

Relationships between species feeding traits and environmental conditions in fish communities: a three-matrix approach

Anik Brind'amour^{1, 3, *} Daniel Boisclair¹ Stéphane Dray²
and Pierre Legendre¹

¹ Département de Sciences Biologiques, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, Succursale Centre-ville, Montréal, Québec H3C3J7 Canada

² Université de Lyon, F-69000, Lyon, France, and Université Lyon 1, CNRS, UMR 5558, Laboratoire de Biométrie et Biologie Evolutive, 43 Boulevard du 11 Novembre 1918, F-69622 Villeurbanne, France

³ Present address: Ifremer, Centre de Nantes, Rue de l'Île d'Yeu, B.P. 21105, F-44311 Nantes, France

* Corresponding author : Anik Brind'amour, email address: Anik.Brindamour@ifremer.fr

Abstract:

Understanding the relationships between species biological traits and the environment is crucial to predicting the effect of habitat perturbations on fish communities. It is also an essential step in the assessment of the functional diversity. Using two complementary three-matrix approaches (fourth-corner and RLQ analyses), we tested the hypothesis that feeding-oriented traits determine the spatial distributions of littoral fish species by assessing the relationship between fish spatial distributions, fish species traits, and habitat characteristics in two Laurentian Shield lakes. Significant associations between the feeding-oriented traits and the environmental characteristics suggested that fish communities in small lakes (displaying low species richness) can be spatially structured. Three groups of traits, mainly categorized by the species spatial and temporal feeding activity, were identified. The water column may be divided in two sections, each of them corresponding to a group of traits related to the vertical distribution of the prey coupled with the position of the mouth. Lake areas of low structural complexity were inhabited by functional assemblages dominated by surface feeders while structurally more complex areas were occupied by mid-water and benthic feeders. A third group referring to the time of feeding activity was observed. Our work could serve as a guideline study to evaluate species traits-environment associations at multiple spatial scales. Our results indicate that three-matrix statistical approaches are powerful tools that can be used to study such relationships. These recent statistical approaches open up new research directions such as the study of spatially based biological functions in lakes. They also provide new analytical tools for determining, for example, the potential size of freshwater protected areas.

Key words: ecological niche; feeding traits; fish communities; fourth-corner method; functional group; habitat; lake; Laurentian Shield lakes, Quebec, Canada; littoral zone; spatial scale; three-matrix approach

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Assessing the habitat characteristics required by fish to complete their life cycles is of
3 primary importance to predict the effect of habitat perturbations or losses on fish communities
4 and identify the environmental conditions that should be protected for conservation purposes.

5 Differences in the species composition of fish communities among systems and variations in the
6 response of fish species to environmental conditions are major obstacles to the development of
7 habitat models that may be applied to many fish species in many ecosystems (Olden and Jackson
8 2002). Functional classification of fish species in which fish that share common traits are grouped
9 together represents an alternative to individual species-environment models and may circumvent
10 these obstacles (McGill et al. 2006). According to Austen et al. (1994), groups of traits form
11 operational units that respond to environmental changes in a more predictable way than
12 individual species, thereby improving the predictive capabilities of habitat models in comparison
13 to models developed at high levels of taxonomic resolution (i.e., species level). Grouping species
14 according to traits is also a way of identifying functional groups of species to assess “key”
15 functions of an ecosystem: this is an essential step in assessing functional diversity within and
16 between ecosystems (Mouillot et al. 2006, Brind'Amour et al. 2009).

17 Habitats have long been argued to act as templates on which evolution forges phenotypic
18 attributes (Southwood 1977, 1988). Habitat characteristics can be viewed as filters imposed on
19 species gene pools to select traits suited to a particular set of environmental conditions (Díaz et
20 al. 1998). These concepts notably refer to the “niche filtering hypothesis” and suggest that
21 species sharing similar traits form functional groups that may likely occupy similar habitats
22 (Tonn et al. 1990, Zobel 1997). Grouping species according to traits, such as morphology or
23 behavior, is one way to simplify species-rich communities and thus increase the transferability of
24 habitat models among ecosystems (Angermeier and Winston 1998). For instance, traits referring

1 to the beta niche of species (i.e. the type of resources used by species or their mode of
2 acquisition, Ackerly and Cornwell 2007) have been used recently to describe the ecological
3 processes generating species interactions along an altitudinal gradient (Mason et al. 2007).
4 Conclusions from Mason et al. (2007) as well as from early studies (Keast and Webb 1966)
5 suggest that feeding-oriented traits may represent good descriptors of fish communities, and can
6 be used to classify species into functional categories.

7 The relationship between species traits and the environment is commonly assessed
8 indirectly using a two-step analysis. Fish abundances are first linked to environmental conditions
9 and species responses to environmental variation are then related to the biological and/or
10 physiological traits of species. In such analyses, the relationship between the environment and the
11 species traits is thus assessed indirectly (Thuiller et al. 2004, Santoul et al. 2005). Certain authors
12 accept to sacrifice some information at the species level and compute a traits-sites matrix
13 weighed (or not) by the abundances, which they link directly to the environment (Richards et al.
14 1996, Poff 1997). Although the latter approach may be called a direct functional analysis, the loss
15 of information may be penalizing (Dray and Legendre 2008). Direct assessment of the trait-
16 environment relationships, which keeps all the available ecological information, is rarely done
17 because it requires a statistical method that takes into account simultaneously the information
18 stored in three tables to link fish traits and environmental conditions through fish responses.
19 Among the three-matrix approaches allowing such analyses to be carried out, the RLQ analysis
20 and the fourth-corner method are two complementary approaches. RLQ analysis (Dolédec et al.
21 1996) produces ordination results that can be used to identify the group members of species,
22 species traits, and environmental variables, thereby providing a valuable and complementary tool
23 to the fourth-corner method for the interpretation of the traits-environment relationships. The
24 fourth-corner method was first developed by Legendre et al. (1997) to statistically test the

1 significance of the correlations between species traits and environmental conditions using a
2 matrix of species traits, a matrix of presence-absence of the species obtained by sampling a series
3 of sites, and a matrix of environmental conditions observed at the sites. Dray and Legendre
4 (2008) have recently revised this method to develop new testing procedures and allow the
5 analysis of the species abundances (instead of presence-absence only) observed at the sampling
6 sites. The modified version of the fourth-corner method is particularly appealing in ecosystems in
7 which generalist species may be present in nearly all sampling sites and for which emerging
8 patterns may only be observable with species abundance data. On the other hand, being recently
9 published, this revised version has been used in very few studies (Tall et al. 2006) and its
10 usefulness still needs to be assessed.

11 Our study is addressing the issue of understanding species and trait relations to habitat
12 using the two complementary three-matrix approaches cited above. Since feeding is considered
13 one of the major processes structuring lacustrine fish communities (Gatz 1979a, Pierce et al.
14 1994, Norton 1995, Piet 1998, Mason et al. 2007), we focused mainly on feeding-oriented traits.
15 The objective was to assess whether feeding-oriented traits determine the multiscale distributions
16 of littoral fish species in lakes. It was tested using two lakes from the same watershed, sharing
17 similar geological and biological characteristics. More specifically we (i) define functional
18 groups of species based on feeding-oriented traits, (ii) assess the relationships between the
19 feeding-oriented traits and the environmental conditions, and (iii) investigate the scale-
20 dependency of the feeding-oriented traits and environment correlations.

21 The latter objective (i.e. scale-dependency) was inspired from recent findings on the
22 effect of scale and habitat patchiness on the structure of fish assemblages in lakes (Poizat and
23 Pont 1996, Johnson et al. 2004, Brind'Amour et al. 2005, Stoffels et al. 2005, Brind'Amour and
24 Boisclair 2006). These studies showed that the nature and strength of the relationships between

1 the species abundances and the environmental variables may vary with the scale at which the
2 analysis is conducted. Scale-dependent functional relationships have been extensively
3 investigated in lotic ecosystems (Poff 1997, Angermeier and Winston 1998, Lamouroux et al.
4 2002, Goldstein and Meador 2004, Higgins 2009) but the concept remains poorly studied in
5 lacustrine ecosystems at the scale of a whole lake (Irz et al. 2007, Eros et al. 2009). This is
6 perhaps because of the river continuum concept (Vannote et al. 1980) and its derived theoretical
7 frameworks (e.g. “landscape filter framework”; Poff 1997), which offers a predictive spatial
8 support to study the structure and functional relationships of fish species in lotic systems. For
9 instance, Goldstein and Meador (2004) developed functional hypotheses using the “landscape
10 filter framework” to predict the relationships between categories of species traits and the size of
11 streams. In lakes, the concept of “hierarchical filters” has been introduced by Tonn et al. (1990).
12 It is a framework similar to the one suggested by Poff (1997), in which fish communities are
13 “environmentally filtered” as we move from the continental-scale to the lake-scale.
14 Unfortunately, that framework cannot be used in the present study to develop functional
15 hypotheses because the filters are not assessed at the same spatial scales than the ones in our
16 study: we are positioned under the finest scale studied by Tonn et al. (1990) and other recent
17 papers (Irz et al. 2007, Eros et al. 2009).

18 METHODS

19 *Study lakes*

20 The fish communities of Lake Drouin and Lake Paré were analyzed in this study. The two
21 lakes are located in the same watershed on the Laurentian Shield in the province of Québec,
22 Canada (Fig. 1). Lake Drouin (46°09' N, 73°55'W) has a surface area of 31 ha, a maximum depth
23 of 22 m, and a perimeter of 4.8 km (calculation based on the sum of the linear lengths of our

1 sampling units). Lake Paré (46°08' N, 73°54'W) has a surface area of 23 ha, a maximum depth of
2 9 m, and a perimeter of 3.1 km. Both lakes present a littoral zone with woody debris, rocky
3 substrate, sandy beaches, and patches of macrophytes of mixed species such as *Brasenia*
4 *schreberi* Gmelin, *Eriocaulon aquaticum* (Hill) Druce, *Myriophyllum spicatum* L., and
5 *Nymphaea odorata* Aiton. The two lakes are mesotrophic with similar limnological and
6 geomorphological characteristics. During the period of thermal stratification (May to October),
7 surface water temperatures ranged from 15°C to 26°C and bottom temperatures from 4°C to 8°C.
8 The thermoclines formed at 4.5 m depth in mid-June and broke down in early October
9 (Brind'Amour, unpublished data).

10 *Sampling protocol*

11 The fish community and the environmental variables were quantified at 90 (Lake Drouin)
12 and 60 sites (Lake Paré) that covered the complete perimeter of the littoral zones of the lakes.
13 The sampling sites were defined as an area that possessed fairly homogenous attributes with
14 respect to a combination of environmental variables (i.e., substrate, macrophyte density). Mid-
15 water buoys delimiting the beginning and the end of each site were anchored. The surface area of
16 individual sampling sites ranged from 162.4 to 268.8 m² (average size 215.6 m²) in Lake Drouin
17 and from 109.2 to 390.8 m² (average size 207.6 m²) in Lake Paré. The width of a sampling site (5
18 to 10 m) was determined as the distance from the shore to the 3-m depth isobath. The limit of 3 m
19 was adopted because it corresponded to the depth at which all fish observed could be correctly
20 counted and identified to species while snorkeling. The mean width of a site was 10.5 m (range: 9
21 to 12 m) for the two lakes. Geographical coordinates were determined at each site using a global
22 positioning system (Garmin - GPS 12) with a precision of ± 10 m.

1 *Fish community.* — The sites from both lakes were surveyed three times (i.e., on three
2 consecutive days between 09:00 and 15:00) between 25 July and 4 August 2001. The data for the
3 three days were then averaged within homologous sites of the lake. This procedure was done to
4 minimize the effects of daily variations of fish community characteristics at each site. The
5 detailed justification for this procedure is given in Web Appendix 1 of Brind'Amour et al. (2005).
6 Survey of the fish community was done using a modified version of the visual survey technique
7 described by Harmelin-Vivien et al. (1985). The technique and its sampling efficiency are fully
8 detailed in Brind'Amour and Boisclair (2004). It requires two observers who snorkel at the water
9 surface performing zigzags over the complete length and width of a sampling site following a
10 trajectory that is parallel to shore. During such sampling, the distance between the two observers
11 was 4 m. The observers covered nearly 90% of the total area of each sampling site. They
12 maintained a constant swimming speed of 10m min⁻¹ to minimize fish disturbance (Eklöv 1997).
13 Data were recorded on polyvinyl chloride (PVC) cylinders that snorkellers wore around their
14 forearm. Snorkellers identified the species, the relative abundance and the approximate size (i.e.
15 small, medium, large) of the fish observed as they progressed along their respective transect.
16 Preliminary identification of fish species and relative size had been conducted prior to the study
17 in order to normalize the sampling protocol.

18 We recorded a total of nine species in the two lakes (Table 2): 8 in Lake Drouin and 6 in
19 Lake Paré. Pumpkinseed (*Lepomis gibbosus*) represented 51% of the fish surveyed, whereas
20 seven species represented each less than 20% of the observations: golden shiner (*Notemigonus*
21 *crysoleucas*), creek chub (*Semotilus atromaculatus*), banded killifish (*Fundulus diaphanus*),
22 brown bullhead (*Ameiurus nebulosus*), yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*), lake chub (*Couesius*
23 *plumbeus*), and white sucker (*Catostomus commersoni*). The fathead minnow (*Pimephales*
24 *promelas*), which accounted for less than 0.5% of the observations, was excluded from the

1 analyses. This was done because it was impossible to assess if the low abundance observed for *P.*
2 *promelas* was due its rarity or to methodological limits.

3 *Environmental variables.* — The sampling sites were characterized by ten environmental
4 variables (Table 1). All environmental variables, with the exceptions of density of macrophytes
5 and fetch, were surveyed at the end of May 2001. The density of macrophytes was estimated on
6 July 29 in Lake Drouin and July 27 in Lake Paré. The density of macrophytes at each site was
7 estimated by two snorkelers using four randomly selected quadrats of 1 m² (a 1 m² frame was
8 thrown from the centre of the sampling site in different directions within each site). The number
9 of stems of emergent and submersed species was counted in the 1-m² frame. The average number
10 of stems from the four replicates was used in the statistical analyses. The percentage of cover,
11 mainly composed of a dense decaying weed bed of *M. spicatum* and/or unidentified species, was
12 estimated and used as the 'bottom cover' variable. Fetch was calculated on each sampling day as
13 the distance to the shore in the direction of the dominant wind.

14 *Environmental Complexity Index (ECI).* — We developed an index to estimate the
15 environmental complexity of the littoral zone of the studied lakes. That index, which we called
16 the Environmental Complexity Index (ECI), sums the squared pairwise dissimilarities (Gower
17 distances) between the sites of each lake that we then divide by the number of sites to make the
18 indices comparable. ECI measures the total environmental variation captured in the Gower
19 dissimilarity matrix. Greater variability in the matrix of sites-by-environmental characteristics
20 leads to greater dissimilarity among the sites and, thereby, to greater ECI. Details concerning the
21 computation of that index are found in Appendix B.

Analytical framework

We tested the hypothesis that morphological and behavioral traits determine the spatial distributions of the littoral fish species in the two lakes, using the fourth-corner method (Legendre et al. 1997). This approach requires multiple data taking the form of three input matrices (**R**, **L** and **Q**) and computes species trait-environment correlations in a fourth matrix (**D**; Fig. 2). This section presents the information contained in each matrix used in fourth-corner analysis and describes the field methods used to collect that information.

Matrix L: Abundance of the fish species. — The first matrix (**L**: $m \times k$) contained the abundances of the k species at the m sampling sites. It was composed of 7 species at 90 sampling sites in Lake Drouin, and 6 species at 60 sampling sites in Lake Paré. The abundance data were transformed using square root to reduce the influence of the dominant species in the analysis of community structure (Sokal and Rohlf 1995).

Matrix Q: Morphological and behavioral traits. — The second matrix (**Q**: $k \times n$) described n morphological or behavioral traits of the same k species. Data (i.e. the 8 traits) in this matrix were obtained from several studies providing information on the fish species present in the two lakes (Scott and Crossman 1973, Becker 1983, Carlander 1997, Ultsch et al. 1999, Robb and Abrahams 2002). The species were described using eight feeding-oriented and behavioral traits (Table 3) that had been found to be significantly associated with the environmental conditions in other studies. Some of the traits were not mutually exclusive; a species could be coded as feeding on several types of prey and in different parts of the water column (water surface, mid-water, or bottom).

Matrix R: Environmental variables. — The third matrix **R** ($m \times p$) displayed information about the p environmental variables at the m sampling sites. As our third objective was to

1 investigate the scale-dependency of the feeding-oriented traits and environment correlations, we
2 assessed the link between the species traits and the environmental variables over multiple spatial
3 scales by modeling spatially the environmental variables at four spatial scales (see next paragraph
4 for details). Therefore, we created four matrices \mathbf{R}_{VB} , \mathbf{R}_B , \mathbf{R}_M and \mathbf{R}_F ($m \times p$), one for each spatial
5 scale, containing the spatially-modeled environmental variables.

6 The spatial modeling of the environmental variables was done using *Principal*
7 *Coordinates of Neighbor Matrices* (PCNM) (Borcard and Legendre 2002, Borcard et al. 2004).
8 PCNM eigenvectors represent a spectral decomposition of the spatial relationships among the
9 sampling sites and describe all spatial scales that can be accommodated in the sampling design
10 (Dray et al. 2006). They were obtained by principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) of a truncated
11 geographic distance matrix among the sites, as explained in the above-mentioned papers (step 1
12 in Fig. 2). In the present study, all distances larger than the distance between the centers of
13 adjacent sites were replaced by 4 times that value, before PCoA. The resulting principal
14 coordinates, which are called PCNM variables or eigenvectors, were then used as spatial
15 predictors to analyze the spatial variation of the environmental variables. The PCNM variables
16 corresponded to a series of vectors maximizing the spatial autocorrelation measured by Moran's I
17 and constitute a model of spatial structures at multiple scales (Dray et al. 2006). Only the PCNM
18 eigenvectors modeling positive spatial correlation, as verified by the computation of Moran's I
19 statistics, were included in the next step of variable selection in a multiple regression analysis. A
20 forward selection was then done to identify the significant PCNMs (26 for Lake Drouin and 21
21 for Lake Paré) explaining the environmental variability (step 2 in Fig. 2). The significant PCNMs
22 were divided into four groups corresponding to as many spatial scales: very broad, broad, meso,
23 and fine; see Brind'Amour et al. (2005) for details. We described the spatial scales as patches or

1 sections corresponding to a percentage of the lake perimeter. For instance, the very broad scale
2 corresponded to patches of nearly 40% of the total perimeter of each lake, i.e. 1900 m and 1200
3 m for Lakes Drouin and Paré respectively; the broad scale to sections of 10 to 20% of the total
4 perimeter; the meso scale to sections of 5 to 10% of the total perimeter; and the fine scale to
5 sections smaller than 5% of the total perimeter. Associations between the environmental variables
6 and the groups of PCNMs at the four spatial scales were computed using either multiple
7 regressions for the quantitative continuous variables, or logistic regressions for the binary
8 variables (step 3 in Fig. 2). The predicted values (for the quantitative variables) or the
9 probabilities (for the binary variables) at the sampling sites, which represented the relevant
10 information, were used to form four matrices \mathbf{R}_{VB} , \mathbf{R}_B , \mathbf{R}_M and \mathbf{R}_F . Therefore, these matrices
11 were composed of the environmental conditions predicted at each spatial scale, thereby
12 corresponding to the spatially-modeled environmental conditions. The multiple and logistic
13 regressions were computed using the free software R 2.6.1 (R Development Core Team, 2005).

14 *Species traits-environment relationships (step 4 in Fig. 2).* — Matrix \mathbf{D} ($n \times p$) contained
15 the results obtained after conducting the fourth-corner analysis. It was composed of correlations
16 of the n morphological or behavioral traits (matrix \mathbf{Q}) crossed with the p environmental variables
17 (matrix \mathbf{R}). For each lake, we conducted the analysis four times, one for each spatial scale (i.e.,
18 using the four different \mathbf{R}_{VB} , \mathbf{R}_B , \mathbf{R}_M and \mathbf{R}_F matrices) leading to four matrices \mathbf{D}_{VB} , \mathbf{D}_B , \mathbf{D}_M and
19 \mathbf{D}_F . The analyses were performed using the function 'fourthcorner' of the ade4 package (Dray
20 and Dufour 2007) in the R language. We considered species abundances instead of presence-
21 absence data in matrix \mathbf{L} , the latter being the only type of data used in the original fourth-corner
22 method of Legendre et al. (1997). The correlations obtained in individual cells (d_{ij}) of the \mathbf{D}
23 matrices were tested using 999 permutations, thereby producing P -values. Two permutation

1 models were used (permutation of entire rows and entire columns), and their probabilities
2 combined, to test the null hypothesis (H_0) stating that the species traits (matrix \mathbf{Q}) are not related
3 to the environmental variables (matrix \mathbf{R}). According to Dray and Legendre (2008), the rejection
4 of H_0 ($\mathbf{R} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Q}$) requires two conditions (or hypotheses), (i) the rejection of the absence of a link
5 between species abundances and species traits (i.e. $H_{01} : \mathbf{L} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Q}$) and (ii) the rejection of the
6 absence of a link between species abundances and environmental variables (i.e. $H_{02} : \mathbf{L} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{R}$).
7 The two hypotheses were tested using different permutation models: (i) permutation of entire
8 rows (H_{01} : positions of species assemblages are independent of the environmental characteristics
9 of the sites; model type = 2) and (ii) permutation of entire columns (H_{02} : distribution of species
10 is independent of their biological traits; model type = 4). Rejection of H_0 at significance level $\alpha =$
11 0.05 required the rejection of the two hypotheses at significance levels $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0.2236$; in that
12 way, $\alpha = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 = 0.05$. Only the correlations that remained significant at the 0.05 level after the α
13 adjustment of Holm's procedure for multiple testing (Holm 1979) and α correction ($\alpha_1 \alpha_2$) were
14 used for ecological interpretation. According to Dray and Legendre (2008), combining results
15 from the two hypotheses seems the only way to test properly the whole link between species
16 traits and environmental variables mediated by the abundances of species. A multivariate statistic
17 (inertia or trace of matrix \mathbf{D}), which measures the overall link between the variability of the
18 species traits and the variability of the environmental conditions, was also computed at each
19 spatial scale. That statistic, computed by the R function 'fourthcorner2' of ade4, was tested using
20 permutations.

21 RLQ analyses (Dolédec et al. 1996) were computed using the "rlq" function of the "ade4"
22 package. RLQ is an extension of co-inertia analysis that simultaneously finds linear combinations
23 of the variables of table \mathbf{R} and linear combinations of the variables of table \mathbf{Q} of maximal

1 covariance weighted by the data in table **L** (Dray et al. 2003). It graphically summarizes and
2 represents the main co-structure in the three tables **R**, **L** and **Q**. The RLQ and fourth-corner
3 analyses were jointly used to identify the species and the environmental conditions corresponding
4 to the groups of traits. Graphical representations of the outputs of RLQ analysis (e.g., scores of
5 the species traits and environmental variables) were used for interpretation purposes. The groups
6 of species (G_s), species traits (G_t), and environmental variables (G_e) were obtained by *K*-means
7 partitioning applied to the tables of species scores, trait scores and environmental scores of RLQ
8 analysis, respectively. *K*-means partitioning searches for the groups that minimize the total
9 within-group or “error” sum of squares (TESS), or, equivalently, the total intra-cluster variation.
10 The Calinski-Harabasz criterion, which is a pseudo-*F* statistic as in ANOVA, was used to assess
11 the best number of groups identified by *K*-means partitioning (Calinski and Harabasz 1974,
12 Milligan and Cooper 1985).

13 RESULTS

14 The global multivariate statistic (inertia of **D**) of the fourth-corner analyses indicated that
15 the overall link between the species traits and the environmental variables displayed similar
16 patterns across spatial scales in Lake Drouin and Lake Paré (Fig. 3). Although the values from
17 the two lakes cannot be directly compared, both lakes displayed low values at finer spatial scales
18 (Lake Drouin: 0.48; Lake Paré: 0.68) and high values at broader scales (Lake Drouin: 2.21 at
19 very broad scale; Lake Paré: 1.72). This suggests either that the environmental variables used in
20 this study explained a lower proportion of the species traits variance at finer scales than at larger
21 scales, or that other traits than feeding-oriented traits are associated with the distribution of
22 species at the finer scales. Permutation tests conducted on the overall statistics indicated that only
23 the very broad and broad spatial scales in Lake Drouin displayed global significant correlations

1 between the traits and the environment (i.e. matrices **D**). Therefore, only the trait-environment
2 relationships in Lake Drouin at these two spatial scales are further described. For simplicity, we
3 present hereafter a summary of the fourth-corner results found in matrices **D**. Complete results
4 (i.e. correlation statistics in matrices **D**) can be found in Appendix B.

5 The relationship between species traits and environmental conditions varied widely
6 between the very broad and broad spatial scales. When comparing the significant correlations at
7 the very-broad and broad spatial scales (matrices **D** in Appendix B), we observe that only 6% of
8 the statistically significant correlations were between the same species traits and environmental
9 conditions at the two spatial scales. Graphically, these associations can be observed in Fig. 4
10 where similar positions of the points relative to the origin in both plots indicate associations
11 between environmental variables and species traits.

12 *Groups of traits*

13 The *K*-means analyses, applied to RLQ scores, identified three groups of species traits in
14 Lake Drouin at very broad (Fig. 4A) and broad spatial scales (Fig. 4B). Comparison of the
15 composition of these groups indicates that 75% of the significant species traits were similarly
16 grouped at the two spatial scales. The first group of traits (G_1) included fish having a superior
17 mouth, feeding mainly on invertebrates associated with plants or located near the water surface
18 (surface feeders; Fig. 4A; Δ). Two species, *N. crysoleucas* and *F. diaphanus*, were associated
19 with this group (Table 2). The second group of traits (G_2) included the highest number of species
20 traits and was composed of species with a terminal mouth having mid-water (zooplankton) or
21 benthic (zoobenthos) feeding habits (Fig. 4A; \square). This group was represented by *L. gibbosus*, *P.*
22 *flavescens*, and *S. atromaculatus* at both spatial scales (Table 2). The third group of traits (G_3)
23 was based on the time of day at which feeding is expected to occur and, more specifically, was

1 composed of nocturnally active species with cylindrical bodies and inferior mouth (Fig. 4A; O).
2 Fish species associated with this third group were also the same at the two scales: *C. commersoni*
3 and *A. nebulosus* (Table 2). The sums of the species abundances associated with each group of
4 traits indicated that G_{t1}, G_{t2}, and G_{t3} represented respectively 17.60%, 78.63% , and 3.77% of
5 the total fish species abundances.

6 *Trait-environment relationships*

7 The RLQ analyses identified three groups of environmental variables at very broad (Fig.
8 4C) and broad spatial scales (Fig. 4D). The structure of the RLQ analyses is such that these three
9 groups comprise environmental variables that have the highest correlations with the three groups
10 of species traits for each of these spatial scales. At the very broad spatial scale (Fig. 4C), the first
11 group of environmental variables (G_{e1}), which refers to the presence of boulders (*S4*) and
12 bedrock (*S5*), corresponded to the environmental conditions that have the highest correlations
13 with the species traits found in the first group of traits (G_{t1}), which represents the traits associated
14 with species defined as surface feeders. G_{e2} was defined by gentle slopes (*Litt*, *Rip*) and sandy
15 bottoms (*S1*) with submerged macrophytes (*Subm*). This group of environmental variables was
16 best correlated with the species traits that characterized fish described as mid-water/ benthic
17 feeders (G_{t2}). Finally, G_{e3} was mainly composed of deep sites (*Z*) exposed to the action of the
18 wind (*Fetch*) containing structures such as woody debris (*S6*), high macrophyte cover of *M.*
19 *spicatum* (*Cover*), emergent macrophytes (*Emerg*), and rocks (*S3*). This group of sites was
20 inhabited by nocturnally active fish species with cylindrical bodies and inferior mouth (G_{t3}). At
21 broad spatial scale (Fig. 4D), G_{e1} is expected to represent the group of environmental variables
22 best correlated with traits of surface feeders (G_{t1}) at that scale. This situation is consistent with
23 the similarity between the species trait groupings obtained at the very broad and broad spatial

1 scales. However, at the broad scale, G_e1 was characterized by a gentle riparian slope (*Rip*) and
2 rocks as substrate (*S3*) and not, as found for the G_e1 group at very broad scale, by boulders (*S4*)
3 and bedrock (*S5*). The G_e2 group was mainly associated with the type of substrates (*S4*, *S5*, *S6*)
4 and the littoral slope or variables related to the spatial organization of the sites, such as wind
5 exposition (*Fetch*), tributaries (*Trib*), the size of the sites, and the riparian use (cottages). The G_e3
6 group was defined by high average depth (*Z*), high abundances of macrophytes (*Emerg* or *Subm*),
7 and sandy bottoms (*S1*; Fig. 4D).

8 DISCUSSION

9 This study intended to assess whether feeding-oriented traits determine the spatial
10 distribution of littoral fish species in lakes. The associations between the feeding-oriented traits
11 and the environmental characteristics at different spatial scales suggest that the fish community,
12 in at least one of the two lakes, was spatially structured along the vertical (strata in the water
13 column) and horizontal (habitats or environmental conditions) dimensions.

14 *Three functional groups, two spatial scales, one significant lake*

15 In Lake Drouin, the positive associations among the feeding-oriented traits indicated the
16 presence of three groups of species (sensu Gatz 1979b). These groups were mainly characterized
17 by the vertical distribution of the prey, the position of the mouth, and the time or period of their
18 feeding activity. The groups agreed with early studies which stated that functional groups of
19 species in lakes are likely founded on the criteria of where and how resources are used by species
20 within the water column (Schutz and Northcote 1972, Gatz 1979b). The constancy of the groups
21 of feeding traits across the spatial scales, notwithstanding the environmental variability at these
22 scales, emphasizes the idea that feeding traits are major functional drivers in structuring fish
23 communities in lakes.

1 At the two broader spatial scales, the significant correlations between the species traits
2 forming the functional groups and the environmental variables highlighted the influence of
3 environmental characteristics on the organization of fish communities. Water depth and
4 macrophyte density are expected to play an important role in habitat segregation among the
5 littoral fish species (Beauchamp et al. 1994, Weaver et al. 1997, Grenouillet and Pont 2001). At
6 very broad scale in Lake Drouin, we observed that, as the environmental conditions shifted from
7 areas of low structural complexity such as sites with either boulders or bedrock as substrates to
8 shallow areas with fine sediments and high density of submersed macrophytes (i.e. high habitat
9 complexity), the functional assemblages shifted from surface feeders (G_1) to mid-water and
10 benthic feeders (G_2). Concurrently, the habitat of greater complexity (i.e. G_2 habitat) was also
11 the one in which we observed the highest number of functional traits (see Fig. 3) and the highest
12 relative abundance (G_1 : 17.60% and G_2 : 78.63%). Several studies showed that the diversity and
13 abundance of invertebrate food associated with nearshore macrophytes allow the coexistence of
14 species having multiple dietary specializations (Werner et al. 1977, Grenouillet and Pont 2001).
15 The abundance of microcrustaceans varies widely between emergent and submersed macrophytes
16 and with habitat depths (Paterson 1993), whereas insect larvae (odonata and chironomids), which
17 are the preferred prey of the mid-water and benthic groups (G_2), are typically abundant in fine,
18 organic sediments (James et al. 1998, Weatherhead and James 2001). Direct functional
19 association, such as prey items available to fish or consumed by them, have not been surveyed
20 during our study. Yet, our interpretation is mostly based on earlier findings and theoretical
21 hypotheses on niche partitioning and habitat complexity stating that the more structurally
22 complex the habitat is, the greater diversity of functional traits it can support (Gorman and Karr
23 1978, Ross 1986, Higgins and R.E. 2008). Hori et al. (2009) recently described the relationship
24 between groups of fish appearing at the surface of, inside, and along a gradient of habitat

1 complexity defined by the canopy-height of seagrass beds in coastal areas. They showed that fish
2 found inside the seagrass (similar to our mid-water group) preferred structurally complex habitat
3 with high seagrass biomass and high three-dimensional structure, whereas the group of surface
4 feeders preferred a less complex habitat with low seagrass biomass and high three-dimensional
5 structure.

6 Some environmental variables were structurally significant for different functional groups
7 at different spatial scales. This was notably the case for the fetch and the cover of *M. spicatum*,
8 which were both associated with G₃ at very broad spatial scale but were linked to G₂ at broad
9 scale. This result could be explained by the roles played by the environmental conditions at
10 different scales. For instance, at very broad spatial scale (i.e. large parts of the lake), exposed
11 sites with dense cover of *M. spicatum* may represent good refuges for nocturnally active species
12 during the day, whereas at broader spatial scale (i.e. habitat patches of ~ 500 m), the fetch may
13 enhance benthic productivity serving as resource areas for mid-water and benthic feeders (G₂)
14 (Mittelbach 1981, Werner et al. 1983, Tabor and Wurtsbaugh 1991, Gafny et al. 1992, Diehl
15 1993). These causal links were not properly tested in our study. We can only hypothesize on the
16 scale-dependency of some traits-environment correlations that may reflect different processes
17 operating at different scales in lakes.

18 Scale-dependent relationships between species biological traits and potential processes in
19 lakes have been recently observed by Irz et al. (2007) and Eros et al. (2009). These two studies
20 tested the functional convergence of three reproductive traits and four trophic traits of fish
21 species between 75 French and 168 north-east USA lakes (Irz et al. 2007) and characterized the
22 congruence between taxonomic and six trait-based fish assemblages in 125 Finnish boreal lakes
23 (Eros et al. 2009). They both found that reproduction-related traits (i.e. spawning habitat and

1 period) were major drivers of fish assemblages, showing indeed strong intercontinental
2 convergence. Trophic-related traits, omnivores and benthivores, were to a lesser extent associated
3 with lake area (in North American and Finish lakes) and depth (in Finnish lakes). It is however,
4 difficult to overstep the results of the two aforementioned studies as they are both focusing on
5 spatial scales much broader than ours.

6 There were no significant relationships between the feeding-oriented traits and the
7 environmental characteristics at the two finer spatial scales (< 10% of the total perimeter of a
8 lake) in Lake Drouin and none at any of the studied scales in Lake Paré. Owing to the nature of
9 the data in the **R**, **L**, and **Q** matrices, the two non-significant results could be due to different
10 causes. Four hypotheses could notably explain the lack of significant relationships between the
11 fish traits (biological/physiological) and the environment conditions at a single (e.g. fine scales in
12 Lake Drouin) or multiple scales (Lake Paré). The first hypothesis refers to the low species trait
13 variability among the species present in the community to explain the lack of significant
14 relationship in lake Paré. In our study, that hypothesis can be easily refuted by comparing the
15 species richness and their related traits in each lake. The two lakes shared five over nine species
16 and the species present from one lake had similar biological traits to the species present in the
17 other lake. This suggests that the variability of the species traits in lake Paré could unlikely
18 explain the lack of traits-environment relationship in that lake. As for the lack of significant
19 relationships at finer spatial scales in lake Drouin, it could be due to the fact that the feeding-
20 oriented traits used in the study are not structurally important at finer spatial scales: species traits
21 other than feeding-oriented traits might be significant at these scales.

22 The second hypothesis refers to the lack of spatial variability in the species abundances.
23 This could be the case for ubiquitous species, such as *L. gibbosus*. Brind'Amour et al. (2005)

1 showed, however, that the species abundances in the two lakes displayed spatial variability at
2 multiple spatial scales.

3 The third hypothesis refers to the random spatial distribution of the species in the studied
4 lakes. As mentioned in the previous paragraph about the second hypothesis, spatial analyses
5 conducted on the same fish communities found significant spatial patterns in both lakes,
6 indicating a non-random distribution of the fish species in the two lakes.

7 The fourth hypothesis is the one that may explain the lack of significant relationships in
8 lake Paré; it refers to the lack of variability in the environmental conditions. Given that the
9 anthropogenic development surrounding the two studied lakes is comparable (Drouin: 62.12% of
10 the lake perimeter, Paré: 61.60%), that the two lakes display similar species composition (Table
11 2), and that they also display similar geological / morphological characteristics, the only
12 difference between the two lakes lies in the variability of their environmental characteristics
13 (Table 1). The lack of significant species traits-environment relationship at any spatial scale in
14 lake Paré may hence be attributable to the lower structural diversity of the environmental
15 conditions in its littoral zone than in Lake Drouin, thus providing several habitats at multiple
16 spatial scales in that lake. The environmental complexity in Lake Drouin (ECI = 4.06) is greater
17 than in Lake Paré (ECI = 2.38). This is particularly apparent for environmental variables (Table
18 1) such as fetch, depth, and woody debris (S5) which are major environmental drivers structuring
19 the littoral fish communities in lakes (Keast et al. 1978, Brosse et al. 1999a, Brosse et al. 1999b,
20 Vono and Barbosa 2001, Brind'Amour and Boisclair 2006).

21 The absence of significant species traits-environment relationship in lake Paré could also
22 be due to the greater power of the fourth-corner correlation test in the lake in which more sites
23 have been surveyed (Lake Drouin: 90 sites; Lake Paré: 60 sites). However, sensibility and power
24 analyses of the fourth-corner to the number of sampling sites have been tested using simulations

1 in Dray and Legendre (2008). According to their results, 60 sites would not be a shortcoming of
2 the fourth-corner approach.

3 *Testing the reliability of the fourth-corner approach*

4 The fourth-corner method has been recently published but its effectiveness has been rarely
5 evaluated using field data (Tall et al. 2006). Dray and Legendre (2008) used simulated data to
6 measure the influence of several parameters (species richness, sample size, levels of alpha and
7 beta diversities) on the efficiency of the method. They showed that the power of the method (i.e.
8 its ability to detect ecological patterns when they exist) increases with the number of sites and the
9 number of species.

10 Species richness in the two studied lakes may be considered low (6 and 7 species for lake
11 Paré and lake Drouin, respectively). However, it is still comparable to the species richness found
12 in North-American lakes, where species richness ranges between 1 and 22 and the mean species
13 richness equals 6.35 (Randall et al. 1995). Dray and Legendre (2008) showed that increasing the
14 sampling size is a way to counterbalance the effects of low species richness. In our study, several
15 significant associations have been detected by the fourth-corner approach, suggesting that the
16 sampling effort is sufficient to detect significant traits-environment relationships in these two
17 lakes. However, increasing the sampling effort would probably help detect other significant
18 associations. In a more general context, this study is quite “encouraging” as we know that the
19 fourth-corner method would be more powerful in richer ecosystems, but it is still capable to
20 detect significant traits-environment relationships in a species-poor ecosystem if the sampling
21 size is sufficient.

22 The fourth-corner correlation statistic differs greatly from the classical bivariate Pearson's
23 r as it measures the relationship between two variables (trait and environmental variable)

1 recorded on different sampling units (species and sites); its computation thus requires to consider
2 an extra table of species abundances. Hence, the distribution of fourth-corner correlation statistics
3 is unknown, but experience shows that statistically significant values are much lower than in
4 ordinary correlation studies (Dray and Legendre 2008). Moreover, the sampling distribution
5 would probably be influenced by the number of sites or the species richness (i.e. dimension of the
6 table \mathbf{L}) considered in the analysis. Hence, correlations obtained by the fourth-corner method
7 should not be compared between studies (if the dimensions of \mathbf{L} vary) or to correlation values
8 obtained in the classical bivariate case. For instance, the maximum value reached by the
9 significant correlations in our study was 0.14. Low values could have been favored by the
10 indirect way the information about the fish species traits was gathered. Fish traits were not
11 estimated specifically for the two study lakes but were extracted from the literature, just as in the
12 fish study of the fourth-corner paper of Legendre et al. (1997). Several studies observed that,
13 beside ontogenetic shifts, fish morphology may be affected by spatial and temporal variations in
14 abiotic and biotic factors (Taylor 1999). The underlying assumption that species traits obtained
15 from the literature may adequately represent the fish traits in our study lakes may have weakened
16 our trait-environment relationships. Therefore, we suggest using direct measurements of the
17 functional traits or at least measurements gathered in the same ecosystem or geographic region
18 than the one where the species come from, whenever possible.

19 *New research directions and potential implications for lake management*

20 The present work showed that in small lakes displaying low species richness, species
21 traits can be spatially structured. It also indicated that three-table statistical approaches, such as
22 the fourth-corner analysis coupled with RLQ analysis, are powerful tools to assess such
23 relationships. Approaches like the one we applied here opens up a new research direction: the

1 study of spatially-based biological functions in lakes and in other ecosystems. To our knowledge,
2 this research field is growing in marine ecosystems (Bremner et al. 2003, Frid et al. 2008) but is
3 still in its infancy in lacustrine ecosystems. For instance, spatial patches of high functional
4 diversity or spatial distribution of essential ecological functions, such as nursery areas, have been
5 recently identified in estuaries (Islam and Tanaka 2006). Determination of biological traits
6 identified as indicators of key aspects of functioning in potential Marine Protected Areas (MPA)
7 have also been recently tested and suggested by Frid et al. (2008). Studies, such as the ones cited
8 above, are all incorporating functional aspects (assessed by species biological traits) into the
9 designation and protection of marine habitats (McLeod et al. 2009).

10 Freshwater Protected Areas (FPA, Suski and Cooke 2007) are the freshwater counterpart
11 of MPAs. As in MPAs, the success of FPAs relies notably on their spatial design, i.e. the spatial
12 arrangement and the appropriate size to optimise the exchange between productive (or functionally
13 diverse) areas (Pauly et al. 2002). An analytical approach like the one used here could help determine
14 the dominant spatial scales (i.e. geographic ranges) at which functional groups of species are varying,
15 thereby identifying habitat patches of high biological (or functional) diversity (i.e. potential FPA sizes).

16 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

17 We thank M. Coinçon, J. Guimmond-Cataford, and C. Desroches for much appreciated
18 field and lab assistance and two referees for valuable comments. Financial support was provided
19 by scholarships from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada
20 (NSERC) and Fonds québécois de la recherche sur la nature et les technologies (FQRNT) to A.
21 Brind'Amour and NSERC research funds to D. Boisclair (no. 46225) and P. Legendre (no. 7738).

22

LITERATURE CITED

- 1
2 Ackerly, D. D., and W. K. Cornwell. 2007. A trait-based approach to community assembly:
3 partitioning of species trait values into within- and among-community components.
4 *Ecology Letters* **10**:135-145.
- 5 Angermeier, P. L., and M. R. Winston. 1998. Local vs regional influences on local diversity in
6 stream fish community of Virginia. *Ecology* **79**:911-927.
- 7 Austen, D. J., P. B. Bayley, and B. W. Menzel. 1994. Importance of the guild concept to fisheries
8 research and management. *Fisheries* **19**:12-20.
- 9 Beauchamp, D. A., E. R. Byron, and W. A. Wurtsbaugh. 1994. Summer habitat use by littoral-
10 zone fishes in Lake Tahoe and the effects of shoreline structures. *North American Journal*
11 *of Fisheries Management* **14**:385-394.
- 12 Becker, G. C. 1983. *Fishes of Wisconsin*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.
- 13 Borcard, D., and P. Legendre. 2002. All-scale spatial analysis of ecological data by means of
14 principal coordinates of neighbour matrices. *Ecological Modelling* **153**:51-68.
- 15 Borcard, D., P. Legendre, C. Avois-Jacquet, and H. Tuomisto. 2004. Dissecting the spatial
16 structure of ecological data at multiple scales. *Ecology* **85**:1826-1832.
- 17 Bremner, J., S. I. Rogers, and C. L. J. Frid. 2003. Assessing functional diversity in marine benthic
18 ecosystems: a comparison of approaches. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **254**:11-25.
- 19 Brind'Amour, A., and D. Boisclair. 2004. Comparison between two sampling methods to evaluate
20 the structure of fish communities in the littoral zone of a Laurentian lake. *Journal of Fish*
21 *Biology* **65**:1372-1384.

- 1 Brind'Amour, A., and D. Boisclair. 2006. The effect of the spatial arrangement of habitats on the
2 development of fish habitat models in the littoral zone of a Laurentian lake. *Canadian*
3 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **63**:1-17.
- 4 Brind'Amour, A., D. Boisclair, P. Legendre, and D. Borcard. 2005. Multiscale spatial distribution
5 of a littoral fish community in relation to environmental variables. *Limnology and*
6 *Oceanography* **50**:465-479.
- 7 Brind'Amour, A., A. Rouyer, and J. Martin. 2009. Functional gains of including non-commercial
8 epibenthic taxa in coastal beam trawl surveys: a Note. *Continental Shelf Research*
9 **29**:1189-1194.
- 10 Brosse, S., F. Dauba, T. Oberdorff, and S. Lek. 1999a. Influence of some topographical variables
11 on the spatial distribution of lake fish during summer stratification. *Archiv fur*
12 *Hydrobiologie* **145**:359-371.
- 13 Brosse, S., J.-F. Guegan, J.-N. Tourenq, and S. Lek. 1999b. The use of artificial neural networks
14 to assess fish abundance and spatial occupancy in the littoral zone of a mesotrophic lake.
15 *Ecological Modelling* **120**:299-311.
- 16 Calinski, T., and J. Harabasz. 1974. A Dendrite Method for Cluster Analysis. *Communications in*
17 *Statistics*, **3**:1-27.
- 18 Carlander, K. D. 1997. *Handbook of Freshwater Fishery Biology*. Iowa University Press, Ames,
19 Iowa.
- 20 Díaz, S., M. Cabido, and F. Casanoves. 1998. Plant functional traits and environmental filters at a
21 regional scale. *Journal of Vegetation Science* **9**:113-122.

- 1 Diehl, S. 1993. Effects of habitat structure on resource availability, diet and growth of
2 benthivorous perch, *Perca fluviatilis*. *Oikos* **67**:404-414.
- 3 Dolédec, S., D. Chessel, C. J. F. ter Braak, and S. Champely. 1996. Matching species traits to
4 environmental variables:a new three-table ordination method. *Environmental and*
5 *Ecological Statistics* **3**:143-166.
- 6 Dray, S., D. Chessel, and J. Thioulouse. 2003. Co-inertia analysis and the linking of ecological
7 data tables. *Ecology* **84**:3078-3089.
- 8 Dray, S., and A. B. Dufour. 2007. The ade4 package: implementing the duality diagram for
9 ecologists. *Journal of Statistical Software* **22**:1-20.
- 10 Dray, S., and P. Legendre. 2008. Testing the link between species traits and environmental
11 characteristics: the fourth-corner problem revisited. *Ecology* **89**:3400-3412.
- 12 Dray, S., P. Legendre, and P. R. Peres-Neto. 2006. Spatial modelling: a comprehensive
13 framework for principal coordinate analysis of neighbour matrices. *Ecological Modelling*
14 **196**:483-493.
- 15 Eklöv, P. 1997. Effects of habitat complexity and prey abundance on the spatial and temporal
16 distributions of perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) and pike (*Esox lucius*). *Canadian Journal of*
17 *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **54**:1520-1531.
- 18 Eros, T., J. Heino, D. Schmera, and M. Rask. 2009. Characterising functional trait diversity and
19 trait–environment relationships in fish assemblages of boreal lakes. *Freshwater Biology*
20 **54**:1788-1803.

- 1 Frid, C. L. J., O. A. L. Paramor, S. Brockington, and J. Bremner. 2008. Incorporating ecological
2 functioning into the designation and management of marine protected areas.
3 *Hydrobiologia* **606**:69-79.
- 4 Gafny, S., A. Gasith, and M. Goren. 1992. Effect of water level fluctuation on shore spawning of
5 *Mirogrex terraesanctae* (Steinitz), (Cyprinidae) in Lake Kinneret, Israel. *Journal of Fish*
6 *Biology* **41**:863-871.
- 7 Gatz, A. J. 1979a. Community organization in fishes as indicated by morphological features.
8 *Ecology* **60**:711-718.
- 9 Gatz, A. J. 1979b. Ecological morphology of freshwater stream fishes. *Tulane Studies in Zoology*
10 *and Botany* **21**:91-124.
- 11 Goldstein, R. M., and M. R. Meador. 2004. Comparisons of fish species traits from small streams
12 to large rivers. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **133**:971-983.
- 13 Gorman, O. T., and J. R. Karr. 1978. Habitat structure and stream fish communities. *Ecology*
14 **59**:507-515.
- 15 Grenouillet, G., and D. Pont. 2001. Juvenile fishes in macrophyte beds: influence of food
16 resources, habitat structure and body size. *Journal of Fish Biology* **59**:939-959.
- 17 Harmelin-Vivien, M. L., J. G. Harmelin, C. Chauvet, C. Duval, R. Galzin, G. Lejeune, G.
18 Barnabé, F. Blanc, R. Chevalier, J. Duclerc, and G. Lasserre. 1985. Évaluation visuelle
19 des peuplements et populations de poissons: méthodes et problèmes. *Revue d'écologie*
20 *(Terre et Vie)* **40**:466-539.
- 21 Higgins, C. L. 2009. Spatiotemporal variation in functional and taxonomic organization of
22 stream-fish assemblages in central Texas. *Aquatic Ecology* **43**:1133-1141.

- 1 Higgins, C. L., and S. R.E. 2008. Modeling stream fish assemblages with niche apportionment
2 models: patterns, processes, and scale dependence. *Transactions of the American*
3 *Fisheries Society* **137**:696-706.
- 4 Holm, S. 1979. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of*
5 *Statistics* **6**:65-70.
- 6 Hori, M., T. Suzuki, Y. Monthum, T. Srisombat, Y. Tanaka, M. Nakaoka , and H. Mukai. 2009.
7 High seagrass diversity and canopy-height increase associated fish diversity and
8 abundance. *Marine Biology* **156**:1447-1458.
- 9 Irz, P., F. Michonneau, T. Oberdorff, T. R. Whittier, N. Lamouroux, D. Mouillot, and C.
10 Argillier. 2007. Fish community comparisons along environmental gradients in lakes of
11 France and north-east USA. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **16**:350-366.
- 12 Islam, M. S., and M. Tanaka. 2006. Spatial variability in nursery functions along a temperate
13 estuarine gradient: role of detrital versus algal trophic pathways. *Canadian Journal of*
14 *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **63**:1848-1864.
- 15 James, M. R., M. Weatherhead, C. Stanger, and E. Graynoth. 1998. Macroinvertebrate
16 distribution in the littoral zone of Lake Coleridge, South Island, New-Zeland: Effects of
17 habitat stability, wind exposure, and macrophytes. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and*
18 *Freshwater Research* **32**:287-305.
- 19 Johnson, R. K., W. Goedkoop, and L. Sandin. 2004. Spatial scale and ecological relationships
20 between the macroinvertebrate communities of stony habitats of streams and lakes.
21 *Freshwater Biology* **49**:1179-1194.

- 1 Keast, A., J. Harker, and D. Turnbull. 1978. Nearshore fish habitat utilization and species
2 associations in Lake Opinicon (Ontario, Canada). *Environmental Biology of Fishes*
3 **3**:173-184.
- 4 Keast, A., and D. Webb. 1966. Mouth and body form relative to feeding ecology in the fish fauna
5 of a small lake, lake Opinicon, Ontario. *Journal of Fisheries Research Board of Canada*
6 **23**:1845-1873.
- 7 Lamouroux, N., L. N. Poff, and P. L. Angermeier. 2002. Intercontinental convergence of stream
8 fish community traits along geomorphic and hydraulic gradients. *Ecology* **83**:1792-1807.
- 9 Legendre, P., R. Galzin, and M. L. Harmelin-Vivien. 1997. Relating behavior to habitat:
10 Solutions to the fourth-corner problem. *Ecology* **78**:547-562.
- 11 Legendre, P., and L. Legendre. 1998. *Numerical Ecology*. 2nd ed edition. Elsevier Science BV,
12 Amsterdam.
- 13 Mason, N. W. H., C. Lanoiselée, D. Mouillot, P. Irz, and C. Argillier. 2007. Functional characters
14 combined with null models reveal inconsistency in mechanisms of species turnover in
15 lacustrine fish communities. *Oecologia* **153**:441-452.
- 16 McGill, B. J., B. J. Enquist, E. Weiher, and M. Westoby. 2006. Rebuilding community ecology
17 from functional traits. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **21**.
- 18 McLeod, E., R. Salm, A. Green, and J. Almany. 2009. Designing marine protected area networks
19 to address the impacts of climate change. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*
20 **7**:362-370.
- 21 Milligan, G. W., and M. C. Cooper. 1985. An examination of procedures for determining the
22 number of clusters in a data set. *Psychometrika* **50**:159-179.

- 1 Mittelbach, G. G. 1981. Foraging efficiency and body size: a study of optimal diet and habitat use
2 by bluegills. *Ecology* **62**:1370-1386.
- 3 Mouillot, D., S. Spatharis, S. Reizopoulou, T. Laugier, L. Sabetta, A. Basset, and T. Do Chi.
4 2006. Alternatives to taxonomic-based approaches to assess changes in transitional water
5 communities. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* **16**:469-482.
- 6 Norton, S. F. 1995. A functional approach to ecomorphological patterns of feeding in cottid
7 fishes. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **44**:61-78.
- 8 Olden, J. D., and D. A. Jackson. 2002. A comparison of statistical approaches for modelling fish
9 species distributions. *Freshwater Biology* **47**:1976-1995.
- 10 Paterson, M. 1993. The distribution of microcrustacea in the littoral zone of a freshwater lake.
11 *Hydrobiologia* **263**:173-183.
- 12 Pauly, D., V. Christensen, S. Guénette, T. J. Pitcher, U. R. Sumaila, C. J. Walters, R. Watson, and
13 D. Zeller. 2002. Towards sustainability in world fisheries. *Nature* **418**:689-695.
- 14 Pierce, C. L., J. B. Rasmussen, and W. C. Leggett. 1994. Littoral fish communities in southern
15 Quebec lakes: Relationships with limnological and prey resource variables. *Canadian*
16 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **51**:1128-1138.
- 17 Piet, G. J. 1998. Ecomorphology of a size-structured tropical freshwater fish community.
18 *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **51**:67-86.
- 19 Poff, L. N. 1997. Landscape filters and species traits: towards mechanistic understanding and
20 prediction in stream ecology. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*
21 **16**:391-409.

- 1 Poizat, G., and D. Pont. 1996. Multi-scale approach to species-habitat relationships: juvenile fish
2 in a large river section. *Freshwater Biology* **36**:611-622.
- 3 Randall, R. G., J. R. M. Kelso, and C. K. Minns. 1995. Fish production in freshwater: Are rivers
4 more productive than lakes? *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **52**:631-
5 643.
- 6 Richards, C., L. B. Johnson, and G. E. Host. 1996. Landscape-scale influences on stream habitats
7 and biota. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **53**:295-311.
- 8 Robb, T., and M. V. Abrahams. 2002. The influence of hypoxia on risk predation and habitat
9 choice by the fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas*. *Behavioural Ecology and*
10 *Sociobiology* **52**:25-30.
- 11 Ross, S. T. 1986. Resource partitioning in fish assemblages: A review of field studies. *Copeia*
12 **2**:352-388.
- 13 Santoul, F., J. Cayrou, S. Mastrorillo, and R. Céréghino. 2005. Spatial patterns of the biological
14 traits of freshwater fish communities in south-west France. *Journal of Fish Biology*
15 **66**:301-314.
- 16 Schutz, D. C., and T. G. Northcote. 1972. An experimental study of feeding behavior and
17 interaction of coastal cutthroat trout (*Salmo clarki clarki*) and dolly varden (*Savelinus*
18 *malma*). *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada* **29**:555-565.
- 19 Scott, W. B., and E. J. Crossman. 1973. Freshwater fishes of Canada. *Bulletin of the Fisheries*
20 *Research Board of Canada* **184**:966 pp.
- 21 Sokal, R. R., and F. J. Rohlf. 1995. *Biometry*. 3rd edition edition. W.H. Freeman & Co., New
22 York.

- 1 Southwood, T. R. E. 1977. Habitat, the templet for ecological strategies. *Journal of Animal*
2 *Ecology* **46**:337-365.
- 3 Southwood, T. R. E. 1988. Tactics, strategies and templates. *Oikos* **52**:3-18.
- 4 Stoffels, R. J., K. R. Clarke, and G. P. Closs. 2005. Spatial scale and benthic community
5 organisation in the littoral zones of large oligotrophic lakes: potential for cross-scale
6 interactions. *Freshwater Biology* **50**:1130-1145.
- 7 Suski, C. D., and S. J. Cooke. 2007. Conservation of aquatic resources through the use of
8 freshwater protected areas: opportunities and challenges *Biodiversity and Conservation*
9 **16**:2015-2029.
- 10 Tabor, R. A., and W. A. Wurtsbaugh. 1991. Predation risk and the importance of cover for
11 juvenile rainbow trout in lentic systems. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*
12 **120**:728-738.
- 13 Tall, L., A. Cattaneo, L. Cloutier, S. Dray, and P. Legendre. 2006. Resource partitioning in a
14 grazer guild feeding on a multilayer diatom mat. *Journal of the North American*
15 *Benthological Society* **25**:800-810.
- 16 Taylor, E. B. 1999. Species pairs of north temperate freshwater fishes: Evolution, taxonomy, and
17 conservation. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* **9**:299-324.
- 18 Thuiller, W., S. Lavorel, G. Midgley, S. Lavergne, and T. Rebelo. 2004. Relating plant traits and
19 species distributions along bioclimatic gradients for 88 *Leucadendron* taxa. *Ecology*
20 **85**:1688-1699.

- 1 Tonn, W. M., J. J. Magnuson, M. Rask, and J. Toivonen. 1990. Intercontinental comparison of
2 small-lake fish assemblages: the balance between local and regional processes. *The*
3 *American Naturalist* **136**:345-375.
- 4 Ultsch, G. R., S. A. Reese, M. Nie, J. D. Crim, W. H. Smith, and C. M. LeBerte. 1999. Influences
5 of temperature and oxygen upon habitat selection by bullfrog tadpoles and three species
6 of freshwater fishes in two Alabama strip mine ponds. *Hydrobiologia* **416**:149-162.
- 7 Vannote, R. L., G. W. Minshall, K. W. Cummins, J. R. Sedell, and C. E. Cushing. 1980. The
8 River Continuum Concept. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **37**:130-
9 137.
- 10 Vono, V., and F. A. R. Barbosa. 2001. Habitats and littoral zone fish community structure of two
11 natural lakes in southeast brazil. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **61**:371-379.
- 12 Weatherhead, M. A., and M. R. James. 2001. Distribution of macroinvertebrates in relation to
13 physical and biological variables in the littoral zone of nine New Zealand lakes.
14 *Hydrobiologia* **462**:115-129.
- 15 Weaver, M. J., J. J. Magnuson, and M. K. Clayton. 1997. Distribution of littoral fishes in
16 structurally complex macrophytes. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*
17 **54**:2277-2289.
- 18 Werner, E. E., D. J. Hall, D. R. Laughlin, D. J. Wagner, L. A. Wilsmann, and F. C. Funk. 1977.
19 Habitat partitioning in a freshwater fish community. *Journal of Fisheries and Research*
20 *Board of Canada* **34**:360-370.

1 Werner, E. E., G. G. Mittlebach, D. J. Hall, and G. F. Gilliam. 1983. Experimental tests of
2 optimal habitat use in fish: the role of relative habitat profitability. *Ecology* **64**:1525-
3 1539.

4 Zobel, M. 1997. The relative role of species pools in determining plant species richness: an
5 alternative explanation of species coexistence? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **12**:266-
6 269.

7

8

TABLE 1. Description of the codes, the numerical resolutions and the characteristics of the environmental variables estimated in Lake Drouin and Lake Paré. Values in columns Drouin and Paré are either percentages of occurrence or averages with their standard deviation in square bracket. * The environmental complexity index (ECI) represents the sum of the pairwise distances between the sites (formula: Appendix A).

Environmental variable	Code	Resolution	Drouin	Paré
Average littoral slope	Litt	Quantitative	0.29 [0.17]	0.14 [0.09]
Average depth	Z	Quantitative	1.66 [0.58]	1.28 [0.34]
Macrophytes				
Average density of emergent	Emer	Quantitative	7.49 [12.70]	13.95 [21.03]
Average density of submersed	Subm	Quantitative	3.43 [4.62]	10.99 [16.45]
Bottom cover (<i>M. spicatum</i>)	Cover	Percentage	26.36 [22.06]	71.08 [38.52]
Fetch (m)	Fetch	Quantitative	303.63 [406.63]	2.964 [3.62]
Distance to tributary (m)	Trib	Quantitative	596.76 [401.94]	785.86 [455.89]
Surface of a sampling site (m ²)	Size	Quantitative	215,60 [52.84]	207.60 [80.93]
Riparian slope	Rip	Presence/absence	24.44	35.00
Substrates				
Sand (< 2 mm)	S1	Presence/absence	17.78	10.00
Rock (60 - 250 mm)	S2	Presence/absence	41.11	14.44
Boulders (> 250 mm)	S3	Presence/absence	16.67	0.00
Bedrock	S4	Presence/absence	1.11	0.00
Woody debris	S5	Presence/absence	3.33	1.11
Riparian use				
Cottage/brick wall	U1	Presence/absence	62.22	61.67
Forest	U2	Presence/absence	46.67	30.00

Beach	U3	Presence/absence	5.56	10.00
Bush	U4	Presence/absence	26.67	21.67
Riparian trees	Tree	Presence/absence	24.44	43.33
Environmental complexity			<hr/>	
index* (ECI)			4.02	2.38

TABLE 2. Classification of the fish species into functional groups in Lake Drouin obtained by *K*-means partitioning on the species feeding-oriented trait matrices (i.e., matrix **B**). Δ : G_s1, \square : G_s2, O: G_s3. In Lake Paré, the symbols are replaced by an X when a species is present in that lake.

Species	Functional group of species (G _s)		
	Lake Drouin	Lake Drouin	Lake Paré
	Very broad	Broad	
<i>A. nebulosus</i>	O	O	X
<i>C. commersoni</i>	O	O	X
<i>C. plumbeus</i>	Absent	Absent	X
<i>F. diaphanous</i>	Δ	Δ	Absent
<i>L. gibbosus</i>	\square	\square	X
<i>N. crysoleucas</i>	Δ	Δ	Absent
<i>P. flavescens</i>	\square	\square	X
<i>S. atromaculatus</i>	\square	\square	X

G_s1: Surface feeders ; G_s2: Mid-water feeders ; G_s3: Bottom feeders

Very broad and Broad spatial scales are defined in the analytical framework of the Methods section.

TABLE 3. Description of the species morphological and behavioral traits used in this study.

Code numbers for the species traits are in parentheses.

Species traits		<i>A. nebulosus</i>	<i>C. commersoni</i>	<i>C. plumbeus</i>	<i>F. diaphanous</i>	<i>L. gibbosus</i>	<i>N. crysoleucas</i>	<i>P. flavescens</i>	<i>S. atromaculatus</i>
Type of diet	Plant (1)	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
	Zoobenthos (2)	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
	Zooplankton (3)	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
	Insect larvae (4)	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
	Fish (5)	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Feeding strata	Benthic (6)	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
	Water column (7)	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0
	Surface (8)	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Body morphology	Fusiform (9)	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
	Compressed (10)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
	Cylindrical (11)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Migration	Daily (12)	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
	Seasonal (13)	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
Mouth position	Inferior (14)	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Superior (15)	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
	Terminal (16)	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1

Temperature	1: 10-15°C (17)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	2: 15-20°C (18)	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
	3: 20-25°C (19)	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Dissolved oxygen	1: 7-8 mg L ⁻¹ (20)	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
	2: 5-7 mg L ⁻¹ (21)	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
	3: < 2 mg L ⁻¹ (22)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Activity	Diurnal (23)	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
	Nocturnal (24)	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0

FIGURE LEGENDS

FIG. 1. Bathymetric maps of the two study lakes on the Laurentian Shield in Québec (Canada). Depth contour values are in meters. Arrows identify inflows and outflows.


FIG. 2. Schematic flow diagram of the statistical framework used in the present study.


Environmental variables were spatially modeled (2, 3) prior to the analyses using Principal Coordinates of Neighbour Matrices (PCNM) (constructed in 1). (4) The fourth-corner and RLQ analyses were conducted in parallel to assess the multi-scale species traits-environment relationships. The fourth-corner method was used to test statistically each combination of species traits and environmental variables and estimate the total inertia (matrix trace). RLQ analysis was used for its graphical representations of the species traits and environment ordinations (hyperspaces) which facilitated the ecological interpretation of the results.


FIG. 3. Inertia between the species traits and the environmental variables at the four spatial scales in Lake Drouin (upper panel) and Lake Paré (lower panel). ** $P \leq 0.001$; n.s. relationship not significant.


FIG. 4. Results of the RLQ analysis indicating the scores of species traits along the two RLQ axes for Lake Drouin (A) at very broad spatial scale and (B) at broad spatial scale and the scores of environmental variables (C) at very broad spatial scale and (D) at broad spatial scale. Positions of the points relative to the origin indicate relative contributions to RLQ axes. Ellipses delineate groups of traits (G_t) and groups of environmental variables (G_e) identified by K -means partitioning; see Methods for details. Species traits are identified by numbers defined in Table 3. To simplify the interpretation, only the traits that were tested significant using the fourth-corner analyses are displayed. See Methods section for more details.

Fig. 1









APPENDIX A

Computation of the Environmental Complexity Index (ECI)

First, we calculated a distance matrix [D^2_{hi}] among the pairs of sites using Gower's dissimilarity coefficient on the sites-environment matrix. This coefficient was chosen because it can be used with mixed variable types (quantitative, categorical, and binary) and missing values (Legendre and Legendre 1998, eq. 7.20; Podani and Schmera 2006).

From this distance matrix, we computed the index of environmental complexity (ECI) as the sum of the squared distances among the pairs of sampling sites (i, j) divided by the number of sampling sites (n_m) in each lake:

$$ECI = \left[\sum_{h, i=1}^{n_m} D^2_{hi} \right] / n_m$$

This equation produces a generalized form of sum-of-squares representing the total variation in the Gower dissimilarity matrix (Legendre and Legendre 1998, eq. 8.6).

LITERATURE CITED

- Legendre, P., and L. Legendre. 1998. Numerical Ecology. 2nd ed edition. Elsevier Science BV, Amsterdam.
Podani, J., and D. Schmera. 2006. On dendrogram-based measures of functional diversity. *Oikos* **115**:179-185.

APPENDIX B

Ecological Application Archives xxxxxx

ASSESSMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SPECIES TRAITS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS FOR LITTORAL FISH COMMUNITIES USING THE FOURTH-CORNER METHOD
APPENDIX B: ASSESSMENT OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SPECIES TRAITS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS FOR LITTORAL FISH COMMUNITIES USING THE FOURTH-CORNER METHOD

Table B1 Correlations from the fourth-corner analysis between the species traits (columns) and the environmental variables (rows) at very broad spatial scale in Lake Drouin. Species trait codes are found in Table 3. Each environmental variable name is followed by a line of fourth-corner correlation coefficients.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Litt	0.110	-0.114	0.031	-0.079	-0.039	-0.114	-0.116	0.110	-0.027	0.029	-0.006	0.068	-0.075	-0.006	0.138	-0.116	0.007	0.047	-0.029	0.029	0.067	0.011	0.006	-0.006
Z	-0.112	0.129	-0.060	0.070	0.054	0.129	0.086	-0.112	0.016	-0.035	0.038	-0.056	0.080	0.038	-0.127	0.086	0.012	-0.067	0.018	-0.018	-0.066	-0.022	-0.038	0.038
Emerg	-0.112	0.143	-0.100	0.044	0.070	0.143	0.026	-0.112	-0.010	-0.039	0.092	-0.023	0.089	0.092	-0.096	0.026	0.033	-0.099	0.001	-0.001	-0.061	-0.040	-0.092	0.092
Subm	0.103	-0.136	0.096	-0.045	-0.070	-0.136	-0.031	0.103	0.004	0.039	-0.081	0.026	-0.082	-0.081	0.093	-0.031	-0.036	0.090	-0.001	0.001	0.056	0.037	0.081	-0.081
cover	-0.097	0.129	-0.088	0.047	0.065	0.129	0.035	-0.097	-0.001	-0.037	0.073	-0.030	0.075	0.073	-0.093	0.035	0.034	-0.083	0.002	-0.002	-0.055	-0.033	-0.073	0.073
Fetch	-0.116	0.147	-0.103	0.043	0.071	0.147	0.023	-0.116	-0.012	-0.039	0.097	-0.021	0.093	0.097	-0.096	0.023	0.032	-0.103	0.000	0.000	-0.063	-0.042	-0.097	0.097
Trib	-0.111	0.145	-0.103	0.043	0.073	0.145	0.025	-0.111	-0.009	-0.040	0.093	-0.022	0.090	0.093	-0.095	0.025	0.036	-0.100	0.000	0.000	-0.060	-0.042	-0.093	0.093
Size	0.097	-0.128	0.087	-0.047	-0.064	-0.128	-0.035	0.097	0.001	0.037	-0.073	0.030	-0.074	-0.073	0.093	-0.035	-0.033	0.082	-0.002	0.002	0.055	0.033	0.073	-0.073
Rip	0.112	-0.122	0.043	-0.077	-0.046	-0.122	-0.106	0.112	-0.023	0.032	-0.019	0.064	-0.078	-0.019	0.136	-0.106	-0.001	0.056	-0.025	0.025	0.068	0.016	0.019	-0.019
S1	0.063	-0.101	0.097	-0.016	-0.062	-0.101	0.022	0.063	0.017	0.032	-0.092	0.000	-0.053	-0.092	0.041	0.022	-0.048	0.080	0.014	-0.014	0.033	0.036	0.092	-0.092
S3	-0.105	0.131	-0.078	0.058	0.061	0.131	0.057	-0.105	0.006	-0.037	0.060	-0.042	0.078	0.060	-0.109	0.057	0.025	-0.077	0.009	-0.009	-0.061	-0.029	-0.060	0.060
S4	-0.056	0.030	0.047	0.063	-0.011	0.030	0.128	-0.056	0.039	-0.003	-0.067	-0.065	0.031	-0.067	-0.100	0.128	-0.044	0.018	0.038	-0.038	-0.038	0.017	0.067	-0.067
S5	-0.079	0.061	0.023	0.074	0.006	0.061	0.134	-0.079	0.038	-0.012	-0.047	-0.071	0.049	-0.047	-0.121	0.134	-0.034	-0.003	0.038	-0.038	-0.051	0.009	0.047	-0.047
S8	-0.075	0.111	-0.096	0.026	0.063	0.111	-0.004	-0.075	-0.013	-0.034	0.088	-0.010	0.060	0.088	-0.058	-0.004	0.044	-0.082	-0.009	0.009	-0.040	-0.036	-0.088	0.088
S9	0.090	-0.120	0.080	-0.048	-0.060	-0.120	-0.039	0.090	-0.002	0.035	-0.064	0.034	-0.067	-0.064	0.091	-0.039	-0.032	0.074	-0.003	0.003	0.052	0.029	0.064	-0.064
U1	-0.103	0.135	-0.093	0.046	0.067	0.135	0.032	-0.103	-0.004	-0.038	0.080	-0.027	0.080	0.080	-0.094	0.032	0.034	-0.089	0.001	-0.001	-0.057	-0.036	-0.080	0.080
U2	0.094	-0.125	0.085	-0.047	-0.063	-0.125	-0.037	0.094	0.000	0.036	-0.069	0.031	-0.071	-0.069	0.092	-0.037	-0.034	0.079	-0.002	0.002	0.053	0.031	0.069	-0.069
Tree	0.095	-0.125	0.086	-0.047	-0.064	-0.125	-0.036	0.095	0.000	0.037	-0.070	0.031	-0.072	-0.070	0.092	-0.036	-0.034	0.079	-0.002	0.002	0.054	0.032	0.070	-0.070

Table B2 Correlations from the fourth-corner analysis between the species traits (columns) and the environmental variables (rows) at broad spatial scale in Lake Drouin. Species trait codes are found in Table 3.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Litt	0.137	-0.102	0.034	0.018	-0.003	-0.102	0.015	0.137	0.067	-0.021	-0.081	-0.035	-0.107	-0.081	0.040	0.015	0.066	0.111	-0.007	0.007	0.077	0.047	0.081	-0.081
Z	-0.038	0.088	-0.130	-0.016	0.089	0.088	-0.035	-0.038	0.000	-0.043	0.082	0.016	0.047	0.082	-0.017	-0.035	0.067	-0.105	-0.002	0.002	-0.012	-0.034	-0.082	0.082
Emerg	0.004	0.042	-0.110	-0.072	0.078	0.042	-0.091	0.004	-0.021	-0.015	0.067	0.071	0.035	0.067	0.057	-0.091	0.066	-0.079	-0.033	0.033	0.023	-0.059	-0.067	0.067
Subm	0.012	0.030	-0.102	-0.098	0.076	0.030	-0.111	0.012	-0.033	-0.001	0.061	0.099	0.042	0.061	0.085	-0.111	0.062	-0.072	-0.049	0.049	0.035	-0.078	-0.061	0.061
cover	-0.011	-0.031	0.102	0.097	-0.076	-0.031	0.110	-0.011	0.032	0.001	-0.061	-0.098	-0.041	-0.061	-0.084	0.110	-0.062	0.073	0.048	-0.048	-0.034	0.077	0.061	-0.061
Fetch	-0.021	-0.021	0.093	0.111	-0.075	-0.021	0.121	-0.021	0.037	-0.008	-0.053	-0.116	-0.045	-0.053	-0.102	0.121	-0.062	0.061	0.061	-0.061	-0.045	0.090	0.053	-0.053
Trib	-0.013	-0.029	0.100	0.100	-0.076	-0.029	0.113	-0.013	0.034	-0.001	-0.060	-0.102	-0.042	-0.060	-0.088	0.113	-0.062	0.071	0.051	-0.051	-0.036	0.080	0.060	-0.060
Size	-0.011	-0.032	0.103	0.095	-0.076	-0.032	0.109	-0.011	0.032	0.002	-0.062	-0.096	-0.041	-0.062	-0.082	0.109	-0.062	0.073	0.047	-0.047	-0.033	0.075	0.062	-0.062
Rip	0.067	-0.043	-0.032	-0.046	0.030	-0.043	-0.050	0.067	0.022	-0.021	0.000	0.040	-0.014	0.000	0.058	-0.050	0.042	0.000	-0.002	0.002	0.059	0.002	0.000	0.000
S1	0.014	0.045	-0.121	-0.048	0.113	0.045	-0.039	0.014	0.039	-0.062	0.047	0.056	0.072	0.047	0.012	-0.039	0.087	-0.073	-0.004	0.004	0.053	-0.043	-0.047	0.047
S3	-0.088	0.031	0.078	0.027	-0.076	0.031	0.018	-0.088	-0.067	0.056	0.015	-0.008	0.030	0.015	-0.032	0.018	-0.092	0.011	-0.014	0.014	-0.070	-0.016	-0.015	0.015
S4	0.017	-0.035	0.033	-0.002	-0.013	-0.035	0.032	0.017	0.027	-0.002	-0.046	-0.004	-0.001	-0.046	-0.005	0.032	-0.024	0.020	0.025	-0.025	0.016	0.022	0.046	-0.046
S5	0.118	-0.105	0.051	-0.020	-0.012	-0.105	0.004	0.118	0.043	0.010	-0.097	0.000	-0.085	-0.097	0.065	0.004	0.032	0.099	-0.016	0.016	0.070	0.020	0.097	-0.097
S8	0.094	-0.114	0.105	-0.024	-0.058	-0.114	-0.003	0.094	0.008	0.043	-0.097	0.016	-0.070	-0.097	0.073	-0.003	-0.019	0.119	-0.027	0.027	0.054	0.011	0.097	-0.097
S9	-0.013	-0.029	0.101	0.100	-0.076	-0.029	0.113	-0.013	0.033	-0.001	-0.060	-0.102	-0.042	-0.060	-0.088	0.113	-0.062	0.071	0.050	-0.050	-0.036	0.079	0.060	-0.060
U1	-0.013	-0.029	0.100	0.100	-0.076	-0.029	0.113	-0.013	0.034	-0.001	-0.059	-0.103	-0.042	-0.059	-0.089	0.113	-0.062	0.071	0.051	-0.051	-0.037	0.080	0.059	-0.059
U2	0.011	0.032	-0.103	-0.095	0.077	0.032	-0.109	0.011	-0.032	-0.002	0.062	0.096	0.041	0.062	0.082	-0.109	0.062	-0.073	-0.047	0.047	0.033	-0.076	-0.062	0.062
Tree	-0.012	-0.031	0.102	0.096	-0.077	-0.031	0.110	-0.012	0.032	0.001	-0.061	-0.098	-0.041	-0.061	-0.084	0.110	-0.062	0.073	0.048	-0.048	-0.034	0.077	0.061	-0.061

Table B3 Correlations from the fourth-corner analysis between the species traits (columns) and the environmental variables (rows) at meso spatial scale in Lake Drouin. Species trait codes are found in Table 3.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Litt	0.026	-0.029	0.000	-0.043	-0.007	-0.029	-0.052	0.026	-0.021	0.017	0.006	0.039	-0.014	0.006	0.056	-0.052	-0.001	0.000	-0.015	0.015	0.019	-0.011	-0.006	0.006
Z	0.033	-0.010	-0.045	-0.013	0.026	-0.010	-0.066	0.033	0.016	-0.058	0.080	0.040	0.037	0.080	0.019	-0.066	0.036	-0.023	0.011	-0.011	0.052	0.017	-0.080	0.080
Emerg	-0.017	0.007	-0.027	-0.012	0.014	0.007	-0.012	-0.017	0.015	-0.036	0.040	0.021	0.052	0.040	-0.015	-0.012	-0.016	-0.052	0.043	-0.043	0.012	0.021	-0.040	0.040
Subm	-0.012	0.001	-0.028	-0.019	0.011	0.001	-0.025	-0.012	0.012	-0.036	0.047	0.029	0.052	0.047	-0.005	-0.025	-0.017	-0.054	0.042	-0.042	0.017	0.022	-0.047	0.047
cover	-0.012	0.002	-0.028	-0.019	0.012	0.002	-0.024	-0.012	0.012	-0.036	0.046	0.029	0.052	0.046	-0.006	-0.024	-0.017	-0.054	0.042	-0.042	0.016	0.022	-0.046	0.046
Fetch	-0.015	0.005	-0.028	-0.015	0.013	0.005	-0.017	-0.015	0.014	-0.036	0.043	0.024	0.052	0.043	-0.011	-0.017	-0.016	-0.053	0.042	-0.042	0.014	0.021	-0.043	0.043
Trib	0.011	0.000	0.028	0.020	-0.011	0.000	0.026	0.011	-0.011	0.036	-0.048	-0.031	-0.052	-0.048	0.003	0.026	0.017	0.054	-0.042	0.042	-0.017	-0.022	0.048	-0.048
Size	-0.012	0.001	-0.028	-0.019	0.012	0.001	-0.024	-0.012	0.012	-0.036	0.046	0.029	0.052	0.046	-0.005	-0.024	-0.017	-0.054	0.042	-0.042	0.016	0.022	-0.047	0.046
Rip	0.101	-0.079	-0.011	-0.053	0.006	-0.079	-0.083	0.101	0.013	-0.016	0.007	0.050	-0.042	0.007	0.091	-0.083	0.042	0.027	-0.012	0.012	0.076	0.015	-0.007	0.007
S1	-0.024	0.010	-0.004	-0.041	0.003	0.010	-0.031	-0.024	-0.024	0.014	0.019	0.049	0.046	0.019	0.023	-0.031	-0.023	-0.029	-0.008	0.008	0.002	-0.030	-0.019	0.019
S3	-0.060	0.006	0.043	0.052	-0.058	0.006	0.055	-0.060	0.003	-0.009	0.012	-0.053	0.014	0.012	-0.073	0.055	-0.084	-0.027	0.072	-0.072	-0.051	0.068	-0.012	0.012
S4	-0.051	0.043	0.031	0.019	-0.014	0.043	0.044	-0.051	-0.035	0.055	-0.040	-0.024	-0.007	-0.040	-0.023	0.044	-0.018	0.022	-0.042	0.042	-0.054	-0.048	0.040	-0.040
S5	-0.050	-0.003	0.053	-0.008	-0.069	-0.003	-0.020	-0.050	-0.061	0.049	0.018	0.008	-0.001	0.018	0.010	-0.020	-0.082	-0.012	0.004	-0.004	-0.049	0.006	-0.018	0.018
S8	-0.094	0.028	0.058	0.093	-0.084	0.028	0.087	-0.094	-0.012	0.005	0.013	-0.101	-0.011	0.013	-0.110	0.087	-0.105	-0.029	0.082	-0.082	-0.099	0.087	-0.013	0.013
S9	-0.015	0.004	-0.028	-0.015	0.013	0.004	-0.018	-0.015	0.014	-0.036	0.044	0.025	0.052	0.044	-0.010	-0.018	-0.016	-0.053	0.042	-0.042	0.014	0.022	-0.044	0.044
U1	0.010	0.001	0.028	0.022	-0.010	0.001	0.030	0.010	-0.010	0.036	-0.049	-0.033	-0.052	-0.049	0.001	0.030	0.017	0.054	-0.041	0.041	-0.019	-0.022	0.049	-0.049
U2	0.011	-0.001	0.028	0.020	-0.011	-0.001	0.026	0.011	-0.012	0.036	-0.048	-0.030	-0.051	-0.048	0.004	0.026	0.016	0.054	-0.042	0.042	-0.017	-0.022	0.048	-0.048
Tree	-0.013	0.002	-0.028	-0.018	0.012	0.002	-0.023	-0.013	0.012	-0.036	0.046	0.028	0.052	0.046	-0.007	-0.023	-0.016	-0.054	0.042	-0.042	0.016	0.022	-0.046	0.046

Table B4 Correlations from the fourth-corner analysis between the species traits (columns) and the environmental variables (rows) at fine spatial scale in Lake Drouin. Species trait codes are found in Table 3.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Litt	0.002	-0.002	0.007	-0.007	-0.014	-0.002	-0.022	0.002	-0.028	0.025	0.003	0.004	-0.025	0.003	0.024	-0.022	0.001	0.010	-0.025	0.025	-0.012	-0.014	-0.003	0.003
Z	0.036	-0.049	0.000	-0.039	-0.023	-0.049	-0.067	0.036	-0.014	-0.002	0.029	0.035	-0.020	0.029	0.056	-0.067	-0.015	-0.015	0.016	-0.016	0.025	0.028	-0.029	0.029
Emerg	-0.004	0.022	-0.007	-0.023	0.012	0.022	-0.002	-0.004	-0.038	0.061	-0.046	-0.001	-0.048	-0.046	0.035	-0.002	0.025	0.016	-0.063	0.063	-0.031	-0.062	0.046	-0.046
Subm	-0.002	-0.020	0.014	0.024	-0.017	-0.020	0.006	-0.002	0.034	-0.054	0.042	0.000	0.048	0.042	-0.037	0.006	-0.032	-0.014	0.062	-0.062	0.025	0.059	-0.042	0.042
cover	-0.002	-0.020	0.014	0.024	-0.018	-0.020	0.006	-0.002	0.034	-0.054	0.042	0.000	0.048	0.042	-0.037	0.006	-0.032	-0.014	0.062	-0.062	0.024	0.059	-0.042	0.042
Fetch	-0.001	0.021	-0.010	-0.023	0.015	0.021	-0.004	-0.001	-0.036	0.058	-0.044	-0.001	-0.048	-0.044	0.036	-0.004	0.028	0.015	-0.063	0.063	-0.028	-0.061	0.044	-0.044
Trib	-0.004	-0.020	0.016	0.024	-0.019	-0.020	0.008	-0.004	0.032	-0.052	0.040	-0.001	0.048	0.040	-0.037	0.008	-0.035	-0.014	0.061	-0.061	0.022	0.058	-0.040	0.040
Size	-0.002	-0.020	0.013	0.023	-0.017	-0.020	0.006	-0.002	0.034	-0.055	0.042	0.000	0.048	0.042	-0.037	0.006	-0.032	-0.015	0.062	-0.062	0.025	0.059	-0.042	0.042
Rip	-0.037	0.014	0.007	-0.010	0.001	0.014	0.002	-0.037	0.004	-0.018	0.028	0.034	0.081	0.028	-0.022	0.002	-0.037	-0.028	0.023	-0.023	0.008	-0.004	-0.028	0.028
S1	0.037	0.002	-0.034	-0.009	0.056	0.002	0.015	0.037	0.041	-0.025	-0.028	0.007	0.008	-0.028	0.003	0.015	0.059	0.014	-0.014	0.014	0.040	-0.022	0.028	-0.028
S3	-0.003	-0.015	0.008	0.007	-0.006	-0.015	0.009	-0.003	0.029	-0.038	0.021	0.009	0.046	0.021	-0.025	0.009	-0.026	-0.016	0.047	-0.047	0.022	0.037	-0.021	0.021
S4	0.002	0.035	-0.003	0.031	0.050	0.035	0.083	0.002	0.038	0.004	-0.077	-0.035	0.000	-0.077	-0.041	0.083	0.054	0.050	-0.039	0.039	0.002	-0.048	0.077	-0.077
S5	0.001	-0.013	0.025	0.025	-0.051	-0.013	-0.025	0.001	-0.038	0.023	0.025	-0.030	-0.061	0.025	0.011	-0.025	-0.017	0.016	-0.008	0.008	-0.033	0.027	-0.025	0.025
S8	0.050	-0.020	-0.019	0.020	0.015	-0.020	-0.004	0.050	0.030	-0.030	0.002	-0.024	-0.040	0.002	0.003	-0.004	0.048	0.022	0.002	-0.002	0.027	0.026	-0.002	0.002
S9	-0.004	-0.020	0.015	0.024	-0.019	-0.020	0.007	-0.004	0.033	-0.053	0.041	0.000	0.048	0.041	-0.037	0.007	-0.034	-0.014	0.061	-0.061	0.023	0.058	-0.041	0.041
U1	-0.002	-0.020	0.014	0.024	-0.018	-0.020	0.006	-0.002	0.034	-0.054	0.042	0.000	0.048	0.042	-0.037	0.006	-0.032	-0.014	0.062	-0.062	0.024	0.059	-0.042	0.042
U2	0.002	0.020	-0.013	-0.024	0.017	0.020	-0.006	0.002	-0.034	0.054	-0.042	0.000	-0.048	-0.042	0.037	-0.006	0.032	0.014	-0.062	0.062	-0.025	-0.059	0.042	-0.042
Tree	0.002	0.020	-0.013	-0.024	0.017	0.020	-0.006	0.002	-0.034	0.054	-0.042	0.000	-0.048	-0.042	0.037	-0.006	0.032	0.014	-0.062	0.062	-0.025	-0.059	0.042	-0.042

Table B5 Correlations from the fourth-corner analysis between the species traits (columns) and the environmental variables (rows) at very broad spatial scale in Lake Paré. Species trait codes are found in Table 3.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Litt	0.117	-0.108	-0.040	0.039	0.067	-0.108	-0.051	0.089	0.067	-0.091	0.051	0.006	0.034	0.051	0.108	-0.086	0.117	0.005	-0.040	0.040	0.093	-0.007	-0.086	0.086
Z	-0.119	-0.031	0.073	-0.069	-0.047	-0.031	-0.071	-0.132	-0.047	0.001	0.071	0.127	0.132	0.071	0.031	-0.078	-0.119	-0.050	0.042	-0.042	0.016	-0.097	-0.078	0.078
Emerg	0.044	-0.098	-0.004	-0.001	0.037	-0.098	-0.042	0.016	0.037	-0.058	0.042	0.042	0.066	0.042	0.098	-0.074	0.044	-0.019	-0.012	0.012	0.068	-0.049	-0.074	0.074
Subm	0.057	-0.104	-0.008	0.009	0.040	-0.104	-0.072	0.028	0.040	-0.079	0.072	0.053	0.079	0.072	0.104	-0.105	0.057	-0.013	-0.019	0.019	0.087	-0.041	-0.105	0.105
cover	-0.057	0.104	0.008	-0.009	-0.040	0.104	0.073	-0.028	-0.040	0.079	-0.073	-0.054	-0.079	-0.073	-0.104	0.105	-0.057	0.013	0.019	-0.019	-0.087	0.040	0.105	-0.105
Fetch	-0.056	0.104	0.007	-0.008	-0.040	0.104	0.070	-0.027	-0.040	0.078	-0.070	-0.053	-0.078	-0.070	-0.104	0.103	-0.056	0.014	0.019	-0.019	-0.086	0.042	0.103	-0.103
Trib	0.055	-0.104	-0.007	0.007	0.040	-0.104	-0.066	0.026	0.040	-0.075	0.066	0.051	0.077	0.066	0.104	-0.099	0.055	-0.015	-0.018	0.018	0.084	-0.043	-0.099	0.099
Size	-0.057	0.105	0.008	-0.009	-0.040	0.105	0.073	-0.028	-0.040	0.079	-0.073	-0.054	-0.079	-0.073	-0.105	0.105	-0.057	0.013	0.019	-0.019	-0.087	0.041	0.105	-0.105
Rip	-0.048	-0.072	0.043	-0.040	-0.010	-0.072	-0.080	-0.071	-0.010	-0.038	0.080	0.107	0.123	0.080	0.072	-0.101	-0.048	-0.039	0.018	-0.018	0.053	-0.082	-0.101	0.101
S1	0.064	-0.105	-0.012	0.012	0.043	-0.105	-0.068	0.035	0.043	-0.080	0.068	0.047	0.073	0.068	0.105	-0.101	0.064	-0.012	-0.021	0.021	0.087	-0.038	-0.101	0.101
S3	-0.121	0.108	0.042	-0.041	-0.068	0.108	0.049	-0.093	-0.068	0.092	-0.049	-0.003	-0.031	-0.049	-0.108	0.084	-0.121	-0.007	0.041	-0.041	-0.093	0.004	0.084	-0.084
S4	0.170	-0.092	-0.073	0.070	0.087	-0.092	-0.018	0.148	0.087	-0.090	0.018	-0.052	-0.027	0.018	0.092	-0.049	0.170	0.028	-0.059	0.059	0.084	0.038	-0.049	0.049
S5	-0.171	0.092	0.074	-0.071	-0.087	0.092	0.017	-0.149	-0.087	0.090	-0.017	0.053	0.028	-0.017	-0.092	0.048	-0.171	-0.029	0.059	-0.059	-0.084	-0.038	0.048	-0.048
S8	0.176	-0.027	-0.091	0.087	0.080	-0.027	0.042	0.174	0.080	-0.049	-0.042	-0.119	-0.110	-0.042	0.027	0.030	0.176	0.051	-0.061	0.061	0.033	0.090	0.030	-0.030
S9	0.056	-0.104	-0.007	0.008	0.040	-0.104	-0.070	0.027	0.040	-0.078	0.070	0.053	0.078	0.070	0.104	-0.102	0.056	-0.014	-0.019	0.019	0.086	-0.042	-0.102	0.102
U1	0.048	-0.101	-0.005	0.000	0.038	-0.101	-0.047	0.019	0.038	-0.063	0.047	0.044	0.069	0.047	0.101	-0.079	0.048	-0.018	-0.013	0.013	0.072	-0.049	-0.079	0.079
U2	0.056	-0.104	-0.007	0.008	0.040	-0.104	-0.069	0.027	0.040	-0.077	0.069	0.052	0.078	0.069	0.104	-0.102	0.056	-0.014	-0.018	0.018	0.085	-0.042	-0.102	0.102
Tree	-0.100	0.037	0.082	0.007	-0.086	0.037	0.057	-0.092	-0.086	0.112	-0.057	-0.041	-0.050	-0.057	-0.037	0.067	-0.100	0.024	-0.013	0.013	-0.109	-0.023	0.067	-0.067

Table B6 Correlations from the fourth-corner analysis between the species traits (columns) and the environmental variables (rows) at broad spatial scale in Lake Paré. Species trait codes are found in Table 3.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Litt	0.001	-0.018	0.051	0.065	-0.045	-0.018	-0.021	-0.004	-0.045	0.029	0.021	-0.035	-0.030	0.021	0.018	-0.026	0.001	0.057	-0.065	0.065	-0.028	-0.009	-0.026	0.026
Z	0.000	-0.020	0.001	0.002	-0.001	-0.020	-0.107	-0.006	-0.001	-0.061	0.107	0.069	0.073	0.107	0.020	-0.108	0.000	-0.011	0.005	-0.005	0.057	0.026	-0.108	0.108
Emerg	0.073	-0.087	0.032	0.086	-0.003	-0.087	0.054	0.049	-0.003	0.034	-0.054	-0.099	-0.074	-0.054	0.087	0.021	0.073	0.065	-0.095	0.095	-0.027	-0.041	0.021	-0.021
Subm	-0.015	0.042	-0.037	-0.045	0.020	0.042	-0.018	-0.003	0.020	-0.029	0.018	0.041	0.030	0.018	-0.042	-0.002	-0.015	-0.039	0.053	-0.053	0.023	0.035	-0.002	0.002
cover	-0.012	0.040	-0.037	-0.043	0.021	0.040	-0.018	-0.001	0.021	-0.030	0.018	0.040	0.029	0.018	-0.040	-0.003	-0.012	-0.037	0.051	-0.051	0.024	0.035	-0.003	0.003
Fetch	0.023	-0.048	0.037	0.052	-0.018	-0.048	0.018	0.010	-0.018	0.027	-0.018	-0.046	-0.033	-0.018	0.048	0.000	0.023	0.043	-0.060	0.060	-0.021	-0.036	0.000	0.000
Trib	0.017	-0.044	0.037	0.047	-0.020	-0.044	0.018	0.005	-0.020	0.029	-0.018	-0.043	-0.031	-0.018	0.044	0.002	0.017	0.040	-0.055	0.055	-0.022	-0.035	0.002	-0.002
Size	-0.010	0.038	-0.037	-0.042	0.022	0.038	-0.017	0.001	0.022	-0.030	0.017	0.038	0.027	0.017	-0.038	-0.003	-0.010	-0.036	0.049	-0.049	0.024	0.034	-0.003	0.003
Rip	-0.042	0.028	0.055	0.032	-0.057	0.028	0.080	-0.035	-0.057	0.099	-0.080	-0.077	-0.083	-0.080	-0.028	0.085	-0.042	0.044	-0.037	0.037	-0.095	-0.023	0.085	-0.085
S1	-0.099	0.051	0.062	-0.005	-0.076	0.051	-0.010	-0.087	-0.076	0.064	0.010	0.008	-0.005	0.010	-0.051	0.009	-0.099	0.008	0.008	-0.008	-0.067	0.012	0.009	-0.009
S3	-0.091	0.083	0.024	-0.041	-0.044	0.083	0.122	-0.069	-0.044	0.112	-0.122	-0.055	-0.075	-0.122	-0.083	0.145	-0.091	-0.014	0.040	-0.040	-0.113	0.003	0.145	-0.145
S4	-0.011	-0.003	0.040	0.036	-0.034	-0.003	0.039	-0.012	-0.034	0.055	-0.039	-0.051	-0.050	-0.039	0.003	0.036	-0.011	0.039	-0.041	0.041	-0.050	-0.025	0.036	-0.036
S5	-0.073	0.057	0.012	-0.053	-0.021	0.057	0.134	-0.059	-0.021	0.098	-0.134	-0.049	-0.062	-0.134	-0.057	0.146	-0.073	-0.028	0.047	-0.047	-0.095	-0.020	0.146	-0.146
S8	0.031	-0.005	-0.051	-0.030	0.047	-0.005	-0.103	0.031	0.047	-0.103	0.103	0.091	0.091	0.103	0.005	-0.099	0.031	-0.036	0.036	-0.036	0.099	0.026	-0.099	0.099
S9	-0.013	0.040	-0.037	-0.044	0.021	0.040	-0.018	-0.001	0.021	-0.030	0.018	0.040	0.029	0.018	-0.040	-0.003	-0.013	-0.038	0.052	-0.052	0.024	0.035	-0.003	0.003
U1	0.034	-0.056	0.035	0.059	-0.015	-0.056	0.018	0.018	-0.015	0.024	-0.018	-0.052	-0.037	-0.018	0.056	-0.002	0.034	0.048	-0.067	0.067	-0.018	-0.037	-0.002	0.002
U2	-0.014	0.041	-0.037	-0.044	0.021	0.041	-0.018	-0.002	0.021	-0.030	0.018	0.041	0.029	0.018	-0.041	-0.003	-0.014	-0.038	0.052	-0.052	0.023	0.035	-0.003	0.003
Tree	0.068	-0.090	0.027	0.075	0.001	-0.090	0.075	0.043	0.001	0.043	-0.075	-0.105	-0.080	-0.075	0.090	0.040	0.068	0.052	-0.083	0.083	-0.037	-0.038	0.040	-0.040

Table B7 Correlations from the fourth-corner analysis between the species traits (columns) and the environmental variables (rows) at meso spatial scale in Lake Paré. Species trait codes are found in Table 3.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Litt	0.147	0.035	-0.123	0.020	0.104	0.035	-0.012	0.162	0.104	-0.103	0.012	-0.018	-0.027	0.012	-0.035	0.001	0.147	0.017	-0.006	0.006	0.094	0.049	0.001	-0.001
Z	0.021	0.029	-0.015	0.023	0.000	0.029	-0.036	0.030	0.000	-0.021	0.036	-0.002	-0.009	0.036	-0.029	-0.024	0.021	0.020	-0.011	0.011	0.014	0.041	-0.024	0.024
Emerg	-0.038	0.012	0.077	0.070	-0.081	0.012	-0.038	-0.036	-0.081	0.052	0.038	-0.030	-0.033	0.038	-0.012	-0.032	-0.038	0.068	-0.067	0.067	-0.054	0.007	-0.032	0.032
Subm	0.000	0.022	0.040	0.068	-0.048	0.022	-0.039	0.007	-0.048	0.021	0.039	-0.030	-0.035	0.039	-0.022	-0.029	0.000	0.066	-0.062	0.062	-0.024	0.016	-0.029	0.029
cover	-0.002	-0.022	-0.039	-0.068	0.047	-0.022	0.039	-0.008	0.047	-0.021	-0.039	0.030	0.035	-0.039	0.022	0.029	-0.002	-0.066	0.062	-0.062	0.024	-0.016	0.029	-0.029
Fetch	-0.001	-0.022	-0.039	-0.068	0.048	-0.022	0.039	-0.008	0.048	-0.021	-0.039	0.030	0.035	-0.039	0.022	0.030	-0.001	-0.066	0.062	-0.062	0.024	-0.016	0.030	-0.030
Trib	-0.007	0.021	0.047	0.068	-0.054	0.021	-0.039	-0.001	-0.054	0.027	0.039	-0.029	-0.034	0.039	-0.021	-0.029	-0.007	0.066	-0.062	0.062	-0.030	0.014	-0.029	0.029
Size	-0.001	0.022	0.042	0.068	-0.050	0.022	-0.039	0.005	-0.050	0.023	0.039	-0.030	-0.035	0.039	-0.022	-0.029	-0.001	0.066	-0.062	0.062	-0.026	0.015	-0.029	0.029
Rip	-0.072	0.046	0.048	0.014	-0.068	0.046	-0.011	-0.060	-0.068	0.057	0.011	-0.015	-0.027	0.011	-0.046	0.006	-0.072	0.015	0.000	0.000	-0.066	0.051	0.006	-0.006
S1	-0.032	0.023	-0.027	-0.052	0.011	0.023	0.036	-0.027	0.011	0.011	-0.036	0.003	-0.003	-0.036	-0.023	0.042	-0.032	-0.056	0.065	-0.065	-0.022	0.058	0.042	-0.042
S3	-0.075	0.084	0.062	0.037	-0.087	0.084	0.050	-0.052	-0.087	0.110	-0.050	-0.072	-0.092	-0.050	-0.084	0.077	-0.075	0.053	-0.029	0.029	-0.115	0.028	0.077	-0.077
S4	0.030	0.008	-0.038	-0.014	0.034	0.008	-0.062	0.033	0.034	-0.068	0.062	0.053	0.050	0.062	-0.008	-0.056	0.030	-0.013	0.016	-0.016	0.066	0.009	-0.056	0.056
S5	-0.078	0.016	0.049	-0.023	-0.046	0.016	0.068	-0.076	-0.046	0.082	-0.068	-0.022	-0.026	-0.068	-0.016	0.070	-0.078	-0.009	0.014	-0.014	-0.077	-0.033	0.070	-0.070
S8	-0.096	0.051	0.048	-0.023	-0.061	0.051	0.053	-0.084	-0.061	0.087	-0.053	-0.020	-0.033	-0.053	-0.051	0.068	-0.096	-0.007	0.024	-0.024	-0.088	0.004	0.068	-0.068
S9	-0.006	-0.024	-0.034	-0.067	0.043	-0.024	0.039	-0.014	0.043	-0.017	-0.039	0.030	0.035	-0.039	0.024	0.029	-0.006	-0.066	0.061	-0.061	0.020	-0.018	0.029	-0.029
U1	0.000	-0.022	-0.041	-0.068	0.049	-0.022	0.039	-0.007	0.049	-0.022	-0.039	0.030	0.035	-0.039	0.022	0.030	0.000	-0.066	0.062	-0.062	0.025	-0.016	0.030	-0.030
U2	-0.001	-0.022	-0.040	-0.068	0.048	-0.022	0.039	-0.007	0.048	-0.021	-0.039	0.030	0.035	-0.039	0.022	0.030	-0.001	-0.066	0.062	-0.062	0.024	-0.016	0.030	-0.030
Tree	-0.071	0.024	0.118	0.092	-0.123	0.024	-0.028	-0.066	-0.123	0.097	0.028	-0.054	-0.059	0.028	-0.024	-0.019	-0.071	0.093	-0.089	0.089	-0.098	0.002	-0.019	0.019

Table B8 Correlations from the fourth-corner analysis between the species traits (columns) and the environmental variables (rows) at fine spatial scale in Lake Paré. Species trait codes are found in Table 3.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Litt	-0.059	0.058	0.024	-0.018	-0.035	0.058	0.010	-0.044	-0.035	0.038	-0.010	0.011	-0.004	-0.010	-0.058	0.029	-0.059	0.004	0.014	-0.014	-0.035	-0.014	0.029	-0.029
Z	-0.017	-0.030	0.033	0.021	-0.029	-0.030	-0.083	-0.027	-0.029	-0.022	0.083	0.039	0.046	0.083	0.030	-0.089	-0.017	0.007	-0.017	0.017	0.019	0.015	-0.089	0.089
Emerg	0.069	-0.083	-0.008	0.046	0.022	-0.083	-0.007	0.046	0.022	-0.025	0.007	-0.037	-0.015	0.007	0.083	-0.036	0.069	0.011	-0.038	0.038	0.021	0.025	-0.036	0.036
Subm	-0.068	0.089	0.007	-0.045	-0.022	0.089	0.015	-0.043	-0.022	0.029	-0.015	0.032	0.009	-0.015	-0.089	0.045	-0.068	-0.007	0.036	-0.036	-0.024	-0.031	0.045	-0.045
cover	0.068	-0.089	-0.008	0.045	0.023	-0.089	-0.014	0.043	0.023	-0.029	0.014	-0.033	-0.009	0.014	0.089	-0.044	0.068	0.007	-0.036	0.036	0.024	0.030	-0.044	0.044
Fetch	-0.067	0.091	0.007	-0.045	-0.021	0.091	0.019	-0.042	-0.021	0.031	-0.019	0.030	0.006	-0.019	-0.091	0.050	-0.067	-0.006	0.035	-0.035	-0.025	-0.034	0.050	-0.050
Trib	0.068	-0.087	-0.008	0.045	0.023	-0.087	-0.011	0.045	0.023	-0.028	0.011	-0.034	-0.011	0.011	0.087	-0.040	0.068	0.008	-0.036	0.036	0.023	0.027	-0.040	0.040
Size	0.067	-0.090	-0.007	0.045	0.022	-0.090	-0.016	0.043	0.022	-0.030	0.016	-0.032	-0.008	0.016	0.090	-0.046	0.067	0.007	-0.036	0.036	0.024	0.032	-0.046	0.046
Rip	-0.072	0.002	0.064	0.007	-0.063	0.002	0.037	-0.073	-0.063	0.080	-0.037	-0.030	-0.030	-0.037	-0.002	0.036	-0.072	0.009	-0.008	0.008	-0.079	-0.008	0.036	-0.036
S1	-0.011	-0.077	0.065	0.066	-0.056	-0.077	-0.032	-0.034	-0.056	0.032	0.032	-0.040	-0.019	0.032	0.077	-0.057	-0.011	0.026	-0.052	0.052	-0.041	0.046	-0.057	0.057
S3	0.033	0.009	-0.011	0.031	0.004	0.009	0.058	0.037	0.004	0.030	-0.058	-0.071	-0.072	-0.058	-0.009	0.058	0.033	0.025	-0.023	0.023	-0.034	0.024	0.058	-0.058
S4	-0.009	-0.015	0.049	0.042	-0.037	-0.015	0.051	-0.014	-0.037	0.065	-0.051	-0.061	-0.056	-0.051	0.015	0.043	-0.009	0.045	-0.052	0.052	-0.057	-0.042	0.043	-0.043
S5	-0.049	0.021	0.041	0.004	-0.042	0.021	0.051	-0.044	-0.042	0.069	-0.051	-0.035	-0.040	-0.051	-0.021	0.056	-0.049	0.015	-0.009	0.009	-0.066	-0.019	0.056	-0.056
S8	-0.100	0.053	0.043	-0.060	-0.038	0.053	0.108	-0.087	-0.038	0.098	-0.108	-0.010	-0.023	-0.108	-0.053	0.121	-0.100	-0.017	0.035	-0.035	-0.082	-0.090	0.121	-0.121
S9	-0.067	0.090	0.007	-0.045	-0.022	0.090	0.016	-0.043	-0.022	0.030	-0.016	0.031	0.008	-0.016	-0.090	0.047	-0.067	-0.007	0.036	-0.036	-0.024	-0.032	0.047	-0.047
U1	0.068	-0.089	-0.007	0.045	0.022	-0.089	-0.015	0.043	0.022	-0.029	0.015	-0.032	-0.008	0.015	0.089	-0.046	0.068	0.007	-0.036	0.036	0.024	0.031	-0.046	0.046
U2	-0.067	0.090	0.007	-0.045	-0.022	0.090	0.017	-0.042	-0.022	0.030	-0.017	0.031	0.007	-0.017	-0.090	0.048	-0.067	-0.007	0.035	-0.035	-0.024	-0.033	0.048	-0.048
Tree	-0.062	0.090	0.003	-0.048	-0.016	0.090	0.028	-0.038	-0.016	0.031	-0.028	0.027	0.004	-0.028	-0.090	0.058	-0.062	-0.007	0.036	-0.036	-0.024	-0.041	0.058	-0.058