversity of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research.

- Loreau, M., Naeem, S. & Inchausti, P. (2002) *Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning: Synthesis and Perspectives* (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford).
- Schmid, B., Joshi, J. & Schlöpfer, F. (2002) in *Functional Consequences of Biodiversity: Experimental Progress and Theoretical Extensions*, eds. Kinzig, A., Tilman, D. & Pacala, S. W. (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ), pp. 120–150.
- Aarssen, L. W. (1997) *Oikos* **80**, 183–184.
- Huston, M. A. (1997) *Oecologia* **110**, 449–460.
- Loreau, M., Naeem, S., Inchausti, P., Bengtsson, J., Grime, J. P., Hector, A., Hooper, D. U., Huston, M. A., Raffaelli, D. G., Schmid, B., et al. (2001) *Science* **294**, 804–808.
- Loreau, M. (2000) *Oikos* **91**, 3–17.

7. Tilman, D., Lehman, C. L. & Thomson, K. T. (1997) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **94**, 1857–1861.
8. Loreau, M. & Hector, A. (2001) *Nature* **412**, 72–76.
9. Hooper, D. U. (1998) *Ecology* **79**, 704–719.
10. Hector, A., Schmid, B., Beierkuhnlein, C., Caldeira, M. C., Diemer, M., Dimitrakopoulos, P. G., Finn, J. A., Freitas, H., Giller, P. S., Good, J., *et al.* (1999) *Science* **286**, 1123–1127.
11. Spehn, E. M., Joshi, J., Schmid, B., Diemer, B. & Körner, C. (2000) *Func. Ecol.* **14**, 326–337.
12. Leps, J., Brown, V. K., Diaz Len, T. A., Gormsen, D., Hedlund, K., Kailova, J., Korthals, G. W., Mortimer, S. R., Rodriguez-Barrueco, C., Roy, J., *et al.* (2001) *Oikos* **92**, 123–134.
13. Dukes, J. S. (2001) *Oikos* **94**, 468–480.
14. Hector, A., Bazeley-White, E., Loreau, M., Otway, S. J. & Schmid, B. (2002) *Ecol. Lett.* **5**, 502–511.
15. Špačková, I. & Lepš, J. (2001) *Ecol. Lett.* **4**, 585–594.
16. van Ruijven, J. & Berendse, F. (2003) *Ecol. Lett.* **6**, 170–175.
17. Fridley, J. D. (2002) *Oecologia* **132**, 271–277.
18. Fridley, J. D. (2003) *J. Ecol.* **91**, 396–406.
19. Tilman, D., Reich, P. B., Knops, J., Wedin, D., Mielke, T. & Lehman, C. L. (2001) *Science* **294**, 843–846.
20. Mulder, C. P. H., Jumpponen, A., Högberg, P. & Huss-Danell, K. (2002) *Oecologia* **133**, 412–421.
21. Hooper, D. U. & Dukes, J. S. (2004) *Ecol. Lett.* **7**, 95–105.
22. Hille Ris Lambers, J., Harpole, W. S., Tilman, D., Knops, J. & Reich, P. B. (2004) *Ecol. Lett.* **7**, 661–668.
23. Berendse, F. (1981) *Oecologia* **48**, 334–341.
24. McKane, R. B., Grigal, D. F. & Russelle, M. P. (1990) *Ecology* **71**, 1126–1132.
25. McKane, R. B., Johnson, L. C., Shaver, G. R., Nadelhoffer, K. J., Rastetter, E. B., Fry, B., Giblin, A. E., Kielland, K., Kwiatkowski, B. L., Laundre, J. A., *et al.* (2002) *Nature* **415**, 68–71.
26. Callaway, R. M. (1995) *Bot. Rev.* **61**, 306–349.
27. Fridley, J. D. (2001) *Oikos* **93**, 514–526.
28. Chesson, P. (2000) *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **31**, 343–367.
29. Bruno, J. F., Stachowicz, J. J. & Bertness, M. D. (2003) *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **18**, 119–125.
30. Petchey, O. L. (2000) *Am. Nat.* **155**, 696–702.
31. Mouquet, N., Moore, J. L. & Loreau, M. (2002) *Ecol. Lett.* **5**, 56–65.
32. Craine, J. M., Reich, P. B., Tilman, D., Ellsworth, D., Fargione, J., Knops, J. & Naeem, S. (2003) *Ecol. Lett.* **6**, 623–630.
33. van Ruijven, J., De Deyn, G. B. & Berendse, F. (2003) *Ecol. Lett.* **6**, 910–918.
34. van der Meijden, R. (1990) *Heukels' Flora van Nederland* (Wolters-Noordhoff, Groningen, The Netherlands).
35. de Wit, C. T. & van den Bergh, J. P. (1965) *Neth. J. Agr. Sci.* **13**, 212–221.
36. de Wit, C. T. (1960) *Verslagen Landbouwkundig Onderzoek* **66**, 1–82.
37. Jolliffe, P. A. (2000) *J. Ecol.* **88**, 371–385.
38. Novozamsky, I., Houba, V. J. G., van Eck, R. & van Vark, W. (1983) *Comm. Soil Sci. Plant Anal.* **14**, 239–249.
39. Koerselman, W. & Meuleman, A. F. M. (1996) *J. Appl. Ecol.* **33**, 1441–1450.
40. Olde Venterink, H., Wassen, M. J., Verkerst, A. W. M. & de Ruiter, P. C. (2003) *Ecology* **84**, 2191–2199.
41. Trenbath, B. R. (1974) *Adv. Agron.* **26**, 177–210.
42. Petchey, O. L. (2003) *Oikos* **101**, 323–330.
43. Niklaus, P. A., Leadley, P. W., Schmid, B. & Körner, C. (2001) *Ecol. Monogr.* **71**, 341–356.
44. Grime, J. P. & Hunt, R. (1975) *J. Ecol.* **63**, 393–422.
45. Berendse, F. (1982) *Oecologia* **53**, 50–55.
46. Wardle, D. A. & Peltzer, D. A. (2003) *Oikos* **100**, 497–506.
47. Jumpponen, A., Högberg, P., Huss-Danell, K. & Mulder, C. P. H. (2002) *Funct. Ecol.* **16**, 454–461.
48. van der Krift, A. J. & Berendse, F. (2002) *Funct. Ecol.* **16**, 198–203.
49. Fitter, A. H. (1986) *Oecologia* **69**, 594–599.
50. Hooper, D. U. & Vitousek, P. M. (1998) *Ecol. Monogr.* **68**, 121–149.
51. Berendse, F. (1981) Ph.D. dissertation (Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands).
52. Müller, I., Schmid, B. & Weiner, J. (2000) *Perspect. Plant Ecol. Evol. Sys.* **3**, 115–127.