PRIMARY RESEARCH PAPER

# Spatial and temporal community structure of desmids on a small spatial scale

Pavel Svoboda · Jana Kulichová · Jan Šťastný

Received: 26 June 2013/Revised: 25 September 2013/Accepted: 5 October 2013/Published online: 26 October 2013 © Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

Abstract Besides spatial heterogeneity, another important component of the diversity of protist communities is the variation in species assemblages through time. Despite its importance, temporal turnover of benthic communities has been studied to a lesser extent than spatial heterogeneity has. In this study, we examine the desmid assemblages on small spatial scale in relation to the spatial, temporal, and environmental parameters. The samples were collected within two different types of peatland localities in the Czech Republic over 3 years. The differences in species composition between samples were mainly correlated with the geographic distance, while the effects of the environmental and temporal variables were much weaker. Since the spatial heterogeneity of the assemblages was not induced by the variation of the environmental factors or by the restricted dispersal ability at such a small spatial scale, we assume that both the temporal stability and strong spatial autocorrelation might have been the result of a priority effect,

Handling editor: Judit Padisak

**Electronic supplementary material** The online version of this article (doi:10.1007/s10750-013-1713-4) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

e-mail: p.svoboda@natur.cuni.cz

with subsequent monopolization of resources. Stochasticity in colonization can introduce noise into the match between community composition and environmental conditions, which may result in stronger effect of the spatial parameters on the community structure.

**Keywords** Community structure · Desmids · Microphytobenthos · Monopolization · Temporal turnover · Spatial heterogeneity

## Introduction

Natural communities are variable in space and time, and an understanding of these dynamics represents one of ecology's greatest challenges. In particular, knowledge of the spatio-temporal structure of assemblages underlies the understanding of such ecological processes as colonization, succession, niche differentiation, and competition (Ricklefs & Schluter, 1993). Moreover, identifying the spatio-temporal pattern of species composition in water ecosystems is crucial for the evaluation of their biodiversity, as well as the formulation of appropriate conservation strategies (Coleman, 2002). Therefore, spatial (and to a lesser extent also temporal) analyses have recently become a rapidly growing field in aquatic ecology (Steinbauer et al., 2012).

At various spatial scales, different factors appeared to reflect the heterogeneity of the phytobenthic communities (Soininen, 2007). On the small spatial

P. Svoboda (⊠) · J. Kulichová · J. Šťastný Department of Botany, Faculty of Science, Charles University in Prague, Benátská 2, Prague 128 01, Czech Republic

scale (centimeters to meters), a stronger effect of the geographic distance, compared to the effects of environmental parameters, is usually attributed to the environmental relatively homogeneous factors between microsites (Černá, 2010). Community patchiness is often ascribed to the local biotic processes such as colonization, intensity of grazing, niche differentiation, and extinction (Saburova et al., 1995; Rindi & Cinelli, 2000; Benedetti-Cecchi, 2001; Coleman, 2003; Machová-Černá & Neustupa, 2009). On the large spatial scale (kilometers and greater), geographical distance as well as physicochemical factors often play a similar role in structuring benthic algal assemblages in freshwater ecosystems (Potapova & Charles, 2002; Soininen et al., 2004; Charles et al., 2006). Despite the fact that protists are generally considered as good passive dispersers (i.e., the wellknown ubiquity model; Becking, 1934; Finlay & Clarke, 1999), several recent studies have demonstrated the limited dispersal ability of various protists groups at large distances (reviewed by Foissner, 2006). Therefore, the spatial autocorrelation in community composition may be associated with broadscale historical or evolutionary factors and/or with a restricted dispersal ability (Telford et al., 2006; Soininen, 2007).

