

This is a repository copy of *Phylogeny and ecological processes influence grass coexistence at different spatial scales within the steppe biome*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/149865/

Version: Accepted Version

# Article:

Liu, H., Osborne, C.P. orcid.org/0000-0002-7423-3718, Yin, D. et al. (3 more authors) (2019) Phylogeny and ecological processes influence grass coexistence at different spatial scales within the steppe biome. Oecologia. ISSN 0029-8549

https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-019-04475-0

This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in Oecologia. The final authenticated version is available online at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00442-019-04475-0

#### Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

#### Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



1	Phylogeny and ecological processes influence grass coexistence at different spatial
2	scales within the steppe biome
3	Hui Liu <sup>1, 2, 3*</sup> , Colin P. Osborne <sup>3</sup> , Deyi Yin <sup>1, 2</sup> , Robert P. Freckleton <sup>3</sup> , Gaoming Jiang <sup>4</sup> ,
4	Meizhen Liu <sup>4</sup>
5	<sup>1</sup> Key Laboratory of Vegetation Restoration and Management of Degraded Ecosystems,
6	Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Applied Botany, South China Botanical Garden,
7	Chinese Academy of Sciences, Guangzhou 510650, China
8	<sup>2</sup> Center for Plant Ecology, Core Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
9	Guangzhou 510650, China
10	<sup>3</sup> Department of Animal and Plant Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S10 2TN,
11	UK
12	<sup>4</sup> Key Laboratory of Vegetation and Environmental Change, Institute of Botany, Chinese
13	Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100093, China
14	
15	*Correspondence: Hui Liu
16	E-mail: hui.liu@scbg.ac.cn; Tel: +86-20-37081975; Fax: +86-20-37252615
17	
18	Author contribution statement HL and CPO designed research; HL, GJ and ML
19	performed research; HL, RPF and DY analyzed data; HL wrote the initial manuscript, all
20	authors contributed to revisions.
21	

#### 23 Abstract

Phylogenetic analyses are essential for disentangling how environmental filtering and 24 competition determine species coexistence across spatial scales. Inner Mongolia steppe 25 26 has strong environmental gradients, but how the phylogenetic relatedness of co-occurring species and phylogenetic signals of functional traits change across spatial scales remain 27 unclear. We investigated the phylogenetic structure of grass assemblages along 28 environmental gradients from regional to local scales, and measured functional traits 29 within assemblages. We compared phylogenetic signals of plant traits between the same 30 31 numbers of species randomly selected from the regional pool and species observed at the local scale, did phylogenetic principal component analysis to infer the main factors 32 driving species coexistence, and examined the key plant trait-environment relationships 33 34 across the phylogeny to reveal ecological adaptation mechanisms. Regionally, grass 35 species were phylogenetically clustered with contrasting climate preferences. With decreasing spatial scales, species richness declined, changing from phylogenetically 36 37 clustered to overdispersed, and phylogenetic signals of plant traits became weaker. At the local scale, grass assemblages were structured by soil water content and neighbor density, 38 39 and the trait-environment relationships were less clear than those at the regional scale. This study demonstrated that at smaller scales, co-occurring grass species in the steppe 40 41 tended to be more phylogenetically overdispersed, and that phylogenetic signals of plant 42 functional traits became weaker with increasing abiotic and biotic interactions. Our findings contributed evidence for understanding species coexistence and maintenance at 43 scales spanning regional to local communities in the East Asia steppe biome. 44

45

Keywords Inner Mongolian steppe, phylogenetic niche conservatism, plant functional trait,
Poaceae, scale dependence.

48 Introduction

The phylogenetic structure of species coexistence in different spatial units (Kraft and 49 Ackerly 2010; Swenson et al. 2006; Trisos et al. 2014) or in different ecosystems 50 51 (Kunstler et al. 2012; Swenson 2013) is basic information that is essential for understanding species assemblage patterns and the underlying processes (Weber et al. 52 53 2017). It is likely to change across spatial scales because the dominant processes that structure communities are different when spatial scale shifts (Cavender-Bares et al. 2018; 54 55 Mouquet et al. 2012). When the spatial scale is sufficiently large, species are more likely 56 to be phylogenetically clustered (co-occurred species are more closely related than the random expectation), due to larger species pools, geographic separation and climatic 57 58 restrictions (Swenson et al. 2007; Webb et al. 2002). Also the importance of species 59 interactions in determining the phylogenetic structure is relaxed at the large spatial scale 60 compared to small scale because plant individuals tend to interact only with their nearest neighbors (Uriarte et al. 2010; Wiegand et al. 2017). At smaller spatial scales, 61 62 phylogenetic overdispersion (co-occurring species tend to be more distantly related than the random expectation) or a random species assemblage might occur, and in some cases 63 phylogenetic clustering might also be observed such as the clustering of C<sub>4</sub> 64 Andropogoneae in burned grasslands (Forrestel et al. 2014). Therefore, continuous 65 species sampling across the geographical gradients could help to elaborate phylogenetic 66 67 patterns in terms of different ecological processes and to determine the scale at which the phylogenetic patterns shift. 68

However, the linkage between phylogenetic patterns and ecological processes is complex, and strongly associates with species strategies in the trait-based context (Cadotte 2017; Gerhold et al. 2015; Mayfield and Levine 2010). For example, if closely related species have similar fitness with advantageous functional traits, they can coexist through

73 competition and lead to phylogenetic clustering, which is often attributed to 74 environmental filtering (HilleRisLambers et al. 2012; Kunstler et al. 2012; Mayfield and Levine 2010). Conversely, if critical functional traits that adapt to the environment and 75 76 influence distributions are convergent across co-occurring species, this environmental filtering can also cause phylogenetic overdispersion, which often indicates competition 77 exclusion (Cavender Bares et al. 2004; Kraft et al. 2007). Furthermore, the relative 78 79 contributions of environmental filtering and competition are expected to be strongly scaledependent (Wiegand et al. 2017). Thus, it is fundamental to consider both phylogenetic 80 81 structures and functional traits in studying species assemblages across spatial scales.

Phylogeny reveals the past dispersal and evolutionary patterns (Donoghue 2008; 82 Swenson 2013; Wiens 2018), and studies that only consider ecological processes will lose 83 84 the historical information. Recent plant community studies on functional traits also 85 suggest that different phylogenetic structures might depend on whether the functional traits of coexisting species are convergent or divergent (Wilcox et al. 2018; Zhang et al. 86 87 2018). On one hand, the determinate functional traits of coexisting species may be phylogenetically conserved (closely related species are more similar, i.e. phylogenetic 88 niche conservatism, PNC) (Wiens and Graham 2005). On the other hand, these traits 89 could also arise through convergent evolution in unrelated groups (Webb et al. 2002). 90 91 Therefore, phylogenetic tests on the key functional traits in species assemblages (Pavoine 92 et al. 2011) can predict how different lineages respond differently to global changes, and thus how new distribution patterns are formed (Edwards and Smith 2010). It can also 93 reveal more clearly the underlying species assemblage rules (Weber et al. 2017), and/or 94 95 even macroevolution patterns such as the role of diversification (Cavender-Bares et al. 2018; Gerhold et al. 2015) and dispersal (Wiens 2018). 96

97 To gain insights into the interplay of phylogenetic patterns, ecological processes and functional traits on species coexistence, especially to integrate results across spatial scales, 98 we chose the Inner Mongolian steppe as our study object. It covers a large area, and is the 99 100 main component of Mid-Asian temperate grasslands, with gradually increasing altitude and decreasing temperature and precipitation from east to west. The low (120 - 460 mm) 101 102 mean annual precipitation (MAP) in the steppe makes it important to explore species distribution patterns in relation to restricted water availability. At the regional scale, 103 studies have reported productivity (Bai et al. 2008), biodiversity (Zhang 1998) and 104 105 species distribution (Pyankov et al. 2000) along climatic gradients, but no literature has yet carried out phylogenetic analyses of plant ecophysiological traits and species 106 107 coexistence mechanisms in this steppe biome. However, such studies could not only test 108 the theories about how phylogeny and ecological processes structure assemblages, but 109 also are extremely important to understand this fragile biome, where species composition might change under future climatic changes such as greater drought incidence. 110

111 We comprehensively sampled the grass species pool of the Inner Mongolian steppe, investigating how species were filtered across different spatial scales. Here we refer to the 112 regional, intermediate and local scales by reference to the whole area of Inner Mongolia, 113 the administrative county and the field site scales, respectively (Fig. 1). We then selected 114 local habitats with contrasting soil water gradients, and directly measured 115 116 ecophysiological traits of all coexisting grasses, including plant functional traits related with water and nutrient use, soil water and nitrogen content, and neighbor density. To 117 infer the main factors driving species coexistence in Poaceae assemblages, we used 118 119 phylogenetic principal component analysis (PPCA) and analyzed how the functional traits associated with environmental gradients against the phylogenetic background. Our 120 hypotheses are: (H1) Phylogenetic structure of co-occurring species will be more 121

clustered at regional and intermediate spatial scales than that at local scale. (H2)
Phylogenetic signals in functional traits and environmental variables become weaker at
the local scale. (H3) Based on phylogenetic principal component analysis, both
environmental filtering and competition will affect species coexistence at the local scale.
(H4) Based on phylogenetic general linear models, the relationships between functional
traits and environmental variables persist across scales.

128

129 Materials and methods

#### 130 Study area

The Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region (IMAR) in China covers an area of 1.2 million km<sup>2</sup>, of which 66% is natural grasslands. The Inner Mongolian steppe biome has a strong east-west altitude (230~1400 m) and climatic gradients (Fig. 1). The mean annual temperature (MAT) ranges from -1.7 to 8.6 °C, and the mean annual precipitation (MAP) from 120 to 460 mm, ~70-80% of which coincides with peak temperature during the growing season (May to September).

There are 88 counties in total in the IMAR, each with a fully documented species pool, 137 138 which allowed us to investigate species filtering into smaller areas. In the middle of the steppe, we chose the Hunshandake sandland within the Zhenglan county for the local scale 139 study (Fig. 1). Our local field site is located in the Hunshandake sandland, where around 140 27 km<sup>2</sup> land area has been fenced since 2001 to exclude livestock for vegetation recovery 141 and environmental protection. Data for 1960~1999 from the local meteorological bureau 142 showed a temperate arid and semi-arid climate, with MAT, average January and average 143 July temperatures of 1.8°C, -17.9°C and 18.7°C, respectively. The MAP is 378 mm, 144 fluctuating from 150 to 450 mm, 64% of which concentrated in the growing season. 145

The four main habitat types at the local field site are moving dune, fixed dune, lowland meadow and wetland. There are strong increasing gradients of soil water content, soil nitrogen contents and species density in each habitat along the gradient from moving dune to wetland (Appendix S1).

150

# 151 **Data collection at the regional scale**

152 We assembled three datasets for the Inner Mongolian grasses:

(1) Records of 265 Poaceae species from the Flora of Inner Mongolia (Editorial 153 154 Committee on Flora Intramongolica 1998), including culm height, leaf length and width, flowering date, leaf type (flat and/or folded/rolled, use "folded" hereafter), and county-155 156 scaled occurrences for each species (Appendix S2 Table S1). Folded leaf is an important 157 adaptation strategy of grass species to avoid drought and its occurrence differs among 158 grass subfamilies (Liu and Osborne 2014). The taxonomy was based on Grass Genera of the World (Watson 1992 onwards). There are six subfamilies of Poaceae in Inner 159 160 Mongolia: the largest, Pooideae, accounted for nearly 80% of the total species, the second and third largest subfamilies, Panicoideae and Chloridoideae, had 35 and 21 species, 161 respectively (Appendix S3). 162

(2) Geographical and climatic information for 88 counties of the IMAR for 1971~2000, 163 including temperature, precipitation, area and population for each county (China 164 Meteorological Data Sharing Service System 2005, Standard climate dataset for 165 international Chinese 166 exchange on surface weather stations 1971-2000. http://data.cma.cn/site/index.html; Appendix S2 Table S2). Based on the species 167 168 distribution table (Appendix S2 Table S3), we calculated species richness and proportions of each subfamily/tribe for each county, and arithmetic means of the climatic values 169 associated with the county-scaled distribution for each species, including mean growing 170

season (May to September) temperature (MGT) and precipitation (MGP). We tested
phylogenetic structures of co-occurring species in each county (Appendix S2 Table S4).

(3) For each species in Inner Mongolia, we calculated species water requirement 173 174 (Editorial Committee on Flora Intramongolica 1998) (Appendix S2 Table S1). We assigned a numerical score to each plant ecological tolerance describing water availability, 175 giving equal weighting to the extremes (Hydrophyte = 5, Helophyte = 4, Mesophyte = 3, 176 Xerophyte = 1), resulting in a continuous sequence of values for each species. These four 177 values were summarized as a range "water range" and a mean "water score" for each 178 species (Osborne and Freckleton 2009). This "water score" was positively related with 179 MGP (regional scale) and soil water content (local scale), supporting the consistency of 180 181 species water requirements across spatial scales (Appendix S1 Figure S2).

182

## **183** Sampling and measurements at the local scale

To investigate community structure in the Hunshandake sandland, we carried out field 184 surveys and measurements in July and August, 2010. First, three sites (each  $\sim 0.3 \text{ km}^2$ ) 185 were chosen from each of the four habitats (moving dune, fixed dune, lowland meadow 186 and wetland), with 12 sites in total. At each site, we collected all distinguishable grass 187 species for identification. Second, we randomly sampled three individuals for each 188 species from each habitat, apart from two rare and one early season species, where only 189 190 two individuals were available. We sampled 147 individuals of 32 Poaceae species in total. For each individual, we dug the soil from the surface down to 30 cm depth (30 cm 191 covers the main root distribution layer due to the shallow roots of most grass species), 192 measuring the water content of three layers (0~10, 10~20 and 20~30 cm) using a soil 193 moisture probe (ThetaKit type TK3; Delta-T Devices Ltd, Cambridge, UK), then took soil 194 samples separately. We then ground dried soil samples with a ball mill (Mixer Mill MM 195

196 200; Retsch, Haan, Germany), and measured total soil nitrogen through Kjeldahl 197 determination on an Auto Distillation Unit (KejeltecTM 2200; FOSS, Denmark). To 198 quantify the biotic environment, we recorded relative species abundance (assessed by 199 Drude's scale), together with neighbor number (within a 30cm radius), distance to the 200 nearest neighbor and the height of the tallest neighbor.

201 Functional traits can explain and predict the dramatic variations in species abundances and compositions (Adler et al. 2014), therefore we selected traits to reflect life history 202 203 strategies of each species, including plant growth (e.g. culm and leaf sizes, root depth), 204 resource acquisition (e.g. leaf nutrient concentration, stomatal pore area index) and abiotic stress adaptation (e.g. folded leaf and midday water potential). We directly measured 205 206 culm height, leaf height, leaf length and width, and the number of living leaves per tiller, 207 and referenced root depths for each species from a previous study (Chen 1986), with five 208 missing species measured by completely excavating their roots in the field. During soil moisture measurements, we took roots connected to the aboveground culms to ensure they 209 210 were from the same species. After carefully washing and sieving, we scanned a part of the fine roots (diameter < 1mm) on a flatbed scanner (PhantomF60; Microtek, Shanghai, 211 China) to calculate specific root length (SRL). 212

From 12:00 to 14:00 on sunny days, we cut one or two young mature leaves at the 213 ligule for each individual to measure midday water potential using a psychrometer 214 215 (PSYPRO; Wescor, Utah, USA) with C-30 Sample Chambers. We calibrated the psychrometer beforehand in an air-conditioned laboratory (25°C) with a series of standard 216 NaCl solutions. To keep the samples at a stable temperature (~25°C) under strong sunlight, 217 218 we used an insulated ice box with a thick towel separating ice packs and sample chambers. We scanned leaf samples after measurements and imported both leaf and root images into 219 ImageJ (Abramoff et al. 2004) to obtain leaf area and root length (Kimura et al. 1999). 220

We calculated specific leaf area (SLA) and specific root length (SRL) after weighing the oven dried (65°C, 24h) samples. We ground dried leaf samples using a ball mill (Tissuelyser, Retsch, Qiagen GmbH, Germany), and determined leaf carbon and nitrogen concentrations and stable isotope rations using a stable isotope ratio mass spectrometer (PDZ Europa 20-20; PDZ Europa Ltd, Cheshire, UK).

226 According to the leaf economic spectrum, photosynthetic capacity is one of the most important axes in plant life history strategies, and is closely related with stomatal 227 conductance (Wright et al. 2004). For dried leaf samples, to estimate stomatal 228 229 conductance and photosynthetic potential, stomatal pore area index (SPI) was calculated based on stomatal morphological traits, on the assumption that stomata would open 230 231 completely at their maximum photosynthetic rate (Franks and Beerling 2009). We made 232 dental putty (President Plus-light body, Coltène/Whaledent Ltd., Burgess Hill, West Sussex, UK) impressions from the rehydrated leaf samples, and prepared microscope 233 slides of both adaxial and abaxial surfaces using nail polish imprints of the impressions. 234 235 We observed slides under an inverted microscope equipped with a digital camera (Leica Laborlux S, Wetzlar, Germany) and an image analysis system (Leica Quantimet 500 Q 236 win software). From each peel, we randomly chose three images as replicates and 237 measured: guard cell length (GL) and width of the guard cell pair (SW), the stomatal 238 density (SD) and SPI (a dimensionless index of stomata pore area per lamina area), where 239  $SPI = SD \cdot GL^2$  (Sack et al. 2003). 240

241

# 242 Phylogenetic trees

We constructed phylogenetic trees for the 265 species (76 genera) of Poaceae in the Flora of Inner Mongolia by integrating published phylogenies. First, we used a large phylogenetic tree of over 3000 Poaceae species as a framework (Edwards et al. 2010), 246 then extracted 110 matched species from it after accounting for synonymies (Clayton 2002 onwards). Second, we comprehensively searched published phylogenies for 247 different genera and identified 60 more species (10 genera) (Appendix S3 Table S5). We 248 249 assembled all the 60 species (10 small trees) into the 110-species tree, using function bind.tree in the R (https://www.r-project.org) package ape (Paradis et al. 2004), such that 250 251 a 170-species tree (species for which DNA sequence data were measured) was used in the following phylogenetic tests (Appendix S3 Figure S4 tree A). Finally, we added 58 more 252 species by replacing their congeners' positions based on the phylogeny from Edwards et 253 254 al. (2010) using species name replacement (Appendix S3). Due to the potential uncertainty of this 238-species tree, we only used it as a phylogenetic background (all 255 256 species in the region) in the sampling test (Table 1), and used the 170-species tree for all 257 the phylogenetic models. We also compared our phylogenetic tree with the latest phylogenetic work on Poaceae (Soreng et al. 2017), finding that the two phylogenetic 258 trees were consistent with each other. 259

There were 88 species recorded in the Zhenglan county, and 32 of them were found in the four habitats within the field sites. Corresponding phylogenetic trees of each of the 88 counties and the 32-species tree were extracted from the 170-species tree for the phylogenetic analyses in each case (Appendix S3 Figure S4 tree BC).

264

## 265 Statistical analysis

Based on the strong climatic gradients in the steppe, we firstly analyzed the relationship between species richness of different phylogenetic lineages and climatic conditions at the regional scale, to see if different lineages have different climatic niches. For example, if a dominant lineage occurred more in dry areas, it generally will lead to a phylogenetically clustered pattern in dry areas due to niche conservatism (Wiens and Graham 2005). In thiscase, it is simple and direct to link biogeographical with phylogenetic perspectives.

For hypothesis (H1), to analyze phylogenetic structure across spatial scales, net 272 273 relatedness index (NRI) was used as a standardized index based on the mean phylogenetic distance (MPD) of species co-occurring in an assemblage. NRI is defined as (rndMPD-274 275 MPD)/sdrndMPD, where MPD was calculated from the phylogenetic tree of the regional species pool, rndMPD and sdrndMPD were the average and standard deviation of MPDs 276 obtained from a null model by reshuffling the species tips 9999 times across the same 277 phylogenetic tree (Faith 1992). NRI indicates whether co-occurring species in one 278 assemblage are phylogenetically clustered (NRI > 0) or overdispersed (NRI < 0) (Webb et 279 280 al. 2002). Many studies have also calculated the nearest taxon index (NTI), but NTI 281 focuses on specific differences and is more sensitive to tree topology than NRI (Letcher 2010). Here we tried to compare among different trees and communities, thus only NRI 282 was calculated using the R package picante. 283

284 Phylogenetic signal measures the statistical dependence among species' trait values based on their phylogenetic relationships. For binary variables, we used Fritz and Purvis's 285 D to calculate phylogenetic signals (Fritz and Purvis 2010). D measures the sum of 286 changes in estimated nodal values of a binary trait along edges in a phylogeny. To 287 calibrate for phylogenetic size, observed D is compared with simulated D values using the 288 289 same phylogeny under two models: Brownian threshold model and phylogenetic randomness, in order to set points of 0 and 1, respectively. D < 0 indicates a highly 290 phylogenetically conserved trait, while D > 1 suggests a phylogenetically overdispersed 291 292 trait. Although species occurrence in each county (a binary variable, 1 and 0) is not a trait, we interpreted its phylogenetic signal as a niche similarity measurement of local species 293 filtered from a larger species pool. If local species are more closely related than expected 294

by chance, it represents the influences of biogeographic or climatic heterogeneity onspecies distributions and local diversification (Levin 1993).

For hypothesis (H2), to test ecophysiological traits, Pagel's  $\lambda$  was used based on a Brownian model of quantitative trait evolution (Pagel 1999). The extent to which traits evolve by random drift from a common ancestor gives a  $\lambda$  value between 0 and 1, where  $\lambda$ = 1 indicates strong phylogenetic dependence, while  $\lambda = 0$  implies no phylogenetic dependence (Freckleton et al. 2002). Our interpretation of conservatism here is that high  $\lambda$ values indicate that traits of closely related species are more similar than expected by chance (Cooper et al. 2010). Both D and  $\lambda$  were calculated using the R package caper.

Furthermore, to test whether the  $\lambda$  values for quantitative traits differed significantly between the 170 (regional) and 32 (local) species samples, we used a randomization method by drawing 1000 random samples of 32 species from the 170-species phylogeny and calculated the average  $\lambda$  value. The results were compared with those obtained from the real assemblage. If the observed  $\lambda$  were lower than the average  $\lambda$  based on random samples, we interpreted this as a scale-dependent decline in PNC at the local scale (32 species) compared with the regional scale (170 species).

For hypothesis (H3), to distinguish the driving factors in determining species 311 distributions within local assemblages, phylogenetic principal component analysis (PPCA) 312 was used (Felsenstein 1985). Data were log-transformed to meet the requirement of a 313 314 normal distribution. PPCA was carried out using the phyl.pca function in the R package phytools. The variables for each of the 32 species in the Hunshandak sand were divided 315 into two groups, 10 environmental variables and 17 plant traits. Since the 32 species 316 317 scattered among the four habitats with a contrasting water gradient (Appendix S1), we expected that both the driving environmental variables and plant intrinsic traits should be 318 related with water availability, absorption and consumption. 319

For hypothesis (H4), the key traits that distinguished species at the local scales detected by PPCA were used to analyze plant-environment relationships. Phylogenetic general linear models (PGLM) were used, based on the same functions in estimating  $\lambda$ values in the R package caper. Currently PGLM is the best suitable method to test correlations between trait pairs, other methods such as phylogenetic independent contrast (PIC) is an extreme case of PGLM when phylogenetic signal  $\lambda$  is set to one.

326

327 **Results** 

# 328 H1: Phylogenetic structure of grass assemblages across spatial scales

The three largest monophyletic lineages (subfamilies) of Poaceae in the Inner Mongolian 329 steppe showed distinct patterns along the regional climatic gradients from east to west 330 (Fig. 2). With increasing MGT, species richness of Pooideae dropped significantly, while 331 that of Chloridoideae and Panicoideae slightly increased (Fig. 2a). However, at higher 332 333 MGP, species richness of Chloridoideae decreased while that of Panicoideae increased, and species richness of Pooideae varied widely (Fig. 2bc). Among the monophyletic 334 lineages in Pooideae, species richness of Aveneae and Stipeae had positive and negative 335 336 relationships with MGP, respectively (Fig. 2d), but all the others showed no associations. General linear models with county area as an additive factor confirmed that sampling area 337 had no significant effects on these relationships. 338

Across spatial scales, the sampling distribution of the 170-species across the 238species showed a phylogenetically clustered trend (NRI > 0 and D = 0.44; Table 1). This was mainly due to the lack of DNA sequence data for native Chinese species in several large genera like Festuca, Poa, Roegneria and Stipa (Appendix S3 Figure S4 tree A). The 88-species pool of the Zhenglan county showed phylogenetic overdispersion against the regional species pool represented by the 238-species tree (NRI < 0, D = 0.84; P < 0.05 for 345 D = 1), but phylogenetic clustering against the 170-species tree (NRI > 0, D > 1, Table 1; Appendix S3 Figure S4 tree B). However, 32 out of 88 counties in the IMAR were 346 phylogenetically clustered, most of these formed a contiguous cropland-grassland border 347 348 area, dominated by species from Paniceae, Eragrostideae, Triticeae, Bromeae and Aveneae (Appendix S2 Table S4). The 32-species local assemblage in the Hunshandake 349 350 sandland also showed phylogenetically overdispersed patterns within either the 238- or 170-species tree (NRI < 0 ns, D values ns from 1, Table 1; Appendix S3 Figure S4 tree C). 351 For the four habitats, species assemblages showed no patterns from NRI values, but were 352 353 phylogenetically overdispersed based on D values (all D ns from 1; Table 1).

354

# 355 H2: Phylogenetic signals in plant traits and environmental variables across spatial 356 scales

At the regional scale, significant phylogenetic signals were detected for most of the traits (Table 2). Morphological traits, flowering start and end date showed  $\lambda$  values from 0.29 to 0.95 (P < 0.05 for both  $\lambda = 0$  and 1), although leaf shape had  $\lambda$  around 0. Measures of environmental niches (water score, MGT and MGP) showed phylogenetic signals ( $\lambda$  from 0.14 to 0.92; P < 0.05 for both  $\lambda = 0$  and 1), with the exception of water range.

For the traits measured at both regional and local scales, random selection models of 362 363 32 species from the 170-species dataset showed  $\lambda$  values lower than those for the full 364 regional sample of species (except water range), but higher than those for the full local species sample (except culm height) (Table 2). Of the traits measured only at the local 365 scale, specific root length (SRL), stomatal density, guard cell length, stomatal width and 366 leaf  $\delta^{13}$ C showed phylogenetic signals. Meanwhile, no phylogenetic signals were detected 367 in either biotic or abiotic factors except the tallest neighbour ( $\lambda = 0.48$ , P < 0.01 for both  $\lambda$ 368 = 0 and 1), water score and SWC ( $\lambda$  = 0.21 and 0.39, but both P ns for  $\lambda$  = 0) (Table 2). 369

370

## 371 H3: PPCA results at the local scale

PPCA on environmental variables showed that local species distributions were separated first by abiotic factors, and then biotic factors (Table 3a). Three principal components (PC) together explained 77% of the variance. The first PC indicated soil nitrogen content (SNC) of three soil layers and soil water content (SWC) of the 20-30cm soil layer (positive loadings). The second PC showed neighbor density, relative abundance and tallest neighbor (negative loadings). The third PC was tallest neighbor, SWC of the first layer (positive loadings), and SNC of the first and second layers (negative loadings).

For the whole set of morphological traits, three PCs explained 68% of the variance, indicating that leaf morphology, stomatal and rooting traits were three axes that distinguished species (Table 3b). The first PC included leaf length and width, single leaf area and mass (negative loadings). The second PC was mainly from stomatal width, SLA (negative loadings) and root depth (positive loadings). The third PC corresponded to guard cell length and width (negative loadings), and stomatal density (positive loadings).

Water-related traits were plotted across the phylogenetic tree (Appendix S4). It was hard to discern patterns for culm and leaf size, except two extreme values in Stipeae. However, larger but less dense stomata were seen in Pooideae compared with other subfamilies (Appendix S4, column 1 to 4). Meanwhile, there was no phylogenetic signal in leaf water potential, which was inversely associated with culm height (Appendix S4, column 5). Both neighbor density and SWC showed high values in Poeae and Aveneae, without overall phylogenetic dependences (Appendix S4, column 6 and 7).

392

# 393 H4: Phylogeny-based trait-environment relationships

Phylogenetic models of trait-environment relationships did not show consistent patterns atthe regional and local scales (Table 4).

Regionally, culm height unexpectedly decreased with increasing MGT, although the variance explained was low. Morphological traits had significant positive relationships with both MGP and water score, and water score (habitat-scale measurements) was better in explaining variance (Table 4a). Since all the regressions had low explanatory power, and all  $\lambda$  values were greater than zero (0.16 to 0.80, P < 0.05 for both  $\lambda = 0$  and 1), the three morphological traits were not explained well by environmental variables, but depended on phylogeny.

At the local scale, most models showed no patterns, only SWC explained variance in 403 404 culm height and SRL, and neighbor density explained variance in culm height and root 405 depth. The  $\lambda$  values of models were similar to those for the univariate analysis, and were 406 only higher for culm height and stomata related traits (Table 4b). Results were also insensitive to whether SWC was averaged over the whole profile or taken from the 407 408 surface layer only. No trends were found for leaf traits with increasing SWC or neighbor density, but there were significant positive relationships between culm height, SRL and 409 410 SWC (Fig. 3ab), and between culm height, root depth and neighbor density (Fig. 3cd).

411

# 412 **Discussion**

# 413 H1: Scale dependence within the steppe: from phylogenetic clustering to 414 overdispersion

At the regional scale, Poaceae species in the steppe biome indicated phylogenetically
clustered patterns, which was consistent with the global picture (Edwards and Smith 2010;
Hartley 1950; Liu et al. 2012; Visser et al. 2014), and patterns in other regions, such as
Australia (Hattersley 1992), North America (Taub 2000), Mongolia (Pyankov et al. 2000)

419 and South Africa (Visser et al. 2012). Pooideae had more species in low MGT areas with 420 an early flowering date, indicating its cold tolerant strategy (Vigeland et al. 2013). Chloridoideae occurred more in drier habitats than Panicoideae, which was supported by 421 422 our previous findings that shorter height and narrower leaves, denser and smaller stomata, and smaller seeds, better adapt Chloridoideae to low water availability (Liu et al. 2012). 423 Different climatic niches of the main grass lineages indicated phylogenetic niche 424 conservatism (Wiens and Graham 2005), emphasizing the importance of phylogeny in 425 426 understanding species geographical distributions. Specifically, the contrasting responses 427 to climatic gradients of different Poaceae lineages in our study might indicate their different distribution patterns under future global changes (Edwards and Smith 2010). 428

429 With decreasing spatial scales, co-occurring species in the steppe ecosystem shifted 430 from phylogenetically clustered to overdispersed patterns (Table 1). Our results agreed with other community-scale studies showing phylogenetic overdispersion, as in oak 431 communities across the US (Cavender-Bares et al. 2018) and English meadows 432 433 (Silvertown et al. 2006), but contrasted with the phylogenetic clustering observed for other plant communities at small scales (Forrestel et al. 2014; Prinzing et al. 2008). One 434 possible explanation for the phylogenetic overdispersion of grass assemblages at smaller 435 scales in our results was interspecific interactions, such as competition, because at large 436 437 spatial scales, biotic interactions are less important in structuring communities, causing 438 overdispersion to diminish as reported in previous work on oaks across spatial scales (Cavender-Bares et al. 2018). It was also notable that at intermediate scale of Zhenglan 439 and other counties, grass assemblages could be either phylogenetic overdispersed or 440 441 clustered depending on different species pools. This indicated the important role of species pool in determining phylogenetic structures, and suggested that county could be 442 the spatial scale at which the phylogenetic pattern of grass assemblages started to shift. 443

444

## 445 H2: Weaker phylogenetic signals in functional traits and environmental variables

As expected, phylogenetic signals in the same traits tested at regional scale became 446 447 weaker at intermediate and local scales. The simulated random draw from the regional dataset also produced higher  $\lambda$  values of these traits than the observed dataset, verifying a 448 scale-dependent decline in PNC at the local scale compared with the regional scale (Table 449 450 2). PNC is generally caused by stabilizing selection within the same climate zone or at the 451 regional scale (Donoghue 2008), but smaller spatial scales restricted not only the species 452 pool but also the trait variation. This tends to weaken the phylogenetic signals of traits, either through the narrower phylogenetic range caused by environmental filtering, or the 453 454 tendency towards convergence caused by competitive exclusion, leading to the 455 phylogenetic overdispersion of co-occurring species (Webb et al. 2002). For example, grass species have a wide global range of MAT (-20~40 °C) and MAP (10~810 mm), but 456 the narrow range of both MAT (-2~9 °C) and MAP (100~500 mm) in the Inner Mongolia 457 458 steppe constrained both co-occurring species and their trait variability.

Of the traits only measured at the local scale, we used a number of ecophysiological 459 traits that have not been commonly tested in previous studies on species coexistence. 460 However, the phylogenetic signals of these traits were very weak within habitats (Table 2). 461 462 The loss of phylogenetic signals is potentially due to: (1) lowered species richness at 463 smaller scales, where the phylogenetically overdispersed pattern will weaken the statistical power to detect phylogenetic signals; (2) Other functional traits fluctuated over 464 time like leaf water potential, so that they might also be unrepresentative of long-term 465 466 species values for the phylogenetic tests; (3) The sensitivity of phylogenetic tests among species could be reduced by using average values across the four habitats. Phenotypic 467 468 plasticity and the ability to extract limiting resources from the environment determine the

niche breadth of each species, and crucially affect interactions among and within species
(Genung et al. 2012). In our data, some species were exclusively in one habitat, indicating
strong, specific environmental adaptations, while others had wide niche breadths.
Therefore, phylogenetic niche conservatism in traits alone was insufficient to explain
species distribution, and environmental factors had to be added at the small spatial scales
(Wiegand et al. 2017).

However, for traits that still retained phylogenetic signals at smaller scales, the 475 divergences among major lineages might have contributed to species coexistence, since 476 our previous work found that separate phylogenetic tests on the two largest C<sub>4</sub> subfamilies 477 would weaken the strong phylogenetic signals for the whole dataset (Liu et al. 2012). In 478 this study, leaf  $\delta^{13}$ C had strong phylogenetic signals due to the large difference in CO<sub>2</sub> 479 discrimination between  $C_3$  and  $C_4$  species (Farquhar et al. 1989), and the clustering of  $C_4$ 480 photosynthesis into particular lineages (Grass Phylogeny Working Group II 2012; Sage 481 and Monson 1999). 482

483

### 484 H3: Environmental drivers for species assemblage at local scales

The SWC and SNC in deeper soil layers were the best predictors of species distribution 485 across the four habitats, suggesting that water and nitrogen at depth are most important for 486 sorting species in semiarid steppes (Sala et al. 1992), in agreement with previous studies 487 488 in the same area of Inner Mongolia based on soil water and nutrient measurements for 102 communities (Song and Guo 2007). Environmental filtering could sort species into 489 different niches, increase species coexistence through the complementary use of water and 490 491 nutrient resources (Cardinale 2011). The complementarity is also related to neighborrelated indices and leaf morphology in our data, emphasizing the importance of 492 competition intensity. Phylogenetic overdispersion of grass species at the local scale was 493

494 confirmed by niche complementarity of species in the same genus using different 495 strategies to cope with neighbors (Gubsch et al. 2011). For example, in the wetland, 496 Puccinellia macranthera has a very dense population and tall culms in or around water; 497 but its congener, Puccinellia hauptiana, is tiny and dispersed near water margins. Unlike 498 plant trait hierarchy-driven interactions in tree communities (Kunstler et al. 2012), we 499 argue that strong correlations between biotic and abiotic factors, as well as trait variation 500 are all involved in differentiating niche gradients in this semi-arid region (Table 3).

501

## 502 H4: Weaker functional trait-environment relationships

Regionally, trait-environment relationships were influenced more by phylogenetic 503 504 background than the same tests both at the global (Liu et al. 2012) and the intermediate 505 scales (Table 4). This scale dependence supported the idea that phylogeny and environment both play roles in species distribution (Webb et al. 2002). Within the region, 506 morphological traits correlated better with water availability than MGT/MGP, suggesting 507 508 that species growth was associated more closely with habitat wetness than regional precipitation (Appendix S1). Meanwhile, these positive trait-environment relationships 509 510 became weaker at smaller spatial scales, implying that more environmental factors must be invoked to explain variance in plant traits (Table 4). Specifically, positive relationships 511 between culm height and SWC suggested more aboveground growth with more soil water, 512 513 while SRL increased with SWC indicated that with more water availability, species tended to use a resource acquisitive strategy with a high root surface area per unit 514 investment (Eissenstat 1991). Culm height and root depth increased with neighbor density 515 showing the importance of above- and below-ground competition in understanding 516 species coexistence (Kraft et al. 2015). 517

#### 519 Conclusions

This study has demonstrated that co-occurring grass species in the steppe biome tend to 520 overdispersed, and phylogenetic signals of plant 521 be more phylogenetically ecophysiological traits become weaker at smaller spatial scales. At the local scale, abiotic 522 and biotic interactions are tested to be more important than the regional scale, at which 523 scale other processes such as dispersal limitation might be more determinant. Our findings 524 525 contribute to the understanding of species coexistence and maintenance at scales spanning regional to local communities in the East Asia steppe biome. 526

527

Acknowledgements We thank Chuangye Song, Wenli Chen, Bing Liu, Jin Liu (Institute 528 of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences) and Li Chen, who helped with scientific and 529 530 technical matters during the fieldwork in Inner Mongolia and lab work in Beijing. We 531 also thank Samuel Taylor for technical training and Nasen Wuritu (Zhenglan field station) for assistance. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of 532 China (31670411, 31300334), the Youth Innovation Promotion Association of the 533 Chinese Academy of Sciences (2019339), and a UK/China Excellence Scholarship (China 534 Scholarship Council and UK Government). 535

536

537 **Conflict of interest** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

538

## 539 **References**

- 540 Adler PB et al. (2014) Functional traits explain variation in plant life history strategies. P. Natl.
- 541 Acad. Sci. USA. 111:740-745. <u>https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1315179111</u>
- 542 Bai YF et al. (2008) Primary production and rain use efficiency across a precipitation gradient on
- the Mongolia plateau. Ecology 89:2140-2153. <u>https://doi.org/10.1890/07-0992.1</u>

- 544 Cadotte MW (2017) Functional traits explain ecosystem function through opposing mechanisms.
- 545 Ecol. Lett. 20:989-996. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12796</u>
- 546 Cardinale BJ (2011) Biodiversity improves water quality through niche partitioning. Nature
  547 472:86-89. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature09904
- 548 Cavender-Bares J, Kothari S, Meireles JE, Kaproth MA, Manos PS, Hipp AL (2018) The role of
- 549 diversification in community assembly of the oaks (Quercus L.) across the continental US. Am.
- 550 J. Bot. 105:565-586. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/ajb2.1049</u>
- 551 Cavender Bares J, Ackerly DD, Baum DA, Bazzaz FA (2004) Phylogenetic overdispersion in
- 552 Floridian oak communities. Am. Nat. 163:823-843. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/386375</u>
- 553 Chen SH (1986) The type of plants' roots in Inner Mongolian sandy grassland (In Chinese). Inner
- 554 Mongolian People Press, Hohhot
- 555 Clayton WD, Vorontsova, M.S., Harman, K.T. and Williamson, H. (2002 onwards) World Grass
  556 Species: Synonymy. http://www.kew.org/data/grasses-syn.html.
- 557 Cooper N, Jetz W, Freckleton RP (2010) Phylogenetic comparative approaches for studying niche
- 558 conservatism. J. Evol. Biol. 23:2529-2539. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.02144.x</u>
- 559 Donoghue MJ (2008) A phylogenetic perspective on the distribution of plant diversity. P. Natl.
- 560 Acad. Sci. USA. 105:11549-11555. <u>https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0801962105</u>
- 561 Editorial Committee on Flora Intramongolica (1998) Flora Intramongolica (In Chinese). Inner
- 562 Mongolian People Press, Huhhot (In Chinese)
- Edwards EJ, Osborne CP, Stromberg CAE, Smith SA, Consortium CG (2010) The origins of C<sub>4</sub>
- 564 grasslands: Integrating evolutionary and ecosystem science. Science 328:587-591.
- 565 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1177216</u>
- Edwards EJ, Smith SA (2010) Phylogenetic analyses reveal the shady history of  $C_4$  grasses. P.
- 567 Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 107:2532-2537. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0909672107</u>
- 568 Eissenstat DM (1991) On the relationship between specific root length and the rate of root
- proliferation: a field study using citrus rootstocks. New Phytol. 118:63-68.
- 570 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.1991.tb00565.x</u>

- 571 Faith DP (1992) Conservation evaluation and phylogenetic diversity. Biol. Conserv. 61:1-10.
  572 https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(92)91201-3
- 573 Farquhar GD, Ehleringer JR, Hubick KT (1989) Carbon isotope discrimination and
  574 photosynthesis. Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol. 40:503-537.
  575 <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.pp.40.060189.002443</u>
- 576 Felsenstein J (1985) Phylogenies and the comparative method. Am. Nat.:1-15.
  577 https://doi.org/10.1086/284325
- 578 Forrestel EJ, Donoghue MJ, Smith MD (2014) Convergent phylogenetic and functional responses
- 579 to altered fire regimes in mesic savanna grasslands of North America and South Africa. New
- 580 Phytol. 203:1000-1011. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12846
- 581 Franks PJ, Beerling DJ (2009) Maximum leaf conductance driven by CO<sub>2</sub> effects on stomatal size
- and density over geologic time. P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 106:10343-10347.
   https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0904209106
- Freckleton RP, Harvey PH, Pagel M (2002) Phylogenetic analysis and comparative data: a test
  and review of evidence. Am. Nat. 160:712-726. <u>https://doi.org/10.1086/343873</u>
- 586 Fritz SA, Purvis A (2010) Selectivity in mammalian extinction risk and threat types: a new
- 587 measure of phylogenetic signal strength in binary traits. Conserv. Biol. 24:1042-1051.
- 588 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01455.x</u>
- Genung MA, Bailey JK, Schweitzer JA (2012) Welcome to the neighbourhood: interspecific
  genotype by genotype interactions in Solidago influence above- and belowground biomass and
- 591 associated communities. Ecol. Lett. 15:65-73. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-</u>
  592 0248.2011.01710.x
- 593 Gerhold P, Cahill JF, Winter M, Bartish IV, Prinzing A (2015) Phylogenetic patterns are not
- proxies of community assembly mechanisms (they are far better). Funct. Ecol. 29:600-614.
- 595 https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12425
- Grass Phylogeny Working Group II (2012) New grass phylogeny resolves deep evolutionary
  relationships and discovers C<sub>4</sub> origins. New Phytol. 193:304-312.
  http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2011.03972.x

- 599 Gubsch M, Buchmann N, Schmid B, Schulze E-D, Lipowsky A, Roscher C (2011) Differential
- effects of plant diversity on functional trait variation of grass species. Ann. Bot. 107:157-169.
  https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcq220
- 602 Hartley W (1950) The global distribution of tribes of the Gramineae in relation to historical and
- 603 environmental factors. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 1:355-373. <u>https://doi.org/10.1071/AR9500355</u>
- Hattersley P (1992) C<sub>4</sub> photosynthetic pathway variation in grasses (Poaceae): its significance for
- arid and semi-arid lands Desertified grasslands: their biology and management. Linn. Soc.
  Symp. ser, pp 181-212
- 607 HilleRisLambers J, Adler P, Harpole W, Levine J, Mayfield M (2012) Rethinking community
- assembly through the lens of coexistence theory. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 43:227-248.
- 609 <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110411-160411</u>
- Kraft NJ, Ackerly DD (2010) Functional trait and phylogenetic tests of community assembly
  across spatial scales in an Amazonian forest. Ecol. Monogr. 80:401-422.
- 612 <u>https://doi.org/10.1890/09-1672.1</u>
- 613 Kraft NJ, Godoy O, Levine JM (2015) Plant functional traits and the multidimensional nature of
- 614 species coexistence. P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 112:797-802.
  615 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1413650112
- 616 Kraft NJB, Cornwell WK, Webb CO, Ackerly DD (2007) Trait evolution, community assembly,
- and the phylogenetic structure of ecological communities. Am. Nat. 170:271-283.
  http://www.jstor.org/stable/4541080
- 619 Kunstler G et al. (2012) Competitive interactions between forest trees are driven by species' trait
- 620 hierarchy, not phylogenetic or functional similarity: implications for forest community
- 621 assembly. Ecol. Lett. 15:831-840. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01803.x</u>
- 622 Letcher SG (2010) Phylogenetic structure of angiosperm communities during tropical forest
- 623 succession. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 277:97-104. <u>https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2009.0865</u>
- 624 Levin DA (1993) Local speciation in plants: the rule not the exception. Syst. Bot.:197-208.
- 625 <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/2419397</u>

- 626 Liu H, Edwards EJ, Freckleton RP, Osborne CP (2012) Phylogenetic niche conservatism in C<sub>4</sub>
- 627 grasses. Oecologia 170:835-845. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-012-2337-5</u>
- 628 Liu H, Osborne CP (2014) Water relations traits of C4 grasses depend on phylogenetic lineage,
- 629 photosynthetic pathway, and habitat water availability. J. Exp. Bot. 66:761-773.
- 630 <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eru430</u>
- 631 Mayfield MM, Levine JM (2010) Opposing effects of competitive exclusion on the phylogenetic
- 632 structure of communities. Ecol. Lett. 13:1085-1093. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-</u>
  633 0248.2010.01509.x
- Mouquet N et al. (2012) Ecophylogenetics: advances and perspectives. Biological reviews
  87:769-785. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2012.00224.x
- 636 Osborne CP, Freckleton RP (2009) Ecological selection pressures for  $C_4$  photosynthesis in the
- 637 grasses. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 276:1753-1760. <u>https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1762</u>
- Pagel M (1999) Inferring the historical patterns of biological evolution. Nature 401:877-884.
  https://doi.org/10.1038/44766
- 640 Paradis E, Claude J, Strimmer K (2004) APE: Analyses of Phylogenetics and Evolution in R
- 641 language. Bioinformatics 20:289-290. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btg412</u>
- 642 Pavoine S, Vela E, Gachet S, de Bélair G, Bonsall MB (2011) Linking patterns in phylogeny,
- traits, abiotic variables and space: a novel approach to linking environmental filtering and plant
- 644 community assembly. J. Ecol. 99:165-175. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-</u>
  645 <u>2745.2010.01743.x</u>
- Prinzing A et al. (2008) Less lineages-more trait variation: phylogenetically clustered plant
  communities are functionally more diverse. Ecol. Lett. 11:809-819.
  http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01189.x
- 649 Pyankov VI, Gunin PD, Tsoog S, Black CC (2000) C<sub>4</sub> plants in the vegetation of Mongolia: their
- 650 natural occurrence and geographical distribution in relation to climate. Oecologia 123:15-31.
- 651 https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420050985

- 652 Sack L, Cowan PD, Jaikumar N, Holbrook NM (2003) The 'hydrology' of leaves: co-ordination of
- structure and function in temperate woody species. Plant Cell Environ. 26:1343-1356.
  https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0016-8025.2003.01058.x
- 655 Sage RF, Li, M., Monson RK (1999) The taxonomic distribution of C<sub>4</sub> photosynthesis. In: Sage
- 656 RF, Monson RK (eds) C<sub>4</sub> Plant Biology. Academic Press, San Diego, pp 551-584
- 657 Sala OE, Lauenroth WK, Parton WJ (1992) Long-term soil water dynamics in the shortgrass
- 658 steppe. Ecology 73:1175-1181. <u>http://www.jstor.org/stable/1940667</u>
- 659 Silvertown J et al. (2006) Absence of phylogenetic signal in the niche structure of meadow plant
- 660 communities. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 273:39-44. <u>https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2005.3288</u>
- 661 Song CY, Guo K (2007) Relationship between plant community and soil on the interdune lowland
- in the middle of Otingdag sandland Acta Phytoecol. Sin. 31:40-49
- 663 Soreng RJ et al. (2017) A worldwide phylogenetic classification of the Poaceae (Gramineae) II:
- An update and a comparison of two 2015 classifications. Journal of Systematics and Evolution
- 665 55:259-290. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/jse.12262</u>
- 666 Swenson NG (2013) The assembly of tropical tree communities-the advances and shortcomings of
- 667 phylogenetic and functional trait analyses. Ecography 36:264-276.
  668 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.00121.x
- 669 Swenson NG, Enquist BJ, Pither J, Thompson J, Zimmerman JK (2006) The problem and promise
- 670 of scale dependency in community phylogenetics. Ecology 87:2418-2424.
  671 https://www.jstor.org/stable/20069252
- 672 Swenson NG, Enquist BJ, Thompson J, Zimmerman JK (2007) The influence of spatial and size
  673 scale on phylogenetic relatedness in tropical forest communities. Ecology 88:1770-1780.
- 674 <u>https://doi.org/10.1890/06-1499.1</u>
- Taub DR (2000) Climate and the US distribution of C<sub>4</sub> grass subfamilies and decarboxylation
- 676 variants of C<sub>4</sub> photosynthesis. Am. J. Bot. 87:1211-1215. https://doi.org/10.2307/2656659
- 677 Trisos CH, Petchey OL, Tobias JA (2014) Unraveling the Interplay of Community Assembly
- 678 Processes Acting on Multiple Niche Axes across Spatial Scales. Am. Nat. 184:593-608.
- 679 <u>https://doi.org/10.1086/678233</u>

- 680 Uriarte M et al. (2010) Trait similarity, shared ancestry and the structure of neighbourhood
  681 interactions in a subtropical wet forest: implications for community assembly. Ecol. Lett.
  682 13:1503-1514. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2010.01541.x</u>
- 683 Vigeland MD et al. (2013) Evidence for adaptive evolution of low-temperature stress response
- 684 genes in a Pooideae grass ancestor. New Phytol. 199:1060-1068.
  685 https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12337
- 686 Visser V, Clayton WD, Simpson DA, Freckleton RP, Osborne CP (2014) Mechanisms driving an
- 687 unusual latitudinal diversity gradient for grasses. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 23:61-75.

688 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12107</u>

- 689 Visser V, Woodward FI, Freckleton RP, Osborne CP (2012) Environmental factors determining
  690 the phylogenetic structure of C<sub>4</sub> grass communities. J. Biogeogr. 39:232-246.
- 691 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02602.x</u>
- 692 Watson LD, M.J. (1992 onwards) The grass genera of the world: descriptions, illustrations,
- 693 identification, and information retrieval; including synonyms, morphology, anatomy,
- 694 physiology, phytochemistry, cytology, classification, pathogens, world and local distribution,

and references. Version: 23rd April 2010., <u>http://delta-intkey.com</u>

- 696 Webb CO, Ackerly DD, McPeek MA, Donoghue MJ (2002) Phylogenies and community ecology.
- 697 Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst. 33:475-505. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.33.010802.150448</u>
- 698 Weber MG, Wagner CE, Best RJ, Harmon LJ, Matthews B (2017) Evolution in a Community
- 699 Context: On Integrating Ecological Interactions and Macroevolution. Trends Ecol. Evol.
  700 32:291-304. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2017.01.003
- 701 Wiegand T, Uriarte M, Kraft NJ, Shen G, Wang X, He F (2017) Spatially explicit metrics of
- species diversity, functional diversity, and phylogenetic diversity: Insights into plant
- 703 community assembly processes. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 48:329-351.
- 704 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110316-022936
- 705 Wiens JJ (2018) Patterns of local community composition are linked to large-scale diversification
- and dispersal of clades. Am. Nat. 191:184-196. <u>https://doi.org/10.1086/695495</u>

- Wiens JJ, Graham CH (2005) Niche conservatism: Integrating evolution, ecology, and
  conservation biology. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 36:519-539.
  https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.36.102803.095431
- 710 Wilcox TM, Schwartz MK, Lowe WH (2018) Evolutionary community ecology: time to think
- 711
   outside
   the
   (taxonomic)
   box.
   Trends
   Ecol.
   Evol.
   33:240-250.

   712
   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.01.014
- 713 Wright IJ et al. (2004) The worldwide leaf economics spectrum. Nature 428:821.
  714 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02403
- 715 Zhang H et al. (2018) Using functional trait diversity patterns to disentangle the scale dependent
- 716 ecological processes in a subtropical forest. Funct. Ecol. 32:1379-1389.
- 717 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13079</u>
- Zhang W (1998) Changes in species diversity and canopy cover in steppe vegetation in Inner
  Mongolia under protection from grazing. Biodivers. Conserv. 7:1365-1381.
  https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008852017493

- 722 Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article contains
- supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.
- 724
- 725 Appendix S1 Environmental gradients and the consistency of water availability across726 spatial scales
- 727 Appendix S2 Poaceae species list with morphological traits, habitat, biogeographic data
- and species occurrence in the 88 counties in Inner Mongolia. County-level phylogenetic
- signals and phylogenetic structure were also reported
- 730 Appendix S3 A phylogenetic tree of 238 Poaceae species in Inner Mongolia, showing
- 731 species filtered across spatial scales
- 732 Appendix S4 A phylogenetic tree of 32 Poaceae species at the local scale (Hunshandake
- sandland), with species abundance in four habitats and main variables mapped across the
- tree based on PPCA results
- 735

736 Tables

Table 1 Phylogenetic analyses for grass species occurrences filtered from the regional 737 (238 and 170 species pools) to the intermediate (88 species) and then local (32 species) 738 scales in the Inner Mongolian steppe. The 238-species phylogenetic tree is an overall 739 species pool; it merged the 170-species tree that was strictly constructed based on DNA 740 data and another 58 congeners. Sample size (n), D and P values for D = 0 and 1 are 741 reported. Level of significance: \* P < 0.05; \*\* P < 0.01; \*\*\* P < 0.001; ns, not significant. 742 SR, species richness; NRI, net relatedness index. C, phylogenetically clustered; O, 743 phylogenetically overdispersed 744

	SR	NRI	Р	Pattern	n	D	P <sub>(D=0)</sub>	P <sub>(D=1)</sub>	Pattern
Filtered from 238 spp. tree									
170 spp. in the region	170	0.63	ns	С	238	0.44	***	***	С
88 spp. in the county	88	-1.93	ns	0	238	0.84	***	*	0
32 spp. in the local field	32	-4.82	ns	0	238	1.03	***	ns	0
Filtered from 170 spp. tree									
88 spp. in the county	88	0.10	ns	С	170	1.12	***	ns	0
32 spp. in the local field	32	-2.03	ns	0	170	0.70	*	ns	0
Filtered from 32 spp. tree									
5 spp. in the moving dune	5	-1.07	ns	0	32	1.20	***	ns	0
10 spp. in the fixed dune	10	0.04	ns	С	32	1.28	***	ns	0
21 spp. in the meadow	21	-1.26	ns	0	32	0.88	*	ns	0
12 spp. in the wetland	12	2.14	ns	С	32	0.77	*	ns	0
5									

746	Table 2 Phylogenetic signals in plant functional traits, abiotic and biotic environmental
747	variables for grasses in the Inner Mongolian steppe at both regional and local scales.
748	Random selection models give the mean $\pm$ SD of $\lambda$ values based on 1000 random
749	selections of 32 species from the regional dataset. Data are natural logged in tests except
750	those with $\dagger$ . Sample size (n), $\lambda$ and P values for both $\lambda = 0$ and 1 are reported. Level of
751	significance: * P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; ns, not significant. SLA, specific
752	leaf area; SRL, specific root length; DNN, distance to the nearest neighbor; MGT, mean
753	growing season (May to September) temperature; MGP, mean growing season
754	precipitation

	Dagia		1.		Random	Local	scale		
	Regio	onal sca	ue		selection models	(n = 32)			
	n	λ	$P_{(\lambda = 0)}$	$P_{(\lambda = 1)}$	λ	λ	$P_{(\lambda = 0)}$	$P_{(\lambda = 1)}$	
Culm height (cm)	166	.83	***	***	.37±.01	.51	**	**	
Leaf length (cm)	159	.95	***	***	.48±.01	.36	ns	***	
Leaf width (mm)	154	.78	***	***	.56±.01	.00	ns	***	
Leaf mass (g)						.07	ns	***	
Leaf number per tiller						.00	ns	***	
SLA (cm <sup>2</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> )						.19	ns	***	
Root depth (cm)						.13	ns	***	
SRL (cm $g^{-1}$ )						.41	*	***	
Flat leaf (%) †	127	.39	ns	ns		.00	ns	***	
Folded leaf (%) †	75	.43	ns	ns		.14	ns	***	
Flowering start †	135	.29	***	***	.18±.01	.00	ns	*	
Flowering end †	135	.50	***	***	.43±.01	.34	ns	*	
Leaf nitrogen content (%)						.26	ns	***	
Leaf $\delta^{15}$ N (‰)						.00	ns	***	
Leaf carbon content (%)						.23	ns	***	
Leaf $\delta^{13}$ C (‰)						.78	***	ns	
Leaf water potential (MPa)						.12	ns	***	
Stomatal density (mm <sup>-2</sup> )						.46	***	***	
Guard cell length (µm)						.56	***	***	
Stomatal width (µm)						.43	*	***	

Stomatal pore index						.14	ns	***
Water range	166	.00	ns	***	.09±.01	.00	ns	***
Water score	166	.92	***	***	.31±.01	.21	ns	***
MGT (°C)	165	.24	**	***	.12±.01	.00	ns	***
MGP (mm $y^{-1}$ )	165	.14	*	***	.11±.01	.00	ns	***
Soil water content (%)						.39	ns	***
Soil nitrogen content (%)						.00	ns	***
Relative abundance						.00	ns	***
Neighbour density (m <sup>-2</sup> )						.09	ns	***
DNN (cm)						.15	ns	***
Tallest neighbour (cm)						.48	**	***

756	Table 3 Principal component (PC) loadings for phylogenetic PCA (PPCA) on (a)
757	environmental variables and (b) plant functional traits of grasses at the local scale
758	(Hunshandak sandland). SWC1-2-3, soil water content from 0-10, 10-20, 20-30 cm layers;
759	SNC1-2-3, soil nitrogen content from 0-10, 10-20, 20-30 cm layers; ND, neighbour
760	density; RA, relative abundance; TN, tallest neighbour; NN, nearest neighbour distance;
761	LL, leaf length; LA, leaf area; LM, leaf mass; LW, leaf width; SW, stomatal width; RD,
762	root depth; LC, leaf carbon content; GL, guard cell length; SD, stomatal density. For each
763	PC, the first four variables with highest loadings are in bold

(a) PPCA on e	nvironme	ntal varia	bles	(b) PPCA on	morpholo	gical traits	
Variable	PC1	PC2	PC3	Variable	PC1	PC2	PC3
n = 10				n = 17			
SNC3	0.886	0.137	0.226	LL	-0.957	0.108	-0.064
SNC2	0.81	0.174	0.418	LA	-0.947	0.01	-0.095
SNC1	0.803	-0.122	0.435	LM	-0.932	0.193	-0.123
SWC3	0.752	0.165	-0.353	LW	-0.891	-0.3	0.105
ND	0.478	-0.788	0.05	Abxial SW	-0.185	-0.8	-0.396
RA	0.09	-0.774	-0.114	RD	-0.425	0.751	-0.142
TN	0.201	-0.547	-0.619	SLA	0.377	-0.659	0.199
NN	-0.581	0.533	0.006	LC	-0.435	-0.581	0.001
SWC1	0.553	0.468	-0.546	Abxial GL	-0.104	-0.149	-0.876
SWC2	0.722	0.442	-0.286	Adxial SD	-0.681	0.072	0.595
				Adxial GL	-0.516	-0.155	-0.468
				Adxial SW	-0.185	-0.8	-0.396
Total	40.92	23.09	13.18		38.74	18.49	10.44
variance (%)							
Cumulative	40.92	64.01	77.19		38.74	57.23	67.67
variance (%)							

765	Table 4 Phylogenetic general linear models (PGLM) of relationships between plant
766	functional traits and environmental variables for grasses in (a) the whole Inner Mongolia
767	region and (b) the local scale (Hunshandak sandland). Sample size (n), F, P and $\lambda$ values,
768	slopes and $R^2$ are listed. All data are natural-logged for standardization. Slopes and F
769	values with significant fits are in bold. CH, culm height; LL, leaf length; LW, leaf width;
770	water, water score; SWC, soil water content; ND, neighbor density; SNC, soil nitrogen
771	content; LM, leaf mass; LA, leaf area; RD, root depth; GL, guard cell length; SW, stomatal
772	width

(a) Regional scale	n	λ	P	(λ= 0)	$P_{(\lambda=1)}$	F <sup>P</sup>	slope	$R^2$
CH ~ MGT	161	.18	*		***	<b>7.9</b> <sup>**</sup>	-1.43	.04
LL ~ MGT	155	.77	*>	**	***	1.25 <sup>ns</sup>	66	.002
LW ~ MGT	149	.47	*		***	.59 <sup>ns</sup>	59	.003
CH ~ MGP	161	.16	*		***	1.88**	.50	.058
LL ~ MGP	155	.73	*>	**	***	<b>5.08</b> <sup>*</sup>	.41	.026
LW ~ MGP	149	.42	*>	k	***	8.35**	.65	.047
CH ~ water	162	.43	*		***	2.63***	.39	.11
LL ~ water	155	.80	*>	**	***	<b>22.66</b> <sup>***</sup>	.50	.12
LW ~ water	151	.48	*		***	42.80***	.76	.22
( <b>b</b> ) Local scale		n	2	р	Р		F P	
(b) Local scale		11		1	1		1	
				$(\lambda = 0)$	$(\lambda = 1)$	SWC	ND	SNC
CH ~ SWC+ND+S	NC	32	.63	$(\lambda = 0)$	(λ = 1) **	SWC 4.30 *	ND 6.22 **	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+SI LL ~ SWC+ND+SN	NC NC	32 32	.63 .35	$(\lambda = 0)$ ** ns	(λ = 1) ** **	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup>	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup>	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+SI LL ~ SWC+ND+SN LW ~ SWC+ND+SI	NC NC NC	32 32 32	.63 .35 .00	(λ = 0) ** ns ns	(λ = 1) ** ** ***	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup> .81 <sup>ns</sup>	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup> .05 <sup>ns</sup>	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> .15 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+S LL ~ SWC+ND+S LW ~ SWC+ND+S LM ~ SWC+ND+S	NC IC NC NC	32 32 32 32 32	.63 .35 .00 .00	(λ = 0) ** ns ns ns	( $\lambda = 1$ ) ** *** *** ***	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup> .81 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup>	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup> .05 <sup>ns</sup> 1.66 <sup>ns</sup>	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> .15 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+SI LL ~ SWC+ND+SI LW ~ SWC+ND+SI LM ~ SWC+ND+SI LA ~ SWC+ND+SI	NC NC NC NC	32 32 32 32 32 32	.63 .35 .00 .00	(λ = 0) ** ns ns ns ns	( $\lambda = 1$ ) ** *** *** *** ***	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup> .81 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .17 <sup>ns</sup>	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup> .05 <sup>ns</sup> 1.66 <sup>ns</sup> .92 <sup>ns</sup>	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> .15 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .00 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+SI LL ~ SWC+ND+SI LW ~ SWC+ND+SI LM ~ SWC+ND+SI LA ~ SWC+ND+SI SLA ~ SWC+ND+SI	NC NC NC NC NC SNC	32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32	.63 .35 .00 .00 .00	(λ = 0) ** ns ns ns ns ns ns	( $\lambda = 1$ ) ** *** *** *** *** ***	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup> .81 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .17 <sup>ns</sup> .56 <sup>ns</sup>	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup> .05 <sup>ns</sup> 1.66 <sup>ns</sup> .92 <sup>ns</sup> 2.76 <sup>ns</sup>	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> .15 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .00 <sup>ns</sup> .09 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+SI LL ~ SWC+ND+SI LW ~ SWC+ND+SI LM ~ SWC+ND+SI LA ~ SWC+ND+SI SLA ~ SWC+ND+SI RD ~ SWC+ND+SI	NC NC NC NC NC SNC	32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32	.63 .35 .00 .00 .00 .00	(λ = 0) ** ns ns ns ns ns ns ns ns	( $\lambda = 1$ ) ** *** *** *** *** *** ***	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup> .81 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .17 <sup>ns</sup> .56 <sup>ns</sup> 1.64 <sup>ns</sup>	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup> .05 <sup>ns</sup> 1.66 <sup>ns</sup> .92 <sup>ns</sup> 2.76 <sup>ns</sup> 4.20 *	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> .15 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .00 <sup>ns</sup> .09 <sup>ns</sup> .49 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+SI LL ~ SWC+ND+SI LW ~ SWC+ND+SI LM ~ SWC+ND+SI LA ~ SWC+ND+SI SLA ~ SWC+ND+SI RD ~ SWC+ND+SI SRL ~ SWC+ND+SI	NC NC NC NC SNC SNC	32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32	.63 .35 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .37	(λ = 0) ** ns ns ns ns ns ns ns ns	( $\lambda = 1$ ) ** *** *** *** *** *** ***	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup> .81 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .17 <sup>ns</sup> .56 <sup>ns</sup> 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> 7.78 **	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup> .05 <sup>ns</sup> 1.66 <sup>ns</sup> .92 <sup>ns</sup> 2.76 <sup>ns</sup> 4.20 * .16 <sup>ns</sup>	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> .15 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .00 <sup>ns</sup> .09 <sup>ns</sup> .49 <sup>ns</sup> 2.06 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+SI LL ~ SWC+ND+SI LW ~ SWC+ND+SI LM ~ SWC+ND+SI LA ~ SWC+ND+SI SLA ~ SWC+ND+SI RD ~ SWC+ND+SI SRL ~ SWC+ND+SI SD ~ SWC+ND+SI	NC NC NC NC SNC SNC SNC	32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32	.63 .35 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .37 .45	(λ = 0) ** ns ns ns ns ns ns ns **	( $\lambda = 1$ ) ** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup> .81 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .17 <sup>ns</sup> .56 <sup>ns</sup> 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> 7.78 ** .99 <sup>ns</sup>	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup> .05 <sup>ns</sup> 1.66 <sup>ns</sup> .92 <sup>ns</sup> 2.76 <sup>ns</sup> 4.20 * .16 <sup>ns</sup> .03 <sup>ns</sup>	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> .15 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .00 <sup>ns</sup> .09 <sup>ns</sup> .49 <sup>ns</sup> 2.06 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup>
CH ~ SWC+ND+SI LL ~ SWC+ND+SI LW ~ SWC+ND+SI LM ~ SWC+ND+SI LA ~ SWC+ND+SI SLA ~ SWC+ND+SI SLA ~ SWC+ND+SI SRL ~ SWC+ND+SI SD ~ SWC+ND+SI GL ~ SWC+ND+SI	NC NC NC NC SNC SNC SNC NC	32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32 32	.63 .35 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .37 .45 .66	(λ = 0) ** ns ns ns ns ns ns ** **	( $\lambda = 1$ ) ** *** *** *** *** *** *** *** ***	SWC 4.30 * .01 <sup>ns</sup> .81 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .17 <sup>ns</sup> .56 <sup>ns</sup> 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> 7.78 ** .99 <sup>ns</sup> 1.68 <sup>ns</sup>	ND 6.22 ** .52 <sup>ns</sup> .05 <sup>ns</sup> 1.66 <sup>ns</sup> .92 <sup>ns</sup> 2.76 <sup>ns</sup> 4.20 * .16 <sup>ns</sup> .03 <sup>ns</sup> .37 <sup>ns</sup>	SNC 1.64 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> .15 <sup>ns</sup> .01 <sup>ns</sup> .00 <sup>ns</sup> .09 <sup>ns</sup> .49 <sup>ns</sup> 2.06 <sup>ns</sup> .04 <sup>ns</sup> 3.19 <sup>ns</sup>

# 775 Figure legends

Fig. 1 Map of the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region (IMAR), China, showing spatial and environmental gradients. (a) Main vegetation types of each county in IMAR, intermediate (Zhenglan county) and local field site (Hunshandak sandland, the red triangle) are labeled. (b) Altitude, (c) mean annual temperature (MAT), and (d) mean annual precipitation (MAP) and grass species richness of each county across IMAR. See Appendix S1 for detailed environmental data. This figure is available in color in the online version of the journal

783

Fig. 2 Species richness of different grass lineages along the mean annual growth (a) 784 785 temperature and (b-c) precipitation gradients. Panel (b) is enlarged to show (c) 786 Chloridoideae and Panicoideae, and (d) tribes in Pooideae. In (d), Aveneae and Stipeae are the only two of eight tribes in Pooideae that have significant regressions. In (a): Pooideae 787 (triangles),  $y = -7.7 \cdot x + 189.8$ ,  $F_{1.86} = 48.9$ ,  $R^2 = 0.36^{***}$ . In (b, c): Chloridoideae (black 788 dots),  $y = -0.02 \cdot x + 14.0$ ,  $F_{1.86} = 16.1$ ,  $R^2 = 0.15^{***}$ ; Panicoideae (white dots),  $y = 0.03 \cdot x + 14.0$ 789 9.2,  $F_{1.86} = 4.4$ ,  $R^2 = 0.31^{***}$ . In (d): Aveneae (white guares)  $y = 0.03 \cdot x + 4.6$ ,  $F_{1.86} = 24.9$ ,  $R^2$ 790 =  $0.22^{***}$ ; and Stipeae (black quares), y =  $-0.03 \cdot x + 17.2$ , F<sub>1.86</sub> = 58.3, R<sup>2</sup> =  $0.40^{***}$ 791

792

**Fig. 3** Relationships between plant functional traits and environmental factors based on the models in Table 4. (a) culm height and (b) specific root length with soil water content; (c) culm height and (d) root depth with neighbour density. Data are mean  $\pm$  SD. Subfamilies are Pooideae (black dot), Panicoideae (white dot), Chloridoideae (white square) and Arundinoideae (white triangle). Significant regressions based on PGLMs are (a):  $y = 0.4 \cdot x$ + 2.6,  $F_{1,30} = 3.2$ ,  $R^2 = 0.07^{ns}$ ; (b):  $y = 0.4 \cdot x + 3.2$ ,  $F_{1,30} = 7.9$ ,  $R^2 = 0.18^{**}$ ; (c):  $y = 0.3 \cdot x + 2.0$ ,  $F_{1,30} = 6.9$ ,  $R^2 = 0.16^*$ ; and (b):  $y = 0.29 \cdot x + 1.6$ ,  $F_{1,30} = 3.7$ ,  $R^2 = 0.08^*$ 



801 Fig. 1



804 Fig. 2



