

# Food web structure and energy flux dynamics, but not taxonomic richness, influence microbial ecosystem functions in a Sphagnum-dominated peatland

Vincent E.J. Jassey, Owen Petchey, Philippe Binet, Alexandre Buttler, Geneviève Chiapusio, Frédéric Delarue, Fatima Laggoun-Défarge, Daniel Gilbert, Edward A.D. Mitchell, Janna Barel

#### ▶ To cite this version:

Vincent E.J. Jassey, Owen Petchey, Philippe Binet, Alexandre Buttler, Geneviève Chiapusio, et al.. Food web structure and energy flux dynamics, but not taxonomic richness, influence microbial ecosystem functions in a Sphagnum-dominated peatland. European Journal of Soil Biology, 2023, 118, pp.103532. 10.1016/j.ejsobi.2023.103532. insu-04182721

# HAL Id: insu-04182721 https://insu.hal.science/insu-04182721

Submitted on 10 Oct 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# 1 Food web structure and energy flux dynamics, but not taxonomic richness, influence

## 2 microbial ecosystem functions in a *Sphagnum*-dominated peatland

3

- 4 Vincent E.J. Jassey<sup>1</sup>\*, Owen L. Petchey<sup>2</sup>, Philippe Binet<sup>3</sup>, Alexandre Buttler<sup>4</sup>, Geneviève Chiapusio<sup>5</sup>,
- 5 Frédéric Delarue<sup>6</sup>, Fatima Laggoun-Défarge<sup>7,8,9</sup>, Daniel Gilbert<sup>3</sup>, Edward A.D. Mitchell<sup>10</sup>, Janna M. Barel<sup>1,11</sup>

6

- 7 Laboratoire Ecology Fontionelle et Environnement, Université Paul Sabatier III, CNRS, F-31062 Toulouse,
- 8 France
- 9 <sup>2</sup> Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
- <sup>3</sup> Chrono-environnement UMR6249, CNRS Université de Franche-Comté, F-25000, Besançon, France
- <sup>4</sup> School of Architecture, Civil and Environmental Engineering (ENAC), Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de
- 12 Lausanne (EPFL), Station 2, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland
- <sup>5</sup> Laboratoire CARRTEL, Université Savoie Mont Blanc, INRAE, F-73376 Le Bourget du Lac cedex, France
- <sup>6</sup> CNRS, EPHE, PSL, UMR 7619 METIS, Sorbonne Université, 4 place Jussieu, 75005 Paris Cedex 05, France
- <sup>7</sup> Université d'Orléans, ISTO, UMR 7327, 45071 Orléans, France; <sup>8</sup> BRGM, ISTO, UMR 7327, BP 36009,
- 16 45060 Orléans, France, 9 CNRS/INSU, ISTO, UMR 7327, 45071 Orléans, France
- 17 Laboratory of Soil Biodiversity, University of Neuchâtel, Rue Emile-Argand 11, CH-2000 Neuchâtel,
- 18 Switzerland
- 19 11 Aquatic Ecology & Environmental Biology, Radboud Institute for Biological and Environmental Sciences,
- 20 Faculty of Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, AJ 6525 Nijmegen, The Netherlands

21 22

\* corresponding author: vincent.jassey@univ-tlse3.fr

23

- 24 Authorship: VEJJ conceived the study in close consultation with JMB and OLP. DG and FLD obtained the
- 25 field permit for sampling. VEJJ, PB, AB, GC, FD, DG, EADM and FLD did the sampling. VEJJ performed
- 26 the microscopic analyses with the help of DG and EADM. AB performed the vegetation survey. PB and FD
- 27 performed the enzymatic and decomposition analyses, respectively. VEJJ and JMB developed the food web
- 28 modelling framework with the help of OLP. VEJJ performed numerical analyses and wrote the first draft of
- 29 the manuscript. All authors reviewed and contributed to the final form of the manuscript.

30 31

- OrcIDs
- 32 Vincent E.J. Jassey (0000-0002-1450-2437); Owen L. Petchey (0000-0002-7724-1633), Philippe Binet (0000-
- 33 0003-2272-618X), Alexandre Buttler (0000-0001-5900-4573), Geneviève Chiapusio (0000-0003-0481-
- 34 141X), Frederic Delarue (0000-0001-7054-612X), Fatima Laggoun-Défarge (0000-0002-2945-1978), Daniel
- 35 Gilbert (0000-0001-9956-345X), Edward A. D. Mitchell (0000-0003-0358-506X), Janna M. Barel (0000-
- 36 0001-8520-8289)

3738

Running title (45 characters): Microbial food web-ecosystem functions linkages

# 39 Highlights

- Soil microbial food webs determine soil biodiversity and ecosystem functioning
- What aspect of microbial food web underpin ecosystem functions is unclear
- Biomass and energy flux dynamics, but not taxonomic richness, influence peatland ecosystem
- 43 functions
- The inclusion of microbial food web properties in biogeochemical models is fundamental

## **Abstract**

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

Soil microbial communities are vital for multiple ecosystem processes and services. In particular, soil microbial food webs are key determinants of soil biodiversity, functioning and stability. Unclear, however, is how structural features of food webs, such as species richness and turnover, biomass and energy transfer across trophic levels, influence the provisioning and stability of ecosystem functioning. Here, we explore the relationships between different facets of microbial food web structure (e.g. species richness, connectance, biomass and energy fluxes across trophic levels) and ecosystem functions (i.e. decomposition and microbial enzyme activity) across different habitats and depths in a peatland. We show that no aspect of taxonomic richness directly explained variation in ecosystem functions. Instead, we find that trophic interactions between basal species and primary consumers, and especially increasing connectance, biomass and energy flux transiting from decomposers and phototrophs to algivores, bacterivores and fungivores, enhance ecosystem functions in the peatland. These findings demonstrate that focusing on taxonomic diversity without explicit inclusion of food web structure and energy flows therein gives an incomplete and uninformative comprehension of relationships between biodiversity and ecosystem functioning, at least in peatlands. Our findings further suggest that the inclusion of soil microbial food webs in large-scale biogeochemical models is of fundamental importance to provide the necessary guidance for managing and mitigating the effects of environmental change.

63

64

67

# Keywords

- 65 Biodiversity-ecosystem functioning, ecosystem function variation, energy channels, food web
- 66 modelling, microbiome, soil functioning, phototrophs, decomposition, predation

## 1. Introduction

The current erosion of biodiversity raises concerns regarding the provisioning and stability of ecosystem functioning. A large body of experimental studies showed the positive, but saturating, effect of increasing biodiversity on ecosystem functioning across different groups of organisms, trophic levels, and ecosystems [1–6]. These findings provided fundamental knowledge in understanding the link between diversity and ecosystem services and offered novel insights for predicting the consequences of global biodiversity loss on ecosystems [7,8]. However, studies examining the effect of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning are often limited in terms of the diversity tested. For example, many studies only involved levels of species richness far lower than in natural conditions— especially in soils [9]— and/or examined biodiversity effects only within a single trophic level [6]. These limitations constrain the practical importance of any revealed relationship between diversity and ecosystem functioning because real systems are often very diverse and have multiple trophic levels [6,10,11].

Recently, ecologists began to remove this limitation by exploring the effect of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning in multitrophic systems [4,12,13], sometimes highlighting hidden relationships between biodiversity and ecosystem functioning [10]. Although these studies have provided fundamental advances about how the structure of complex ecological systems modulates ecosystem functioning [14,15], they are often based on unrealistically simplified food chains or foodweb configurations [10,16] but see [17,18]. Furthermore, a number of these studies typically investigated trophic structures with qualitative feeding relationships assessed in terms of network connectance and nestedness [19,20], ignoring important aspects of food web structure such as biomass distribution across trophic levels, omnivory, intraguild predation, and fluxes of energy along trophic links.

Such structural features of food webs have long been demonstrated to have large impacts on food-web stability [21,22], but their effect on the provisioning and stability of ecosystem functioning is still poorly understood [15,21,23,24]. Yet changes in trophic structure facets can influence ecosystem functioning [23,25]. For example, previous work showed that ecosystem functions such as productivity decrease when consumer diversity increases and/or when the diversity of basal species decreases [10,15]. Other studies suggested that shifts in the biomass of basal species and/or predators can destabilize connected ecosystem functions such as primary production or carbon mineralization through top-down or bottom-up effects [26–28]. Further, energy fluxes across trophic levels which express energy consumption by different trophic groups [29] can have feedback effects on basal consumers and the ecosystem processes they drive such as C, N, and P mineralization rates [28,30–32]. What trophic structure facet best predict rates of ecosystem functioning is however poorly

known, and many links between structural features of food webs and ecosystem functions still remain to be tested.

Despite an increasing focus on understanding whether and how structural features of food webs can determine ecosystem functioning, very little concentration emerged on soil systems. The largest body of evidence comes from modelled and experimental studies focusing on aquatic systems, plants, and animals [33,34], often leaving aside soil microbiomes (but see [5,30,31]. This imbalance is concerning given that soils are among the most diverse ecosystems on the planet with millions of species of bacteria, archaea, fungi, protists, and metazoan occupying various trophic levels in soil food webs [35–37]. Although relatively rare, observational evidence shows that soil microbial diversity can determine numerous ecosystem functions [12,38]. However, data are relatively scarce for the relationship between multitrophic soil communities, including bacteria, fungi, protists, and metazoan, and ecosystem functions [5]. Moreover, information about what soil microbial trophic features determine ecosystem functions is also lacking. A rigorous assessment of the role of qualitative and quantitative structural features of soil microbial food web in regulating ecosystem functions is urgently needed to better understand the consequences of soil biodiversity losses for the maintenance of ecosystem functioning and services that are critical for global ecosystem sustainability.