However, variation in the species community structure, in relation to the spatial scale, is only one aspect of diversity. The other important component is the temporal turnover (MacArthur & Wilson, 1963; Korhonen et al., 2010). A survey conducted for an extended period of time at one locality is not only very important for the detection of seasonal dynamics, but also for the pertinent detection of  $\alpha$ diversity of the microorganisms. Many microorganisms may only occur at certain times of year, and may therefore be easily overlooked during a onetime sampling; resulting in an underestimation of species diversity at that particular locality (Zalack et al., 2006). However, despite its importance, temporal variability of benthic communities is studied to a lesser extent in comparison with studies on plankton (Micheli et al., 1999; Vadeboncoeur et al., 2002). Some investigations focused on algal assemblages in various benthic freshwater biotopes described seasonal changes in primary production (O'Reilly, 2006; Kolayli & Sahin, 2009), diversity, and species composition (Ledger & Hildrew, 1998; Aberle & Wiltshire, 2006; Machová-Černá & Neustupa, 2009; Špačková et al., 2009). These seasonal changes in community structure may be induced by the changes in water temperature (Špačková et al., 2009), fluctuations of nutrient content (Talling & Parker, 2002; Aberle & Wiltshire, 2006; Zalack et al., 2006), variations of light intensity (Keithan & Lowe, 1985; Ledger & Hildrew, 1998), and disturbances such as seasonal drying events (Gell et al., 2002; Lane et al., 2009) or freezing (Machová-Černá & Neustupa, 2009).

Desmids (Zygnematophyceae, Streptophyta) belong to the most common and often dominant phytobenthic groups, particularly in oligotrophic and slightly acidic freshwater habitats (Coesel & Meesters, 2007), where they might play an important role in substrate stabilization, and serve as an important nutritional source for heterotrophs (Domozych & Domozych, 2008). Due to the fact that they are frequently used as bioindicators for the environmental monitoring of freshwater wetlands (Coesel, 2001; Krasznai et al., 2008), knowledge of the spatial and temporal changes in their community structure is essential for developing a reliable algalbased bioassessment methodology. Moreover, the detection of their diversity is also crucial for formulation of appropriate conservation strategies; for example, the method for assessing the nature conservation value (NCV), developed by Coesel (2001). However, there are still only a few papers which have investigated the significance of both the spatio-temporal variability in desmid assemblages and the factors affecting their diversity (Machová-Černá & Neustupa, 2009; Neustupa et al., 2012).

The purpose of this study was to describe and examine the patterns of distribution and diversity within desmid assemblages in relation to the spatial, temporal, and environmental parameters from two different peatland types (a minerotrophic lowland fen and an ombrotrophic raised bog). Since desmids respond with sensitivity to the main physicochemical factors (Coesel, 1975, 2001; Šťastný, 2010), we hypothesized that the desmid assemblages would be structured by the environmental variables and also by the spatial distance, as a result of small-scale biotic processes. Second, we assumed a lower species diversity accompanied by changes in species composition in the winter, as a result of disturbances by freezing; followed by its increase through the season, owing to the colonization processes.

### Materials and methods

Two different types of peatland localities were chosen within the Czech Republic for collecting the algal materials: The Swamp Nature Reserve (50°34'33.271"N, 14°40'15.248"E), an oligo-mesotrophic transitional lowland fen; and the Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (50°49′58.304″N, 15°13′52.171″E), an oligotrophic raised bog. The algal material was collected seasonally from autumn 2009 to winter 2012 (Table 1) from nine sampling sites at each locality (three sites within three pools which were from meters to hundreds of meters apart; Supplementary Table 1). Unfortunately, two winter samples were not taken at the raised bog due to conditions unfavorable for sampling (for details, see Table 1). Samples were collected from an area of  $0.25 \text{ m}^2$  by sucking up the algae from the upper layer of the epipelon with a plastic syringe. The samples of algae were fixed with formaldehyde (2% finalconcentration) within 6 h from sampling. At the time of the sampling, pH and conductivity were measured at the sampling sites using a combined pH/conductivity meter WTW 340i (WTW, Germany). The total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) concentrations were measured in the laboratory by a Hach colorimeter DR/890 (Hach total nitrogen kit, method no. 10071; Hach total phosphorus kit, method no. 8190). The temperature was computed as the mean value of the 30 days preceding the sampling date; temperature data were acquired from a publicly available source from the Prague Ruzyně station (http://www.vurv.cz/meteo/default.asp).

