



## **The role of dispersal and local environment in urban land snail assemblages: an example of three cities in Central Italy**

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

*Original:*

Barbato, D., Benocci, A., Caruso, T., & Manganelli, G. (2017). The role of dispersal and local environment in urban land snail assemblages: an example of three cities in Central Italy. *URBAN ECOSYSTEMS*, 20(4), 919-931 [10.1007/s11252-017-0643-8].

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/11365/1005563> since 2021-03-31T09:46:46Z

*Published:*

DOI:10.1007/s11252-017-0643-8

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license.

For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

(Article begins on next page)

1 **The role of dispersal and local environment in urban land snail assemblages: an example of three cities in central**  
2 **Italy**

3  
4  
5  
6 **Debora Barbato,<sup>1\*</sup> Andrea Benocci,<sup>1</sup> Tancredi Caruso,<sup>2</sup> Giuseppe Manganelli<sup>1</sup>**

7  
8  
9 <sup>1</sup> *Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, della Terra e dell'Ambiente, Università di Siena, Via Mattioli 4, 53100 Siena, Italy*

10 <sup>2</sup> *School of Biological Sciences and Institute for Global Food Security, Queen's University Belfast, 97 Lisburn Road,*  
11 *Belfast BT9 7BL, Northern Ireland*

12  
13 \*Corresponding author:

14 Debora Barbato, e-mail [debora.barbato87@gmail.com](mailto:debora.barbato87@gmail.com); phone number +390577232920; fax +390577232896

15  
16 *Keywords: urban biodiversity, terrestrial invertebrates, environment, spatial filters, variation partitioning*

17  
18 *Acknowledgments: Riccardo D'Orazio helped during field work; Folco Giusti, Leonardo Favilli and Emilia Rota made*  
19 *constructive comments and criticisms.*

20  
21

22 **Abstract** Ecologists increasingly appreciate the central role that urban biodiversity plays in ecosystems, however much  
23 urban biodiversity is neglected, especially some very diverse groups of invertebrates. For the first time in southern  
24 Europe, land snail communities are analysed in four urban habitats along a geographical gradient of three cities, using  
25 quantitative methods and assessing the relative roles of local environmental conditions (“distance from sea”, “distance  
26 from city centre”, “vegetation cover”) and spatial effects by principal coordinate analysis of neighbour matrices,  
27 redundancy analysis and variation partitioning. A total of 53 species was recorded, a richness similar to that of natural  
28 areas. At habitat level, species richness did not show a clear increasing trend from more to less urbanized habitats, but  
29 rather a homogeneous pattern. At city level, study areas hosted rather heterogeneous species assemblages and biotic  
30 homogenization did not seem to have any impact; thus, only three species could be considered alien. Variation  
31 partitioning showed that land snail communities were mostly structured by environmental factors, even when spatial  
32 structures independent of measured environmental variables were included: “vegetation cover” and “distance from city  
33 centre” were the environmental variables that explained most of the variation in species composition. The lack of strong  
34 spatial structure also unexpectedly suggested that transport by humans aids dispersal of organisms with low mobility,  
35 which are usually limited by spatial constraints in natural environments. These results provide ecological and  
36 conservation implications for other invertebrate groups, suggesting to set priorities in management strategies that  
37 include habitat conservation at local scale.

38

## 39 **Introduction**

40

41 Nowadays more than half the world's population lives in large urban settlements. This percentage is predicted to  
42 increase to 66% by 2050 (United Nations 2014). Although it is the most common human habitat (Grimm et al. 2008),  
43 the urban environment has been neglected by researchers (Maurer et al. 2000; Beninde et al. 2015; Hartop et al. 2015)  
44 as unnatural and poor in biodiversity (Grimm et al. 2008; Paul and Meyer 2008; Güneralp and Seto 2013), besides  
45 being subject to biotic homogenization due to the increasing number of non-native species (Lockwood 2004; McKinney  
46 2006; La Sorte et al. 2007; Williams et al. 2009) and habitat fragmentation (McKinney 2002; Cadenasso et al. 2007).  
47 While urbanization is certainly a major cause of biodiversity and habitat loss (Czech et al. 2000; McKinney 2006;  
48 Grimm et al. 2008; Hahs et al. 2009), the influence of urban land use on biodiversity is more complex than expected  
49 (McKinney 2008).

50 In recent years, the belief that cities only affect the surrounding environment negatively has been challenged. An  
51 increasing body of literature has investigated urban biodiversity (Beninde et al. 2015), covering groups such as birds,  
52 invertebrates, plants and even zooplankton (Mimouni et al. 2015). Surprisingly, researchers are discovering that cities  
53 can protect and control vulnerable and particular ecosystems (UNEP 2005), as well as high levels of biodiversity  
54 (Aronson et al. 2014) including native species (Barratt et al. 2015), sometimes showing the same dynamic interactions  
55 as in nature (Baldock et al. 2015; Beninde et al. 2015). Studies have revealed the extreme ecological importance of  
56 particular urban habitats for species dispersal (Angold et al. 2006). Moreover, urban green areas can have a positive  
57 influence on human quality of life (Fuller et al. 2007; Mitchell and Popham 2008; Carrus et al. 2015; Taylor and  
58 Hochuli 2015) in terms of recreation and public participation in scientific activities (Beumer and Martens 2015).

59 Although interest in urban ecology is increasing, not much is yet known about less charismatic invertebrates such as  
60 land snails. This is surprising because according to the IUCN Red List, molluscs are the group most subject to  
61 extinctions, which often go completely unnoticed (Lydeard et al. 2004; Régnier et al. 2009). The current lack of  
62 scientific documentation and their low mobility make land snails susceptible to anthropogenic disturbance and habitat  
63 fragmentation (Douglas 2011). Malacofauna currently includes several rare and endangered species, and constitutes  
64 20% of all threatened animals and 37% of known animal extinctions since the year 1600 (Seddon 1998). Land snails are  
65 numerous and diverse; they live in almost all terrestrial environments and play a key role in worldwide trophic webs  
66 (Baur and Baur 1993; Douglas et al. 2013). Snails are preyed on by a wide range of animals from insects to salamanders,  
67 toads, lizards, snakes, birds and mammals. Some species of fireflies (i.e. *Pyrocoelia pectoralis*, *Cratomorphus* spp.)  
68 feed mainly on land snails (Viviani 2001; Wang et al. 2007). Many birds require a huge quantity of calcium carbonate  
69 for the formation of eggshells, relying on land snails for Ca supplementation (Mänd et al. 2000). Their low mobility  
70 makes snails, who also have good bioaccumulation capacity (Pauget et al. 2013), perfect bioindicators of environmental  
71 quality (Cuttelod et al. 2011; Rota et al. 2016).

72 Studies on urban ecology are often descriptive checklists of traditional biodiversity components, such as richness  
73 and diversity measures. Since interactions between communities and their physical environment, and between  
74 organisms, occur at precise spatial and temporal scales (Borcard et al. 2004), discovering spatial structures at each scale  
75 and the processes involved in their creation is important for understanding the ecological patterns of natural  
76 communities (Borcard et al. 2004). In ecology, space has a key role in shaping the distribution of species assemblages,  
77 even if it is often neglected. Spatial heterogeneity is often driven by a wide range of factors that interact with each other  
78 in different ways (Borcard et al. 1992). The traditional niche-based model assumes that the local environment itself  
79 controls the spatial structure of species assemblages: in other words the interaction between a species and its physical

80 environment may mould its distribution through adaptation to and interaction with different habitat features (Borcard et  
81 al. 2004). According to this model, it is the environment itself, through resource types and habitat conditions, that  
82 determines how similar/dissimilar communities are, irrespective of spatial proximity or distance between assemblages  
83 (Caruso et al. 2012). Sometimes spatial structures may be generated by species assemblages themselves and can persist  
84 despite environmental changes (neutral model) (Hubbell 2001). In this case the space effect is described directly by  
85 community dynamics through dispersal limitations, demographic stochasticity or competitive/predatory processes  
86 without any environmental influence (Legendre et al. 2009).