Here, we used an observational field study to identify what structural features of the microbial food web (e.g. richness, connectance, biomass, and energy fluxes across trophic levels) underpin ecosystem functioning. We conducted a soil microbiome analysis across twelve natural peatland plots equally divided between a dry and a wet area (see details in section 2.1). In each plot, we analysed soil microbiome (including bacteria, fungi, protists, and metazoans) at three different depths as decreasing light availability and increasing peat moisture are likely influencing microbial communities and hence food web structures and properties [39,40]. We chose such a multi-spatial approach to simulate changes in microbial richness, diversity, and biomass [39,41], and so the food web structure. Using a machine learning approach to uncover microbial food webs from species lists and traits [42], we obtained plot-and depth-scale food webs (12 plots x 3 depths = 36 food webs in total). We also obtained data for two main ecosystem functions that are influenced by soil microorganisms and that correspond to key components of peatland ecosystem services—organic matter decomposition and soil enzyme activity. We aimed at answering two questions: 1) How do structural features of microbial food web vary along a depth profile and between wet and dry areas? 2) What structural feature of the microbial food web relates to ecosystem functions best?

#### 

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1 Study site and sampling

The research was conducted in an undisturbed *Sphagnum*-dominated peatland; Le Forbonnet peatland (Jura Mountains, north-eastern France (46°49'35", 6°10'20"E). Cold winters (on average -1.4 °C) and mild summers (on average 14.6 °C) characterized the site. The annual mean temperature measured at the site over the last fifteen years was 6.5 °C and the annual precipitation was 1200 mm (https://data-snot.cnrs.fr/data-access/). The site is characterized by two dominant and adjacent areas. The first area (hereafter "WET") was a transitional Sphagnum-dominated poor fen, relatively flat, homogeneous, and wet (Fig. S1). This area was characterized by a moss cover dominated by Sphagnum fallax, and to a lesser extent by vascular plants such as Eriophorum vaginatum, Vaccinum oxycoccus, and Andromeda polifolia. The second sampling area (hereafter "DRY") was a Sphagnum bog directly adjacent to the poor fen area. Patterns of hummocks with S. magellanicum, V. oxycoccos, E. vaginatum and Calluna vulgaris, and hollows with S. fallax, Carex rostrata and A. polifolia characterized the DRY area. The terms "WET" and "DRY" are used to denote the existence of hydrological, microtopographic, and vegetation gradients driven by the decrease of the water table depth, the increasing microtopography, and the increase of plant diversity and abundance of vascular plants between WET and DRY microhabitats [43] (Fig. S1). Commonly found in Sphagnumdominated peatlands, these two areas are representative of peatlands both in terms of microtopography, water table depth, and vegetation [44].

In WET and DRY areas, we selected six homogeneous and independent plots (50 x 50 cm; twelve plots in total; see section 2.7) based on their microtopography, water table depth and vegetation cover (Fig. S1). On June 26<sup>th</sup> 2008, samples of *Sphagnum fallax* were collected in each plot. The minimum distance between the two closest plots was 7m and the maximal distance was 37 m. *S. fallax* shoots were collected in each plot around 10 permanent markers for microbial and function analyses (see below). The goal of this sampling design was to obtain a composite sample from each plot and avoid any bias due to micro-spatial heterogeneity [41].

#### 2.2 Microbial abundances and biomasses

S. fallax shoots were separated immediately in the field into three depths: 0-3 cm (living segments) and 3-6 cm (early decaying segments) and 6-9 cm (dead segments) from the capitulum. Then, the samples were fixed in 20 mL glutaraldehyde (2% final concentration) and stored at 4°C in the dark. Microorganisms were extracted from Sphagnum mosses following [39]. Briefly, each sample was

shaken for 1 min, followed by pressing the mosses by hand to extract liquid. This first filtrate was kept in a capped tube. Subsequently 20 ml of glutaraldehyde (2%) was added to the mosses, shaken for 1 min, and pressed again. This second filtrate was left for 8 hours at 4°C to sediment, after which time the supernatant was added to the mosses while the bottom was added to the first filtrate. The process of shaking, pressing, and sedimentation was repeated six times, each time using the supernatant from the previous sedimentation. At each iteration, the sediment was added to the initial solution to obtain a final sample of 40 ml. The remaining fraction of Sphagnum was dried at 80 °C for 48h and weighed to express microbial density and biomass in grams of dry mass (DM) of Sphagnum. The bacterial abundance was quantified by flow cytometry (bacterial counts) and epifluorescence microscopy (bacterial size). For the estimations, 1 ml sub-samples were filtered using a mesh (pores size: 10  $\mu$ m). The resulting filtrates were stained with SYBR Green (0.1  $\times$  final concentration), incubated in the dark for 15 min, and run on a flow cytometer (FACScalibur, Novocyte) at a low speed with a count rate not exceeding 5,000 events.s<sup>-1</sup>. Epifluorescence microscopy was used to determine the size of bacteria: 1 ml sub-samples were stained with DAPI (4,6- diamino- 2- phenylindole; 3 µg ml<sup>-1</sup> final concentration), incubated in the dark for 15 min, filtered on 0.2  $\mu$ m black membrane filters, and examined by fluorescence microscopy at 1,000× magnification. Bacteria sizes were determined automatically using the ImageJ software. The abundance of fungi, phototrophs (microalgae and cyanobacteria), primary consumers (flagellates, ciliates, rotifers, and nematodes), and top-predators (testate amoebae), as well as their identification to species-level when possible, was carried out using a 3- ml subsample and inverted microscopy (×400, Utermöhl method). For fungi, the number and length of hyphae and spores were quantified. We chose that approach because our aim was to estimate fungal biomass, for which estimation using molecular methods is currently limited [45]. The abundance of each species (or group) was then converted into biovolume (µm3), calculated based on geometrical shapes using dimensions measured under the microscope (length or diameter; width, and height) [46]. Biovolumes were then converted to biomass (µg C) using conversion factors as given in [46]. The abundance data were then expressed into carbon biomass, in micrograms of C per gram of Sphagnum dry mass (µg C/g DM).

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

#### 2.3 Ecosystem functions

Total phenoloxidase activity was quantified as a proxy of soil enzyme activity in each plot and depth. We chose this enzyme as a proxy because of its crucial role in peatland C cycling [47,48]. Following Jassey et al. (2011a), phenoloxidases were extracted from 3g of fresh *Sphagnum* shoots in 50 mL extraction solution containing 0.1 M CaCl<sub>2</sub>, 0.05% Tween 80 and 20g of polyvinylpolypyrrolidone. The samples were shaken at room temperature for 1h on a reciprocal shaker (120 rpm), centrifuged

at 10,000g for 10 min and filtered through 1.2 µm Whatman GF/D filters, and concentrated for 24h in dialysis tubes (10 kDa molecular mass cut-off) covered with polyethylene glycol until a final volume of 1/10 of the initial volume. Enzymatic activities were measured in microplates with L-DOPA (10mM) as substrate. The plates were incubated at 23°C for 24h, and L-DOPA oxidation rates were measured every hour using a spectrophotometer at 460 nm. For each plot, a control with boiled enzyme extraction (2h at 90°C) was used. Enzyme activities were calculated by subtracting the mean absorbance of controls from the mean absorbance of enzyme extracts. Phenoloxidase activities were expressed in enzymatic units (U) defined as 1 nmol of substrate oxidized per hour per gram dry mass.

As a proxy of the organic matter decomposition rate, micro-morphological analyses were performed using light microscopy to quantify the percentage of well-preserved plant tissues in the peat [50]. Bulk peat samples were taken at the same depth as microbial biomass and mounted as smear slides and examined at 20 and 50x magnifications. The plant surfaces covered by primary organic micro-remains were quantified with a reticulated eyepiece on a total of 3000-5000 items per sample.

## 2.4 Inferring microbial food webs and food web metrics

Microbial feeding interactions were inferred using a trait-matching and taxonomic approach and following the workflow developed by [42]. Using a database comprising 27,060 microbial feeding links for 164 taxa and 34 predictors including six taxonomic variables (Species, Genus, Family, Order, Phylum, and Kingdom) and eleven traits (Organism type, Nourishment, Feeding group, Morphology, Lifestyle, Locomotion, Movement, Feeding strategy, Body length, Body width, and Biovolume), we trained a Boosted-regression tree model to predict microbial feeding links in each plot and depth from microbial species lists. The food webs are resolved at the species level, except for bacteria and fungi which remained at their generic group level. The boosted-regression tree algorithm was chosen among five other machine-learning algorithms because it was the most accurate and robust for predicting microbial feeding interactions (see [42] for details). Following food web inferences, we pruned the binary food webs based on the abundance of the prey and consumers and link strength calculations (see details in [42]).

To characterize how various nodes and connections between nodes are arranged in each food webs, we calculated seven unweighted food web metrics, including the number of species (S), connectance (C), generality (G), vulnerability (V), shortest path length (SPL), short-weighted trophic level (TL), the degree of omnivory (OI), averaged food chain length (FCL), and the proportion of basal (Ba), intermediate (Int) and top species (Pred), as well as vulnerability SD and generality SD [51,52]. These metrics were chosen because they relate to the vertical (trophic level, omnivory) and

the horizontal (generality, vulnerability) dimensions of the food webs and to their complexity (species richness, connectance). In addition, we calculated weighted metrics to account for the magnitude of feeding interactions, i.e. link strength, namely the average strength of links (st), the average strength distribution among links (ps), the weighted shortest path length (dist\_w), the transitivity (trans), the average strength of each node's connection (neigh), the modularity (mod), the sum of link weights (flow), the global efficiency (eff), the node-weighted generality (nwG) and vulnerability (nwV), and node-weighted trophic level (nwT). Node-weighted generality and vulnerability are the biomass-weighted averages of prey per predator and of predators per prey, respectively, whilst the node-weighted trophic level is the average of the trophic level weighted by the biomass. More details on these metrics can be found in [42,51,52].

## 2.5 Calculation of energy flux in food webs

The flux of energy in food webs was estimated by calculating metabolic rates from the body mass, assimilation efficiencies, and energy transfer between trophic levels [29,53] and using the *fluxweb* R package [53]. In short, this approach assumes system equilibrium, which implies that each species' losses due to predation or physiological processes are balanced by the metabolized energy it gains from consumption. It considers allometric scaling laws to quantify individual metabolic rates that are dependent on body mass, which together with losses to predation and assimilation efficiencies are used to quantify incoming fluxes (due to consumption) and outcoming fluxes (due to predation) for each species. Individual metabolic rates (I [J/year]) were calculated using the equation:

$$256 X_i = (X_0 \times M_i^a) \times B_i$$

where  $X_i$  is the metabolic loss of species i,  $X_0$  is the organism-specific normalization constant (-0.29),  $M_i$  the body mass of species i ( $\mu$ gC), a is the allometric scaling constant (a = -0.25), and  $B_i$  is the biomass of species i ( $\mu$ gC/g dw). Because  $X_0$  and a are virtually unknown for most microorganisms, we used the same for all species as suggested by Gauzens et al., (2019). Assimilation efficiencies which express the proportion of eaten biomass that can be used for biomass production plus metabolism were estimated from the literature [53–58]: microalgae and cyanobacteria = 0.545, testate amoebae = 0.405, flagellates = 0.200, rotifers = 0.750, nematodes = 0.820, ciliates = 0.650, bacteria = 0.430, fungi = 0.190. The biomass of each taxon was in  $\mu$ g per gram of dried *Sphagnum*. As such, the units of the calculated energy flux are micro-joules per gram of dried *Sphagnum* per second. Please note that the calculated fluxes are a modelled proxy for energy flow in the food webs, and are used to compare the different conditions (vegetation cover, depth). Feeding habit analyses for each

taxon in each condition would be required to quantify the absolute flow of energy through each food web.

## 2.6 Vegetation and environmental parameters

We performed vegetation surveys by the point-intercept method [59]. Briefly, we used a 50 x 50 cm Plexiglas frame placed above a permanently marked quadrat by means of four adjustable poles. A ruler with 20 holes was moved along 20 different positions to obtain 400 measuring points. A metal pin with a 1 mm diameter tip was lowered through each hole in the ruler and each contact of the pin with green living vegetation was recorded by species until the pin reached the moss substrate. Moss and vascular plant species abundances were expressed as a percentage of the mean number of hits (%). Water chemistry was analysed in pore water samples taken in each plot at the three depths (0-3, 3-6, and 6-9 cm) using a syringe and piezometers. pH was measured in the field using a pH-meter whilst total dissolved nitrogen (DN) and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) were determined with a SHIMADZU SSM-5000A total C, and N analyser (Shimadzu Schweiz, Reinach, Switzerland). Ammonium (NH4<sup>+</sup>), nitrate (NO3<sup>-</sup>), and total phosphorus were analysed colorimetrically using a continuous flow analyser (FLOWSYS; Systea, Roma) after filtering the bog water at 0.45 μm. Depth to water level was measured in each plot in a deep piezometer (>1 m depth). All these analyses were performed on the same day as microbial sampling.

#### 2.7 Statistical analyses

To characterize the main differences in food web structures between habitats and depths, we performed a multivariate principal component analysis (PCA) on all food web metrics. Analysis of similarities (ANOSIM) was used to test statistically whether there are significant differences between microhabitats and/or depths. We further calculated the network dissimilarity by measuring the  $\beta$ -diversity of species interactions (WN) and their decomposed components S (dissimilarity in species composition of food webs), ST (dissimilarity of interactions due to species turnover), and OS (dissimilarity of interactions between shared species in the food webs) using the *betalink* R package [60]. We finally used analysis of variance to test the individual response of food web properties, biomass across trophic levels and energy fluxes to habitat and depth. Assumptions on normality and homogeneity of variances were verified using diagnostic plots. Pairwise differences between the algorithms were tested with the Tukey posthoc test. Multivariate distance matrix regressions (MDMR) were used to identify the environmental predictors (vegetation properties, water chemical variables, and water table depth) of microbial biomass distribution across trophic levels, food web

qualitative and quantitative properties, and energy fluxes across trophic levels at the different depths and between WET and DRY areas. Finally, we assessed the effect of distance on species and food web compositions with Mantel tests (999 permutations) using the Spearman correlation coefficient between dissimilarities of species (Bray-Curtis distance) and food webs (WN index) and the Euclidian distance matrix based on sample coordinates. The resulting mantel correlograms showed that microbial communities and microbial food webs were slightly spatially correlated at an Euclidean distance of one (Mantel correlation = 0.25), and beyond that distance they were not spatially autocorrelated (Fig. S2). These results thus validate the choice of having rather distant plots (typically much greater than 7m apart) since they could then be treated as statistically independent.

To identify what structural feature of microbial food webs predicted ecosystem functions best, we used generalized linear models (GLMs). Assumptions on normality and homogeneity of variances were verified using diagnostic plots. Then, to evaluate the effect of environmental changes on the linkages between structural features of microbial food webs and ecosystem functions, we fitted a piecewise structural equation model [61]; a suitable tool to evaluate direct and indirect effects in ecological systems [62]. Specifically, the model tested whether environmental change (vegetation properties, water chemistry, microtopography and WTD), microbial richness and their interactions directly influenced ecosystem functions (averaged standardized values of each function) or indirectly through their respective effects on food web properties (PCA axis of qualitative and quantitative metrics), biomass across trophic levels and energy flow across trophic levels. The model was created using GLMs and pruned using Akaike Information Criteria corrected for small sample size (AICc) until we reached a simple and robust model to test direct and indirect effects.

All computations and statistical analyses were performed in *R* [63] using custom-written codes and available R packages. Several of the food web metrics including the food web graph were performed using the *igraph* package [64].

3. Results

## 3.1 Food web dissimilarity and metrics

The microbial food webs showed substantial variability over *Sphagnum* segments and across habitats in terms of species composition (Fig. 1a, b) and biomass distribution among trophic levels (Fig. 2; Fig. S3, S4). Network dissimilarity analyses revealed that microbial food webs strongly diverged with depth (WN > 0.3) as a result of dissimilarity in species composition of food webs (S  $\sim$  0.2 overall, Fig. 1a) and in feeding interactions due to species turnover (ST  $\sim$ 0.3 overall, Fig. 1a) rather than of dissimilarity of feeding interactions between shared species in the food webs (OS values < 0.1; Fig. 1a). Food web divergences along *Sphagnum* segments translated in changes of food web metrics, as shown by the PCA analysis capturing the relationships and associations of food web metrics along

Sphagnum segments and habitats (Fig. 1c, d). For example, unweighted and weighted connectance and generality increased between living and decaying/dead Sphagnum segments, as well as the size of food chains and the importance of omnivores and intermediate consumers (Fig. 1d, Table 1). On the opposite, living segments were characterized by unweighted and weighted short food chains (SPL and dist w) and by a higher proportion of basal and top-predator species (Fig. 1d, Table 1).

Besides the depth effect, microbial food webs strongly diverged across habitats (WN > 0.4; Fig. 1b). Here again, they diverged because of dissimilarity in species composition (S  $\sim$  0.2 overall, Fig. 1b) and in feeding interactions due to species turnover (ST  $\sim$ 0.4 overall, Fig. 1b) rather than of dissimilarity of feeding interactions between shared species in the food webs (OS values < 0.1; Fig. 1b). Despite food web dissimilarity across habitats, we found that food web metrics only slightly varied across habitats (Fig. 1c, d, Table 1). While food web metrics in living and bottom *Sphagnum* segments were similar, we found that transitivity, FCL efficiency, and the proportion of intermediate consumers and omnivores slightly decreased between WET and DRY habitats, although these tendencies were only marginally significant ( $P \sim 0.1$ ).

Weighted metrics only slightly contributed to food web properties divergences among *Sphagnum* segments and/or across habitats (Fig. 1c). However, the biomass distribution across trophic levels strongly varied with depth and habitats (ANOVA,  $F_{2,113} = 11.1$ , P < 0.001; Fig. 2). Regardless of habitat and depth, the microbial biomass was mostly distributed among basal species (trophic level = 1) and primary consumers (i.e., bacterivores, fungivores and algivores, trophic level = 2), and in a lesser extent among top-predators (trophic level = 2.2; ANOVA,  $F_{3,113} = 213.6$ , P < 0.001; Fig. 2). We further found that the microbial biomass across trophic levels increased with depth (ANOVA,  $F_{2,113} = 33.2$ , P < 0.001), whilst it was overall higher in DRY than in WET habitat, respectively (ANOVA,  $F_{1,113} = 42.9$ , P < 0.001; Fig. 2). In particular, we found that the biomass of decomposers (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 105.6$ , P < 0.001), primary consumers (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 12.6$ , P < 0.01) and top-predators (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 11.2$ , P = 0.002) increased with depth in both habitats, while the biomass of phototrophs decreased (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 19.8$ , P < 0.001; Fig. S3). Also, the biomass of phototrophs (ANOVA,  $F_{1,30} = 12.1$ , P = 0.001) and top-predators (ANOVA,  $F_{1,30} = 3.6$ , P = 0.06) were higher in DRY than in WET (Fig. S3).

Relating species turnover and biomass change to environmental parameters, we found that vegetation properties (composition, richness, and diversity) were the most important drivers of species turnover, biomass shifts across trophic levels, and food web properties (Table S1). To a lesser extent, total phosphorous and pH were also significantly linked to species turnover and biomass shifts across trophic levels, respectively, whilst microtopography and conductivity were significantly related to food web properties (Table S1).

## 3.2 Energy fluxes across trophic levels

Total energy flux transiting in microbial food webs significantly varied along Sphagnum segments and across habitats (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 4.5$ , P = 0.019; Fig. 3). On average, it increased from  $19.7 \pm 4.6$ mJ g<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup> to 61.4 ± 26.2 mJ g<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup> between living and dead *Sphagnum* segments, respectively (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 30.6$ , P < 0.001). Total energy flux also increased from 27.1  $\pm$  14.2 mJ g<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup> to  $49.3 \pm 28.9 \text{ mJ g}^{-1} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  between WET and in DRY (ANOVA,  $F_{1,30} = 25.2$ , P < 0.001), respectively across all segments. Total energy flux was primarily driven by a high energy demand from bacterivores/fungivores, and in second place by algivores, whereas the energy fluxes transiting through mixotrophs and predators were low (Fig. 3b). Bacterivory/fungivory increased with depth in both habitats (ANOVA,  $F_{1.30} = 6.1$ , P < 0.01; Fig. 3). It was also 1.5 times higher in DRY (36.6  $\pm$ 25.1 mJ g<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup>) than in WET (21.2  $\pm$  13.5 mJ g<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup>; ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 5.3$ , P = 0.03), regardless of the depth considered (ANOVA, depth x habitat  $F_{2,30} = 1.8$ , P = 0.18; Fig. 3a, b). Algivory increased with depth in both habitats (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 5.2$ , P = 0.02), as well as between habitats (WET = 5.52  $\pm$  5..93 mJ g<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup>; DRY = 12.4  $\pm$  24.8 mJ g<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup>) but this tendency was not significant (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 1.8$ , P = 0.18). The energy transiting through mixotrophs and predators did not vary across habitats but increased with depth (mixotrophy: ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 2.4$ , P = 0.10; predation: ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 6.1, P < 0.01$ ; Fig. 3). 

Relating energy fluxes to environmental parameters, we found that vegetation composition and diversity were the most important environmental variables driving energy fluxes through food webs (Table S1). Water phenols were also related to energy fluxes in the food webs but to a lesser extent (Table S1).

## 3.3 Linkages between structural features of microbial food webs and ecosystem functions

Species diversity across trophic levels, species turnover (index S), and network dissimilarity indices (OS, ST, and WN) were not related to ecosystem functions (Fig. 4a, b; P > 0.05). Food web metrics were poorly connected to ecosystem functions as well. Only the first PCA axis was significantly related to the microbial activity (measured as phenoloxidase activity; P < 0.05; Fig. 4c). In particular, high connectance, proportion of intermediate consumers, effectiveness, transitivity, and food chain length were found to promote soil enzyme activity, while high fraction of top predators and weighted shortest path length were found to reduce soil enzyme activity (Fig. S4). Similarly, total biomass across trophic levels was poorly linked to ecosystem functions. Only the biomass of intermediate consumers was significantly linked to microbial activity (P < 0.05; Fig. 4d). On the opposite, total energy flux transiting in the food webs was significantly correlated to the decomposition state of the

peat (ANOVA,  $F_{2,30} = 6.2$ , P < 0.02) and soil enzyme activity (ANOVA,  $F_{1,22} = 13.9$ , P < 0.01; Fig. 4). In particular, the decomposition state was significantly related to the energy transiting through algivores (effect size = -0.95, P = 0.05) and predators (effect size = -0.89, P = 0.06), whereas soil enzyme activity was significantly related to the energy flux transiting through bacterivores/fungivores (effect size = 1.15, P = 0.03) and algivores (effect size = 0.94, P = 0.05).

Structural equation modeling explained 63% of the variance of ecosystem functions (Fig. 5). We found indirect effects of species richness and environmental conditions on ecosystem functions mediated by an increase of basal species biomass and changes in food web properties (food web metrics PCA axis), respectively. Increasing vegetation cover (path = 0.36) and total phosphorous in pore water (path = 0.56) both had positive effects on the biomass of basal species in the food web, while the shift in microtopography was an important driver of species richness in the food web (path = -0.74). Increasing biomass of basal species further promoted energy flow through the food web, which in turn promoted ecosystem functions (Fig. 5). Microbial richness had no significant effect on energy flow through the food web nor on ecosystem functions. Finally, our model also showed a direct effect of increasing vegetation cover on ecosystem functions (path = -0.54; Fig. 5).

4. Discussion

Understanding the effects of taxonomic diversity and trophic structure on ecosystem functions is a key question in the ecology of ecosystem services [21]. Here, we explore the relationships between microbial food web structure and ecosystem functioning across different habitats and depths in a peatland. Linking qualitative and quantitative food web metrics to ecosystem functioning, we further our understanding of how structural features of microbial food web determine key peatland functions such as decomposition and soil enzyme activity. Our analyses reveal that no aspect of taxonomic richness directly explained variation in ecosystem functions, whereas aspects of food web structure and energy fluxes did. This demonstrates that, at least in the complex microbial food webs in peatlands, focusing on taxonomic diversity without explicit inclusion of food web structure and energy flows therein will give an incomplete and likely quite uninformative view of relationships between biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. This finding supports conceptual predictions that biomass and energy flux dynamics in ecological networks underpin multitrophic biodiversityecosystem functioning relationships [29,33]. This result also agrees with findings from grassland studies demonstrating the importance of consumption rates in determining soil N mineralization [30]. Moreover, our results clearly show that the integration of a trophic perspective into microbial communities is key for understanding ecosystem functions [29,65].

By analysing microbial communities at different depths and across an environmental gradient, we found that changes in microtopography and to lesser extent nutrient availability in pore water were important but rather indirect determinants of structural features of microbial food webs through their direct effect on species richness and biomass. Microtopography is a complex ecological variable that underpins microvariations in soil moisture, temperature, micro- and mesoporosity, and water chemistry, and which ultimately influence microscale microbial richness and biomass [41,66]. Shifts in microbial richness and biomass further indirectly influence microbial food web structure and functioning (Fig. 5). With depth, the microbial community composition and biomass of species shifted, and so did the food webs (Figs. 2, 5). Notably, the phototrophic biomass decreased. Such a result was expected as phototrophs are by definition sensitive to light availability (Davies et al., 2013; Hamard et al., 2021b; Jassey et al., 2022), which decreases with peat-depth. Phototrophic gross primary production usually decreases under low light availability, thus reducing phototrophic biomass [68,70]. While one would have expected a decrease in the importance of phototrophs in the food web structure with depth, we found the exact opposite with an increase in the energy flux transiting from phototrophs to algivores (Fig. 3). This was unexpected and can be explained by the remarkable plasticity of the phototrophic photosynthetic machinery under low light. Previous findings showed an increase of messenger RNAs involved in phosphorylation under decreasing light [70], allowing phototrophs to persist. Phosphorylation occurs in all kinds of phototrophs when conditions cannot support growth [71], and thus provides energy to phototrophs when photosynthesis is not possible [72]. We, therefore, suggest that phototrophs increasingly supported higher trophic levels under low light through an increase of phosphorylation in their cells, as showed in biofilms [70]. The ingestion of bacteria by some algae to overcome the lack of light and meet their energetic needs may further explain why phototrophs increasingly support higher trophic levels with depth [73]. Anyway, these findings confirm the importance of phototrophs in peatland C cycling [74], and underline the importance of considering phototrophs in soil food webs for ecosystem functioning [75,76].

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454 455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

Besides phototrophs, we found that bacterial and fungal biomass increased with depth and with vascular plant cover. These patterns have been already shown in peatlands [40,49,77] and most probably result from an increase in resource availability, such as vascular plant root exudates [78], that fuels decomposers [79]. We found that the increase in bacterial and fungal biomass supported higher trophic levels, as shown by the increase in energy transiting from decomposers to bacterivores/fungivores (Fig. 3, 5). This indicates an increase in bacterial and fungal consumption by bacterivores and fungivores (mostly protists, nematodes, and rotifers) [29]. Such an increase in bacterivory and fungivory contributed significantly to peatland functions, especially enzyme activity (Figs. 4, 5). This finding agrees with previous studies showing that predatory-prey interactions within the microbiome influence soil C cycling such as decomposition, respiration, and enzyme activity

[40,80–82]. Mechanistically, bacterivores and fungivores might increase decomposition and enzyme activity via specific trophic interactions that change and/or promote microbial functioning. For example, wastes from bacterivores and fungivores, such as undigested food particles and labile carbon, are usually easily degradable and hence favorable for bacterial re-growth [80]. Also, bacterivores and fungivores may preferentially feed on senescent bacteria, thus maintaining young bacteria with higher metabolic activity [83]. Together with our results on algivory, these findings reveal how changes in abiotic conditions have not only direct effects on trophic groups that are directly associated with these changing conditions but also indirect effects on other trophic levels through linkages across food webs, which ultimately modifies ecosystem functions.

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493 494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

We found that species richness across trophic levels, as well as species and network turnover, were poor predictors of ecosystem functions (Fig. 4). It contrasts most recent findings on multitrophic systems, suggesting that increasing microbial richness/diversity promotes ecosystem functioning [5,38]. The choice of ecosystem functions tested here might explain such a finding. However, our finding is consistent with recent results on multi-trophic aquatic food webs showing that there is no clear pattern between ecosystem function variability and species richness across different types of empirical food webs [15]. This suggests that more diverse microbial communities do not necessarily exhibit higher ecosystem function than less diverse ones. It also suggests that species richness of a specific trophic level does not necessarily influence the associated specific ecosystem function (e.g. between basal species (TL = 1) and decomposition/soil enzyme activity). Further, we show that trophic interactions rather than richness across trophic levels are better predictors of ecosystem functions, which is in line with findings from a grassland experiment [10]. Moreover, our results partially confirm previous findings in terrestrial systems suggesting that metrics like connectance, modularity, and hubs provide insights into the structure and functioning of ecosystems [20]. We found that connectance (i.e. the number of feeding links), transitivity, efficiency, and the proportion of intermediate consumers (i.e. bacterivores, fungivores, and algivores) were positively correlated with soil enzyme activity, while the proportion of top predators and shortest path length (i.e. length of food chains) were negatively correlated. It suggests that highly connected food webs with high connections among basal and intermediate consumers promote ecosystem functions such as microbial activity, supporting our findings on the energy flux dynamic in the food webs. This result is also in line with previous experiments demonstrating the importance of primary consumers in mediating ecosystem process rates [84,85].

By embracing the trophic structure of ecological networks, our analyses provide novel insights into patterns of variation in ecosystem function in multitrophic systems. We find that trophic interactions between basal species and primary consumers, and especially increasing connectance,

biomass, and energy flux transiting from decomposers and phototrophs to algivores, bacterivores, and fungivores, enhance ecosystem functions. In other words, increasing the strength of interactions (e.g. consumption) along microbial trophic levels promotes carbon loss from peatland. We caution that the observed multitrophic-ecosystem function relationship highlighted here is strictly correlative, and that future experimental studies are needed to test this specific microbial mechanism in ecosystem functioning. Nevertheless, our findings are supported by recent multitrophic model simulations predicting changes in ecosystem functions following changes in consumer biomass and energy fluxes [23], thus providing confidence in the microbial mechanism found here. Moreover, if such food web structure-ecosystem function relationships can be confirmed for a wider range of peatlands, such structural features of microbial food webs may proof key to explaining variation in global carbon cycling. Climate change has the potential to stimulate bacterial biomass [26,40], while reducing topdown control of top microbial predators on intermediate consumers [26,86,87]. These possible climate-induced changes in microbial food webs may trigger a rise in the trophic interactions between basal species and bacterivores, thus promoting soil enzyme activity and decomposition rates. Only by pursuing our understanding of microbial food web structures and their associated functions can we identify general patterns and mechanisms that determine ecological functions and provide the necessary guidance for managing and mitigating the effects of environmental change.

# Acknowledgments

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531532

This work has been supported by the MIXOPEAT (Grant No. ANR-17-CE01-0007 to VEJJ) and PEATWARM (ANR-07-VUL-010 to FLD, DG, and AB) projects, both funded by the French National Research Agency. JMB was kindly supported by the Dutch Science Foundation (grant no. ENW-M OCENW.M20.339) during the writing stages of this paper. The authors warmly thank the managers of the Regional Natural Reserve of Frasne-Bouverans for allowing access to the site and the SNO Tourbières (https://www.sno-tourbieres.cnrs.fr/) for providing access to environmental data. We kindly thank Romain Frelat for his help in plotting food webs and for sharing his R scripts.

### References

- B.J. Cardinale, J.E. Duffy, A. Gonzalez, D.U. Hooper, C. Perrings, P. Venail, A. Narwani,
   G.M. Mace, D. Tilman, D.A. Wardle, A.P. Kinzig, G.C. Daily, M. Loreau, J.B. Grace, A.
   Larigauderie, D.S. Srivastava, S. Naeem, Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity,
   Nature. 486 (2012) 59–67. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature11148.
- 539 [2] F. Isbell, D. Craven, J. Connolly, M. Loreau, B. Schmid, C. Beierkuhnlein, T.M. Bezemer, C. Bonin, H. Bruelheide, E. de Luca, A. Ebeling, J.N. Griffin, O. Guo, Y. Hautier, A. Hector, 540 A. Jentsch, J. Kreyling, V. Lanta, P. Manning, S.T. Meyer, A.S. Mori, S. Naeem, P.A. 541 Niklaus, H.W. Polley, P.B. Reich, C. Roscher, E.W. Seabloom, M.D. Smith, M.P. Thakur, D. 542 Tilman, B.F. Tracy, W.H. van der Putten, J. van Ruijven, A. Weigelt, W.W. Weisser, B. 543 Wilsey, N. Eisenhauer, Biodiversity increases the resistance of ecosystem productivity to 544 climate extremes, Nature. 526 (2015) 574-577. 545 http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/nature15374. 546
- D. Tilman, F. Isbell, J.M. Cowles, Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning, Annu. Rev. Ecol. (2014). http://annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-120213-091917.
- J.A. Bennett, A.M. Koch, J. Forsythe, N.C. Johnson, D. Tilman, J. Klironomos, Resistance of soil biota and plant growth to disturbance increases with plant diversity, Ecol. Lett. 23 (2019) 119–128. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ele.13408.
- M. Delgado Baquerizo, P.B. Reich, C. Trivedi, D.J. Eldridge, S. Abades, F.D. Alfaro, F.
  Bastida, A.A. Berhe, N.A. Cutler, A. Gallardo, L. García-Velázquez, S.C. Hart, P.E. Hayes,
  J.-Z. He, Z.-Y. Hseu, H.-W. Hu, M. Kirchmair, S. Neuhauser, C.A. Pérez, S.C. Reed, F.
  Santos, B.W. Sullivan, P. Trivedi, J.-T. Wang, L. Weber-Grullon, M.A. Williams, B.K.
  Singh, Multiple elements of soil biodiversity drive ecosystem functions across biomes, Nat.
  Ecol. Evol. (2020) 1–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-1084-y.
- J.S. Lefcheck, J.E.K. Byrnes, F. Isbell, L. Gamfeldt, J.N. Griffin, N. Eisenhauer, M.J.S. Hensel, A. Hector, B.J. Cardinale, J.E. Duffy, Biodiversity enhances ecosystem multifunctionality across trophic levels and habitats, Nat. Commun. 2015 61. 6 (2015) 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7936.
- 562 [7] R.H. Heleno, W.J. Ripple, A. Traveset, Scientists' warning on endangered food webs, Web Ecol. 20 (2020) 1–10. https://doi.org/10.5194/we-20-1-2020.
- J. Hines, W.H. van der Putten, G.B. De Deyn, C. Wagg, W. Voigt, C. Mulder, W.W.
   Weisser, J. Engel, C. Melian, S. Scheu, K. Birkhofer, A. Ebeling, C. Scherber, N.
   Eisenhauer, Towards an Integration of Biodiversity–Ecosystem Functioning and Food Web
   Theory to Evaluate Relationships between Multiple Ecosystem Services, Adv. Ecol. Res. 53
   (2015) 161–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/BS.AECR.2015.09.001.
- J. Hu, Z. Wei, V.P. Friman, S.H. Gu, X.F. Wang, N. Eisenhauer, T.J. Yang, J. Ma, Q.R.
   Shen, Y.C. Xu, A. Jousset, Probiotic diversity enhances rhizosphere microbiome function and plant disease suppression, MBio. 7 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1128/MBIO.01790-16/SUPPL FILE/MBO006163108SF1.DOCX.
- 573 [10] E.W. Seabloom, L. Kinkel, E.T. Borer, Y. Hautier, R.A. Montgomery, D. Tilman, Food webs 574 obscure the strength of plant diversity effects on primary productivity, Ecol. Lett. 20 (2017) 575 505–512. https://doi.org/10.1111/ELE.12754.
- 576 [11] S. Wang, U. Brose, Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning in food webs: the vertical diversity hypothesis, Ecol. Lett. 21 (2017) 9–20. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ele.12865.
- 578 [12] S. Soliveres, F. Van Der Plas, P. Manning, D. Prati, M.M. Gossner, S.C. Renner, F. Alt, H.
  579 Arndt, V. Baumgartner, J. Binkenstein, K. Birkhofer, S. Blaser, N. Blüthgen, S. Boch, S.
  580 Böhm, C. Börschig, F. Buscot, T. Diekötter, J. Heinze, N. Hölzel, K. Jung, V.H. Klaus, T.
  581 Kleinebecker, S. Klemmer, J. Krauss, M. Lange, E.K. Morris, J. Müller, Y. Oelmann, J.
- Overmann, E. Pašalić, M.C. Rillig, H.M. Schaefer, M. Schloter, B. Schmitt, I. Schöning, M.
- 583 Schrumpf, J. Sikorski, S.A. Socher, E.F. Solly, I. Sonnemann, E. Sorkau, J. Steckel, I. Steffan-Dewenter, B. Stempfhuber, M. Tschapka, M. Türke, P.C. Venter, C.N. Weiner,

- W.W. Weisser, M. Werner, C. Westphal, W. Wilcke, V. Wolters, T. Wubet, S. Wurst, M. 585 Fischer, E. Allan, Biodiversity at multiple trophic levels is needed for ecosystem 586 multifunctionality, Nat. 2016 5367617. 536 (2016) 456-459. 587 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature19092. 588
- M.I. O'Connor, A. Gonzalez, J.E.K. Byrnes, B.J. Cardinale, J.E. Duffy, L. Gamfeldt, J.N. [13] 589 Griffin, D. Hooper, B.A. Hungate, A. Paquette, P.L. Thompson, L.E. Dee, K.L. Dolan, A 590 591 general biodiversity–function relationship is mediated by trophic level, Oikos. 126 (2017) 18–31. https://doi.org/10.1111/OIK.03652. 592
- S. Wang, U. Brose, Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning in food webs: the vertical 593 [14] diversity hypothesis, Ecol. Lett. 21 (2018) 9–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/ELE.12865. 594
- D. Wu, C. Xu, S. Wang, L. Zhang, S. Kortsch, Why are biodiversity—ecosystem functioning 595 [15] relationships so elusive? Trophic interactions may amplify ecosystem function variability, J. 596 Anim. Ecol. 92 (2023) 367–376. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13808. 597
- T. Poisot, N. Mouquet, D. Gravel, Trophic complementarity drives the biodiversity-598 [16] ecosystem functioning relationship in food webs., Ecol. Lett. 16 (2013) 853–861. 599 http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ele.12118. 600
- T. Fung, K.D. Farnsworth, D.G. Reid, A.G. Rossberg, Impact of biodiversity loss on 601 [17] production in complex marine food webs mitigated by prey-release, Nat. Commun. 2015 61. 602 6 (2015) 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7657. 603
- F.D. Schneider, U. Brose, B.C. Rall, C. Guill, Animal diversity and ecosystem functioning in 604 [18] dynamic food webs, Nat. Commun. 2016 71. 7 (2016) 1-8. 605 https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12718. 606
- T. Poisot, N. Mouquet, D. Gravel, Trophic complementarity drives the biodiversity— 607 ecosystem functioning relationship in food webs, Ecol. Lett. 16 (2013) 853–861. 608 https://doi.org/10.1111/ELE.12118. 609
- 610 [20] M.R. Felipe-Lucia, S. Soliveres, C. Penone, M. Fischer, C. Ammer, S. Boch, R.S. Boeddinghaus, M. Bonkowski, F. Buscot, A.M. Fiore-Donno, K. Frank, K. Goldmann, M.M. 611 Gossner, N. Hölzel, M. Jochum, E. Kandeler, V.H. Klaus, T. Kleinebecker, S. Leimer, P. 612 Manning, Y. Oelmann, H. Saiz, P. Schall, M. Schloter, I. Schöning, M. Schrumpf, E.F. Solly, 613 B. Stempfhuber, W.W. Weisser, W. Wilcke, T. Wubet, E. Allan, Land-use intensity alters 614 networks between biodiversity, ecosystem functions, and services, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. 615 S. A. 117 (2020) 28140–28149. 616 https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.2016210117/SUPPL FILE/PNAS.2016210117.SAPP.PDF. 617
- R.M. Thompson, U. Brose, J.A. Dunne, R.O. Hall, S. Hladyz, R.L. Kitching, N.D. Martinez, [21] 618 H. Rantala, T.N. Romanuk, D.B. Stouffer, J.M. Tylianakis, Food webs: reconciling the 619 structure and function of biodiversity., Trends Ecol. Evol. 27 (2012) 689–697. 620 http://eutils.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/eutils/elink.fcgi?dbfrom=pubmed&id=22959162&retmo 621 de=ref&cmd=prlinks.
- [22] N. Rooney, K.S. McCann, Integrating food web diversity, structure and stability., Trends 623 Ecol. Evol. 27 (2012) 40-46. 624 http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S016953471100259X. 625

- F.D. Schneider, U. Brose, B.C. Rall, C. Guill, Animal diversity and ecosystem functioning in 626 [23] dynamic food webs., Nat. Commun. 7 (2016) 12718. 627 http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/ncomms12718. 628
- 629 [24] S. Wang, U. Brose, D. Gravel, Intraguild predation enhances biodiversity and functioning in complex food webs, Ecology. 100 (2019) e02616. https://doi.org/10.1002/ECY.2616. 630
- M.K. Trzcinski, D.S. Srivastava, B. Corbara, O. Dézerald, C. Leroy, J.F. Carrias, A. Dejean, 631 [25] R. Céréghino, The effects of food web structure on ecosystem function exceeds those of 632 precipitation, J. Anim. Ecol. 85 (2016) 1147–1160. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-633 2656.12538. 634
- [26] V.E.J. Jassey, G. Chiapusio, P. Binet, A. Buttler, F. Laggoun-Défarge, F. Delarue, N. 635 Bernard, E.A.D. Mitchell, M.-L. Toussaint, A.-J. Francez, D. Gilbert, Above- and 636

- belowground linkages in Sphagnum peatland: climate warming affects plant-microbial interactions, Glob. Chang. Biol. 19 (2013) 811–823. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.12075.
- 640 [27] M. Lamentowicz, L. Bragazza, A. Buttler, V.E.J. Jassey, E.A.D. Mitchell, Seasonal patterns 641 of testate amoeba diversity, community structure and species—environment relationships in 642 four Sphagnum-dominated peatlands along a 1300 m altitudinal gradient in Switzerland, Soil 643 Biol. Biochem. 67 (2013) 1–11. 644 http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0038071713002678.
- [28] R.M. Thompson, C.R. Townsend, Energy availability, spatial heterogeneity and ecosystem
   size predict food-web structure in streams, Oikos. 108 (2005) 137–148.
   https://doi.org/10.1111/J.0030-1299.2005.11600.X.
- [29] A.D. Barnes, M. Jochum, J.S. Lefcheck, N. Eisenhauer, C. Scherber, M.I. O'Connor, P. de
   Ruiter, U. Brose, Energy Flux: The Link between Multitrophic Biodiversity and Ecosystem
   Functioning., Trends Ecol. Evol. 33 (2018) 186–197.
   https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0169534717303257.
- [30] H.W. Hunt, D.C. Coleman, E.R. Ingham, R.E. Ingham, E.T. Elliott, J.C. Moore, S.L. Rose,
   C.P.P. Reid, C.R. Morley, The detrital food web in a shortgrass prairie, Biol. Fertil. Soils. 3
   (1987) 57–68. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00260580/METRICS.
- [31] P.C. De Ruiter, J.A. Van Veen, J.C. Moore, L. Brussaard, H.W. Hunt, Calculation of nitrogen mineralization in soil food webs, Plant Soil. 157 (1993) 263–273.
   https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00011055.
- I. Grass, C. Kubitza, V. V Krishna, M.D. Corre, O. Mußhoff, P. Pütz, J. Drescher, K. 658 [32] Rembold, E.S. Ariyanti, A.D. Barnes, N. Brinkmann, U. Brose, B. Brümmer, D. Buchori, R. 659 Daniel, K.F.A. Darras, H. Faust, L. Fehrmann, J. Hein, N. Hennings, P. Hidayat, D. 660 Hölscher, M. Jochum, A. Knohl, M.M. Kotowska, V. Krashevska, H. Kreft, C. Leuschner, 661 N.J.S. Lobite, R. Panjaitan, A. Polle, A.M. Potapov, E. Purnama, M. Qaim, A. Röll, S. 662 Scheu, D. Schneider, A. Tjoa, T. Tscharntke, E. Veldkamp, M. Wollni, Trade-offs between 663 multifunctionality and profit in tropical smallholder landscapes., Nat. Commun. 11 (2020) 664 1113–1186. http://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-020-15013-5. 665
- A.D. Barnes, P. Weigelt, M. Jochum, D. Ott, D. Hodapp, N.F. Haneda, U. Brose, Species richness and biomass explain spatial turnover in ecosystem functioning across tropical and temperate ecosystems, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 371 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1098/RSTB.2015.0279.
- [34] S. Kortsch, R. Frelat, L. Pecuchet, P. Olivier, I. Putnis, E. Bonsdorff, H. Ojaveer, I.
   Jurgensone, S. Strāķe, G. Rubene, Ē. Krūze, M.C. Nordström, Disentangling temporal food
   web dynamics facilitates understanding of ecosystem functioning, J. Anim. Ecol. 90 (2021)
   1205–1216. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13447.
- N. Fierer, Embracing the unknown: disentangling the complexities of the soil microbiome, Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 15 (2017) 579–590. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro.2017.87.
- 576 [36] S. Geisen, R. Koller, M. Huenninghaus, K. Dumack, T. Urich, M. Bonkowski, The soil food web revisited: Diverse and widespread mycophagous soil protists, Soil Biol. Biochem. 94 (2016) 10–18. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0038071715003934.
- D. Singer, C.V.W. Seppey, G. Lentendu, M. Dunthorn, D. Bass, L. Belbahri, Q. Blandenier, D. Debroas, G.A. de Groot, C. de Vargas, I. Domaizon, C. Duckert, I. Izaguirre, I. Koenig, G. Mataloni, M.R. Schiaffino, E.A.D. Mitchell, S. Geisen, E. Lara, Protist taxonomic and functional diversity in soil, freshwater and marine ecosystems, Environ. Int. 146 (2021) 106262. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENVINT.2020.106262.
- 684 [38] M. Delgado Baquerizo, F.T. Maestre, P.B. Reich, T.C. Jeffries, J.J. Gaitán, D. Encinar, M. Berdugo, C.D. Campbell, B.K. Singh, Microbial diversity drives multifunctionality in terrestrial ecosystems, Nat. Commun. 7 (2016) 1–8.

  https://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms10541.
- 688 [39] V.E.J. Jassey, G. Chiapusio, E.A.D. Mitchell, P. Binet, M.-L. Toussaint, D. Gilbert, Fine-

- scale horizontal and vertical micro-distribution patterns of testate amoebae along a narrow Fen/Bog gradient., Microb. Ecol. 61 (2011) 374–385. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00248-010-9756-9/fulltext.html.
- [40] M.K. Reczuga, M. Lamentowicz, M. Mulot, E.A.D. Mitchell, A. Buttler, B. Chojnicki, M.
   Słowiński, P. Binet, G. Chiapusio, D. Gilbert, S. Słowińska, V.E.J. Jassey, Predator–prey
   mass ratio drives microbial activity under dry conditions in Sphagnum peatlands, Ecol. Evol.
   8 (2018) 5752–5764. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ece3.4114.
- [41] E.A.D. Mitchell, D. Borcard, A.J. Buttler, P. Grosvernier, D. Gilbert, J.M. Gobat, Horizontal
   Distribution Patterns of Testate Amoebae (Protozoa) in a Sphagnum magellanicum Carpet,
   39 (2000) 290–300. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s002489900187.
- [42] J. Barel, O. Petchey, A. Ghafoulli, V. Jassey, Uncovering Microbial Food Webs in
   Ecosystems Using Machine Learning, SSRN Electron. J. (2022).
   https://doi.org/10.2139/SSRN.4303628.
- A. Buttler, B.J.M. Robroek, F. Laggoun-Défarge, V.E.J. Jassey, C. Pochelon, G. Bernard, F. Delarue, S. Gogo, P. Mariotte, E.A.D. Mitchell, L. Bragazza, Experimental warming interacts with soil moisture to discriminate plant responses in an ombrotrophic peatland, J. Veg. Sci. 26 (2015) 964–974. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jvs.12296/full.
- 706 [44] H. Rydin, J.K. Jeglum, The Biology of Peatlands, Oxford University Press, United Kingdom Oxford, 2013.
- P. Baldrian, T. Větrovský, T. Cajthaml, P. DobiáŠová, M. Petránková, J. Šnajdr, I.
   Eichlerová, Estimation of fungal biomass in forest litter and soil, Fungal Ecol. 6 (2013) 1–11.
   https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FUNECO.2012.10.002.
- 711 [46] D. Gilbert, C. Amblard, G. Bourdier, A. Francez, The Microbial Loop at the Surface of a 712 Peatland:Structure, Function, and Impact of Nutrient Input, 35 (1998) 83–93. 713 http://eutils.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/eutils/elink.fcgi?dbfrom=pubmed&id=9459661&retmod 714 e=ref&cmd=prlinks.
- 715 [47] C. Freeman, N. Ostle, H. Kang, An enzymic'latch'on a global carbon store, Nature. 409 (2001) 149. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/35051650.
- 717 [48] N. Fenner, C. Freeman, Drought-induced carbon loss in peatlands, Nat. Geosci. 4 (2011) 895–900. http://www.nature.com/ngeo/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/ngeo1323.html.
- [49] V.E.J. Jassey, G. Chiapusio, D. Gilbert, A. Buttler, M.-L. Toussaint, P. Binet, Experimental climate effect on seasonal variability of polyphenol/phenoloxidase interplay along a narrow fen-bog ecological gradient in Sphagnum fallax, Glob. Chang. Biol. 17 (2011) 2945–2957. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02437.x.
- F. Delarue, F. Laggoun-Défarge, J.R. Disnar, N. Lottier, S. Gogo, Organic matter sources and decay assessment in a Sphagnum-dominated peatland (Le Forbonnet, Jura Mountains, France): impact of moisture conditions, Biogeochemistry. 106 (2011) 39–52. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10533-010-9410-0/fulltext.html.
- [51] S. Kortsch, R. Frelat, L. Pecuchet, P. Olivier, I. Putnis, E. Bonsdorff, H. Ojaveer, I.
   Jurgensone, S. Strāķe, G. Rubene, Ē. Krūze, M.C. Nordström, Disentangling temporal food web dynamics facilitates understanding of ecosystem functioning, J. Anim. Ecol. 90 (2021) 1205–1216. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13447.
- [52] S. Kortsch, R. Primicerio, M. Aschan, S. Lind, A. V. Dolgov, B. Planque, Food-web structure varies along environmental gradients in a high-latitude marine ecosystem,
   Ecography (Cop.). 42 (2019) 295–308. https://doi.org/10.1111/ECOG.03443.
- [53] B. Gauzens, A. Barnes, D.P. Giling, J. Hines, M. Jochum, J.S. Lefcheck, B. Rosenbaum, S.
   Wang, U. Brose, fluxweb: An R package to easily estimate energy fluxes in food webs,
   Methods Ecol. Evol. 10 (2019) 270–279. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13109.
- 737 [54] A. Rogerson, The ecological energetics of Amoeba proteus (Protozoa), Hydrobiologia. 85 (1999) 117–128. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00006621.
- 739 [55] M. V. Zubkov, M.A. Sleigh, Assimilation efficiency of Vibrio bacterial protein biomass by 740 the flagellate Pteridomonas: Assessment using flow cytometric sorting, FEMS Microbiol.

- 741 Ecol. 54 (2005) 281–286. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.FEMSEC.2005.04.001.
- J. Six, S.D. Frey, R.K. Thiet, K.M. Batten, Bacterial and Fungal Contributions to Carbon Sequestration in Agroecosystems, Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 70 (2006) 555–569.
   https://doi.org/10.2136/SSSAJ2004.0347.
- 745 [57] P.A. Del Giorgio, J.J. Cole, BACTERIAL GROWTH EFFICIENCY IN NATURAL
   746 AQUATIC SYSTEMS, Https://Doi.Org/10.1146/Annurev.Ecolsys.29.1.503. 29 (2003) 503–
   747 541. https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV.ECOLSYS.29.1.503.
- J.P. Bryant, F.S. Chapin, D.R. Klein, Carbon/Nutrient Balance of Boreal Plants in Relation to Vertebrate Herbivory, Oikos. 40 (1983) 357. https://doi.org/10.2307/3544308.
- 750 [59] A. Buttler, Permanent plot research in wet meadows and cutting experiment, Vegetatio. 103 (1992) 113–124. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF00047697.
- 752 [60] T. Poisot, E. Canard, D. Mouillot, N. Mouquet, D. Gravel, F. Jordan, The dissimilarity of species interaction networks., Ecol. Lett. 15 (2012) 1353–1361. 754 http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ele.12002.
- 755 [61] J.S. Lefcheck, piecewiseSEM: Piecewise structural equation modelling in r for ecology, 756 evolution, and systematics, Methods Ecol. Evol. (2015). 757 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/2041-210X.12512/full.
- J.B. Grace, T.M. Anderson, H. Olff, S.M. Scheiner, On the specification of structural equation models for ecological systems, Ecol. Monogr. 80 (2010) 67–87. http://www.esajournals.org/doi/abs/10.1890/09-0464.1.
- 761 [63] R Core Team, R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, (2020).
- [64] G. Csardi, T.N. InterJournal, C. Systems, 2006, The igraph software package for complex network research, InterJournal, Complex Syst. 1695 (2006) 1–9.
   http://www.necsi.edu/events/iccs6/papers/c1602a3c126ba822d0bc4293371c.pdf.
- [65] S. Seibold, M.W. Cadotte, J.S. MacIvor, S. Thorn, J. Müller, The Necessity of Multitrophic
   Approaches in Community Ecology, Trends Ecol. Evol. 33 (2018) 754–764.
   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.07.001.
- [66] A.N. Tsyganov, S. Temmerman, P. Ledeganck, L. Beyens, The Distribution of Soil Testate
   Amoebae under Winter Snow Cover at the Plot-scale Level in Arctic Tundra
   (Qeqertarsuaq/Disko Island, West Greenland), Acta Protozool. (2012).
   http://www.wuj.pl/UserFiles/File/Acta Protozoologica 51 2012/51 2/AP 51 2 6.pdf.
- [67] L.O. Davies, H. Schäfer, S. Marshall, I. Bramke, R.G. Oliver, G.D. Bending, Light
   Structures Phototroph, Bacterial and Fungal Communities at the Soil Surface, PLoS One. 8
   (2013) e69048. https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0069048.
- [68] S. Hamard, M. Küttim, R. Céréghino, V.E.J. Jassey, Peatland microhabitat heterogeneity
   drives phototrophic microbes distribution and photosynthetic activity, Environ. Microbiol. 23
   (2021) 6811–6827. https://doi.org/10.1111/1462-2920.15779.
- [69] V.E.J. Jassey, S. Hamard, C. Lepère, R. Céréghino, B. Corbara, M. Küttim, J. Leflaive, C.
   Leroy, J.-F. Carrias, Photosynthetic microorganisms effectively contribute to bryophyte CO2
   fixation in boreal and tropical regions, ISME Commun. 2022 21. 2 (2022) 1–10.
   https://doi.org/10.1038/s43705-022-00149-w.
- 783 [70] M.M. Bengtsson, K. Wagner, C. Schwab, T. Urich, T.J. Battin, Light availability impacts 784 structure and function of phototrophic stream biofilms across domains and trophic levels, 785 Mol. Ecol. 27 (2018) 2913–2925. 786 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/mec.14696.
- 787 [71] J.B. McKinlay, G.M. Cook, K. Hards, Microbial energy management—A product of three 788 broad tradeoffs, Adv. Microb. Physiol. 77 (2020) 139–185. 789 https://doi.org/10.1016/BS.AMPBS.2020.09.001.
- 790 [72] D.F. Wilson, Oxidative phosphorylation: regulation and role in cellular and tissue metabolism, J. Physiol. 595 (2017) 7023. https://doi.org/10.1113/JP273839.
- 792 [73] B.A. Ward, M.J. Follows, Marine mixotrophy increases trophic transfer efficiency, mean

- 793 organism size, and vertical carbon flux., Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. (2016) 201517118.

  794 http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1517118113.
- [74] S. Hamard, R. Céréghino, M. Barret, A. Sytiuk, E. Lara, E. Dorrepaal, P. Kardol, M. Küttim,
   M. Lamentowicz, J. Leflaive, G. le Roux, E. Tuittila, V.E.J. Jassey, Contribution of
   microbial photosynthesis to peatland carbon uptake along a latitudinal gradient, J. Ecol. 109
   (2021) 3424–3441. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.13732.
- W. Xiong, A. Jousset, S. Guo, I. Karlsson, Q. Zhao, H. Wu, G.A. Kowalchuk, Q. Shen, R.
   Li, S. Geisen, Soil protist communities form a dynamic hub in the soil microbiome., ISME J.
   12 (2018) 634–638. http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/ismej.2017.171.
- V.E.J. Jassey, R. Walcker, P. Kardol, S. Geisen, T. Heger, M. Lamentowicz, S. Hamard, E. Lara, Contribution of soil algae to the global carbon cycle, New Phytol. 234 (2022) 64–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.17950.
- B.J.M. Robroek, V.E.J. Jassey, M.A.R. Kox, R.L. Berendsen, R.T.E. Mills, L. Cécillon, J. Puissant, M. Meima-Franke, P.A.H.M. Bakker, P.L.E. Bodelier, Peatland vascular plant functional types affect methane dynamics by altering microbial community structure, J. Ecol. 103 (2015) 925–934. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/1365-2745.12413.
- [78] B.J.M. Robroek, R.J.H. Albrecht, S. Hamard, A. Pulgarin, L. Bragazza, A. Buttler, V.E.J.
   Jassey, Peatland vascular plant functional types affect dissolved organic matter chemistry,
   Plant Soil. 407 (2016) 135–143. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11104-015-2710-3.
- A. Gunina, Y. Kuzyakov, Sugars in soil and sweets for microorganisms: Review of origin, content, composition and fate, Soil Biol. Biochem. 90 (2015) 87–100. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0038071715002631.
- [80] J. Trap, M. Bonkowski, C. Plassard, C. Villenave, E. Blanchart, Ecological importance of soil bacterivores for ecosystem functions, Plant Soil. 398 (2016) 1–24.
   https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-015-2671-6.
- 818 [81] M. Sauvadet, M. Chauvat, D. Cluzeau, P.-A. Maron, C. Villenave, I. Bertrand, The dynamics 819 of soil micro-food web structure and functions vary according to litter quality, Soil Biol. 820 Biochem. 95 (2016) 262–274. 821 http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0038071716000092.
- 822 [82] S. Geisen, S. Hu, T.E.E. Cruz, G.F.C. Veen, Protists as catalyzers of microbial litter 823 breakdown and carbon cycling at different temperature regimes, ISME J. (2020) 1–4. 824 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41396-020-00792-y.
- [83] M. Bonkowski, Protozoa and plant growth: the microbial loop in soil revisited, New Phytol.
   162 (2004) 617–631. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01066.x/full.
- J. Hines, M.O. Gessner, Consumer trophic diversity as a fundamental mechanism linking predation and ecosystem functioning, J. Anim. Ecol. 81 (2012) 1146–1153. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1365-2656.2012.02003.X.
- 831 [85] M.J.S. Hensel, B.R. Silliman, Consumer diversity across kingdoms supports multiple 832 functions in a coastal ecosystem, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 110 (2013) 20621–20626. 833 https://doi.org/10.1073/PNAS.1312317110/-/DCSUPPLEMENTAL.
- [86] V.E.J. Jassey, C. Signarbieux, S. Hättenschwiler, L. Bragazza, A. Buttler, F. Delarue, B.
   Fournier, D. Gilbert, F. Laggoun-Défarge, E. Lara, R.T.E. Mills, E.A.D. Mitchell, R.J.
   Payne, B.J.M. Robroek, An unexpected role for mixotrophs in the response of peatland carbon cycling to climate warming., Sci. Rep. 5 (2015) 16910–16931.
   http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep16931.
- 839 [87] A.M. Basińska, M.K. Reczuga, M. Gabka, M. Stróżecki, D. Łuców, M. Samson, M.

  840 Urbaniak, J. Leśny, B.H. Chojnicki, D. Gilbert, T. Sobczyński, J. Olejnik, H. Silvennoinen,

  841 R. Juszczak, M. Lamentowicz, Experimental warming and precipitation reduction affect the

  842 biomass of microbial communities in a Sphagnum peatland, Ecol. Indic. 112 (2020) 106059.

  843 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1470160X19310556.

**Table 1.** Food web metrics at the three depths and in the two microhabitats. Abbreviations are given

in the method. Letters indicate significant differences between depths and microhabitats (P < 0.05,

847 GLMs).

848

849

845

# Figure captions

- Figure 1: Characterization of the divergence between microbial food webs with depth and/or habitats.
- 851 (a, b) Network beta-diversity indices of the pairwise comparison between the food webs along
- 852 Sphagnum segments (a) and habitat among the same depth (b). OS = dissimilarity of interactions
- between shared species in the food webs, S = dissimilarity in species composition of food webs, ST
- 854 = dissimilarity of interactions due to species turnover, WN =  $\beta$ -diversity of species interactions. (c,
- d) Principal component analysis (PCA) biplot of food web metrics summarising the depth and habitat
- variability in the food web structure. Transparent coloured areas define the convex hull of the depth
- and habitat clusters grouping plots with similar food web properties. The arrow colours of the metrics
- 858 represent different approaches: qualitative metrics (blue), node-weighted metrics (orange) and link-
- weighted metrics (red). The insert on (d) shows the percentage contribution of each food web metric
- to PC1 and PC2. Abbreviations of food web metrics are given in section 2.4.
- Figure 2: Microbial biomass distribution across trophic levels of each food web. Barplots of the total
- biomass spread across trophic levels at each depth and across habitats. Shown are the mean  $\pm$  SD.
- Letters indicate significant differences among habitats and depths (ANOVA).
- 864 **Figure 3**: Energy fluxes in food webs (μJ/g/sec). Boxplots of the energy flux transiting in the entire
- food webs (total) and into each trophic function, *i.e.*, bacterivory/fungivory, algivory, mixotrophy
- and predation, respectively, at each depth and across habitats. Shown are the median and the 25%
- and 75% interquartile range. Letters indicate significant differences among Sphagnum segments
- 868 (ANOVA, P < 0.05), whereas asterisks indicate a global habitat effect (ANOVA, P < 0.05).
- Figure 4: Linkages between food web complexities and ecosystem functions. Relationships between
- ecosystem functions (decomposition and microbial activity) and diversity across trophic levels (a),
- food web dissimilarity components (b), biomass across trophic levels, (d) and energy fluxes across
- functional groups are shown (e). Responses represent standardised effect sizes of GLM models  $\pm$  SD,
- with points situated above or below zero (dotted line) indicating an increase or decrease of the
- function to the increasing value of food web complexity taken into account. Responses with error
- bars not intersecting zero (red) are significant (P < 0.05), and non-significant responses are black.
- 876 Figure 5: Structural equation model (SEM) of environmental and species richness effects on the
- 877 linkages between microbial food web structural features and ecosystem functioning. Solid black
- arrows are significant paths (P < 0.05, piecewise SEM) while dashed arrows are non-significant paths
- 879 (P > 0.05, piecewise SEM).  $R^2s$  of the component are given in the boxes of endogenous variables.
- SEM global goodness-of-fit are Fisher's C = 34.2, P = 0.08, Df = 24, AIC = 80.7. TL 1 = trophic
- level 1, i.e. basal species. Food web properties are the first PCA axis from Fig. 1c, d. Decomposition
- was used as a proxy for Ecosystem functions in this model.

883

884

885

#### Supplementary figures

887

909

910

911

912

- Figure S1: Characterization of the WET and DRY areas. (a) Depth to Water Table (DWT, in meters)
- in the WET and DRY area over 2009. DWT has been measured continuously using sensors for Water
- 890 Level measurements (Campbell scientific®) installed in piezometers in each area. (b-d)
- 891 microtopography (m), plant diversity, and plant community composition in each area. Asterisks
- indicate significant differences between the WET and DRY areas (ANOVAs).
- Figure S2: Effect of distance on the beta-diversity of the microbial communities and associated food
- 894 webs. The Mantel correlogram for microbial species assemblages is based on Bray-Curtis
- dissimilarities compared to the Euclidean spatial distances and the Spearman correlation coefficient.
- The Mantel correlogram for microbial food webs is based on the network-dissimilarity index (WN,
- see section 2.7) compared to the Euclidean distances and the Spearman correlation coefficient.
- Positive and significant correlations were detected between 0 and 7 m, no correlations at distances
- between 7 and 37 m were found.
- 900 Figure S3: The food web metawebs across habitats and Sphagnum segments. Node colours
- orrespond to a taxon's main functional grouping and node size to the biomass of the respective node.
- 902 R = node richness, C = connectance, N = nestedness.
- 903 Figure S4: Biomass of each functional group in function of depth and habitat. Shown are the mean
- 904 ± SD. Letters indicate significant differences among depths (ANOVA). L = living segments, Dec =
- 905 decaying segments; D = dead segments.
- 906 Figure S5: Correlation coefficient between food web metrics and microbial activity, measured as
- 907 phenoloxidase activity. Bars in black are significant at P < 0.05, whilst white bars are non-significant.
- 908 Abbreviations are given in the method.