Table 1 The seasons and dates of individual sampling events

Season	Date				
	Lowland fen	Raised bog			
Autumn	October, 2009	November, 2009			
Spring	March, 2010	April, 2010			
Summer	July, 2010	July, 2010			
Autumn	November, 2010	November, 2010			
Winter	February, 2011	February, 2011 <sup>a</sup>			
Spring	May, 2011	May, 2011			
Summer	July, 2011	July, 2010			
Autumn	October, 2011	October, 2011			
Winter	February, 2012	April, 2012			

<sup>a</sup> Sampling when we were not able to collect two samples from the raised bog

The fixed algal samples were examined under an Olympus BX 31 light microscope. In total, 200 singlecelled desmids from each sample were identified according to Růžička (1977, 1981), Lenzenweger (1996, 1997, 1999, 2003), and Coesel & Meesters (2007). The missing species data for the winter samples (which we were not able to take at the raised bog) were obtained by calculating the mean abundances from corresponding sampling sites for each species from the other seasons (following the recommendations of Legendre & Legendre, 1998). All species found were used for computing species richness and Shannon diversity index (Shannon & Weaver, 1949). Differences between diversity metrics (e.g., between sampling sites, pools, or seasons) were evaluated using non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis tests with post hoc Mann-Whitney pairwise comparisons (Mann & Whitney, 1947; Kruskal, 1964) in PAST software, ver. 2.17b (Hammer et al., 2001). In order to reduce the influence of rare and dominant species in the multivariate analyses, we adjusted the raw species data. Only species occurring with greater than a 1% relative abundance, or present in three or more samples, were included (Weilhoefer & Pan, 2006). The resulting data set was subsequently square root transformed (McCune & Grace, 2002). All environmental variables (pH, conductivity, TN, TP, and mean temperature) and site coordinates were standardized by subtracting the mean and dividing by the standard deviation (Legendre & Legendre, 1998).

Non-metric multidimensional scaling analyses (NMDS; Kruskal, 1964) were performed to display similarities between sampling sites on the basis of species composition data using PAST software. The Kruskal stress value was used as the measure of goodness of fit in the representation of actual multivariate distances between localities in the resulting NMDS ordination diagram (Kruskal, 1964). The community structure between different groups of samples (sampling sites, pools, and sampling dates) was compared by two-way ANOSIM tests (sites and dates were tested with the pool as a covariate; pools with dates as a covariate). The procedures were carried out in PRIMER 6<sup>®</sup> software (Anderson et al., 2008) with 9,999 permutations. In both statistical methods, we used the Bray-Curtis similarity index (Bray & Curtis, 1957). The Mantel tests (Mantel, 1967; Smouse et al., 1986) were performed for testing the correlations between two distance matrices using zt

software, ver. 1.0 (Bonnet & Van der Peer, 2002). Species composition at the sampling sites (Bray-Curtis similarity index) was tested against: (i) the environmental distances (Euclidean distances of standardized environmental parameters), (ii) the geographic distances (in meters), and (iii) the temporal distances between individual sampling events (in days). We used both the full (two matrices) and the partial (two matrices without the influence of the third matrix) Mantel tests with 10,000 permutations. The correlations were illustrated by the linear regression models performed in R, ver. 2.14.2 (R Development Core Team, 2012). Distance-based linear models (DistLM; Legendre & Anderson, 1999) were used to assess the relative importance of spatial, environmental, and temporal factors on desmid communities (Anderson & Gribble, 1998). The matrix of twogeographic coordinates has been dimensional expanded by adding all terms of the third polynomial, which allows extracting more complex features (e.g., patches or gaps) than just the linear gradient pattern (Borcard et al., 1992). The spatial and environmental factors were first submitted to the DistLM procedure with forward selection of explanatory variables. Adjusted  $R^2$  selection criterion, used in DistLM, allows the selection of variables by sequential testing, and helps to reduce the increase of explained variation, by mere chance, by the retention of redundant parameters in the model (Borcard et al., 1992). The variation partitioning was carried out in PRIMER 6<sup>®</sup> software with adjusted  $R^2$  selection criterion and 9,999 permutations. The percentage of explained variation in species data (Bray-Curtis index) and covariance between spatial (distances in meters), environmental (standardized Euclidean distances), and temporal (a number of days since first sampling) variables were illustrated by Venn diagrams obtained by using R, ver. 2.14.2 and a Venneuler package (Wilkinson, 2012).