87 Advanced and nowadays well established multivariate techniques such as principal coordinate analysis of neighbour  
88 matrices (PCNM) and variation partitioning (ter Braak 1986; Borcard et al. 1992; Legendre and Legendre 1998; Borcard  
89 and Legendre 2002; Borcard et al. 2004) have recently made it possible to disentangle and quantify the relative and pure  
90 effects of environment and space in shaping variations in community composition ( $\beta$  diversity), as well as the fraction  
91 of species variation explained by space and environment together. These techniques provided a useful tool for  
92 quantifying the amount of variation uniquely attributable to measured environmental factors, separating it from spatial  
93 structures potentially created by unmeasured environmental factors but also population and dispersal dynamics  
94 independent of environmental factors (e.g Legendre et al. 2009).

95 In southern Europe, there has been a complete lack of any quantitative and spatially explicit research into any aspect  
96 of urban land snail biodiversity, whereas in central Europe Horsák et al. (2009) and Lososová et al. (2011) have been  
97 the only authors to compare plant and land snail diversity in different urban habitats across several cities, using a  
98 standardized sampling protocol. Chytrý et al. (2012) subsequently highlighted the importance not only of the  
99 environmental but also of the space effect in shaping urban community structure across groups of different sizes and  
100 with different dispersal abilities (i.e. subaerial cyanobacteria and algae, vascular plants, land snails, grass, and animal-  
101 dispersed or wind-dispersed trees and shrubs) in central European cities. Thus we have a major gap in scientific  
102 knowledge, since the Mediterranean is one of the world's richest areas in terms of species diversity, but also one of the  
103 most threatened, mainly by human impact, especially habitat loss and degradation (Cuttelod et al. 2008). In this  
104 geographical context, the extremely complex biogeographical framework of Italy makes it a huge source of  
105 biodiversity: with regard to molluscs, the second in Europe, ranking just after Greece in terms of species and subspecies  
106 richness (Cuttelod et al. 2011).

107 Here for the first time, the spatial variation component of urban land snail communities is studied in different  
108 habitats along a geographical gradient of three cities in Tuscany (Italy). The aims of the study were: 1) to analyse and  
109 compare land snail biodiversity in terms of richness and potential differences in species composition (alpha  $\alpha$ , beta  $\beta$   
110 and gamma  $\gamma$  diversity) in four different human habitats along a gradient of three cities in central Italy; 2) to evaluate  
111 the presence of species of European Conservation Concern (ECC) and the impact of alien species, if any; 3) to detect  
112 factors affecting community structure by partitioning the pure effect of "environment" (measured environmental factors)  
113 from that of "space" (unmeasured environmental variation, biotic interactions that structure population spatially even  
114 within an environmentally homogeneous habitat and also dispersal limitations), as well as the combined effect, on the  
115 distribution of urban land snail communities by means of multivariate variation partitioning.

116  
117

## 118 **Materials and methods**

119

### 120 **Study area**

121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161

We investigated three central Italian cities along a geographical transect about 100 km long, extending from the Tyrrhenian coast to the Apennine mountain chain (Fig. 1). The cities differ for example in altitude, population and foundation date, but all have old city walls.

Grosseto (altitude 10 m, population 82,284, area 474 km<sup>2</sup>) is located in southwestern Tuscany, 10 km from the Tyrrhenian coast. Situated in the alluvial plain of the Ombrone river, the largest plain in southern Tuscany, Grosseto was founded in the High Middle Ages. Its Medicean walls were begun in 1574, replacing those from the 12th-14th centuries. Climate is Mediterranean with mild wet winters and hot dry summers.

Siena (altitude 322 m, population 52,774, area 118 km<sup>2</sup>) is located in central Tuscany and is the highest of the three cities and the one with the smallest population. Founded in Roman times, it has well preserved green areas within its perimeter. The historical centre of Siena, a UNESCO World Heritage Site, is surrounded by medieval walls, which include the Medici fort (1561-1563). Climate is sub Mediterranean with precipitation sufficiently distributed throughout the year, so there is no real dry season.

Arezzo (altitude 296 m, population 99,232, area 386 km<sup>2</sup>) is further east, near the Apennines. It is the oldest of the three, believed to have been one of twelve major Etruscan cities. Climate is continental due to its location straddling the Arno and Chiana valleys at the foot of the Apennines. In the high part of the town the Medicean walls enclose the cathedral, town hall and Medici Fortress.

### **Sampling design and data collection**

Sampling design included four urban habitat types over a gradient of human impact from heavily affected and disturbed sites to quite well preserved naturalized habitats (Lososová et al. 2011). Google Earth and city maps were used to choose two spatially independent sites for each habitat type in the three areas, making a total of 24 sites. Habitat types were chosen according to the standardized protocol of Lososová et al. (2011) with modifications: 1. WALLS: historical walls of the city centre; 2. PARK: city parks and public gardens with old deciduous trees (tree cover 10–50%) and frequently mown lawns; 3. E-SUC: early successional sites, strongly disturbed in the last 1–3 years, with a prevalence of bare ground and sparse vegetation cover, usually in or around construction and industrial sites; 4. WOOD: quite well preserved wooded patches, with well-structured vegetation (old and young trees, especially holm oak with scattered shrubs).

A qualitative visual search (presence/absence) was conducted for a standard time of 2 h at each site. The time-constrained sampling strategy made it possible to maximize species numbers by including a huge number of heterogeneous microhabitats and environmental conditions. It also avoided logistic problems related to sampling activity on vertical surfaces (city walls), where a common standard-sized plot can be hard to arrange.

In each site, 5 litres of debris and leaf litter was also collected to detect small and very small species (Cameron and Pokryszko 2005). Despite the huge investment in effort and time, this “volume method” combined with visual search produces more information on small species (Menez 2007; Benocci et al. 2015).

The litter was sieved with a 10 mm mesh, then dried and sieved again with meshes of decreasing size down to 0.5 mm. Specimens were determined at species rank and recorded in a database. The nomenclature follows Manganelli et al. (1995) and subsequent updates. Voucher specimens were deposited in Manganelli collection, Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, della Terra e dell’Ambiente, Università di Siena (Italy).

162 **Explanatory variables**

163

164 Two groups of explanatory variables (environmental and spatial) were calculated for each site and used to model land  
165 snail species richness and composition. The environmental properties of each site were quantified by three variables: 1)  
166 distance from city centre (“*Dist\_center*”) measured as linear distance from the city cathedral to the sampling site  
167 (Horsák et al. 2009); 2) distance from sea (“*Dist\_sea*”) assessed as minimum linear distance from the site to the nearest  
168 point on the coastline; 3) vegetation cover (“*Tree\_cover*”), ranging from 0 to 100% of total area of sampling site.  
169 Spatial variables were XY geographical coordinates and all the spatial structures at different scales detected by PCNM.

170

171 **Statistical analysis**

172

173 Observed and estimated species richness

174

175  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  diversity were used to assess richness and diversity patterns at habitat and city level.  $\alpha$  diversity was defined  
176 as species richness in each of the 24 sites and  $\gamma$  diversity as species richness in each urban habitat or city.  $\beta$  diversity,  
177 concerning species composition turnover within and between habitats and cities, was examined by the Simpson  
178 dissimilarity index ( $\beta_{sim}$ ; Baselga et al. 2007), which only considers dissimilarity due to spatial turnover, irrespective  
179 of species richness (Baselga 2010). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Bonferroni p-value adjustment for multiple  
180 comparisons were used to test for statistically significant differences. The *Chao2* richness estimator and its standard  
181 error *Chao.se* (Chao 1987) were also used to estimate the minimum asymptote of species richness for habitats and cities  
182 in order to detect the number of unseen or undetected species in relation to observed species richness and sampling  
183 efficiency.

184

185 Environmental and spatial effects on land snail assemblages: PCNM and Variation Partitioning

186

187 To evaluate the effects of environment and space on species composition, principal coordinate analysis of neighbour  
188 matrices (PCNM, Borcard et al. 2004) was used to detect spatial structure in the data. Compared to traditional  
189 multivariate trend-surface analysis, PCNM detects, decomposes and models any type of hidden spatial structure in the  
190 data, within the limits of sampling design (Borcard and Legendre 2002). It makes it possible to select the best linear  
191 combination of eigenvectors, maximizing correlation with the data and minimizing the number of vectors (Dray et al.  
192 2006). We first computed a matrix of Euclidean distances among the 24 sites using the latitudes and longitudes of  
193 sampling sites. Before running PCNM, the data was detrended by regressing all variables against the geographical  
194 coordinates (X-Y), retaining residuals. The Euclidean distances were then truncated: PCNM is based on the assumption  
195 that the only meaningful spatial signals for plots are those circumscribed by neighbourhood sites (Dray et al. 2006). The  
196 truncation distance, which defines neighbourhood thresholds, is considered the maximum distance connecting all plots  
197 based on a minimum spanning tree criterion (Rangel et al. 2006). The *give.thresh* function in the *spacemakerR* package  
198 was used.

199 PCNM was performed on the modified (i.e. truncated) distance matrix to extract eigenvectors (PCNM variables) to  
200 use as new spatial explanatory variables. Since PCNM are orthogonal, each PCNM variable represents an independent  
201 spatial gradient. The higher the eigenvalue of a PCNM variable, the broader the spatial scale represented, while PCNM  
202 variables with low eigenvalues only explain small fractions of the total spatial structure and are related to finer spatial

203 gradients (Duarte et al. 2012). The model selection procedure was based on multivariate extension of the AIC criterion  
204 using the *ortho.AIC* function in the SpacemakeR package. Six PCNM vectors obtained from the X-Y coordinates of  
205 each sampling site were then entered as explanatory variables for Redundancy Analysis (RDA) to account for the space  
206 effect on the urban land snail matrix. To reveal the urban gradient effect after removing the effect of space (i.e. pure  
207 spatial patterns that cannot be related to any measured variable + unmeasured spatially structured environmental  
208 variation), we computed the relative contribution of the three environmental variables (distance from city centre,  
209 distance from sea, % vegetation cover) by partial RDA (pRDA) that excluded spatial influence from the community  
210 matrix.

211 Variation partitioning was later conducted to detect the fractions of total variance explained exclusively by the  
212 environmental predictors [a], by environment and space [b], exclusively by spatial variables [c] and finally by residual  
213 variation (Borcard et al. 1992; Peres-Neto et al. 2006), which can be ascribed to internal biological variation, survey  
214 error, or variables not included in the analysis (Legendre and Legendre 1998). Quantification of the variance  
215 components was based on the *varpart* function of the Vegan R package (Oksanen et al. 2016).

216 All multivariate statistical analysis based on Hellinger-transformed land snail presence/absence data was performed  
217 with RStudio version 0.99.473 (RStudio Team 2015).

218  
219

## 220 **Results**

221

222 Observed and estimated species richness

223

224 Total land snail richness was 53 species (Table 1). Communities were dominated by *Cornu aspersum* and *Xerotricha*  
225 *conspurcata* present in 19 and 18 out of 24 sites, respectively, while rare species such as *Howenwartiana howenwartii*,  
226 *Marmorana serpentina*, *Cepaea nemoralis* and *Vitrea etrusca* occurred in 2 or 3 out of 24 sites. Some species are  
227 ranked as LC (Least Concern) in the IUCN Red List, while only three are alien (the Australasian *Paralaoma servilis*,  
228 the Sardo-Corsican *Marmorana serpentina* and the Mediterranean *Deroceras invadens*).

229 Numbers of land snail species found in sites ranged from 5 to 29 with a mean of 14 (Lososová et al. 2011: 0-21,  
230 mean 7.5). The lowest mean number of land snail species per site ( $\alpha$  diversity) was found in early successional sites (E-  
231 SUC) and old city walls (WALLS) (9 and 13, respectively) while the highest mean  $\alpha$  diversity was in wooded sites  
232 (WOOD) and urban gardens and parks (PARK) (17 and 16, respectively). The total number of species found in each  
233 habitat type ( $\gamma$  diversity) was lowest in early successional sites (E-SUC: 30) and increased in old city walls (WALLS:  
234 31), reaching its highest values in wooded suburban areas (WOOD: 37) and parks (PARK: 38) (Fig. 2a). Across  
235 habitats,  $\gamma$  diversity was correlated with mean  $\alpha$  diversity ( $r=0.94$ ,  $p=0.05$ ). One-way ANOVA (df 3; F-value 2.793; P-  
236 value 0.067) revealed no significant difference among habitat types.  $\beta$  diversity was highest in E-SUC, lowest in all the  
237 other habitats. This agrees with the findings of Lososová et al. (2011) (Fig. 3a). One-way ANOVA (df 3; F-value 12.25;  
238 P-value 2.87e-06) and Bonferroni p-value adjustment for multiple comparisons showed that E-SUC significantly  
239 differed with respect to all the other habitats in  $\beta$  diversity values (E-SUC-PARK  $p=9.5e-05$ ; E-SUC-WALLS  $p=3.7e-$   
240  $05$ ; E-SUC-WOOD  $p=2.5e-05$ ). Pairwise  $\beta$  diversity values between habitat types were: WALLS-PARK 0.16;  
241 WALLS-E-SUC 0.37; WALLS-WOOD 0.32; PARK-E-SUC 0.20; PARK-WOOD 0.19; E-SUC-WOOD 0.17.

242 The lowest mean  $\alpha$  diversity in the cities was recorded in Grosseto (GR) and Arezzo (AR) (11 in both cases) while  
243 the highest was recorded in Siena (SI) (19). The total number of species found in each city ( $\gamma$  diversity) was lowest in



244 Grosseto (29), higher in Arezzo (35) and highest in Siena (44) (Fig. 2b). Across cities,  $\gamma$  diversity was not correlated  
245 with mean  $\alpha$  diversity ( $r=0.84$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). After one-way ANOVA (df 2; F-value 6.439; P-value 0.007) and Bonferroni  
246 correction for multiple comparisons, the SI-GR and SI-AR pairs proved to be significantly different in  $\alpha$  diversity (SI-  
247 GR  $p=0.014$ ; SI-AR  $p=0.018$ ). Arezzo showed the highest internal  $\beta$  diversity, while Grosseto and Siena showed similar  
248 values (Fig. 3b). After one-way ANOVA (df 2; F-value 9.739; P-value 0.0002) and Bonferroni p-value adjustment, the  
249 AR-GR and AR-SI pairs resulted to be significantly different in  $\beta$  diversity values (AR-GR  $p=0.001$ ; AR-SI  $p=0.001$ ).  
250 Pairwise  $\beta$  diversity values between cities were: SI-GR 0.17; SI-AR 0.14; AR-GR 0.38.

251 The minimum estimated *Chao2* richness and its standard error *Chao.se* differed among habitat types and cities (Fig.  
252 4a,b). However, a few species are missing: more or less all species were detected with a reasonable degree of certainty  
253 through sampling effort.

254

255 Environmental and spatial effects on land snail assemblages: PCNM and Variation Partitioning

256

257 Total species matrix variation (Table 2) can be portioned in four parts: (a) pure effects of space, (b) combined variation  
258 i.e. spatially structured environmental variation, (c) pure effects of environment, (d) residual variation (Borcard et al.  
259 1992). In our data matrix, the total contribution of spatial structures (a + b) accounted for 16% of community structure  
260 whereas the variation attributed solely to pure spatial patterns, i.e. patterns that cannot be related to any measured  
261 environmental variable, was 13% (a). Environmental factors (c + b) are invoked to explain a higher portion of species  
262 matrix variation (22%) than explained by spatial structures. Furthermore, almost all of this rather high variation (c)  
263 (19%) is ascribed to the pure effect of environment, i.e. species-environment relationship associated with local  
264 environment, irrespective of space. The percentage of residual variation (d) was large: more than half the total variation  
265 remained unexplained, while only 3% of the explained variation was shared (b) between the two factors. All the  
266 variation components had a significant effect ( $p<0.05$ ). Redundancy analysis (Fig. 5) detected significant effect in  
267 shaping urban land snail composition for two out of three local environmental variables, namely “distance from the city  
268 centre” and “vegetation cover”. *Papillifera papillaris* was clearly negatively associated with *Dist\_center* and was the  
269 most characteristic species of WALLS assemblages followed by *Mediterranea hydatina*, which was also negatively  
270 associated with *Tree\_cover*; *Hohenwartiana hohenwartii* was most linked to E-SUC habitat type, *Monacha*  
271 *parumcincta* was clearly positively associated with *Dist\_center* and *Tree\_cover*, proving the most characteristic species  
272 of WOOD assemblages, while *Deroceras invades* and *Cernuella virgata* were associated with PARK habitat type.

273

274

## 275 Discussion

276

277 This study is the first to consider the influence of environment and spatial factors on urban land snail communities in  
278 southern Europe, and the insights it provides are unexpected. In terms of land snail total species richness, we recovered  
279 53 species over our 100 km transect, compared to the 87 species recorded over a much larger transect (>1200 km) in  
280 central Europe by Chytrý et al. (2012) and the 54 forest entities found in three well preserved forest areas of Tuscany  
281 (Benocci et al. 2015). These numbers suggest that urban environments may actually offer a range of different habitat  
282 and environmental conditions to land snails, thereby creating a sort of heterogeneous melting pot of unlimited  
283 ecological situations. Perhaps, the many species found in the assemblage possess a wide variety of ecological  
284 requirements, which even in urban environments allow them to find optimal conditions to adapt, flourish and spread,

285 just as happens in naturalized areas. The various results collected in this study support this general interpretation and we  
286 discuss these results below in terms of our three main aims.

287

288  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  diversity

289

290 Concerning habitat  $\gamma$  diversity, we did not find a clear decreasing trend from more (WALLS and PARK) to less  
291 urbanized habitats (E-SUC and WOOD), but rather a homogeneous pattern with just a dip in proximity to early  
292 successional sites. These open sub-urban habitats are typically in city peripheries; many are highly disturbed, often  
293 close to busy roads or industrial settlements, and function as ecological corridors (or barriers?) to the open countryside  
294 or woods. On the other hand, city parks, public gardens and wooded patches proved to be genuine islands of  
295 biodiversity in the urban matrix, showing the highest values of both  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  diversity. This finding agrees with other  
296 research from which it emerged that parks were the most diverse urban habitat for several groups of organisms  
297 (Lososová et al. 2011). Pairwise species composition differences between habitats showed major  $\beta$  diversity values, the  
298 highest difference being between WALLS and E-SUC habitats: PARK and WOOD shared a common more or less  
299 forested matrix, whereas WALLS and E-SUC showed the strongest differences in terms of ecological conditions and  
300 environmental heterogeneity. At city level, Siena had the richest  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  diversity: it is the greenest of the three cities,  
301 characterized by many well preserved wooded and green patches inside the urban core, also relatively less impacted by  
302 vehicular traffic and the effects of urbanization. These results overall imply the great diversity of conditions in urban  
303 environments, which is reflected by diversity patterns in the land snail assemblage.

304

305 Conservation status

306

307 The checklist did not include species in danger of extinction or threatened; xenodiversity was apparently very low and  
308 only three species (5.7% of the total) were true aliens: *Paralaoma servilis* is a worldwide litter- and humus-dwelling  
309 invasive species, probably of Australasian origin (Manganelli et al. 2015); *Deroceras invadens*, probably of central  
310 Mediterranean origin, is an invasive species worldwide (Reise et al. 2011) and *Marmorana serpentina*, first reported  
311 from the city of Grosseto by the present research, occurs in Sardinia and Corsica and has been introduced into certain  
312 Tuscan cities (Livorno, Pisa, Siena) (Fiorentino et al. 2009). As regards the remaining species, at least two (*Lehmannia*  
313 *melitensis*, *Papillifera papillaris*) may also have been introduced by anthropochory. They are nearly always found in  
314 habitats at the edge of urban areas or used by man at some time in the past. Finally, vast open and built-up areas have  
315 probably facilitated colonization by potentially indigenous but originally less widespread synanthropic species, such as  
316 the slug *Limacus flavus* and land snails *Xerotricha conspurcata*, *Eobania vermiculata* and *Cornu aspersum* (Manganelli  
317 et al. 2015). Biotic homogenization therefore does not seem to have had remarkable ecological impact: the small  
318 Tuscan cities still maintain considerable  $\beta$  diversity, both within and between study areas, despite the restricted  
319 geographical distance gradient. Thus they differ from other cosmopolitan urban areas in Europe where the introduction  
320 of invasive species, together with human-mediated biotic interchange, resulted in widespread floristic and faunistic  
321 homogenization (La Sorte et al. 2007; Ferenc et al. 2014).

322

323 Factors affecting community structure

324

325 Our attempt to discover the processes underlying land snail community structure by partitioning the pure effects of  
326 “environment” and that of unmeasured factors (dispersal, biotic interactions, unmeasured environmental variables) that  
327 create spatial structure (called “space”), provided the most interesting findings. Environment and space can be equally  
328 important in shaping communities but their function should always be considered in relation to the dispersal capacity of  
329 the group in question (Heino 2013). The relative role of deterministic and stochastic aspects driving ecological  
330 metacommunities has been examined in different organisms in natural environments (e.g. oribatid mites, Caruso et al.  
331 2012; oribatid mites and collembola, Ingimarsdóttir et al. 2012; microbial communities, Caruso et al. 2011; several  
332 groups of aquatic organisms, Padial et al. 2014, Rádková et al. 2014, Zhai et al. 2015) but few studies have concerned  
333 urban areas (spiders, bees and birds, Sattler et al. 2010; subaerial cyanobacteria and algae, vascular plants and land  
334 snails, Chytrý et al. 2012). According to general belief, high dispersers should be less influenced by spatial effects since  
335 they move more readily to suitable habitat than low dispersers and species are consequently sorted according to their  
336 ecological requirements (Martiny et al. 2006; Heino 2013). Conversely, weak dispersers are expected to show  
337 significant spatial structuring as a direct consequence of their low mobility while their distribution is often due to  
338 stochastic processes mediated by limited dispersal (Bell 2000; Hubbell 2001). Paradoxically, although land snails are  
339 widely recognised as having low mobility (Baur and Baur 1993), they proved to be most significantly shaped by pure  
340 and spatially independent environmental processes, which often turn out to be irrelevant since the environment is  
341 usually spatially structured by various ecological processes (Legendre and Fortin 1989). In other words, after removing  
342 the effect of space (i.e. pure spatial patterns that cannot be related to any measured variables + unmeasured spatially  
343 structured environmental variation), urban gradient turned out to be the main factor modelling land snail community  
344 structure.

345 Some exceptions to the rule were also found by Hájek et al. (2011), who described much stronger environmental  
346 than spatial structure in bryophytes but not in high dispersers such as diatoms in Western Carpathian fens, and similarly  
347 Astorga et al. (2012) confirmed a preponderant influence of niche-related factors rather than spatially limited dispersal  
348 in bryophytes and macroinvertebrates in Finnish streams. Sattler et al. (2010) first took urban environments seriously  
349 into account, observing higher environmental influence and weak spatial structure for spiders over a gradient of three  
350 Swiss cities. According to Sattler et al. (2010), this combination with traditionally limited dispersers may be a feature  
351 typical of urban areas, where high disturbance affecting the heterogeneous mosaic of urban habitat could inhibit  
352 establishment of well-defined spatial structures, selecting only the species able to adapt and coexist with human  
353 activities. Recent studies on land snail dispersal confirmed the possibility of long distance passive dispersal (Ožgo et al.  
354 2016) so that human-mediated transport in urban environments may be the most reasonable explanation for the high  
355 pure environmental constraint detected in urban land snail data: molluscs can be passively dispersed, but only if  
356 environmental conditions are suitable do they establish and develop well defined assemblages. Diverse microhabitat  
357 conditions and small-scale habitat structures are in fact necessary conditions for mollusc diversification, assuming a  
358 suitable geological substratum (Cuttelod et al. 2011). The pure environmental contribution therefore suggests selection  
359 of species well adapted to man-made environments, while other species show random distributions, probably as a  
360 consequence of occasional dispersal events.

361 The hypothesis of stronger environmental effect was also confirmed by RDA analysis that showed four well  
362 structured and differentiated species assemblages at habitat level, as demonstrated by 95% confidence ellipses (Fig. 5).

363 “Distance from the city centre” and “Vegetation cover” proved to be the environmental variables most significantly  
364 involved in explaining variation in species composition. With the exception of parks and gardens within the city limits,  
365 which can be considered genuine islands of richness and biodiversity inside the urban core (Dedov and Penev 2004),

366 the greater the distance from the urban centre, the higher the vegetation density. It is well known that forest cover  
367 provides shelter for land snails under unfavourable conditions (Dedov and Penev 2004). This has strong implications  
368 for species richness since the richest urban habitats are generally those with the highest tree and vegetation cover values  
369 (PARK and WOOD in our study). At the same time different forest cover values work as ecological filters, selecting  
370 species that depend on different environmental conditions. It is true that poor assemblages with few species are usually  
371 more frequent close to city centres, due to the reduced frequency of natural habitat (Horsák et al. 2009), but although  
372 poor in terms of richness, these completely anthropogenic assemblages often consist of surprisingly unique entities:  
373 WALLS harbour extremely specialist species (e.g. *Marmorana serpentina*, *Papillifera papillaris*, *Papillifera solida*),  
374 that shelter in rock clefts and cracks, instead of in litter and vegetation. Furthermore, subterranean species living in the  
375 ground behind walls, such as *Mediterranean hydatina*, which proved to be typical species in WALLS assemblages, can  
376 be included in this habitat.

377 The response of local land snail assemblages to urbanisation cannot be described as a gradual and linear decline in  
378 species richness with proximity to the city centre (Horsák et al. 2009), but rather as a clear change in species  
379 composition through selection/adaptation to different ecological conditions, presumably after passive human-mediated  
380 dispersal.

381 This significant environmental effect, reflecting niche processes as well as environmental filtering, is an interesting  
382 result since a strong spatially independent environmental constraint has never previously been detected for organisms  
383 limited by low dispersal within the urban matrix. This finding suggests the effect of human-mediated transport in  
384 enhancing the dispersal capacity of organisms normally considered to have low mobility. However, the snails would not  
385 become established in the absence of suitable microhabitat conditions. In particular, two urban environmental variables  
386 were the main constraints shaping urban land snail communities, namely vegetation cover and distance from the city  
387 centre. The detection of a pure spatially independent environmental effect has important conservation implications  
388 which go beyond the analysis of a single taxonomic group: irrespective of study area position, sampling in different  
389 cities would presumably show similar species assemblages explained by exactly the same dataset of environmental  
390 variables.

391

392

## 393 **Conclusion**

394

395 In conclusion, urban environments can show high land snail richness, like natural areas; species richness does not show  
396 a clear inverse trend in relation to urbanization of habitats, but rather a homogeneous pattern. While parks prove to be  
397 real islands of biodiversity inside the urban patchwork in terms of species composition, only urban environments such  
398 as old city walls provide ideal environments for many specialist species with particular ecological requirements (i.e.  
399 carbonate rocks, shaded walls rich in calcium and moist refuges).

400 Although the transect we studied was only 100 km, the gradient explained an higher amount of variation to that  
401 obtained by Lososová et al. (2011) and Chytrý et al. (2012) with transects of more than 1200 km in central Europe. In  
402 addition to demonstrate the wealth of diversity patterns offered by the Mediterranean area and especially the Italian  
403 peninsula, this finding furnishes a proof of the necessity of combining traditional visual search with debris and leaf litter  
404 collection. Indeed, leaf litter collections allowed quantification of small and micro-snails.

405 City study areas host rather heterogeneous species assemblages where biotic homogenization seems very low: only  
406 three out of 53 species were true alien species (*Paralaoma servilis*, *Marmorana serpentina* and *Deroceras invadens*).

407        After detecting and removing the influence of spatial structures, the effect of urban gradient turned out to be the  
408 principal component structuring urban land snail assemblages. In particular, “Distance from the city centre” and  
409 “Vegetation cover” were the environmental variables that explained most of the variation in species composition. This  
410 finding shows the importance of environmental factors, possibly because of a combination of niche and environmental  
411 filtering at local level for organisms with low mobility, which are usually structured by spatial constraints. It also  
412 suggests new urban scenarios with major ecological and conservation implications for other invertebrate groups: inside  
413 this complex urban matrix, even intensively managed habitats could support particular assemblages as results of unique  
414 interactions between species and environment at local scale. This provides guidance for managers to set priorities in  
415 management strategies that include habitat conservation at local scale.  
416

417 **References**

- 418
- 419
- 420 Angold PG, Sadler JP, Hill MO, Pullin A, Rushton S, Austin K, Small E, Wood B, Wadsworth R, Sanderson R, Thompson K (2006)
- 421 Biodiversity in urban habitat patches. *Sci Total Environ* 360(1):196–204. doi:[10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.08.035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.08.035)
- 422 Aronson MF, La Sorte FA, Nilon CH, Katti M, Goddard MA, Lepczyk CA, Warren PS, Williams NSG, Cilliers S, Clarkson B,
- 423 Dobbs C, Dolan R, Hedblom M, Klotz S, Louwe Kooijmans J, Kühn I, MacGregor-Fors I, McDonnell M, Mörtberg U, Pyšek P,
- 424 Siebert S, Sushinsky J, Werner P, Winter M (2014) A global analysis of the impacts of urbanization on bird and plant diversity
- 425 reveals key anthropogenic drivers. *P Roy Soc Lond B Bio* 281(1780):20133330. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.3330
- 426 Astorga A, Oksanen J, Luoto M, Soininen J, Virtanen R, Muotka T (2012) Distance decay of similarity in freshwater communities:
- 427 do macro-and microorganisms follow the same rules? *Global Ecol Biogeogr* 21(3):365–375. doi:10.1111/j.1466-
- 428 8238.2011.00681.x
- 429 Baldock KC, Goddard MA, Hicks DM, Kunin WE, Mitschunas N, Osgathorpe LM, Potts SG, Robertson KM, Scott AV, Stone GN,
- 430 Vaughan IP, Memmott J (2015) Where is the UK's pollinator biodiversity? The importance of urban areas for flower-visiting
- 431 insects. *P Roy Soc Lond B Bio* 282(1803):20142849. doi:10.1098/rspb.2014.2849
- 432 Barratt BI, Dickinson KJ, Freeman C, Porter S, Johnstone PD, Wing J, Heezik Y (2015) Biodiversity of Coleoptera and other
- 433 invertebrates in urban gardens: a case study in a New Zealand city. *Insect Conserv Diver* 8(5):428–437. doi:10.1111/icad.12120
- 434 Baselga A (2010) Partitioning the turnover and nestedness components of beta diversity. *Global Ecol Biogeogr* 19(1):134–143. doi:
- 435 10.1111/j.1466-8238.2009.00490.x
- 436 Baselga A, Jiménez-Valverde A, Niccolini G (2007) A multiple-site similarity measure independent of richness. *Biol Letters*
- 437 3(6):642–645. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2007.0449
- 438 Baur A, Baur B (1993) Daily movement patterns and dispersal in the land snail *Arianta arbustorum*. *Malacologia* 35:89–98
- 439 Bell G (2000) The distribution of abundance in neutral communities. *Am Nat* 155(5):606–617. doi:10.1086/303345
- 440 Beninde J, Veith M, Hochkirch A (2015) Biodiversity in cities needs space: a meta-analysis of factors determining intra-urban
- 441 biodiversity variation. *Ecol Lett* 18(6):581–592. doi:10.1111/ele.12427
- 442 Benocci A, Bacaro G, Manganelli G (2015) Local and regional scale biodiversity patterns of forest snail assemblages in Tuscany
- 443 (central Italy). *Community Ecol* 16(2):147–155. doi:[10.1556/168.2015.16.2.2](https://doi.org/10.1556/168.2015.16.2.2)
- 444 Beumer C, Martens P (2015) Biodiversity in my (back) yard: towards a framework for citizen engagement in exploring biodiversity
- 445 and ecosystem services in residential gardens. *Sustain Sci* 10(1):87–100. doi:10.1007/s11625-014-0270-8
- 446 Borcard D, Legendre P (2002) All-scale spatial analysis of ecological data by means of principal coordinates of neighbour matrices.
- 447 *Ecol Model* 153:51–68. doi:[10.1016/S0304-3800\(01\)00501-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3800(01)00501-4)
- 448 Borcard D, Legendre P, Avois-Jacquet C, Tuomisto H (2004) Dissecting the spatial structure of ecological data at multiple scales.
- 449 *Ecology* 85:1826–1832. doi: 10.1890/03-3111
- 450 Borcard D, Legendre P, Drapeau P (1992) Partialling out the spatial component of ecological variation. *Ecology* 73(3):1045–1055.
- 451 doi:10.2307/1940179
- 452 Cadenasso ML, Pickett ST, Schwarz K (2007) Spatial heterogeneity in urban ecosystems: reconceptualizing land cover and a
- 453 framework for classification. *Front Ecol Environ* 5(2):80–88. doi:[10.1890/1540-](https://doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295%282007%295%5b80%3A%5d2.0.CO%3E2)
- 454 [9295%282007%295%5b80%3A%5d2.0.CO:2](https://doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295%282007%295%5b80%3A%5d2.0.CO%3E2)
- 455 Cameron RAD, Pokryszko BM (2005) Estimating the species richness and composition of land mollusc communities: problems,
- 456 consequences and practical advice. *J Conchol* 38:529–547
- 457 Carrus G, Scopelliti M, Laforteza R, Colangelo G, Ferrini F, Salbitano F, Agrimi M, Portoghesi L, Semenzato P, Sanesi G (2015)
- 458 Go greener, feel better? The positive effects of biodiversity on the well-being of individuals visiting urban and peri-urban green
- 459 areas. *Landscape Urban Plan* 134:221–228. doi:[10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.10.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.10.022)
- 460 Caruso T, Chan Y, Lacap DC, Lau MC, McKay CP, Pointing SB (2011) Stochastic and deterministic processes interact in the
- 461 assembly of desert microbial communities on a global scale. *ISME J* 5(9):1406–1413. doi:10.1038/ismej.2011.21
- 462 Caruso T, Taormina M, Migliorini M (2012) Relative role of deterministic and stochastic determinants of soil animal community: a
- 463 spatially explicit analysis of oribatid mites. *J Anim Ecol* 81(1): 214–221. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01886.x
- 464 Chao A (1987) Estimating the population size for capture-recapture data with unequal catchability. *Biometrics* 43: 783–791.
- 465 doi:10.2307/2531532
- 466 Chytrý M, Lososová Z, Horská M, Uher B, Čejka T, Danihelka J, Fajmon K, Hájek O, Juříčková L, Kintrová Láníková D, Otýpková
- 467 Z, Řehořek V, Tichý L (2012) Dispersal limitation is stronger in communities of microorganisms than macroorganisms across
- 468 Central European cities. *J Biogeogr* 39(6):1101–1111. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02664.x
- 469 Cuttelod A, García N, Abdul Malak D, Temple H, Katariya V (2008) The Mediterranean: a biodiversity hotspot under threat. In: J.-C.
- 470 Vié, C. Hilton-Taylor and S.N. Stuart (eds). *The 2008 Review of The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*. IUCN Gland,
- 471 Switzerland
- 472 Cuttelod A, Seddon M, Neubert E (2011) *European Red List of Non-marine Molluscs*. Publications Office of the European Union,
- 473 Luxembourg. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/RL-4-014.pdf>. Accessed 16 June 2016

474 Czech B, Krausman PR, Devers PK (2000) Economic Associations among Causes of Species Endangerment in the United States  
475 Associations reflect the integration of economic sectors, supporting the theory and evidence that economic growth proceeds at  
476 the competitive exclusion of nonhuman species in the aggregate. *BioScience* 50(7):593-601. doi:10.1641/0006-  
477 3568(2000)050[0593:E

478 Dedov I, Penev L (2004) Spatial variation in terrestrial gastropod communities (Gastropoda, Pulmonata) along urban-rural gradients  
479 in Sofia City, Bulgaria. In: Penev L, Niemelä J, Kotze J, Chipev N (eds) *Ecology of the city of Sofia. Species and communities*  
480 *in an urban environment*. Pensoft Publishers, Moscow, pp 307–318

481 Douglas DD (2011) Land snail species diversity and composition between different forest disturbance regimes in central and eastern  
482 Kentucky Forests. Dissertation, Eastern Kentucky University

483 Douglas DD, Brown DR, Pederson N (2013) Land snail diversity can reflect degrees of anthropogenic disturbance. *Ecosphere*, 4(2)  
484 art28. doi:10.1890/ES12-00361.1

485 Dray S, Legendre P, Peres-Neto PR (2006) Spatial modelling: a comprehensive framework for principal coordinate analysis of  
486 neighbour matrices (PCNM). *Ecol Model* 196(3):483–493. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2006.02.015

487 Duarte LD, Prieto PV, Pillar VD (2012) Assessing spatial and environmental drivers of phylogenetic structure in Brazilian Araucaria  
488 forests. *Ecography* 35(10):952-960. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.2011.07193.x

489 Ferenc M, Sedláček O, Fuchs R, Dinetti M, Fraissinet M, Storch D (2014) Are cities different? Patterns of species richness and beta  
490 diversity of urban bird communities and regional species assemblages in Europe. *Global Ecol Biogeogr* 23(4):479–489.  
491 doi:10.1111/geb.12130

492 Fiorentino V, Caruso T, Manganelli G, Giusti F (2009) Population dynamics of an urban population of the land snail *Marmorana*  
493 *serpentina* (Gastropoda: Pulmonata). *Malacologia* 51(1):01–209. doi:10.4002/040.051.0116

494 Fuller RA, Irvine KN, Devine-Wright P, Warren PH, Gaston KJ (2007) Psychological benefits of greenspace increase with  
495 biodiversity. *Biol Letters* 3(4):390–394. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2007.0149

496 Grimm NB, Faeth SH, Golubiewski NE, Redman CL, Wu J, Bai X, Briggs JM (2008) Global change and the ecology of cities.  
497 *Science* 319:756–760. doi:10.1126/science.1150195

498 Güneralp B, Seto KC (2013) Futures of global urban expansion: uncertainties and implications for biodiversity conservation. *Environ*  
499 *Res Lett* 8(1):014025. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/014025

500 Hahs AK, McDonnell MJ, McCarthy MA, Vesik PA, Corlett RT, Norton BA, Clemants SE, Duncan RP, Thompson K, Shwartz MW,  
501 Williams NS (2009) A global synthesis of plant extinction rates in urban areas. *Ecol Lett* 12(11):1165-1173.  
502 doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2009.01372.x

503 Hájek M, Roleček J, Cottenie K, Kintrová K., Horsák M., Pouličková, A., Hájková P, Fránková, Dítě, D. (2011) Environmental and  
504 spatial controls of biotic assemblages in a discrete semi-terrestrial habitat: comparison of organisms with different dispersal  
505 abilities sampled in the same plots. *J Biogeogr* 38(9):1683–1693. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02503.x

506 Hartop EA, Brown BV, Disney RHL (2015) Opportunity in our Ignorance: Urban Biodiversity Study Reveals 30 New Species and  
507 One New Nearctic Record for *Megaselia* (Diptera: Phoridae) in Los Angeles (California, USA). *Zootaxa* 3941(4):451–484.  
508 doi:10.11646/zootaxa.3941.4.1

509 Heino J (2013) Does dispersal ability affect the relative importance of environmental control and spatial structuring of littoral  
510 macroinvertebrate communities? *Oecologia* 171(4):971–980. doi:10.1007/s00442-012-2451-4

511 Horsák M, Juříčková L, Kintrová K, Hájek O (2009) Patterns of land snail diversity over a gradient of habitat degradation: a  
512 comparison of three Czech cities. *Biodivers Conserv*. doi: 18:3453–3466. 10.1007/s10531-009-9654-y

513 Hubbell SP (2001) *The unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography (MPB-32)* (Vol. 32). Princeton University Press

514 Ingimarsdóttir M, Caruso T, Ripa J, Magnúsdóttir ÓB, Migliorini M, Hedlund K (2012) Primary assembly of soil communities:  
515 disentangling the effect of dispersal and local environment. *Oecologia* 170(3):745–754. doi:10.1007/s00442-012-2334-8

516 La Sorte FA, McKinney ML, Pyšek P (2007) Compositional similarity among urban floras within and across continents:  
517 biogeographical consequences of human-mediated biotic interchange. *Glob Change Biol* 13:913–921. doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
518 2486.2007.01329.x

519 Legendre P, Fortin MJ (1989) Spatial pattern and ecological analysis. *Vegetatio* 80(2):107–138. doi:10.1007/BF00048036

520 Legendre P, Legendre L (1998) *Numerical Ecology*. Elsevier, Amsterdam.

521 Legendre P, Mi X, Ren H, Ma K, Yu M, Sun IF, He F (2009) Partitioning beta diversity in a subtropical broad-leaved forest of China.  
522 *Ecology* 90(3):663–674. doi:10.1890/07-1880.1

523 Lockwood JL (2004) How do biological invasions alter diversity patterns? In: Lomolino MV, Heaney LR (eds) *Frontiers of*  
524 *Biogeography: New Directions in the Geography of Nature*, Sinauer, Sunderland, MA, pp 297–309

525 Lososová Z, Horsák M, Chytrý M, Čejka T, Danihelka J, Fajmon K, Hájek O, Juříčková L, Kintrová K, Láníková D, Otýpková Z,  
526 Řehořek V, Tichý L (2011) Diversity of Central European urban biota: effects of human-made habitat types on plants and land  
527 snails. *J Biogeogr* 38:1152–1163. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02475.x

528 Lydeard C, Cowie RH, Ponder WF, Bogan AE, Bouchet P, Clark SA, Cumming KS, Frest TJ, Gargominy O, Herbert DG, Hershler  
529 R, Perez KE, Roth B, Seddon M, Strong E, Thompson FG (2004) The global decline of nonmarine mollusks. *BioScience*  
530 54(4):321–330. doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2004)054[0321:T

531 Mänd R, Tilgar V, Leivits A (2000) Calcium, snails, and birds: a case study. *Web Ecology* 1(1):63–69. doi:10.5194/we-1-63-2000

532 Manganelli G, Benocci A, Giusti F (2014) Chioccioline e lumache dell' Arcipelago Toscano. I Quaderni del Parco, volume 4.

533 Manganelli G, Bodon M, Favilli L, Giusti F (1995) Gastropoda Pulmonata. In: A. Minelli, S. Ruffo and S. La Posta (eds), Checklist

534 delle specie della fauna d'Italia, 16. Edizioni Calderini, Bologna, pp 1–60

535 Martiny JBH, Bohannan BJ, Brown JH, Colwell RK, Fuhrman JA, Green JL, Horner-Devine MC, Kane M, Adams Krumins J, Ruske

536 CR, Morin PJ, Naeem S, Øvreås L, Reysenbach A, Smith VH, Staley JT (2006) Microbial biogeography: putting

537 microorganisms on the map. *Nat Rev Microbiol* 4(2):102–112. doi:10.1038/nrmicro1341

538 Maurer U, Peschel T, Schmitz S (2000) The flora of selected urban land-use types in Berlin and Potsdam with regard to nature

539 conservation in cities. *Landscape Urban Plan* 46(4):209–215. doi:10.1016/S0169-2046(99)00066-3

540 McKinney ML (2002) Urbanization, Biodiversity, and Conservation The impacts of urbanization on native species are poorly studied,

541 but educating a highly urbanized human population about these impacts can greatly improve species conservation in all

542 ecosystems. *BioScience* 52(10):883–890. doi:10.1641/0006-3568(2002)052[0883:UBA

543 McKinney ML (2006) Urbanization as a major cause of biotic homogenization. *Biol Conserv* 127(3):247–260.

544 doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2005.09.005

545 McKinney ML (2008) Effects of urbanization on species richness: a review of plants and animals. *Urban Ecosyst* 11(2):161–176.

546 doi:10.1007/s11252-007-0045-4

547 Menez A (2007) A new approach to studying and sampling land molluscs: habitat structure and the effects of scale on land molluscs.

548 *J Conchol* 39:321–327

549 Mimouni EA, Pinel-Alloul B, Beisner BE (2015) Assessing aquatic biodiversity of zooplankton communities in an urban landscape.

550 *Urban Ecosyst* 18(4):1353–1372. doi:10.1007/s11252-015-0457-5

551 Mitchell R, Popham F (2008) Effect of exposure to natural environment on health inequalities: an observational population study.

552 *The Lancet*, 372(9650):1655–1660. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61689-X

553 Oksanen J, Blanchet FG, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin PR, O'Hara RB, Simpson GL, Solymos P, Stevens MHH, Wagner HH (2016)

554 vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.3-3. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>

555 Ožgo M, Örstan A, Kirschenstein M, Cameron R (2016) Dispersal of land snails by sea storms. *J Mollus Stud* 82(2):341–343.

556 doi:10.1093/mollus/eyv060

557 Padiál AA, Ceschin F, Declerck SA, De Meester L, Bonecker CC, Lansac-Tôha FA, Rodrigues LC, Train S, Velho LFM, Bini LM

558 (2014) Dispersal ability determines the role of environmental, spatial and temporal drivers of metacommunity structure. *PLoS*

559 *one*, 9(10):e111227. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0111227

560 Pauget B, Gimbert F, Coeurdassier M, Crini N, Pérès G, Faure O, Douay F, Richard A, Grand C, de Vaufléury A (2013) Assessing

561 the in situ bioavailability of trace elements to snails using accumulation kinetics. *Ecol Indic* 34:126–135.

562 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2013.04.018

563 Paul MJ, Meyer JL (2008) Streams in the urban landscape. In: [Marzluff JM](#), [Shulenberg E](#), [Endlicher W](#), [Alberti M](#), [Bradley G](#),

564 [Ryan C](#), [Simon U](#), [ZumBrunnen C](#) (eds) *Urban ecology* Springer, US, pp. 207–231

565 Peres-Neto PR, Legendre P, Dray S, Borcard D (2006) Variation partitioning of species data matrices: estimation and comparison of

566 fractions. *Ecology* 87(10):2614–2625. doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[2614:VPOSDM]2.0.CO;2

567 Rádková V, J. Bojková V, Křoupalová J, Schenková V, Syrovátka, Horsák M (2014) The role of dispersal mode and habitat

568 specialization in metacommunity structuring of aquatic macroinvertebrates at isolated spring fens. *Freshwater Biol* 59:2256–

569 2267. doi:10.1111/fwb.12428

570 Rangel TFL, Diniz-Filho JAF, Bini LM (2006) Towards an integrated computational tool for spatial analysis in macroecology and

571 biogeography. *Glob Ecol Biogeogr* 15(4):321–327. doi:10.1111/j.1466-822X.2006.00237.x

572 Régnier C, Fontaine B, Bouchet P (2009) Not knowing, not recording, not listing: numerous unnoticed mollusk extinctions. *Conserv*

573 *Biol* 23(5):1214–1221. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01245.x

574 Reise H, Hutchinson J, Schunack S, Schlitt B (2011) *Deroceras panormitanum* and congeners from Malta and Sicily, with a

575 redescription of the widespread pest slug as *Deroceras invadens* n. sp. *Folia Malacol* 19(4):201. doi:10.2478/v10125-011-

576 0028-1

577 Rota E, Barbato D, Ancora S, Bianchi N, Bargagli R (2016) *Papillifera papillaris* (O.F. Müller), a small snail living on stones and

578 monuments, as indicator of metal deposition and bioavailability in urban environments. *Ecol Indic* 69: 360–367

579 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.04.024

580 RStudio Team (2015) RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA URL <http://www.rstudio.com/>

581 Sattler T, Borcard D, Arlettaz R, Bontadina F, Legendre P, Obrist MK, Moretti M (2010) Spider, bee, and bird communities in cities

582 are shaped by environmental control and high stochasticity. *Ecology* 91(11):3343–3353. doi:10.1890/09-1810.1

583 Seddon MB (1998) Red Listing for Molluscs: a tool for Conservation? *J Conchol* (2):27–44.

584 Taylor L, Hochuli DF (2015) Creating better cities: how biodiversity and ecosystem functioning enhance urban residents' wellbeing.

585 *Urban Ecosyst* 18(3):747–762. doi:10.1007/s11252-014-0427-3

586 ter Braak CJ (1986) Canonical correspondence analysis: a new eigenvector technique for multivariate direct gradient analysis.

587 *Ecology* 67(5):1167–1179. doi:10.2307/1938672



588 United Nations (2014) World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision. United Nations Department of Economic and Social  
589 Affairs/Population Division, (ST/ESA/SER.A/352)  
590 United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (2005) Ecosystems and Biodiversity The Role of Cities.  
591 <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wup/Publications/Files/WUP2014-Report.pdf>. Accessed 20 June 2016  
592 Viviani VR (2001) Fireflies (Coleoptera: Lampyridae) from Southeastern Brazil: habitats, life history, and bioluminescence. Ann  
593 Entomol Soc Am 94(1):129–145. doi:[10.1603/0013-8746\(2001\)094\[0129:FCLFSB\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1603/0013-8746(2001)094[0129:FCLFSB]2.0.CO;2)  
594 Wang Y, Fu X, Lei C, Jeng ML, Nobuyoshi O (2007) Biological Characteristics of the Terrestrial Firefly *Pyrocoelia pectoralis*  
595 (Coleoptera: Lampyridae). Coleopta Bull 61(1):85–93  
596 Williams NS, Schwartz MW, Vesik PA, McCarthy MA, Hahs AK, Clemants SE, Corlett RT, Duncan RP, Norton BA, Thompson K,  
597 McDonnell MJ (2009) A conceptual framework for predicting the effects of urban environments on floras. J Ecol 97(1):4–9.  
598 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2008.01460.x  
599 Zhai M, Nováček O, Výravský D, Srovátka V, Bojková J, Helešic J (2015) Environmental and spatial control of ostracod  
600 assemblages in the Western Carpathian spring fens. Hydrobiologia 745(1):225–239. doi:10.1007/s10750-014-2104-1  
601

602 **Table captions**

603  
604 **Table 1** Land snail species in three cities (Grosseto, Siena, Arezzo) and total number of species in each urban area

605  
606 **Table 2** Summary of variation partitioning constituents for urban land snails obtained by partial RDAs with environmental and  
607 spatial data as predictors

608

609

610 **Figure captions**

611  
612 **Fig. 1** Map of study area and location of sampling sites (red dots) in each city

613

614 **Fig. 2**  $\alpha$  diversity (species richness per site, box and whiskers) and  $\gamma$  diversity (total number of species, numbers outside box and  
615 whiskers) in habitat types (a, on the left) and cities (b, on the right). Different letters denote significant differences between groups  
616 (ANOVA with Bonferroni p-value adjustment,  $p < 0.05$ )

617

618 **Fig. 3** Box plots of Simpson  $\beta$  diversity in habitat types (a, on the left) and cities (b, on the right). Different letters denote significant  
619 differences between groups (ANOVA with Bonferroni p-value adjustment,  $p < 0.05$ )

620

621 **Fig. 4** Bar plots of  $\gamma$  diversity in habitat types (a, on the left) and cities (b, on the right) showing the minimum estimated richness  
622 Chao2 and its standard error Chao.se

623

624 **Fig. 5** Ordination plots of RDA showing the pure effect of environmental variables (arrows in blue) shaping land snail communities.  
625 Above the entire ordination diagram while below we zoomed in to focus on a section of the ordination plot. The species numbers (s1,  
626 s2, ..., s53) match the numerical order in Table 1, while row numbers (row1, row2, ...row24) match the 24 sampling sites. Ellipses  
627 show the 95% confidence intervals associated with each habitat type

628

629

630