Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Determining the important environmental variables controlling plant species community composition in mesotrophic grasslands in Great Britain

Journal Item

How to cite:

Kalusová, Veronika; Le Duc, Michael G.; Gilbert, Joanne C.; Lawson, Clare S.; Gowing, David J. G. and Marrs, Rob H. (2009). Determining the important environmental variables controlling plant species community composition in mesotrophic grasslands in Great Britain. *Applied Vegetation Science*, 12(4) pp. 459–471.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2009 International Association for Vegetation Science

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.1654-109X.2009.01041.x>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Determining the important environmental variables controlling plant species community composition in
mesotrophic grasslands in the UK

^{1,2}Kalusová, Veronika; ¹Le Duc, Michael G.; ^{3,4}Gilbert, Joanne C.; ^{3,5}Lawson, Clare S.; ^{3,6}Gowing,
David J.G. & ¹Marrs, Rob H.*

¹School of Biological Sciences, University of Liverpool, L69 3GS, UK; ²Department of Botany and Zoology,
Masaryk University, Kotlářská 2, CZ-61137 Brno, Czech Republic; ³Institute of Water and Environment,
Cranfield University, Silsoe, Bedford MK45 4DT, UK, ⁴RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL,
UK; ⁵CAER, University of Reading, Reading RG6 6AR, UK ⁶Open University, Milton Keynes MK7 6AA,
UK; *Corresponding author; E-mail calluna@liv.ac.uk; Tel +44 151 7955172; Fax +44 151 7955171

14 **Abstract**

15 **Question:**

16 **Location:** Ten mesotrophic grassland sites of high conservation value in southern England.

17 **Methods:** In 1998 and 1999 species cover in between 10-20 randomly selected 1m² quadrats were assessed
18 at each site, at each quadrat degree of waterlogging (SEV, metre.weeks), soil Olsen extractable phosphorus
19 (P) and soil pH were measured. Variation Partitioning was used to separate site and soil effects, and HOF
20 modelling was used to produce response curves for the major species on each of the soil gradients. These
21 gradients were coenoclines derived from partial canonical correspondence analysis (pCCA).

22 **Results:** Variation partitioning identified site as the most important environmental variable (23%), with 19%
23 accounted for by climate and only 10% accounted for by soil. However, when shared variation was removed
24 the effects of site and soil were reduced to 13% and 5%, respectively; effects of geographical location and
25 local climate were negligible. Of the soil variables, degree of waterlogging was most important, followed by
26 pH and soil phosphorus. The species responses to each of these soil environmental factors could be separated
27 into four types on each gradient. Most species were abundant where the quadrats had a low degree of
28 waterlogging, low soil phosphorus and intermediate pH.

29 **Conclusions:** Site-based factors were more important than the three soils variables, which were assumed to
30 be directly or indirectly associated with productivity. This implies that each site has unique properties, as yet
31 undefined, that are more important than the measured soil variables. The three soil factors (W, P, pH) were,
32 however, still significant and the groups of the most common species, based on significant response curves,
33 can be used as a first approximation of indicators of environmental conditions in UK mesotrophic grasslands
34 for conservation purposes, for example targeting restoration efforts or interpreting changes in environmental
35 conditions.

36
37
38 **Key words:** Variation partitioning, HOF modelling, species response curves, realized niche, environmental
39 gradients.

40
41 **Nomenclature:** Stace (1997)

42
43 **Abbreviations:** CCA = Canonical Correspondence Analysis; DCA = Detrended Correspondence Analysis;
44 VP = Variation Partitioning; P = soil Olsen available phosphorus ($\mu\text{g P g}^{-1}$); W = degree of waterlogging
45 (SEV in m.weeks).

Deleted: (

51 **Introduction**

52 In most of Europe unimproved, semi-natural grassland communities have a high conservation value
53 (Duffey et al. 1974; Bakker 1989) and many are protected by conservation designation (Anon. 1995a,b).
54 These grasslands are plagio-climax communities and their composition, and hence conservation value, is
55 controlled by a series of environmental factors that impinge on any given site in combination with any
56 applied management. The species composition and diversity of grassland plant communities is conditioned
57 by a number of interacting environmental factors, for example, the local species pool, historic as well as
58 present management (Wells et al. 1976; Gustavsson et al. 2007; Klimek et al. 2007), and site-specific
59 conditions, i.e. water regime and soil physico-chemical properties (Ejrnæs & Bruun 2000; Critchley et al.
60 2002a; Havlová et al. 2004; Marini et al. 2007). Grace (1999) codified these processes into a conceptual
61 model which suggested that the important drivers of species density were (1) spatial heterogeneity and
62 species pool which influenced colonization, (2) community biomass, and (3) the disturbance regime which
63 included natural events like floods, fires, herbivory and human activities, management like grazing, mowing
64 or cultivation. The role of disturbance, especially cutting and grazing, in controlling grassland species
65 diversity and composition has been shown empirically (Smith et al. 2000; Smith & Rushton 1994). Clearly,
66 all of these factors interact within a given site to control the observed species composition. An important
67 goal, therefore, for conservation biology must be to determine the relative importance of the various factors
68 that control plant biodiversity (Corney et al. 2006).

69 In this paper the relative importance of site factors relative to factors that can be viewed as surrogate
70 measures of productivity will be quantified for an important vegetation type from a conservation viewpoint:
71 species-rich mesotrophic grassland in lowland, southern England (Rodwell 1992). During the 20th century
72 over 98% of the area of these grasslands has been lost mainly to agricultural use, through ploughing, re-
73 seeding and fertilizing (Anon. 2001). The remnants left in the UK (now <15,000 ha) are generally subject to
74 conservation management; usually a hay crop is taken followed by aftermath grazing. They are developed on
75 soils that often remain waterlogged for considerable periods as they are subject to periodic inundation. Soils
76 tend to be mesotrophic to nutrient-rich with a pH range from moderately acidic (4.5) to circum-neutral (6.5-
77 7.0). The important environmental variables likely to influence productivity are therefore, the water regime
78 and soil fertility.

79 Productivity is one of the key factors put forward to explain species diversity, and often the relationship
80 between species richness and productivity gradient is often presumed to have the shape of humped-back or
81 unimodal curve (Grime 1979; Huston 1979; Tilman 1982). Mittelbach et al. (2001) in a major review
82 stressed the difficulty in making direct measurements of productivity, and in most studies indirect or
83 surrogate measures, i.e. correlated variables such as peak plant biomass, rainfall, and evapotranspiration,
84 have been used. Two major reviews (Grace 1999; Mittelbach et al. 2001) have shown unimodal responses in
85 the majority of cases, although positive relationships have also been detected. Janssens et al. (1998) argued,
86 that the same relationship can be expected between gradient of soil fertility, because the community biomass
87 is directly influenced by its productivity which depends on the availability of soil nutrients. In their study of

a wide range of European grasslands, they found a unimodal relationship between maximal species density and two of the major soil nutrients, P and K.

On any gradient the overall species density will reflect the combined responses of individual species to that gradient, essentially the realized species niche, described ‘as the position and shape of species response’ showed as species abundance on the resource gradient (Austin et al. 1990). Therefore, modelling the response of species (realized species niche) along gradients should provide important information for determining community responses, which will in turn inform conservation management. These response curves have been modelled as symmetric Gaussian relationships (Begon et al. 1996). However, Huisman et al. (1993) proposed that alternative non-unimodal and skewed relationships were possible, and Oksanen & Minchin (2002) have tested their existence and explained it by changing environmental stress could cause skewed or result in non-unimodal responses. In their study of vascular plants on altitudinal gradients, skewed curves were found for 20% of species and in a subsequent study 29% of species produced skewed responses (Lawesson & Oksanen 2002). Few attempts have been made to fit such skewed relationships along surrogate productivity gradients.

Here, we use mesotrophic grasslands in the UK as a model system to address some of these issues. This dataset was particularly suitable for this analysis because of the detailed assessment of the water regime at each sampling position. First, we attempt to quantify the relative importance of a range of environmental variables in determining plant species composition in these grasslands (site factors versus variables that control productivity, e.g. water regime and soil variables), and second we describe the realized niches of species on gradients described by the soil variables that reflect productivity.

110 **Methods**

111

112 *Study sites and sampling methods*

113 Ten sites were chosen with a representative cover of the mesotrophic grassland communities found in
114 southern England (Table 1). Detailed field sampling methods are provided in Gilbert (2000). Briefly, at each
115 of the 10 sites between 10 and 25 sampling positions were located randomly (194 in total) in either 1998 or
116 1999. At each location the cover (%) of each species of vascular plant and bryophytes in a 1 m² quadrat was
117 recorded. A Dutch auger was used to take four cores (0–15 cm depth) from the corners of each quadrat,
118 which were then mixed together to produce a bulked quadrat sample. These soil samples were then air-dried,
119 ground to pass a 2 mm sieve and both available P ($\mu\text{g P.g}^{-1}$ extracted using Olsen's reagent) and pH
120 measured in water (MAFF 1986). Degree of waterlogging (SEV in metre.weeks, integrated over 5-years, full
121 description in Silvertown et al. 2001) was calculated for each quadrat as the degree to which the water table
122 at each site was above a threshold soil depth during the growing season (March–September). Climate data
123 (30 year annual averages for maximum and minimum temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$), days of air frost, days of rainfall
124 over 1 mm, hours of sunshine and total rainfall) were derived from nearest meteorological recording station.

125

126 *Data analysis*

127 The soil variables (W, P, pH) were examined using Box and whisker in STATISTICA 7.1 (StatSoft Inc.
128 2004). Differences between sites were tested using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test because of the
129 non-normal distribution of all variables. The mean unweighted Ellenberg indicator values (corrected for the
130 British flora, Hill et al. 1999) for moisture (F), light (L), nutrients (N) and reaction (R) were calculated for
131 each quadrat based on species cover data using JUICE v. 6.4 (Tichý 2002).

132 Most multivariate analyses were performed using VEGAN (Oksanen 2005) implemented in R (v. 2.6, R
133 Development Core Team 2004) on $\log_e(x+1)$ transformed data. Species occurring in only one plot were
134 excluded. A full description of preliminary data analysis is available in Kalusová (2008). Four environmental
135 datasets were defined; (1) comprised two surrogate variables, the Site name which reflecting the effects of
136 the local species pool, management history and current site management; (2) Geographical location (Easting,
137 Northing) as a crude measure of site climatic conditions; (3) Climate variables, and (4) the three measured
138 soil variables (W, P, pH). As sampling was done over two years, sampling year was included as a covariable
139 in all ordinations to remove variability caused by inter-annual changes in conditions and sampling.

140 An exploratory DCA produced a gradient length 5.52 for axis 1 so the unimodal model (CCA) was
141 adopted thereafter (ter Braak & Šmilauer 2005). To give an insight into the relationship between species
142 composition and the main environmental gradients Spearman rank correlations were calculated between the
143 DCA scores (axes 1 and 2) and the three soil variables and the weighted quadrat Ellenberg indicator values.

144 VP based on CCA (ter Braak & Šmilauer 2005) was then used to assess the relative importance of the
145 environmental variables in explaining species composition. The variation explained by predefined subsets of
146 environmental variables (Site, Geographic location and Soil), and the shared variation between them, was

147 calculated (e.g. Borcard et al. 1992; Økland & Eilertsen 1994; Marrs & Le Duc 2000; Corney et al. 2006).
148 VP was subsequently applied to the three soil variables (W, P, pH) with all other variables removed as
149 covariables. Significance of all analyses was tested using a Monte-Carlo test (999 permutations) with
150 randomization restricted within Site.

151

152 *Modelling species responses to soil gradients*

153 A coenocline was derived for each of the soil variables using CCA; i.e. axis 1 represented the soil
154 variable on its own with all of the other significant variables removed. The use of such complex gradients
155 derived from ordination is appropriate for estimation of realized plant niche characteristics (Lawesson &
156 Oksanen 2002; Økland 1992; Austin et al. 1990). The responses of the 32 most frequent species (present in
157 more than 35 quadrats, ~20%) were then modelled along the coenoclines using the HOF modelling approach
158 (Huisman et al. 1993). Although Gaussian response curves (Lawesson & Oksanen 2002), Beta response
159 functions and Generalized Additive Models (Oksanen & Minchin 2002) can also be used, their applicability
160 has been previously criticized, and HOF modelling has been suggested as an adequate substitution
161 (Lawesson & Oksanen 2002). The HOF procedure fits five models in a hierarchical sequence and assesses
162 whether the response is monotonic or plateau-like, unimodal or skewed against a null model (Huisman et al.
163 1993). Here the HOF models were fitted using GRAVY (Oksanen 2004), a Gaussian error distribution and
164 the AIC statistic were used for model selection. The models for species were also compared using ΔD , i.e.
165 the difference between the deviances of the null model and the one selected. The species niche optima and
166 probability of occurrence, tolerances and niche width of species along all coenoclines were estimated for the
167 unimodal and skewed models (Lawesson & Oksanen 2002).

168

169

Results

There was significant between-site variation in the soil variables, using the Kruskal-Wallis test: W (H=106.4; $P<0.001$; $n=187$), P (H=89.5; $P<0.001$; $n=187$) and soil pH (H=127.3; $p=0.001$; $n=187$). The most waterlogged sites were Berney Marshes (mean 5.43 m.weeks), Wet Moor (4.64 m.weeks) and East Harnham (3.57 m.weeks) and the least waterlogged were Stonygillfoot (0.44 m.weeks), Portholme (2.08 m. weeks) and Cricklade (1.68 m.weeks). Soil P was greatest at Upton Ham (mean=14.0 $\mu\text{g P. g}^{-1}$), Berney Marshes (11.6 $\mu\text{g P. g}^{-1}$) and Cricklade (14.6 $\mu\text{g P. g}^{-1}$), whereas Moorlinch (2.4 $\mu\text{g P. g}^{-1}$) and Stonygillfoot (5.2 $\mu\text{g P. g}^{-1}$) were much lower. Soil pH ranged from relatively neutral (mean=pH 6.2–7.0) at East Harnham, Cricklade and Portholme, to more acidic sites at Southlake, Berney Marshes and Upton Ham (pH 4.91–5.05).

Indirect gradient analysis (DCA)

The DCA biplot (Figure 1) illustrated two major gradients. Axis 1 is positively associated with waterlogging, with species typical for drier soils (*Anemone nemorosa*, *Euphrasia confusa*, *Trisetum flavescens*, *Ajuga reptans*, *Conopodium majus*, *Hypochaeris radicata*) at the negative end and species of wetter soils (*Bolboschoenus maritimus*, *Ranunculus sceleratus*, *Azolla filiculoides*, *Atriplex prostrata*, *Potentilla anserina*, *Alopecurus geniculatus*) at the positive end. Axis 2 was more complex being associated with pH at the positive end and P as well as Easting and Northing at the negative end. The site factor had a significant but small effect on both axes. There were significant positive correlations between waterlogging and Ellenberg F-values with a weaker positive relationship with N-values (Table 2). Similarly, P was significantly correlated with Ellenberg N-values but showed weaker positive correlations with Ellenberg R- and F-values. Soil pH had a significant negative but weak relationship with Ellenberg N-values but no relationship with R-values.

Variation partitioning and direct gradient analyses (Table 3)

The VP analysis explained 28.5% of the total variation in the dataset. Site explained the greatest amount of variation in the dataset with climate second. Soil was the third most important and Geographic location explained the least. However, when the variation that was shared between Site, Climate and Geographical location was removed, Climate accounted for less variation than the constrained variables, and Geographical location was non-significant. The Soils subset explained 10% of the variation but when Site variation was removed only 5% was explained by soil factors alone. Of the soil variables the greatest proportion of variation was explained by W, followed by P and then pH. When variation due to each soil variable on its own was calculated, W remained most important, pH was intermediate and P accounted for the least.

The biplot from the pCCA where all soil variables were included (Figure 2a) but Site was removed as a covariable showed a strong positive relationship between W and P and axis 1; W had a slight negative relationship with axis 2 and P had a slight positive one. Soil pH was correlated positively with axis 2. Accordingly, the pCCA analyses were re-done for each soil variable separately with the influence of the other two soil variables and Site removed as covariables (Figure 2b,c,d).

For W, the greatest degree of waterlogging was found at the negative end of axis 1 where the following species were present *Drepanocladus aduncus*, *Galium palustre*, *Myosotis laxa*, *Lysimachia nummularia*, *Lotus pedunculatus* or *Carex rostrata*, all species typical for moist grasslands (with Ellenberg F-values > 7) and a lesser degree of waterlogging were found at the positive end, species such as *Ranunculus sardous*, *Poa humilis*, *Carex flacca* or *Cirsium dissectum* (Ellenberg F-values < 8).

For P, the gradient was found from species such as *Veronica beccabunga*, *Myosotis scorpioides*, *Galium uliginosum*, *Carex acutiformis*, *Iris pseudacorus* or *Azolla filiculoides* (with Ellenberg N-values > 4) through to *Drepanocladus aduncus*, *Dactylorhiza praetermissa*, *Briza media*, *Equisetum palustre* or *Bellis perennis* (Ellenberg N-values < 4).

pH had the shortest of the three soil gradients. *Myosotis scorpioides*, *Iris pseudacorus*, *Veronica beccabunga*, *Rumex conglomeratus* (Ellenberg R-value < 7) were found at the acidic end of gradient and *Juncus subnodulosus*, *Juncus inflexus*, *Carex distans*, *Achillea ptarmica* and *Bellis perennis* (with Ellenberg R > 5) were found at the opposite end on more neutral soils.

220

Response of individual species to soil gradients

The HOF models selected and the amount of Deviance explained are presented in E-Appendix I (species abbreviations E-Appendix II). With one exception (*Cardamine pratensis*) all species showed a significant relationship to at least one of the soil variables. For W and P most of the responses (53 % and 63 % respectively) were unimodal or skewed models (IV, V). In both cases the symmetric model IV was more common. In contrast, for pH 68 % of species had a non-unimodal response (i.e. a decreasing/increasing response up to an asymptote) or a null response.

228

Response to waterlogging (Figure 3)

More species showed a greater abundance at the drier end of the W gradient. The species could be grouped on the basis of their response to waterlogging into four general types of response:

(a) Species that increase with W (*Agrostis stolonifera*, *Carex disticha*, *Carex nigra*, *Calliergonella cuspidata*);

(b) Species that showed an unimodal response, peaking near the drier end of the W gradient (*Rumex acetosa*, *Holcus lanatus*, *Ranunculus acris*, *Cerastium fontanum*, *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, *Trifolium pratense*, *Cynosurus cristatus*, *Lolium perenne*);

(c) Species that showed an unimodal response, peaking near the middle of the W gradient (*Trifolium repens*, *Poa trivialis*, *Alopecurus geniculatus*, *Senecio aquaticus*, *Deschampsia cespitosa*);

(d) Species that showed a decrease with W (*Alopecurus pratensis*, *Sanguisorba officinalis*, *Leontodon autumnalis*, *Hordeum secalinum*, *Centaurea nigra*, *Bromus racemosus*, *Filipendula ulmaria*, *Taraxacum* sect. *vulgaria*, *Plantago lanceolata*, *Festuca rubra*)

Poa trivialis, *Trifolium repens*, *Anthoxanthum odoratum* and *Senecio aquaticus* had the largest niche width on the W gradient and *Sanguisorba officinalis*, *Deschampsia cespitosa* and *Hordeum secalinum* had

the narrowest (Figure 4). From the species which had either a unimodal or skewed response two groups were distinguished (Figure 4): with *Deschampsia cespitosa*, *Alopecurus geniculatus*, *Senecio aquaticus*) having their optima at higher W values than *Rumex acetosa*, *Holcus lanatus*, *Ranunculus acris*, *Cerastium fontanum*, *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, *Trifolium pratense*, *Cynosurus cristatus*, *Lolium perenne*, *Trifolium repens*, *Poa trivialis*, *Alopecurus pratensis*, *Sanguisorba officinalis*, *Leontodon autumnalis*, *Hordeum secalinum*. There was, however, substantial overlap in tolerance range between the groups.

Response to soil phosphorus (Figure 5)

More species showed a greater abundance at the low end of the gradient with five showing a positive response to soil P. The widest niche was observed for *Lolium perenne*, *Trifolium repens*, *Cynosurus cristatus* and *Taraxacum* sect. *vulgaria* and the smallest were found with *Centaurea nigra*, *Carex disticha* and *Calliergonella cuspidata*. There was, however, very little difference in tolerance intervals for all of the species with a unimodal or skewed distribution except for *Pedicularis palustris* which was associated at greater soil P concentrations than all other species. (E-Appendix III, Kalusová 2008). The species could be grouped on the basis of their response to soil P into four general types of responses:

- (a) Species that decreased with P (*Trifolium pratense*, *Senecio aquaticus*, *Cerastium fontanum*, *Ranunculus acris*, *Sanguisorba officinalis*);
- (b) Species that showed an unimodal response, peaking at the low-mid point of the P gradient (*Bromus racemosus*, *Festuca pratensis*, *Filipendula ulmaria*, *Rumex acetosa*, *Trifolium repens*, *Festuca rubra*, *Lolium perenne*, *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, *Holcus lanatus*, *Taraxacum* sect. *vulgaria*, *Cynosurus cristatus*, *Carex nigra*, *Plantago lanceolata*, *Calliergonella cuspidata*, *Leontodon autumnalis*, *Centaurea nigra*, *Carex disticha*);
- (c) One species that showed an unimodal response, peaking near the high end of the P gradient (*Hordeum secalinum*);
- (d) Species that showed an increase with P (*Deschampsia cespitosa*, *Pedicularis palustris*, *Poa trivialis*, *Alopecurus geniculatus*, *Glyceria fluitans*).

Response to soil pH (Figure 6)

The species with the widest niche on the pH gradient were *Lolium perenne*, *Alopecurus pratensis*, *Poa trivialis* and *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, whereas the narrowest niche was found for *Ranunculus acris*, *Sanguisorba officinalis* and *Alopecurus geniculatus*. There was again only very little difference in tolerance intervals for all of the species with a unimodal or skewed distributions (E-Appendix IV, Kalusová, 2008). The species could be grouped on the basis of their response to pH into three general types of responses:

- (a) Species that increased with pH (*Carex distans*, *Taraxacum* sect. *Vulgaria*, *Senecio aquaticus*, *Hordeum secalinum*, *Leontodon autumnalis*);
- (b) Species that showed an unimodal response. Within this group the species could be further sub-divided into those that peaked around the mid-point of the gradient (*Poa trivialis*, *Deschampsia*

cespitosa, *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, *Calliergonella cuspidata*, *Ranunculus repens*, *Agrostis stolonifera*, *Ranunculus acris*, *Alopecurus pratensis*, *Lolium perenne*), and those that peaked nearer to the acid end of the pH gradient (*Sanguisorba officinalis*, *Alopecurus geniculatus*);

(c) Species that showed an decrease with pH (*Filipendula ulmaria*, *Rumex acetosa*, *Glyceria fluitans*)

Discussion

The relative importance of environmental variables in determining species composition

A major finding of this study has been the identification and quantification of the relative roles of site-based factors and productivity as determinants of species richness. Whilst there is general agreement that site factors, usually assumed to be dependent on the local species pool, are important (Grace & Pugsek 1997; Grace 1999; 2001; Loreau *et al.* 2001) there have been few attempts to assess their relative significance: Grace & Pugsek (1997) being an exception. Here, we used VP (*sensu* Borcard *et al.* 1992; Marrs & Le Duc 2000; Økland 1999, 2000; Økland & Eilertsen 1994; Corney *et al.* 2006), to quantify the relative contributions of macro-site factors (a crude composite variable which combined information on the local species pool, historical management, current local management practices, site moisture regime, and local climate) and other environmental factors controlling production. The year of sampling was always included as a covariable because sampling was spread over two years, and it is quite possible that there is a seasonal effect induced as a result of differential species performance in the different years, or sampling error. As the sampling was done by the same experienced team in both years it is unlikely that the latter is a major error. The most important drivers of species composition in these mesotrophic grasslands were the site-based variables (Site; Geographical variables - Easting, Northing) which accounted for 23% and 7% of the variation respectively. That local climatic factors expressed here crudely as annual means and the geographical variables reflecting location were subsumed within Site implying that Site accounted for all variation associated with local climatic responses also. This result was expected but it is useful to have it confirmed. Soil variables (W, P, R) explained much less of the variation (10 %), W was the most important variable followed by P and pH.

These results agree with Grace's (1999) suggestion of importance assigned to site-base factors as drivers of species diversity and productivity. The Site variable is a surrogate one covering a very large number of potential variables, for example variations in the local species pool at each site, different management histories and differing current management. Thus, site is a very crude variable, and merely highlights that much more detailed research is needed to identify the important environmental drivers and to quantify influence. Nevertheless, soil variables were still of importance, so a detailed study of these was made.

Although this study included grasslands that broadly covered the core of British lowland neutral or mesotrophic grasslands (Rodwell 1992), some communities were not included, specifically MG1 and MG2. MG1, the *Arrhenatherum elatius* grassland occurs where the mowing management is absent or grazing is irregular, and it is often found on lowland road verges and railway embankments. MG2, the *Arrhenatherum elatius-Filipendula ulmaria* community is a tall-herb grassland with tussock grasses and tall dicotyledons and tends to be found in the uplands of the northern England. Most of the other mesotrophic grassland communities (MG9, MG11, MG12) are species-poor swards, usually have dominated by species adapted to unsuitable conditions (Rodwell 1992), and have limited conservation importance. Thus, although most of the communities of major conservation importance have been included here an expanded survey is required for an assessment of the entire mesotrophic grassland resource. However, it provides a first approximation of the

337 response to these UK plant communities to some of the important variables likely to influence species
338 composition.

339

340 *Responses to soil variables*

341 Of all the soil variables, W was the most important determinant of plant community composition in these
342 mesotrophic grasslands (Rodwell 1992; Wallace et al. 2002). A strong significant correlation was found
343 between the Ellenberg indicator value for moisture (F, modified for the UK by Hill et al. 1999), and the
344 measured degree of waterlogging, confirming that these modified Ellenberg values are useful indirect
345 indicators of water regime (Wallace et al. 2002). The positive correlation between Ellenberg values for light
346 (L) and waterlogging (W) can be explained by the fact that at the wet end of moisture gradient there are
347 permanently waterlogged soils where only open, species-poor vegetation is found because of these extreme
348 wet conditions. The wet conditions found in these grasslands are, however, not just important for
349 maintaining plant populations; they provide suitable conditions for other conservation targets, e.g. breeding
350 wading birds (Lyons & Ausden 2005).

351 Species composition was also affected by soil available P but its influence was not completely
352 independent from W: when their shared variability was removed pH became even more important. P, on its
353 own, had a relatively minor role in determining species composition. However, P is a limiting nutrient for
354 most plant species and can significantly influence vegetation (DiTomasso & Aarsen 1989; Janssens et al.
355 1998; Critchley et al. 2002a, b). However, is difficult to separate the effects of P from N and other plant
356 nutrients. For example, it has been suggested that the role of P in controlling vegetation composition is
357 through interactions (ratio) with soil N and K concentrations (Bobbink 1991; Roem & Berendse 2000).
358 Unfortunately in this study no measurements of soil available N or K were made, and we do not have enough
359 information for to determine the potential complex role of P as one of the drivers of grassland species
360 composition.

361 The highest values of soil available P were recorded on sites which were seasonally flooded (Wallace et
362 al. 2002); this can be inferred from the positive relationship between soil P and waterlogging degree in the
363 DCA. Presumably this reflects increased P deposition in alluvial silt containing washed out P from fertilisers
364 used on upstream arable land and from sewage water treatment plants (Lawson pers. comm.). In addition, the
365 higher proportion of soil P in waterlogged soils can also be maintained by chemical reactions when the soils
366 are under anoxic reducing conditions (Olila & Reddy 1997). The zonation of vegetation in the mesotrophic
367 meadows is likely to be linked to both waterlogging and the inevitable nutrient addition that occurs during
368 inundation. The species-poor communities occur often in depressions, where water remains the longest time
369 and the largest proportion of sediments are deposited (Rodwell 1992).

370 The strong positive correlation between Ellenberg N values, which reflects soil fertility or biomass
371 production (Schaffers & Sýkora 2000) with P and W is probably the result of biomass increase in swards
372 with an increase P availability though inundation and a reduction in loss through decomposition in the

373 waterlogged soils. Both processes lead to a dominance of more competitive species and a greater biomass
374 production.

375 Here, soil pH had a lesser effect than W and P which contrasts with Critchley (2002a), who reported pH
376 as the main factor separating different communities and sub-communities of improved or unimproved
377 mesotrophic grasslands. This apparent discrepancy might be because of the communities sampled. Here, the
378 pH range was much greater (pH 4.5–7.0), whereas Critchley's study also included improved grasslands,
379 where soil pH might have been increased by liming. No relationship was found between Ellenberg R value
380 and soil pH, but a significant relationship was found with soil P. These results agree with those from the
381 long-term Rengen Grassland Experiment in Germany where Ellenberg R values were significantly increased
382 by P fertilizer addition (Chytrý et al. 2009). As Ellenberg R values have been considered better related to the
383 total amount of calcium present rather than to soil pH per se (Schaffers & Sýkora 2000), perhaps a
384 relationship with pH should not be expected.

385

386 *Niche investigation and its application*

387 In this study, complex coenocline derived from pCCA ordination was used for modelling species
388 responses and for obtaining measure of species niche in relation to three soil variables (W, P, pH). This
389 coenocline represents 'floristic-environment gradient' (Heikkinen 1996) assessing not only the position of
390 species to the single environmental variable, but also interactions between species in given dataset. Use of
391 complex gradients derived from ordination is more appropriate for estimation of plant niche characteristic
392 (Lawesson & Oksanen 2002; Økland 1992). Models of species niches are necessary for description of the
393 role of environment and competition in determining community composition (Austin et al. 1990). The main
394 value of this approach is that the response of a given variable can be estimated, once all other interactions
395 with other environmental variables have been removed (as covariables). The coenocline was, therefore,
396 derived from the site scores from the pCCA with all interacting variables defined as conditional or
397 covariables. The species response curves and estimates of niche parameters for modelling of species niche on
398 gradient of single soil variable were then estimated using the HOF procedure (Huisman et al. 1993). The
399 disadvantage of this approach is that the accurate values of soil variables for parameters as species optima
400 cannot be obtained in comparison with using measured values as a gradient.

401 Four groups of species were distinguished according to their position and response for each of the three
402 soil gradients. This could have a potential application for the predicting change in species composition if
403 there is a change in management regime. This can also be easier way for initial phases of targeting sites
404 under potential threat of changes in environmental conditions, when field observation based on species
405 composition can substitute expensive and time-consuming repeated measuring. Knowledge of species
406 preferences can be useful in choosing target communities for restoration schemes, and the choice of seed
407 mixtures (Gilbert et al. 2003).

408

409

Species responses to soil gradients

The majority of species were more abundant on the drier part of the waterlogging gradient, suggesting that extreme conditions of waterlogging (anoxic conditions, toxicity of Fe and Mn) restrict the occurrence and performance of species from very wet sites. Only those species with specific adaptation to waterlogging, for example through the creation of internal air-space tissues, the ability to exclude toxins from roots by their oxidation because of radial loss of oxygen or enzymatic oxidation, and ability to respire anaerobically (Etherington 1975) can prosper. The species able to withstand waterlogged conditions include (a) those with high optima on the W-axis *Deschampsia cespitosa*, *Alopecurus geniculatus*, *Senecio aquaticus*, and (b) species with increasing abundance on the W gradient *Agrostis stolonifera*, *Carex disticha*, *Carex nigra*, *Calliergonella cuspidata*. It should be noted that mesotrophic grasslands tend to occur from moist to wet conditions and so dry grasslands or meadows on strictly free-draining soils were not included in this study. Thus, the overall response of these species to water was not determined, merely the response to degree of waterlogging. Thus further studies are needed to cover a range of water regimes from extreme drought through to substantial waterlogging.

Although P was of lesser importance than W, the same pattern of species responses was found on the P gradient. Most species were more abundant at low P, almost certainly because of reduced inter-specific competition. This conforms to the general view that species diversity is increased at low soil fertility (Marrs 1993). The competitive grasses *Deschampsia cespitosa*, *Poa trivialis*, *Alopecurus geniculatus* and *Glyceria fluitans* showed a positive response to available P, and these species probably exclude other species on the more fertile soils. These species could be also use as indicators of high P availability in mesotrophic grasslands.

A positive response to P was shown mainly by grasses, but also by *Pedicularis palustris* (high optimum and tolerance). *Pedicularis palustris* belongs to a group of root hemi-parasites in the *Scrophulariaceae*, which parasitize grasses (Press & Graves 1995), thus its mineral nutrition is mainly obtained from host plant and is not directly dependent on soil nutrient content. The abundance of *Pedicularis palustris* at high concentrations of available P might reflect an indirect effect, i.e. an increased availability of suitable host species in the sward rather the soil available P itself. Its value as an indicator of high P is, therefore, disputable.

As the majority of response curves for both soil variables were unimodal symmetric or skewed, it can be concluded, that a major part of their gradients was evaluated in the study and entire niches of chosen species for mesotrophic grasslands were described. Soil pH on the other hand had a very short gradient and there were a large number of non-unimodal species responses. This may have been brought about by site selection which excluded communities at the extremes of soil pH. However, selected groups of species could be used for indicating pH changes within these mesotrophic grasslands, for example those species with decreasing responses *Filipendula ulmaria*, *Rumex acetosa* and *Glyceria fluitans* may be useful as indirect indicators of acid conditions or acidification.

447 *Relevance for conservation management*

448 The most important result from this paper has been the clear identification that site-based factors are the
449 most important environmental variables controlling species community composition in these mesotrophic
450 grasslands, and these are much greater than variables directly associated with productivity. Of course at this
451 point we do not know which of the myriad of interacting factors that are most important on any site, but they
452 must include differences in the local species pool, historic as well as present management (Wells et al. 1976;
453 Gustavsson et al. 2007; Klimek et al. 2007), and site-specific conditions, i.e. water regime and soil physico-
454 chemical properties and soil microbial properties (Balátová-Tuláčková 1966, 1968; Ejrnæs & Bruun 2000;
455 Critchley et al. 2002a; Havlová et al. 2004; Marini et al. 2007). Of particular note has been the recent
456 discovery by Gustavsson et al. (2007) that historic management signatures remain evident for centuries, and
457 being more important than some recent management practices (Marrs 2008). In spite of this, the soil factors
458 (W, P, pH) were also significant in affecting community composition, and the most common species found
459 in these grasslands were grouped into response types along each of these environmental gradients. These,
460 groups, therefore, can be used as a first approximation of environmental indicators of environmental
461 conditions in UK mesotrophic grasslands for conservation purposes.

462

463 **Acknowledgements.** We thank DEFRA and the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust for funding the data
464 collection phase of this work; Kate Barber for helping with soil collection and analysis; and Mike Prosser,
465 Hilary Wallace and Owen Mountford for assistance with the collecting the botanical data.

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484 **References**

- 485 Anon. 1995a. *Biodiversity UK Steering Group Report Vol I. Action Plans*. HMSO, London, UK.
- 486 Anon. 1995b. *Biodiversity UK Steering Group Report Vol II. Meeting the Rio Challenge*. HMSO, London, UK.
- 487 Anon. 2001. *UK Biodiversity action plan: Action plan for lowland meadows*. HMSO, London, UK.
- 488 Austin, M.P., Nicholls, A.O. & Margules C.R. 1990. Measurement of the realized qualitative niche: environmental
489 niche of five Eucalyptus species. *Ecological Monographs* 60: 161–177.
- 490 Bakker, J.P. 1989. *Nature management by grazing and cutting*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, NL.
- 491 Balátová-Tuláčková E. 1966. Synökologické Charakteristik der südmährischen Überschwemmungswiesen. *Rozpravy*
492 *Československé Akademie Věd, Řada Mat. Přír. Věd*, 76/1: 1–41.
- 493 Balátová-Tuláčková E. 1968. Grundwasserganglinien und Wiesengesellschaften (Vergleichende Studie der Wiesen aus
494 Südmähren und der Südwestslowakei). *Přírodovědné Práce Ústavů Československé Akademie Věd Brno* 2/2: 1–37.
- 495 Begon, M., Harper, J.L. & Towsend, C.R. 1996. *Ecology: Individuals, Populations and Communities*. Blackwells,
496 Oxford, UK.
- 497 Bobbink, R. 1991. Effects of nutrients enrichment in Dutch chalk grassland. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 28: 28–41.
- 498 Borcard, D., Legendre, P. & Drapeau, P. 1992. Partialling out the spatial component of ecological variation. *Ecology*
499 73: 1045–1055.
- 500 Chytrý, M., Hejčman, M., Hennekens, S.M. & Schellberg, J. 2009. Changes in vegetation types and Ellenberg indicator
501 values after 65 years of fertilizer application in the Rengen Grassland Experiment, Germany. *Applied Vegetation*
502 *Science* (in press).
- 503 Critchley, C.N.R., Chambers, B.J., Fowbert, J.A., Sanderson, R.A., Bhogal, A. & Rose, S.C. 2002a. Association
504 between lowland grassland plant communities and soil properties. *Biological Conservation* 105: 199–215.
- 505 Critchley, C.N.R., Chambers, B.J., Fowbert, J.A., Bhogal, A., Rose, S.C. & Anderson, R.A. 2002b. Plant species
506 richness, functional type and soil properties of grasslands and allied vegetation in English Environmentally
507 Sensitive Areas. *Grass and Forage Science* 57: 82–92.
- 508 Corney, P.M., Le Duc, M.G., Smart S.M., Kirby, K.J., Bunce, R.G.H. & Marrs, R.H. 2006. Relationships between the
509 species composition of forest field-layer vegetation and environmental drivers assessed using a national scale
510 survey. *Journal of Ecology* 94: 383–401.
- 511 DiTomasso, A. & Aarssen, L.W. 1989. Resource manipulations in natural vegetation: a review. *Vegetatio* 84: 9–29.
- 512 Duffey, E., Morris, M.G., Sheail, J., Ward, L.K., Wells, D.A. & Wells, T.C.E. 1974. *Grassland ecology and wildlife*
513 *management*. Chapman and Hall, London, UK.
- 514 Ejrnæs, R. & Bruun, H.H. 2000. Gradient analysis of dry grassland vegetation in Denmark. *Journal of Vegetation Science*
515 11: 573–584.
- 516 Etherington, J.R. 1974. *Environment and Plant Ecology*. John Wiley & Sons, London, UK.
- 517 Gilbert, J. 2000. *High soil phosphorus availability and the restoration of species-rich grassland*. PhD thesis, Cranfield
518 University, Silsoe, UK.
- 519 Gilbert, J.C., Gowing, D.J.G. & Bullock, R.J. 2003. Influence of seed mixture and hydrological regime on the
520 establishment of a diverse grassland sward at a site with high phosphorus availability. *Restoration Ecology* 11:
521 424–435.

522 Grace, J.B. 1999. The factors controlling species density in herbaceous plant communities: an assessment. *Perspectives*
523 *in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* 2: 1–28.

524 Grace, J.B. & Pugsek, B.H. 1997. A structural model of plant species richness and its application to a coastal wetland.
525 *American Naturalist* 149: 436–460.

526 Grime, J.P. 1979. *Plant strategies and vegetation processes*. Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK.

527 Gustavsson, E., Lennartsson, T. & Emanuelsson, M. 2007. Land use more than 200 years ago explains current grassland
528 plant diversity in a Swedish agricultural landscape. *Biological Conservation*. 138: 47–59.

529 Havlová, M., Chytrý, M. & Tichý, L. 2004. Diversity of hay meadows in the Czech Republic: major types and
530 environmental gradients. *Phytocoenologia* 34: 551–567.

531 Heikkinen, R.K. 1996. Predicting patterns of vascular plant species richness with composite variables: a meso-scale
532 study in Finnish Lapland. *Vegetatio* 126: 151–165.

533 Hill, M.O. 1996. *TABLEFIT version 1.0 for identification of vegetation types*. Institute of Terrestrial Ecology,
534 Huntingdon, UK.

535 Hill, M.O., Mountford, J.O., Roy, D.B. & Bunce, R.G.H. 1999. *Ellenberg's indicator values for British plants: Ecofact*
536 *Vol 2 Technical Annex*. HMSO, Norwich, UK.

537 Huisman, J., Olff, H. & Fresco, L.F.M. 1993. A hierarchical set of model for species response analysis. *Journal of*
538 *Vegetation Science* 4: 37–46.

539 Huston, M.A. 1979. A general hypothesis of species diversity. *American Naturalist* 113: 81–101.

540 Janssens, F., Peeters, A., Tallowin, J.R.B., Bakker, J.P., Bekker, R.M., Fillat, F. & Oomes, M.J M. 1998. Relationship
541 between soil chemical factors and grassland diversity. *Plant and Soil* 202: 69–78.

542 Kalusová, V. 2008. *Factors affecting plant community composition in mesotrophic grassland in the UK*. BSc thesis,
543 University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.

544 Klimek, S., Kemmermann, A.R., Hofmann, M. & Isselstein, J. 2007. Plant species richness and composition in
545 managed grasslands: The relative importance of field management and environmental factors. *Biological*
546 *Conservation* 134: 559–570.

547 Lawesson, J.E. & Oksanen, J. 2002. Niche characteristics of Danish woody species as derived from coenoclines.
548 *Journal of Vegetation Science* 13: 279–290.

549 Loreau, M., Neem, S., Inchausti, P., Bengtsson, J., Grime, J.P., Hector, A., Hooper, D.U., Huston, M.A., Raffaelli, D.,
550 Schmid, B., Tilman, D. & Wardle, D.A. 2001. Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: current knowledge and
551 future challenges. *Science* 294: 804–808.

552 Lyons, G. & Ausden, M. 2005. Raising water levels to revert arable land to grazing marsh at Berney Marshes RSPB
553 Reserve, Norfolk, England. *Conservation Evidence* 2: 47–49.

554 MAFF 1986. *ADAS reference book 427: the analysis of agricultural materials*. HMSO, London, UK.

555 Marini, L., Scotton, M., Klimek, S., Isselstein, J. & Pecile, A. 2007. Effects of local factors on plant species richness and
556 composition of Alpine meadows. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 119: 281–288.

557 Marrs, R.H. 1993. Soil fertility and nature conservation in Europe: theoretical considerations and practical management
558 solutions. *Advances in Ecological Research* 24: 241–300.

559 Marrs, R.H. 2008. Landscape as a Palimpsest: grassland sustainability in Sweden. *Biological Conservation* 141: 1445–
560 1446.

561 Marrs, R.H. & Le Duc M.G. 2000. Factors controlling vegetation change in long-term experiments designed to restore
562 heathland in Breckland, UK. *Applied Vegetation Science* 3: 135–146.

563 Mittelbach, G.G., Steiner, C.F., Scheiner, S.M., Gross, K.L., Reynolds, H.L., Waide, R.B., Willig, M.R., Dodson, S.I. &
564 Gough, L. 2001. What is the observed relationship between species richness and productivity? *Ecology* 82: 2381–
565 2396.

566 Økland, R.H. 1992. Studies in SE Fennoscandian mires: relevance to ecological theory. *Journal of Vegetation Science*
567 3: 279–284.

568 Økland, R.H. 1999. On the variation explained by ordination and constrained ordination axes. *Journal of Vegetation*
569 *Science* 10: 131–136.

570 Økland, R.H. 2000. Understorey development in North Finnish *Picea* forests after disturbance: re-analysis of Sirén's
571 data. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 11: 533–546.

572 Økland, R.H. & Eilertsen, O. 1994. Canonical correspondence analysis with variation partitioning: some comments and
573 an application. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 5: 117–126.

574 Oksanen, J. 2004. *Gradient Analysis of Vegetation (gravy) software, version 0.0-21*. URL:
575 <http://cc.oulu.fi/~jarioksa/softhelp/sofalist.html>.

576 Oksanen, J. 2005. *Multivariate Analysis of Ecological Communities in R: vegan tutorial, version 1.6-10 for Windows*.
577 URL: <http://cc.oulu.fi/~jarioksa/softhelp/vegan.html>.

578 Oksanen, J. & Minchin, P. R. 2002. Continuum theory revisited: what shape are species responses along ecological
579 gradients? *Ecological Modelling* 157: 119–129.

580 Olila, O.G. & Reddy, K.R. 1997. Influence of redox potential on phosphorus uptake by sediments in two sub-tropical
581 eutrophic lakes. *Hydrobiologia* 345: 45–57.

582 O'Sullivan, A.N. 1968). *The lowland grasslands (Molinio-Arrhenatheretea) of County Limerick*. Irish Vegetation
583 Studies, 2. An Foran Talúntais, Dublin.

584 Press, M.C. & Graves, J.D. 1995. *Parasitic Plants*. Chapman & Hall, London, UK.

585 R Development Core Team 2004. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for
586 Statistical computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: <http://www.r-project.org>.

587 Rodwell, J.S. 1992. *British Plant Communities, Vol 3 Grasslands and Montane Communities*. CUP, Cambridge, UK.

588 Rodwell, J.S. 2000. *British Plant Communities, Vol 5 Maritime Communities and Vegetation of Open Habitats*. CUP,
589 Cambridge, UK.

590 Rodwell, J.S., Dring, J.C., Averis, A.B.G., Protor, M.C.F., Malloch, A.J.C., Schaminée, J.H.J. & Dargie, T.C.D. (2000)
591 *Review of coverage of the National Vegetation Classification. JNCC Report. No 302*. JNCC, Peterborough, UK.

592 Roem, W. J. & Berendse, F. 2000. Soil acidity and nutrient supply ratio as possible factors determining changes in plant
593 species diversity in grassland and heathland communities. *Biological Conservation* 92: 151–161.

594 Schaffers, A.P. & Sýkora, K.V. 2000. Reliability of Ellenberg indicator values for moisture, nitrogen and soil reaction:
595 a comparison with field measurements. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 11: 225–244.

596 Schaminée, J.H.J., Weeda, E.J. & Westhoff, V. 1996. *De Vegetatie van Nederland, 3*. Opulus Press, Uppsala.

- Silvertown, J., Dodd, M. & Gowing, D. 2001. Phylogeny and the niche structure of meadow plant communities. *Journal of Ecology* 89: 428–435.
- Smith, R.S. & Rushton, S.P. 1994. The effects of grazing management on the vegetation of mesotrophic (meadow) grassland in Northern England. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 31: 13–24.
- Smith, R.S., Shiel, R.S., Millward, D. & Corkhill, P. 2000. The interactive effects of management on the productivity and plant community structure of an upland meadow: an 8-year field trial. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 37: 1029–1043.
- Stace, C.A. 1997. *New Flora of the British Isles*. CUP, Cambridge, UK.
- StatSoft Inc. 2004. *STATISTICA C*, v. 7.1. www.StatSoft.cz.
- Tichý, L. 2002. JUICE, software for vegetation classification. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 13: 451–453.
- Tilman, D. 1982. *Resource competition and community structure*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, USA.
- ter Braak, C.J.F. & Šmilauer, P. 2005. *CANOCO reference manual and CanoDraw for Windows user's guide. Software for Canonical Community Ordination* (version 4.5). Biometris, Wageningen & České Budějovice, CZ.
- Wallace, M.V., Rodwell, J.S., Mountford, J.O. & Spoor, G. 2002. *The water-regime requirements and the response to hydrological change of grassland plant communities*. Final report to DEFRA, Project BD1310, DEFRA, London, UK.
- Wells, T.C.E., Sheail, J., Ball, D.F. & Ward, L.K. 1976. Ecological studies on the Porton Ranges: relationships between vegetation, soils and land-use history. *Journal of Ecology* 64: 589–626.

Table 1. Description of the mesotrophic grassland communities found at each site; (a) site locations, number of quadrats sampled and the NVC mesotrophic grassland communities found at each site, and (b) a brief description of the NVC communities detected (after Rodwell 1992, 2000; Rodwell et al. 2000). NVC communities were fitted using TABLEFIT (Hill 1996).

(a)

Site	Grid reference	Year sampled	Number of quadrats sampled	Main vegetation type	NVC Mesotrophic grassland communities ascribed to quadrat data
Berney Marshes	TG465055	1998	20	<i>Lolio-Potentillion</i>	MG13
Cricklade	SU096958	1998	20	<i>Alopecurion</i>	MG4, 5, 7c, OV28
East Harnham	SU151289	1999	10	<i>Calthion</i>	MG8
Moorlinch	ST393362	1999	25	<i>Calthion</i>	MG8 ¹ , Ag/Cx
Portholme	TL238708	1999	20	<i>Alopecurion</i>	MG4, OV28
Southlake	ST364301	1998	19	<i>Alopecurion/Calthion</i>	MG7c, Ag/Cx,
Stonygillfoot	NY926263	1999	11	<i>Polygono-Trisetion</i>	MG3, 8
Tadham	ST416455	1998	24	<i>Cynosurion/Calthion</i>	MG5 ² , 8 ¹ , OV28
Upton Ham	SO860400	1999	25	<i>Alopecurion</i>	MG4, 7c, OV28
Wet Moor	ST435245	1999	20	<i>Calthion</i>	Ag/Cx

(b)

NVC Community	Brief description
MG3	<i>Anthoxanthum odoratum</i> – <i>Geranium sylvaticum</i> grassland: Northern hay meadow
MG4	<i>Alopecurus pratensis</i> – <i>Sanguisorba officinalis</i> grassland: Flood meadow
MG5	<i>Cynosurus cristatus</i> – <i>Centaurea nigra</i> grassland: Old hay meadow
MG6	<i>Lolium perenne</i> – <i>Cynosurus cristatus</i> grassland: Ordinary pasture
MG7c	<i>Lolium perenne</i> – <i>Alopecurus pratensis</i> – <i>Festuca pratensis</i> grassland leys
MG8	<i>Cynosurus cristatus</i> – <i>Caltha palustris</i> grassland: Water meadow
MG13	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> – <i>Alopecurus geniculatus</i> grassland: Inundation grassland
OV 28	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> – <i>Ranunculus repens</i> community
Ag/Cx	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i> – <i>Carex nigra</i> community

¹ similar to *Ranunculo-Senecionetum* (Schaminée et al. 1996)

² similar to *Cynosurion* (O’Sullivan 1968)

³ Ag/Cx, *Agrostis stolonifera* – *Carex nigra* community (Rodwell et al. 2000).

655 **Table 2.** Spearman rank correlation coefficients of (1) measured soil variables: W is waterlogging
 656 (m.weeks), P is Olsen phosphorus ($\mu\text{g P. g}^{-1}$), pH and (2) DCA axes scores and Ellenberg indicator values.
 657 Significance: *** $P<0.001$; * $P<0.05$; n.s. non significant.
 658

Contrast	Spearman r_s	Signif.	Contrast	Spearman r_s	Signif.
P & Light	0.116	n.s.	DCA1 & Light	0.307	***
P & Moisture	0.149	*	DCA1 & Moisture	0.728	***
P & Reaction	0.394	***	DCA1 & Reaction	0.220	**
P & Nutrients	0.567	***	DCA1 & Nutrients	0.538	***
pH & Light	0.027	n.s.	DCA2 & Light	-0.088	n.s.
pH & Moisture	-0.112	n.s.	DCA2 & Moisture	0.296	***
pH & Reaction	0.084	n.s.	DCA2 & Reaction	-0.557	***
pH & Nutrients	-0.281	***	DCA2 & Nutrients	-0.659	***
W & Light	0.269	***			
W & Moisture	0.663	***			
W & Reaction	0.089	n.s.			
W & Nutrients	0.365	***			

659
 660
 661 **Table 3.** The relative contributions of three sets of environmental variables in explaining species
 662 composition in Variation Partitioning. Total Inertia (TI) is value of constrained inertia in the CCA; Var the
 663 variation explained by the variable set as a % of TI; Pseudo-F is value of a Monte-Carlo test with 999
 664 permutations. Significance: *** $P<0.001$; n.s. non significant; n.c.= not calculable, i.e. variation accounted
 665 for by variable < variation accounted for by covariables.
 666

Groups / Variables	Including variability shared with other groups, Conditional variable=Time			Excluding variability shared with other groups		
	Inertia	Variation (%)	Pseudo-F	Inertia	Variation (%)	Pseudo-F
Total	6.3219					
All (Site, Geog, Soil)	1.8004	28.48	4.053***			
Site	1.4533	22.99	4.545***	0.7986	12.63	3.082***
Geography (Northing, Easting)	0.4424	7.00	4.558***	0.0139	0.22	0.377 n.s.
Climate (Temperature, Sunshine, Rainfall, Frost)	1.1750	18.59	4.628***	n.c.	0	n.c.
Soil (P, W, pH)	0.6364	10.07	4.524***	0.3331	5.27	2.999***
P	0.1733	2.74	3.411***	0.0635	0.97	1.714***
W	0.3438	5.44	6.965***	0.1166	1.84	3.150***
pH	0.1569	2.48	3.080***	0.0916	1.45	2.474***

679
680
681

Fig. 2. pCCA biplots illustrating species composition of mesotrophic grasslands in relation to (a) three soil variables P is soil phosphorus ($\mu\text{g P. g}^{-1}$), W is waterlogging (m.weeks) and pH; (b) waterlogging W; (c) phosphorus P; (d) soil pH. Species were drawn without overlap with priority of a higher abundance in the dataset; abbreviations of species names can be found in E-Appendix II.

Fig. 3. Species response curves with respect to waterlogging (W) represented by site scores from constrained ordination (W is explanatory variable and all other environmental variables are removed as conditional); HOF models II, III, IV, V are shown. Abbreviations of species names are: Agrsto – *Agrostis stolonifera*, Cardis – *Carex disticha*, Carnig – *Carex nigra*, Calcus – *Calliergonella cuspidata*, Rumace – *Rumex acetosa*, Hollan – *Holcus lanatus*, Ranacr – *Ranunculus acris*, Cerfon – *Cerastium fontanum*, Antodo – *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, Triprat – *Trifolium pratense*, Cyncri – *Cynosurus cristatus*, Lolper – *Lolium perenne*, Trirep – *Trifolium repens*, Poatri – *Poa trivialis*, Alogen – *Alopecurus geniculatus*, Senaqu – *Senecio aquaticus*, Desces – *Deschampsia cespitosa*, Alopra – *Alopecurus pratensis*, Sanoff – *Sanquisorba officinalis*, Leoaut – *Leontodon autumnalis*, Horsec – *Hordeum secalinum*, Cennig – *Centaurea nigra*, Brorac – *Bromus racemosus*, Filulm – *Filipendula ulmaria*, Tarvul – *Taraxacum sect. vulgaria*, Plalan – *Plantago lanceolata*, Fesrub – *Festuca rubra*.

Figure 4. Tolerance intervals for species with unimodal symmetric or skewed response (IV and V HOF models) on gradient of waterlogging W (site scores from constrained pCCA ordination with W as explanatory variable and all other variables removed as conditional); location of optimum (u) and extent of tolerance for each species is shown; species are sort according to the decreasing height (top) value.

Fig. 5. Species response curves with respect to soil phosphorus (P) represented by site scores from constrained ordination (P is explanatory variable and all other environmental variables are removed as conditional); HOF models II, III, IV, V are shown. Abbreviations of species names are: Triptra – *Trifolium pratense*, Senaqu – *Senecio aquaticus*, Cerfon – *Cerastium fontanum*, Ranacr – *Ranunculus acris*, Sanoff – *Sanguisorba officinalis*, Horsec – *Hordeum secalinum*, Brorac – *Bromus racemosus*, Fespra – *Festuca pratensis*, Filulm – *Filipendula ulmaria*, Rumace – *Rumex acetosa*, Trirep – *Trifolium repens*, Fesrub – *Festuca rubra*, Lolper – *Lolium perenne*, Antodo – *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, Hollan – *Holcus lanatus*, Tarvul – *Taraxacum* sect. *vulgaria*, Cyncri – *Cynosurus cristatus*, Carnig – *Carex nigra*, Plalan – *Plantago lanceolata*, Calcus – *Calliergonella cuspidata*, Leoaut – *Leontodon autumnalis*, Cennig – *Centaurea nigra*, Cardis – *Carex disticha*, Desces – *Deschampsia cespitosa*, Pedpal – *Pedicularis palustris*, Poatri – *Poa trivialis*, Alogen – *Alopecurus geniculatus*, Glyflu – *Glyceria fluitans*.

Fig. 6. Species response curves with respect to soil pH represented by site scores from constrained ordination (pH is explanatory variable and all other environmental variables are removed as conditional); HOF models II, III, IV, V are shown. Abbreviations of species names are: Cardis – *Carex distans*, Tarvul – *Taraxacum* sect. *vulgaria*, Senaqu – *Senecio aquaticus*, Horsec – *Hordeum secalinum*, Leoaut – *Leontodon autumnalis*, Poatri – *Poa trivialis*, Desces – *Deschampsia cespitosa*, Antodo – *Anthoxanthum odoratum*, Calcus – *Calliergonella cuspidata*, Ranrep – *Ranunculus repens*, Agrsto – *Agrostis stolonifera*, Ranacr – *Ranunculus acris*, Alopra – *Alopecurus pratensis*, Lolper – *Lolium perenne*, Sanoff – *Sanguisorba officinalis*, Alogen – *Alopecurus geniculatus*, Filulm – *Filipendula ulmaria*, Rumace – *Rumex acetosa*, Glyflu – *Glyceria fluitans*.