The relationship between local population persistence and local abundance (according to Soininen & Heino, 2005) was assessed by the linear correlation analysis in R, ver. 2.14.2. Local population persistence was calculated for each species as the number of seasons with the presence of a particular species at the locality (averaged over the sampling sites); therefore, population persistence expresses the average number of seasons with the species present in the population. All the analyses were performed using both the maximum and mean local abundance of each species at the locality. Mean abundances were calculated as the sum of abundances from all seasons divided by the number of sites with an occurrence of the species, and then were log-transformed to down-weight dominant taxa (Soininen & Heino, 2005).

# Results

In total, 95 species of desmids were determined from 160 samples from both localities and all seasons (Supplementary Table 2); 85 species from the minerotrophic lowland fen, and 25 species from the ombrotrophic raised bog. The difference in the species richness and diversity (Shannon index) clearly reflected the different environmental conditions of both localities, particularly the pH and conductivity values (Table 2). Both the species richness and diversity (mean values from all seasons) were distinctly higher at the lowland fen (species richness = 49.3; diversity = 2.8) than at the raised bog (species richness = 15; diversity = 2.1). The NMDS ordination plots showed noticeable differences in species composition between both the individual pools (Fig. 1) and sampling sites (graph not shown) within the peatlands. The statistical significance of the differences in species composition between all pools and between the majority of individual sampling sites was confirmed by the non-parametric two-way ANOSIM tests (Table 3). Apart from that, all pools at the lowland fen, most of the pools at the raised bog, and most of the individual sampling sites at both localities had significantly different values of species richness and diversity (all Kruskal–Wallis tests: P < 0.001; results of pairwise comparisons not shown). These differences were associated with spatial, rather than environmental, distances according to DistLM analyses and Mantel tests. A strong correlation between spatial distance and similarity in species composition among samples was detected at both localities (Fig. 2). The significance of spatial autocorrelation was also confirmed by the partial Mantel tests (Table 4), with the effect of measured environmental variables controlled for. The similarity in species composition was only correlated with environmental parameters at the lowland fen (Fig. 3), but this effect was much smaller than the effect of geographical distance (Table 4).

Although ANOSIM analysis showed a significant temporal difference in the community structure within

Table 2 Environmental characteristics of the investigated sampling sites through the sampling period

Swamp Nature Reserve (lowland fen)Whole locality $5.0 (\pm 0.1)$ $100.1 (\pm 4.2)$ $3.4 (\pm 0.6)$ $0.14 (\pm 1.2)$ $1-1$ $4.6 (\pm 0.1)$ $91.6 (\pm 14.2)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 1.2)$ $1-2$ $5.5 (\pm 0.1)$ $95.4 (\pm 9.9)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 1.3)$ $1-3$ $5.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $90.6 (\pm 10.0)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 1.3)$ $2-1$ $5.7 (\pm 0.1)$ $96.7 (\pm 10.9)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 1.2)$ $2-2$ $5.8 (\pm 0.1)$ $89.3 (\pm 9.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 1.3)$ $2-3$ $5.3 (\pm 0.2)$ $92.8 (\pm 10.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 1.3)$ $3-1$ $4.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $116.7 (\pm 15.6)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 1.3)$ $3-3$ $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $112.4 (\pm 15.4)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 1.3)$ Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	
Whole locality $5.0 (\pm 0.1)$ $100.1 (\pm 4.2)$ $3.4 (\pm 0.6)$ $0.14 (\pm 0.1)$ $1-1$ $4.6 (\pm 0.1)$ $91.6 (\pm 14.2)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 0.1)$ $1-2$ $5.5 (\pm 0.1)$ $95.4 (\pm 9.9)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 0.1)$ $1-3$ $5.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $90.6 (\pm 10.0)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 0.1)$ $2-1$ $5.7 (\pm 0.1)$ $96.7 (\pm 10.9)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.2)$ $2-2$ $5.8 (\pm 0.1)$ $89.3 (\pm 9.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.3)$ $2-3$ $5.3 (\pm 0.2)$ $92.8 (\pm 10.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.3)$ $3-1$ $4.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $116.7 (\pm 15.6)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 0.3)$ $3-3$ $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $112.4 (\pm 15.4)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 0.3)$ Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	
1-14.6 (±0.1)91.6 (±14.2)2.3 (±1.0)0.17 (±1-25.5 (±0.1)95.4 (±9.9)2.3 (±1.0)0.17 (±1-35.3 (±0.1)90.6 (±10.0)2.3 (±1.0)0.17 (±2-15.7 (±0.1)96.7 (±10.9)3.0 (±1.5)0.18 (±2-25.8 (±0.1)89.3 (±9.5)3.0 (±1.5)0.18 (±2-35.3 (±0.2)92.8 (±10.5)3.0 (±1.5)0.18 (±3-14.3 (±0.1)116.7 (±15.6)5.0 (±2.6)0.07 (±3-24.4 (±0.1)115.4 (±15.7)5.0 (±2.6)0.07 (±Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)5.05.0 (±2.6)0.07 (±	±0.02)
1-2 $5.5 (\pm 0.1)$ $95.4 (\pm 9.9)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 1.3)$ 1-3 $5.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $90.6 (\pm 10.0)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 1.3)$ 2-1 $5.7 (\pm 0.1)$ $96.7 (\pm 10.9)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 1.2)$ 2-2 $5.8 (\pm 0.1)$ $89.3 (\pm 9.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 1.3)$ 2-3 $5.3 (\pm 0.2)$ $92.8 (\pm 10.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 1.3)$ 3-1 $4.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $116.7 (\pm 15.6)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 1.3)$ 3-2 $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $115.4 (\pm 15.7)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 1.3)$ 3-3 $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $112.4 (\pm 15.4)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 1.3)$ Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	$\pm 0.05)$
1-3 $5.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $90.6 (\pm 10.0)$ $2.3 (\pm 1.0)$ $0.17 (\pm 0.1)$ 2-1 $5.7 (\pm 0.1)$ $96.7 (\pm 10.9)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.1)$ 2-2 $5.8 (\pm 0.1)$ $89.3 (\pm 9.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.1)$ 2-3 $5.3 (\pm 0.2)$ $92.8 (\pm 10.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.1)$ 3-1 $4.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $116.7 (\pm 15.6)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 0.1)$ 3-2 $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $115.4 (\pm 15.7)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 0.1)$ 3-3 $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $112.4 (\pm 15.4)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 0.1)$ Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	$\pm 0.05)$
2-1 $5.7 (\pm 0.1)$ $96.7 (\pm 10.9)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.1)$ 2-2 $5.8 (\pm 0.1)$ $89.3 (\pm 9.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.1)$ 2-3 $5.3 (\pm 0.2)$ $92.8 (\pm 10.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 0.1)$ 3-1 $4.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $116.7 (\pm 15.6)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 0.7)$ 3-2 $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $115.4 (\pm 15.7)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 0.7)$ 3-3 $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $112.4 (\pm 15.4)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 0.7)$ Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	$\pm 0.05)$
2-2 $5.8 (\pm 0.1)$ $89.3 (\pm 9.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 2.3)$ 2-3 $5.3 (\pm 0.2)$ $92.8 (\pm 10.5)$ $3.0 (\pm 1.5)$ $0.18 (\pm 2.3)$ 3-1 $4.3 (\pm 0.1)$ $116.7 (\pm 15.6)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 2.6)$ 3-2 $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $115.4 (\pm 15.7)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 2.6)$ 3-3 $4.4 (\pm 0.1)$ $112.4 (\pm 15.4)$ $5.0 (\pm 2.6)$ $0.07 (\pm 2.6)$ Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	$\pm 0.06)$
2-3       5.3 (±0.2)       92.8 (±10.5)       3.0 (±1.5)       0.18 (±         3-1       4.3 (±0.1)       116.7 (±15.6)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±         3-2       4.4 (±0.1)       115.4 (±15.7)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±         3-3       4.4 (±0.1)       112.4 (±15.4)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±         Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	$\pm 0.06)$
3-1       4.3 (±0.1)       116.7 (±15.6)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±15.6)         3-2       4.4 (±0.1)       115.4 (±15.7)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±15.6)         3-3       4.4 (±0.1)       112.4 (±15.4)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±15.6)         Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	$\pm 0.06)$
3-2       4.4 (±0.1)       115.4 (±15.7)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±         3-3       4.4 (±0.1)       112.4 (±15.4)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±         Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	±0.03)
3-3       4.4 (±0.1)       112.4 (±15.4)       5.0 (±2.6)       0.07 (±0.7)         Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)       5.0 (±0.7)       5.0 (±0.7)       5.0 (±0.7)	±0.03)
Na Čihadle Nature Reserve (raised bog)	±0.03)
Whole locality $4.4 (\pm 0.0)$ $15.3 (\pm 0.5)$ $7.0 (\pm 0.7)$ $0.12 (\pm 0.7)$	±0.01)
1-1 4.6 (±0.1) 15.0 (±1.9) 9.1 (±2.7) 0.10 (±	±0.03)
1-2 4.6 (±0.1) 11.8 (±1.2) 8.9 (±3.0) 0.10 (=	±0.03)
1-3 4.5 (±0.1) 16.1 (±1.6) 9.1 (±2.7) 0.10 (=	±0.03)
2-1 4.3 (±0.0) 15.6 (±1.8) 7.5 (±1.8) 0.10 (=	$\pm 0.02)$
2-2 4.3 (±0.0) 18.8 (±1.7) 7.5 (±1.8) 0.10 (=	$\pm 0.02)$
2-3 4.3 (±0.1) 17.8 (±1.5) 7.5 (±1.8) 0.10 (=	$\pm 0.02)$
3-1       4.4 (±0.0)       16.0 (±2.0)       4.5 (±1.1)       0.16 (±0.0)	$\pm 0.05)$
3-2 4.5 (±0.1) 13.1 (±0.7) 4.5 (±1.1) 0.16 (=	$\pm 0.05)$
3-3       4.4 (±0.1)       13.5 (±0.9)       4.7 (±1.2)       0.16 (=	$\pm 0.05)$

Data are expressed as mean values calculated from all samplings (±standard error)

TN total nitrogen, TP total phosphorus

**Fig. 1** The NMDS ordination plot of samples from individual pools within the lowland fen (**a**) and the raised bog (**b**), based on their species composition. The *crosses* correspond to pool 1, the *squares* to pool 2, and the *diamonds* to pool 3. The  $R^2$  values determine the proportion of variance accounted for by the ordination procedure



samples from the raised bog (R = 0.12, P < 0.05), the overall significance was mostly caused by the differences of samples from autumn 2011 and winter 2012, including some samples from previous seasons (Table 5). In addition, seasonal changes in species

composition were not apparent in the NMDS ordination plot (Fig. 4) and the diversity of the desmid assemblages (Shannon diversity index) did not significantly differ between individual seasons (Fig. 5). Moreover, the Mantel tests (Table 4) showed that the

 Table 3 Comparisons of species composition structure

 between pools and individual sampling sites within pools,

 calculated through the use of two-way ANOSIM tests

	Lowland fen	Raised bog
Pools		
Global test	0.93***	0.71***
$1 \times 2$	0.75***	1.00***
$1 \times 3$	0.96***	0.44***
$2 \times 3$	1.00***	0.54***
Sampling sites		
Global test	0.58***	0.40***
$1-1 \times 1-2$	1.00***	0.11 <sup>n.s.</sup>
1-1 × 1-3	1.00***	0.51***
$1-2 \times 1-3$	0.99***	0.51***
2-1 × 2-2	0.18*	0.12 <sup>n.s.</sup>
2-1 × 2-3	0.85***	0.18*
$2-2 \times 2-3$	0.59***	0.11 <sup>n.s.</sup>
3-1 × 3-2	0.03 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.96***
3-1 × 3-3	0.26**	0.96***
3-2 × 3-3	0.38***	0.28***

Values of R statistics and P values are represented \*\*\* P < 0.001, \*\* P < 0.01, \* P < 0.05, <sup>n.s.</sup> P > 0.05

correlation between similarity in species composition and temporal distance was insignificant. Local population persistence of epipelic desmids during the sampling period showed a significant positive relationship with both the maximum abundances (the lowland fen: r = 0.747; the raised bog: r = 0.835; P < 0.001; Fig. 6) and the mean abundances (the

Hydrobiologia (2014) 722:291-303

lowland fen: r = 0.682; the raised bog: r = 0.734; P < 0.001; graph not shown) at both localities.

Congruent with previous analyses, the largest proportion of variability in species composition was explained by the positions of the sampling sites within the peatlands (Fig. 7); 47.5% (P < 0.001) of variance at the lowland fen, and 58.4% (P < 0.001) at the raised bog. Covariance of the spatial and environmental factors was relatively strong (the lowland fen: 34.9%; the raised bog: 11.0%), which corresponds with the results of partial Mantel tests (Table 4). The pure effect of environmental parameters was only associated with 0.3% ( $P^{n.s.}$ ) of the variability in species composition at the lowland fen, and 1.8% (P < 0.001) at the raised bog. According to the DistLM procedures, the best environmental predictor, associated with species similarity at both localities, was pH (the lowland fen:  $R^2 = 0.35$ ; the raised bog:  $R^2 = 0.15$ ; P < 0.001). With the exception of TP at the lowland fen  $(R^2 = 0.02, P < 0.01)$ , the addition of other environmental variables to the DistLM model did not increase the predicting power of the model significantly. Temporal aspects, themselves. explained an additional 0.7% (P < 0.001) and 2.3%(P < 0.001) variability at the lowland fen and the raised bog, respectively. Covariance of temporal parameters with environmental and/or spatial parameters was negligible (Fig. 7). The proportion of the unexplained variability in the species composition, which could not be accounted for by measured spatial, environmental, and temporal parameters was



Fig. 2 The relationship between species composition similarity of the individual sampling sites within the lowland fen (a) and the raised bog (b), and their geographic distance (in meters). The linear correlation r and the P values are indicated in the graphs

**Table 4** The results of full and partial Mantel tests evaluating correlation between similarity in species composition, spatial distance, Euclidean distance of environmental parameters, and temporal distance

	Lowland fen	Raised bog
Similarity × spatial distance	-0.70***	-0.49***
Similarity × spatial distance (environmental parameters)	-0.69***	-0.48***
Similarity × environmental parameters	-0.21***	$-0.05^{\text{n.s.}}$
Similarity × environmental parameters (spatial distance)	$-0.08^{n.s.}$	$-0.02^{\text{n.s.}}$
Similarity $\times$ temporal distance	$-0.01^{n.s.}$	$-0.04^{n.s.}$
Spatial distance × environmental parameters	0.23***	0.08**
Temporal distance × environmental parameters	0.10*	0.13**

Covariates used in partial Mantel tests are given in brackets. The linear correlation *r* and *P* values are represented \*\*\* P < 0.001, \*\* P < 0.01, \* P < 0.05, <sup>n.s.</sup> P > 0.05

relatively small at both localities; 16.5% at the lowland fen, and 24.7% at the raised bog.

#### Discussion

This study illustrated the dominant effect of spatial distance on species composition of the epipelic desmids on a small spatial scale (i.e., within a single peatland). These results are comparable with previous studies that had reported a significant effect of spatial distance on community structure within various

freshwater peatlands (Machová-Černá & Neustupa, 2009; Černá, 2010; Neustupa et al., 2012). In this study, most of the sampling sites within and between the individual pools had a different species community structure, despite their very similar environmental parameters. Although we measured abiotic parameters (pH, conductivity, TP, TN, and temperature) which are generally considered as significant in shaping desmid assemblages (e.g., Coesel, 1982; Nováková, 2003; Neustupa et al., 2009), their effects were relatively unimportant. It is possible that some other abiotic factors, which influenced the desmid community structure in other studies, might be important; for example: alkalinity (Negro et al., 2003), humic acids content (Černá, 2010), and concentration of Pb or  $Mg^{2+}$  (Štěpánková et al., 2012). However, it is unlikely that the variability of these parameters would be more pronounced along such a small spatial scale. On the other hand, microorganisms may perceive physicochemical factors at a much finer resolution than we are able to measure at the sampling site (Azovsky, 2002). Nevertheless, even diurnal fluctuations of physicochemical parameters of water are often relatively large (e.g., due to photosynthetic/respiration activity; Talling, 1976; Kaplan & Bott, 1982); therefore, a more accurate measurement would probably not lead to a higher proportion of variability in the species composition explained by environmental factors.

Contrary to the strong effect of spatial distance on the desmid community structure, temporal changes were weak. Some studies of algal assemblages from various types of freshwater biotopes often describe



Fig. 3 The relationship between species similarity of the individual sampling sites within the lowland fen (a) and the raised bog (b), and their environmental distances. The linear correlation r and the P values are indicated in the graphs

	Autumn (2009)	Spring (2010)	Summer (2010)	Autumn (2010)	Winter (2011)	Spring (2011)	Summer (2011)	Autumn (2011)	Winter (2012)
Autumn (2009)		$-0.21^{\text{n.s.}}$	0.14 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.06 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.16 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.31 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.33*	0.27 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.38*
Spring (2010)	0.11 <sup>n.s.</sup>		0.11 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.15 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.19 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.21 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.27 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.31 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.35*
Summer (2010)	0.12 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.24 <sup>n.s.</sup>		$-0.22^{\text{n.s.}}$	0.10 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.30 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.07^{\text{n.s.}}$	0.04 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.06 <sup>n.s.</sup>
Autumn (2010)	$-0.05^{\text{n.s.}}$	0.05 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.26 <sup>n.s.</sup>		0.06 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.06 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.15^{\text{n.s.}}$	$-0.06^{\text{n.s.}}$	$-0.06^{\text{n.s.}}$
Winter (2011)	0.15 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.05^{\text{n.s.}}$	0.14 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.05^{\text{n.s.}}$		0.07 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.14^{\text{n.s.}}$	0.09 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.09 <sup>n.s.</sup>
Spring (2011)	0.28*	0.17 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.04^{n.s.}$	0.12 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.12 <sup>n.s.</sup>		$-0.12^{\text{n.s.}}$	$-0.06^{\text{n.s.}}$	$-0.04^{\text{n.s.}}$
Summer (2011)	0.26 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.22 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.07 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.14 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.01 <sup>n.s.</sup>	-0.19 <sup>n.s.</sup>		-0.30 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.07^{\text{n.s.}}$
Autumn (2011)	0.42*	0.31*	0.30*	0.36*	0.22 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.01 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.16^{\text{n.s.}}$		$-0.15^{\text{n.s.}}$
Winter (2012)	0.51**	0.33*	0.19 <sup>n.s.</sup>	0.43*	0.28 <sup>n.s.</sup>	$-0.05^{\text{n.s.}}$	$-0.15^{\text{n.s.}}$	$-0.17^{\text{n.s.}}$	

 Table 5
 Pairwise comparisons of species composition structure between individual sampling events calculated through the use of two-way ANOSIM tests

Values of R statistics and P values are represented. The values in the upper triangle represent samplings from the lowland fen, and the values in the lower triangle represent samplings from the raised bog

\*\* P < 0.01, \* P < 0.05, <sup>n.s.</sup> P > 0.05



Fig. 4 The NMDS ordination plot of samples from individual seasons within the lowland fen (a) and the raised bog (b), based on their species composition. The *squares* correspond to those samples from spring, the *diamonds* to those from summer, the



*crosses* to the autumnal, and the *triangles* to the winter. The  $R^2$  values determine the proportion of variance accounted for by the ordination procedure

seasonal changes in primary production (O'Reilly, 2006; Kolayli & Sahin, 2009), diversity and species composition (Ledger & