



Beta redundancy for functional ecology

Carlo Ricotta, Evsey Kosman, Fabien Laroche, Sandrine Pavoine

► To cite this version:

Carlo Ricotta, Evsey Kosman, Fabien Laroche, Sandrine Pavoine. Beta redundancy for functional ecology. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 2021, 12 (6), pp.1062-1069. 10.1111/2041-210X.13587 . hal-03463567

HAL Id: hal-03463567

<https://hal.science/hal-03463567>

Submitted on 2 Dec 2021

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Beta redundancy for functional ecology

Carlo Ricotta^{1,*} Evsey Kosman² Fabien Laroche³ Sandrine Pavoine⁴

¹ Department of Environmental Biology, University of Rome ‘La Sapienza’, Rome, Italy. ² Institute for Cereal Crops Improvement, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel. ³ Irstea, UR EFNO, 45290 Nogent-sur-Vernisson, France. ⁴ Centre d’Ecologie et des Sciences de la Conservation (CESCO), Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle, CNRS, Sorbonne Université, 75005 Paris, France.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: carlo.ricotta@uniroma1.it

Abstract.

1. Functional beta redundancy has been recently defined as the fraction of species dissimilarity between two plots not expressed by functional dissimilarity. As such, it summarizes to what degree the compositional differences between two plots mirror their functional differences.

2. A fundamental condition to obtain an appropriate measure of functional beta redundancy is that the functional dissimilarity between the plots is always lower (or at least not higher) than the corresponding species dissimilarity. However, many of the extant measures of functional dissimilarity do not fulfill this requirement.

3. To overcome this problem, a class of tree-based indices of functional dissimilarity that conform to the above ‘redundancy property’ has been recently proposed. However, functional dissimilarity measures need not necessarily be based on a hierarchical representation of the species functional relationships.

4. In this paper we introduce an algorithmic index of functional dissimilarity that conforms to the redundancy property. Since it does not rely on a hierarchical species organization, the proposed index allows to calculate functional beta redundancy in a more suitable way to the non-hierarchical structure of the species functional relationships. The behavior of the proposed measure is illustrated with data on the species functional turnover along real and simulated ecological gradients.

Keywords: Algorithmic measure; Functional dissimilarity; Local vs. global scaling; Redundancy property; Standardized vs. non-standardized coefficients.

1. Introduction

In a recent paper, Ricotta, Laroche, Szeidl, & Pavoine (2020) introduced the notion of beta redundancy to quantify the fraction of species dissimilarity between two plots not expressed by functional or phylogenetic dissimilarity. Therefore, beta redundancy basically summarizes to what degree the species turnover between two plots is associated to a functional or phylogenetic turnover. This might help to infer the processes underpinning diversity distribution in space and time.

For a pair of plots P and Q , the chief condition to get a meaningful index of beta redundancy is that the functional or phylogenetic dissimilarity D_F is always lower than the corresponding species dissimilarity D_S . However, many of the most popular indices of functional and phylogenetic dissimilarity violate this condition, thus leading to the paradoxical situation of a negative beta redundancy (see Ricotta et al., 2020; Appendix S1). To overcome this problem, Ricotta et al. (2020) proposed a class of tree-based indices of functional and phylogenetic dissimilarity between plots that conform to the condition $D_F \leq D_S$. The indices are said ‘tree-based’ because they depend on a functional or phylogenetic tree with species as tips and branches that express functional or phylogenetic relationships between species. However, while phylogenies have a hierarchical, non-overlapping structure, functional diversity tends to have a non-hierarchical, overlapping structure (Von Euler & Svensson, 2001). Therefore, being based on a hierarchical structure of species relationships, the proposed tree-based measures are the more natural way for summarizing plot-to-plot phylogenetic dissimilarity, whereas a tree-based representation of the species functional relationships is not unanimously accepted by ecologists (see e.g. Poos, Walker & Jackson, 2009; Pavoine, 2016). For example, Maire, Grenouillet, Brosse, & Villéger (2015) and Loiseau et al. (2017) have reported that dendrograms tend to overestimate the functional distance between species leading to a biased assessment of functional relatedness.

The aim of this paper is thus to propose an abundance-based version of the algorithmic index of functional dissimilarity developed by Kosman (1996) and Gregorius, Gillet, & Ziehe (2003) that conforms to the requirement $D_F \leq D_S$. Since it does not rely on a tree-based species organization, the proposed measure allows to calculate functional beta redundancy in a way that is more appropriate to the non-hierarchical structure of functional relationships among species. Two worked examples with artificial and actual data sets, both representing the species functional turnover along ecological gradients are used to illustrate our approach.

2. An algorithmic measure of functional beta redundancy

Let P and Q be two plots with species relative abundance vectors $P = (p_1, \dots, p_i, \dots, p_S)$ and $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_i, \dots, q_S)$, where $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^S p_i = 1$ (similarly, $0 \leq q_i \leq 1$, $\sum_{i=1}^S q_i = 1$) and S is the total number of species in both plots. The information on the species functional organization within both plots is usually represented by a symmetric $S \times S$ matrix of pairwise functional dissimilarities d_{ij} between species i and j with $0 \leq d_{ij} \leq 1$, $d_{ij} = d_{ji}$ and $d_{ii} = 0$ ($i, j = 1, 2, \dots, S$). Also, let D_F be the functional dissimilarity between P and Q and D_S be the corresponding species dissimilarity. D_F is typically calculated by combining the species relative abundances in both plots

72 with their functional dissimilarities d_{ij} , whereas D_s is calculated with the same species abundances
 73 as D_F but considering all species equally and maximally dissimilar from each other (i.e. with $d_{ij} = 1$
 74 for all $i \neq j$).

75 The basic condition to obtain a meaningful and easily interpretable index of beta redundancy in
 76 the range $[0,1]$ is that the functional dissimilarity D_F is lower (or at least not higher) than the
 77 corresponding species dissimilarity D_s . In this case, beta redundancy can be calculated as (Ricotta et
 78 al., 2020):

$$80 \quad R_\beta = \frac{(D_s - D_F)}{D_s} \quad (1)$$

81
 82 while beta uniqueness, which is the complement of beta redundancy, can be calculated as:

$$84 \quad U_\beta = 1 - R_\beta = \frac{D_F}{D_s} \quad (2)$$

85
 86 For $R_\beta = 0$, the species turnover between P and Q goes together with a corresponding functional
 87 turnover such that $D_F = D_s$. Hence, the compositional differences between P and Q mirror their
 88 functional differences. On the contrary, for $R_\beta = 1$, both plots are functionally identical to each other
 89 (i.e. $D_F = 0$). In this case, the species turnover between P and Q is not associated to a corresponding
 90 change in functional properties.

91 Kosman (1996) and Gregorius et al. (2003) independently proposed an algorithmic measure of
 92 (functional) dissimilarity which is based on the optimal overall matching between the species
 93 abundances in P and Q so as to minimize the mean functional dissimilarity between both plots. We
 94 can think of this operation as follows: for two plots of equal size P and Q with n individuals in each
 95 plot, to each individual in P an individual in Q is matched to obtain n pairs that minimize the sum of
 96 functional dissimilarities between individuals of the corresponding pairs (Kosman & Leonard, 2007).
 97 The pairs are constructed in such a way that all individuals in both plots are used only once. The
 98 dissimilarity between plots is then calculated by dividing this sum by n (the number of pairs of
 99 individuals). Finding the optimal matching between the species abundances in P and Q is known as
 100 the ‘assignment problem’ (Bellman, Cooke, & Lockett, 1970), a special case of the Transportation
 101 Problem (TP) of linear programming (Hitchcock, 1941).

Note that, since the number of individuals in both plots is usually not the same, to get a complete matching between P and Q , this operation is best performed on the species relative abundances (see Gregorius et al., 2003). Note also that, since this index is a mean dissimilarity between matched pairs of individuals, if the functional dissimilarity between each pair of individuals is in the range $[0,1]$, the resulting mean plot-to-plot dissimilarity also ranges between 0 and 1.

In terms of relative abundances, the algorithmic index of functional dissimilarity between plots P and Q can be defined as (Gregorius et al., 2003):

$$D_{KG} = \min_a \sum_{i=1}^S \sum_{j=1}^S d_{ij} \times a(i, j) \quad (3)$$

where $a(i, j)$ is the proportion of abundance of species i in plot P that is assigned to individuals of species j in plot Q . According to Kosman & Leonard (2007), if the functional dissimilarity between species is metric, then D_{KG} is also metric. Gregorius et al. (2003) and Kosman (2014) further showed that if all species are considered maximally dissimilar from each other (i.e. if $d_{ij} = 1$ for all species $i \neq j$ and $d_{ii} = 0$), D_{KG} will be equal to the Rogers (1972) dissimilarity:

$$D_R = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^S |p_i - q_i| \quad (4)$$

Otherwise, for any dissimilarity d_{ij} in the range $[0,1]$, D_{KG} is always lower than D_R , thus conforming to the redundancy property that $D_F \leq D_S$ (proof in Appendix 1). For those that are unfamiliar with the Rogers dissimilarity, it is worth mentioning that this coefficient is identical to the well-known Bray & Curtis (1957) dissimilarity (D_{BC}) computed on the species relative abundances:

$$D_{BC} = \sum_{i=1}^S |p_i - q_i| / \sum_{i=1}^S (p_i + q_i) = \sum_{i=1}^S |p_i - q_i| / 2.$$

Accordingly, based on the algorithmic dissimilarity D_{KG} , we can define a measure of beta redundancy and uniqueness as:

$$R_\beta = \frac{(D_S - D_F)}{D_S} = \frac{(D_R - D_{KG})}{D_R} \quad (5)$$

and

131

$$132 \quad U_{\beta} = \frac{D_F}{D_S} = \frac{D_{KG}}{D_R} \quad (6)$$

133

134 where beta uniqueness is the fraction of species dissimilarity that is associated to functional
 135 dissimilarity, and beta redundancy is the fraction of species dissimilarity that is not associated to
 136 functional dissimilarity.

137 While the algorithmic dissimilarity of Kosman (1996) and Gregorius et al. (2003) has been
 138 originally developed in the field of genetics, in community ecology, a number of non-algorithmic
 139 measures based on minimum dissimilarity between the species in both plots have been proposed
 140 (Clarke & Warwick, 1998; Izsak & Price, 2001; Clarke, Somerfield, & Chapman, 2006; Ricotta &
 141 Burrascano, 2008; Swenson, 2011; Ricotta, Podani, & Pavoine, 2016). All these measures basically
 142 calculate the functional dissimilarity between a given species in the first plot and its closest
 143 functional relative in the second plot. This procedure is repeated for all species in P and Q and then
 144 averaged over both plots. The main difference is that D_{KG} is based on a (computationally intensive)
 145 optimal matching between the species abundances in both plots. This ensures that all individuals in P
 146 and Q are involved in the calculation of D_{KG} . By contrast, the ‘suboptimal’ matching performed by
 147 the non-algorithmic measures retains only nearest-neighbor differences between species for the
 148 calculation of functional dissimilarity. As a result, they generally underestimate functional
 149 dissimilarity compared to D_{KG} . For details, see Ricotta et al. (2020, Appendix S2).

150 Beta uniqueness $U_{\beta} = D_F / D_S$ and redundancy $R_{\beta} = (D_S - D_F) / D_S$ are standardized coefficients
 151 that allow us to partition species dissimilarity into two complementary components: the degree of
 152 overlap between species dissimilarity and functional dissimilarity (U_{β}), and the fraction of species
 153 dissimilarity not expressed by functional dissimilarity (R_{β}) such that $U_{\beta} + R_{\beta} = 1$. However, these
 154 measures tell us nothing on the amount of similarity among plots. To get a more complete picture of
 155 the patterns of species and functional similarity among pairs of plots, non-standardized coefficients
 156 may be also used.

157 We start by noticing that if species dissimilarity D_S is bounded between zero and one, its
 158 complement $1 - D_S$ represents a suitable measure of species similarity among plots. At the same
 159 time, D_S can be also partitioned into two complementary components which represent the non-
 160 standardized versions of uniqueness and redundancy: functional dissimilarity D_F , and $D_S - D_F$
 161 which is the (absolute) amount of species dissimilarity not expressed by functional dissimilarity. To

differentiate $D_S - D_F$ from beta redundancy, in the remainder we will call this quantity ‘dissimilarity gap’ (Table 1 contains a summary of terms along with their definitions).

Therefore, for any functional dissimilarity coefficient that conforms to the redundancy property, we can define three non-standardized components: functional dissimilarity (D_F), dissimilarity gap ($D_S - D_F$) and species similarity ($1 - D_S$) such that $D_F + (D_S - D_F) + (1 - D_S) = 1$. For the algorithmic measures of Kosman (1996) and Gregorius et al. (2003), these three non-standardized components are D_{KG} , $D_R - D_{KG}$ and $1 - D_R$, respectively. Note however, that the same approach can be used for any functional dissimilarity measure in the range $[0, 1]$ that conforms to the redundancy property, including the tree-based functional and phylogenetic dissimilarity measures proposed by Ricotta et al. (2020).

3. Worked examples

3.1. Artificial data

The behavior of the proposed measures was first evaluated on a small artificial data set representing an ideal ecological gradient. The data consist of a matrix with the relative abundances of 15 species (S1-S15) in 10 plots (P1-P10). The matrix was built such that all species have unimodal abundance pattern of varying amplitude along the gradient (Table 1), while the corresponding functional dissimilarity matrix among species was built such that the interspecies dissimilarities reflect the species ecological differences along the simulated gradient (Appendix 2). To this end, the interspecies similarities were set proportional to the distance between the species optima (i.e. the locations along the gradient where the species show their maximum abundances).

To explore the response of the proposed measures to changes in species composition along the simulated gradient, we compared plot P1 with itself and with the remaining plots in terms of beta redundancy, species dissimilarity, functional dissimilarity, and dissimilarity gap. All measures were calculated with a new R function available in Appendix 3 of this paper, which uses the same TP algorithm of Gregorius et al. (2003).

3.2. Vegetation primary succession

We also explored the behavior of the proposed measures on Alpine vegetation sampled by Caccianiga, Luzzaro, Pierce, Ceriani, & Cerabolini (2006) along a primary succession. The data set, which has been already used in previous papers on alpha and beta redundancy (Ricotta et al., 2016; Ricotta et al., 2020) is composed of 59 plots of approximately 25 m² sampled at the foreland of the Rutor Glacier (Northern Italy). For each plot, species abundances were measured with a five-point ordinal scale transformed to ranks. Based on the age of the moraine deposits, the plots were then

classified into three successional stages: early-successional stage (17 plots), mid-successional stage (32 plots), and late-successional stage (10 plots).

For all 45 plant species in the data set, we selected six quantitative traits measured by Caccianiga et al. (2006, Table 2), which provide a good representation of the global spectrum of form and function (Díaz et al., 2016): canopy height (CH; mm), leaf dry mass content (LDMC; %), leaf dry weight (LDW; mg), specific leaf area (SLA; $\text{mm}^2 \times \text{mg}^{-1}$), leaf nitrogen content (LNC; %), and leaf carbon content (LCC; %). All data are available in the data object named ‘RutorGlacier’ of the *adiv* package (Pavoine, 2020) of R (R Core Team, 2021).

We used the Euclidean distance to calculate an interspecies dissimilarity matrix from the six functional traits. Before calculations, all traits were standardized to zero mean and unit standard deviation. The resulting functional distances among species were then rescaled to the unit range by dividing each distance by the maximum value in the distance matrix.

Based on the scaled matrix, we calculated the standardized and non-standardized functional dissimilarity components for all pairs of plots in each successional stage. We next used the PERMDISP test (Permutational Analysis of Multivariate Dispersions) of Anderson (2006) to test for differences in the dispersion of species dissimilarity D_R , functional dissimilarity D_{KG} and functional uniqueness U_β among the three successional stages.

4. Results

4.1. Artificial data

The profile diagrams in Figure 1 (Podani & Miklós, 2002) show the response of species dissimilarity D_R , functional dissimilarity D_{KG} , beta redundancy R_β and dissimilarity gap $D_R - D_{KG}$ to changes in species composition along the artificial gradient in Table 1. The comparison of the first plot with itself and all other plots shows a monotonic increase of species and functional dissimilarity along the gradient. Note however that, while for the pair of plots P1/P10, species dissimilarity reaches its maximum value (i.e. $D_R = 1$), meaning that P1 has no species in common with P10, functional dissimilarity does not reach its maximum value because the species in both plots are not completely functionally distinct. The profile diagrams in Figure 1 also show the main conceptual differences between standardized beta redundancy $R_\beta = (D_R - D_{KG})/D_R$ and the non-standardized dissimilarity gap $D_R - D_{KG}$. In absolute terms, $D_R - D_{KG}$ increases along the first part of the gradient where the species turnover among plot P1 and the other plots is only weakly associated to a corresponding functional turnover. Then, it decreases along the second part of the gradient, where most of the species differences among P1 and the other plots are associated to functional differences

among plots. By contrast, in relative terms, as species dissimilarity increases along the gradient, functional redundancy R_β tends to be progressively replaced by functional uniqueness $U_\beta = 1 - R_\beta$.

Note that for two identical plots, species dissimilarity D_S and functional dissimilarity D_F are both zero. In this case, beta uniqueness $U_{PP} = D_F / D_S$ and redundancy $R_{PP} = (D_S - D_F) / D_S$ are not defined. However, considering that beta uniqueness $U_\beta = D_F / D_S$ is a relative measure that relates plot-to-plot functional dissimilarity to its local maximum, we set by definition $U_{PP} = 0$ if $D_S = 0$. At the other extreme, for two maximally dissimilar plots P and Q with no species in common and maximum functional dissimilarity $d_{ij} = 1$ for species i and j belonging to P and Q , respectively, we have $D_F = D_S = 1$ and hence $U_{PP} = 1$. Likewise, since beta redundancy $R_\beta = 1 - U_\beta$ it follows that $R_{PP} = 1$ if $D_S = 0$, and $R_{PP} = 0$ if $D_F = D_S = 1$.

4.2. Vegetation primary succession

Caccianiga et al. (2006) showed that in the early-successional stage, the colonization of the moraine ridges of the Rutor glacier by the first pioneer species is primarily controlled by random dispersal, whereas the vegetation of the mid- and late-successional stages shows a higher level of functional homogeneity. This increase in functional homogeneity produces a similar increase in functional alpha and beta redundancy along the primary succession (Ricotta et al., 2016; 2020).

The results of the test for differences in the dispersion of D_R , D_{KG} and U_β among the three successional stages are shown in Table 3. First, based on the pairwise dissimilarities among pair of plots in each successional stage, the test calculates the dissimilarity of individual plots from the corresponding group centroid. Next, a permutational t-test with 9999 randomizations of these dissimilarities is used to test for pairwise differences in average dissimilarity of individual plots from their group centroids. For details on the PERMDISP test, see Anderson (2006).

In good agreement with the results of Ricotta et al. (2020), the successional stages do not differ significantly in species dissimilarity D_R , meaning that the species turnover among plots is more or less the same in all successional stages. By contrast, (non-standardized) functional dissimilarity D_{KG} and (standardized) uniqueness D_{KG} / D_R in the early-successional stage are both significantly higher than in the mid- and late-successional stages. That is, due to the more random dispersal mechanisms, in the early-successional stage, the species turnover is associated to a higher rate of functional turnover compared to the mid- and late-successional stages where the species in one plot tend to be replaced by functionally related species in the other plots.

Discussion

Ricotta et al. (2020) introduced the concept of beta redundancy to summarize the fraction of species dissimilarity D_S between two plots not expressed by functional or phylogenetic dissimilarity D_F . From an ecological viewpoint, this index tells us to what degree the species turnover between two plots is associated to a functional or phylogenetic turnover among the species in both plots. From a technical viewpoint, a necessary condition for a suitable index of beta redundancy is that the functional or phylogenetic dissimilarity is always lower than species dissimilarity: $D_F \leq D_S$. This condition prevents beta redundancy from taking negative values. Ricotta et al. (2020) also developed a new class of indices of functional and phylogenetic dissimilarity between plots that conform to the redundancy property $D_F \leq D_S$. However, these indices depend on a hierarchical structure (a tree) of functional differences among species, which is not always considered adequate to portray the species functional relationships.

To develop a new index of functional beta redundancy that does not require the definition of a functional tree, our first step was to ‘import’ in the ecological literature an algorithmic index of functional dissimilarity D_{KG} originally proposed by Kosman (1996) and Gregorius et al. (2003) for genetic studies. Given two plots P and Q , the index is based on the optimal overall matching between the species abundances in both plots, so as to minimize the mean functional dissimilarity for the matched species abundances between P and Q . Since the calculation of D_{KG} does not require a tree-based species structure, the proposed measure of functional beta redundancy is now more flexible and compatible with the usual ways of representing functional relationships among species. Note that, since this index is essentially a kind of mean functional dissimilarity between the species in two plots, the practitioner can base the analysis on any functional dissimilarity measure of choice.

Being conform to the redundancy property $D_F \leq D_S$, this algorithmic index enables to calculate (relative) functional redundancy and uniqueness in the usual way: $R_\beta = (D_S - D_F)/D_S$ and $U_\beta = 1 - R_\beta = D_F/D_S$. In addition to these relative coefficients, for a dissimilarity index that is bounded in the range $[0, 1]$ the non-standardized coefficients of functional dissimilarity D_F and dissimilarity gap $D_S - D_F$ may be also used.

The main difference between beta redundancy and uniqueness and their non-standardized versions, $D_S - D_F$ and D_F , is how the measures are scaled. For two plots with relative abundance vectors $P = (p_1, \dots, p_i, \dots, p_S)$ and $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_j, \dots, q_S)$, a measure of non-standardized functional dissimilarity D_F in the range $[0, 1]$, attains its maximum value (i.e. its global maximum) $D_F = 1$ for two maximally dissimilar plots with no species in common and maximum functional differences

293 $d_{ij} = 1$ for species i belonging to plot P and species j to plot Q . By contrast, to calculate U_β
 294 functional dissimilarity D_F is scaled by its local maximum D_S , i.e. by the maximum value that D_F
 295 can reach by keeping the relative abundance vectors unchanged and by imposing $d_{ij} = 1$ for all $i \neq j$.

296 The ecologically interesting aspect of the non-standardized dissimilarity gap $D_S - D_F$ is related to
 297 its dual nature. In fact, $D_S - D_F$ is at the same time a component of species *dissimilarity* and of
 298 functional *similarity*. The dissimilarity gap thus summarizes to what degree the differential species in
 299 two plots are able to perform the same ecological functions. Therefore, $D_S - D_F$ and its standardized
 300 version R_β are directly related to classical ecological processes, such as habitat filtering (Zobel,
 301 1997), dark diversity (Pärtel, Szava-Kovats, & Zobel, 2011) and the species carousel model (van der
 302 Maarel & Sykes, 1993).

303 For example, using simulated and real data, Laroche, Violle, Taudière, & Munoz (2020)
 304 illustrated how the difference between functional and compositional dissimilarities can help in
 305 identifying the processes underpinning diversity patterns at the metacommunity scale. In case of
 306 habitat filtering, species in the same habitat tend to have more similar traits that help them to cope
 307 with the local environmental conditions. Optimal traits are different from one habitat to another.
 308 Species present in the regional species pool but absent from a given habitat may thus have non-
 309 optimal traits for that habitat that enable them to colonize different habitats with different
 310 environmental conditions. If species traits are more related to their fitness than to their niche, then,
 311 competitive exclusion could lead to the absence of the less competitive species from a given site and
 312 thus to coexisting species with similar trait values. Combined together, these equalizing processes
 313 due to abiotic and biotic filtering (i.e. species share trait values that make them locally adapted to
 314 their environment and that ensure their similarity in terms of fitness; Chesson, 2000) could both lead
 315 to high D_S and D_F , low R_β and low $D_S - D_F$ between plots of different habitats, and to low D_F
 316 and relatively high to high R_β between plots of similar habitats depending on the level of the
 317 corresponding D_S .

318 If dispersal is high between plots regardless of habitat conditions, and if stabilizing niche
 319 differences (see Chesson, 2000) favor coexistence between species with distinct trait values allowing
 320 low overlap in resource use and stronger intraspecific competition than interspecific competition,
 321 then we expect high functional differences between locally coexisting species and high species
 322 turnover between plots because similar species cannot coexist. Accordingly, we also expect high
 323 functional overdispersion meaning that the functional differences within plots are high, and the plots
 324 are functionally similar because for each species in one plot we can expect to find a ‘functionally-

relative' species not in the same plot but in another plot. In that case, limiting similarity due to stabilizing niche differences will lead to high D_S , low D_F , and hence high R_β and high $D_S - D_F$ between plots irrespective of the environmental conditions in the different plots.

High beta redundancy between plots (R_β and $D_S - D_F$), combined with high species dissimilarity (high D_S) could also inform priorities of conservation if some vulnerable species are absent in a site although the local ecological (biotic and abiotic) conditions would be favorable (dark diversity, Pärtel et al., 2011). This could be due to the species mobility and to stochastic colonization processes of favorable habitats (the species carousel of van der Maarel & Sykes, 1993). However, this could also be driven by habitat fragmentation, local extinction and limited or even hampered dispersal between the remnant habitat patches. This diversity of processes emphasizes the importance of selecting an appropriate null hypothesis for analyzing beta-redundancy patterns. In this paper, we used a standard permutational approach. Narrower null hypotheses, such as constrained permutations (Peres-Neto, Olden, & Jackson, 2001) or the neutral baseline approach of Laroche et al. (2020) could also be used to facilitate the distinction between alternative processes that may produce similar species distribution patterns.

Temporal surveys, revealing increase in D_S over years, accompanied by an increase in R_β and $D_S - D_F$, could be even more informative alerting conservation agencies to potentially drastic environmental impact on biodiversity necessitating ecosystem restoration. Consider a hypothetical case where functional dissimilarities between plots in a habitat are proportional to species dissimilarities: the more complementary the plots are in terms of species, the more functional types they together contribute to the functional diversity of the habitat. If in addition local species extinctions are so numerous that some species become globally extinct (over all habitat patches), R_β is expected to remain constant but $D_S - D_F$ to decrease, meaning that the original levels of species and functional diversity could only be reestablished by habitat restoration and species reintroductions, wherever possible.

To conclude, functional beta redundancy allows us to explore an important aspect of the complex multidimensional space of ecological data. As highlighted by several authors (see e.g. Lavorel et al., 2008; Ricotta & Moretti, 2011), which traits are actually relevant for ecosystem functioning depends on the specific process of interest. Therefore, a critical point is the selection of an appropriate set of functional traits. The basic assumption for exploring the effects of dissimilarity on ecosystem functioning is that communities with similar functional traits have similar ecological properties. Therefore, two communities are supposed to be functionally similar with respect to some a priori-defined ecological property if they share the same traits. In principle, increasing the number of traits

leads to more accurate measures of community similarity. However, these higher-dimensional functional spaces generally do not have any direct biological connection to the specific ecological properties under scrutiny. Therefore, instead of building increasingly larger functional spaces, we need to develop increasingly focused spaces that optimize their association to the property of interest (Ricotta and Moretti 2010). The construction of such ‘tailored’ functional spaces may be based on expert knowledge (Caccianiga et al., 2006), statistical methods (Ricotta & Moretti, 2010; Pierce et al., 2017) or on modeling approaches (Petchey & Gaston, 2006). In this view, we believe that future work combining indices of beta redundancy with the development of functional spaces strongly connected to a priori-selected properties will greatly contribute to the understanding of the relationships among different facets of community dissimilarity and ecosystem functioning.

Authors contributions. CR and SP formulated the research problem; EK and FL provided important feedback which helped shape the research; CR and SP analyzed the data; CR took the lead in writing the manuscript and SP in writing the appendices. All authors revised the manuscript critically and approved the final version.

Data availability statement

The R code used in this paper is deposited in the Dryad Digital Repository: <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.b2rbnzsds> (Ricotta, Kosman, Laroche, & Pavoine, 2021). The data of the Alpine vegetation are available online in the R package adiv: <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/adiv/index.html> (R Core Team, 2021). The functional dissimilarity matrix of the artificial data set is available in the supporting information of this paper (Appendix 2).

References

- Anderson, M.J. (2006) Distance-based tests for homogeneity of multivariate dispersions. *Biometrics*, 62, 245–253.
- Bellman, R., Cooke, K.L., Lockett, J.A. (1970). *Algorithms, graphs and computers*. Academic Press, New York.
- Bray, J.R., Curtis, J.T. (1957). An ordination of the upland forest communities of southern Wisconsin. *Ecological Monographs*, 27, 325–349.
- Caccianiga, M., Luzzaro, A., Pierce, S., Ceriani, R. M., Cerabolini, B.E.L. (2006). The functional basis of a primary succession resolved by CSR classification. *Oikos*, 112, 10–20.
- Chesson, P. (2000) Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, 31, 343–358.
- Clarke, K.R., Somerfield, P.J., Chapman, M. (2006) On resemblance measures for ecological studies, including taxonomic dissimilarities and a zero-adjusted Bray-Curtis coefficient for denuded assemblages. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 330, 55–80.
- Clarke, K.R., Warwick, R.M. (1998) Quantifying structural redundancy in ecological communities. *Oecologia*, 113, 278–89.
- Díaz, S., Kattge, J., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Wright, I.J., Lavorel, S., Dray, S., Reu, B., Kleyer, M., Wirth, C., Prentice, I.C., Garnier, E., Bönsch, G., Westoby, M., Poorter, H., Reich, P.B., Moles, A.T., Dickie, J., Gillison, A.N., Zanne, A.E., Chave, J., Wright, S.J., Sheremet'ev, S.N., Jactel, H., Baraloto, C., Cerabolini, B., Pierce, S., Shipley, B., Kirkup, D., Casanoves, F., Joswig, J.S., Günther, A., Falczuk, V., Rüger, N., Mahecha, M.D., Gorné, L.D., 2016. The global spectrum of plant form and function. *Nature*, 529, 167–171.
- Gregorius, H.-R., Gillet, E.M., Ziehe, M. (2003) Measuring differences of trait distributions between populations. *Biometrical Journal*, 45, 959–973.
- Hitchcock, F.L. (1941) Distribution of a product from several sources to numerous localities. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 20, 224–230.
- Izsak, C., Price, R.G. (2001) Measuring β -diversity using a taxonomic similarity index, and its relation to spatial scale. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 215, 69–77.
- Kosman, E. (1996). Difference and diversity of plant pathogen populations: a new approach for measuring. *Phytopathology*, 86, 1152–1155.
- Kosman, E. (2014) Measuring diversity: from individuals to populations. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 138, 467–486.
- Kosman, E., Leonard, K.J. (2007). Conceptual analysis of methods applied to assessment of diversity within and distance between populations with asexual or mixed mode of reproduction. *New Phytologist*, 174, 683–696.

417 Laroche, F., Violle, C., Taudière, A., Munoz, F. (2020) Analyzing snapshot diversity patterns with
 418 the Neutral Theory can show functional groups' effects on community assembly. *Ecology* 101,
 419 e02977.

420 Lavorel, S., Grigulis, K., McIntyre, S., Garden, D., Williams, N., Dorrough, J., Berman, S., Quétier,
 421 F., Thébault, A., Bonis, A. (2008) Assessing functional diversity in the field - methodology
 422 matters! *Functional Ecology*, 22, 134–147.

423 Loiseau, N., Legras, G., Gaertner, J.C., Verley, P., Chabanet, P., Mérigot, B. (2017) Performance of
 424 partitioning functional beta-diversity indices: Influence of functional representation and
 425 partitioning methods. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 26, 753–762.

426 Maire, E., Grenouillet, G., Brosse, S., Villéger, S. (2015) How many dimensions are needed to
 427 accurately assess functional diversity? A pragmatic approach for assessing the quality of
 428 functional spaces. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 24, 728–740.

429 Pärtel, M., Szava-Kovats, R., Zobel, M. (2011) Dark diversity: shedding light on absent species.
 430 *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 26, 124–128.

431 Pavoine, S., 2016. A guide through a family of phylogenetic dissimilarity measures among sites.
 432 *Oikos*, 125, 1719–1732.

433 Pavoine, S. (2020) Adiv: An r package to analyse biodiversity in ecology. *Methods in Ecology and*
 434 *Evolution*, 11, 1106–1112.

435 Peres-Neto, P.R., Olden, J.D., Jackson, D.A. (2001) Environmentally constrained null models: site
 436 suitability as occupancy criterion. *Oikos*, 93, 110–120.

437 Petchey, O.L., Gaston, K.J. (2006) Functional diversity: back to basics and looking forward. *Ecology*
 438 *Letters*, 9, 74–758.

439 Pierce, S., Negreiros, D., Cerabolini, B.E.L., Kattge, J. Díaz, S., Kleyer, M., Shipley, B., Wright,
 440 S.J., Soudzilovskaia, N.A., Onipchenko, V.G., van Bodegom, P.M., Frenette-Dussault, C.,
 441 Weiher, E., Pinho, B.X., Cornelissen, J.H.C., Grime, J.P., Thompson, K., Hunt, R., Wilson, P.J.,
 442 Buffa, G., Nyakunga, O.C., Reich, P.B., Caccianiga, M., Mangili, F., Ceriani, R.M., Luzzaro, A.,
 443 Brusa, G., Siefert, A., Barbosa, N.P.U., Chapin III, F.S., Cornwell, W.K., Fang, J., Fernandes,
 444 G.W., Garnier, E., Le Stradic, S., Peñuelas, J., Melo, F.P.L., Slaviero, A., Tabarelli, M.,
 445 Tampucci, D. (2017) A global method for calculating plant CSR ecological strategies applied
 446 across biomes world-wide. *Functional Ecology*, 31, 444–457.

447 Podani, J., Miklós, I. (2002) Resemblance coefficients and the horseshoe effect in principal
 448 coordinates analysis. *Ecology*, 83, 3331–3343.

449 Poos, M.S., Walker, S.C., Jackson, D.A. (2009) Functional-diversity indices can be driven by
 450 methodological choices and species richness. *Ecology*, 90, 341–347.

451 R Core Team (2021) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
 452 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.

453 Ricotta C., Burrascano, S. (2008) Beta diversity for functional ecology. *Preslia* 80, 61–71.

454 Ricotta, C., de Bello, F., Moretti, M., Caccianiga, M., Cerabolini, B.E.L., Pavoine, S. (2016).
 455 Measuring the functional redundancy of biological communities: A quantitative guide. *Methods in*
 456 *Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 1386–1395.

457 Ricotta, C., Kosman, E., Laroche, F., & Pavoine, S. (2021). Data from: Beta redundancy for
 458 functional ecology. Dryad Digital Repository, <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.b2rbnzds>.

459 Ricotta, C., Laroche, F., Szeidl, L., Pavoine, S. (2020). From alpha to beta functional and
 460 phylogenetic redundancy. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 11, 487–493.

461 Ricotta, C., Moretti, M. (2010) Assessing the functional turnover of species assemblages with
 462 tailored dissimilarity matrices. *Oikos*, 119, 1089–1098.

463 Ricotta, C., Moretti, M. (2011) CWM and Rao’s quadratic diversity: a unified framework for
 464 functional ecology. *Oecologia*, 167, 181–188.

465 Ricotta, C., Podani, J., Pavoine, S. (2016) A family of functional dissimilarity measures for presence
 466 and absence data. *Ecology and Evolution*, 6, 5383–5389.

467 Rogers, J.S. (1972). *Measures of genetic similarity and genetic distance*. In: Studies in genetics VII.
 468 University of Texas Publication, Austin, pp. 145–143.

469 Swenson, N.G. (2011) Phylogenetic beta diversity metrics, trait evolution and inferring the
 470 functional beta diversity of communities. *PloS One*, 6, e21264.

471 van der Maarel, E., Sykes, M.T. (1993) Small-scale plant species turnover in a limestone grassland:
 472 the carousel model and some comments on the niche concept. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 4,
 473 179–188.

474 Von Euler, F., Svensson, S. (2001) Taxonomic distinctness and species richness as measures of
 475 functional structure in bird assemblages. *Oecologia*, 129, 304–311.

476 Zobel, M. (1997) The relative role of species pools in determining plant species richness: an
 477 alternative explanation of species coexistence? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 12, 266–269.

478 **Supporting Information**
479 Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the
480 end of the article.
481
482 **Appendix 1.** Proof that the algorithmic dissimilarity D_{KG} is always not higher than the Rogers
483 dissimilarity D_R .
484
485 **Appendix 2.** Interspecies dissimilarity matrix used for the calculation of the proposed redundancy
486 measures with the artificial data in Table 1.
487
488 **Appendix 3.** R scripts for the calculation of the proposed redundancy measures.

Table 1. Summary of all redundancy components used in this study. All components are formulated in terms of species and/or functional dissimilarities.

Component	Definitions and Abbreviations
Functional Dissimilarity	D_F
Species Dissimilarity	D_S
Dissimilarity Gap	$D_S - D_F$
Species Similarity	$1 - D_S$
Functional Similarity	$1 - D_F$
Beta Uniqueness	$U_\beta = D_F/D_S$
Beta Redundancy	$R_\beta = (D_S - D_F)/D_S$

Table 2. Artificial data set with the relative abundances of 15 species (S1-S15) in 10 plots (P1-P10) ordered along an ideal ecological gradient. The matrix was built such that all species have unimodal response of varying amplitude and abundance to a hypothetical one-dimensional gradient. Non-zero abundances are shown in grey. The locations of the species optima are highlighted in bold.

Species	Plot									
	P1	P2	P3	P4	P5	P6	P7	P8	P9	P10
S1	0.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S2	0.4	0.2	0.15	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
S3	0.1	0.15	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S4	0.2	0.35	0.25	0.15	0.05	0	0	0	0	0
S5	0	0	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
S6	0	0	0	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	0
S7	0.15	0.2	0.25	0.35	0.25	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0
S8	0	0.1	0.15	0.25	0.35	0.3	0.2	0.1	0	0
S9	0	0	0.05	0.15	0.25	0.2	0.1	0	0	0
S10	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.2	0.15	0	0	0
S11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.15	0	0	0
S12	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.25	0.5	0.45	0.45
S13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.05	0.15	0.25	0.05
S14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.15	0.3
S15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.05	0.05	0.2

507 **Table 3.** Mean (Standard deviation) dissimilarity values of the vegetation plots in each successional
 508 stage from the corresponding centroids. Pairwise differences in mean plot dissimilarity from the
 509 group centroids were tested with permutational t-tests (9999 permutations). For each dissimilarity
 510 index, numbers followed by the same letter do not differ significantly at $P < 0.05$. D_R = species
 511 dissimilarity; D_{KG} = functional dissimilarity; U_β = beta uniqueness.

	Early-successional stage (17 plots)	Mid-successional stage (32 plots)	Late-successional stage (10 plots)
D_R	0.407 (0.075) ^a	0.365 (0.083) ^a	0.361 (0.106) ^a
D_{KG}	0.149 (0.044) ^a	0.095 (0.026) ^b	0.091 (0.023) ^b
U_β	0.253 (0.037) ^a	0.182 (0.024) ^b	0.170 (0.016) ^b

515

516 **Figure 1.** Profile diagram showing the response of species dissimilarity D_R , functional dissimilarity
 517 D_{KG} , dissimilarity gap $D_R - D_{KG}$ and beta redundancy $R_\beta = (D_R - D_{KG})/D_R$ to changes in species
 518 composition along the artificial gradient in Table 1. The profile diagram reflects the comparison of
 519 the first plot with itself and all other plots along the gradient.
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524

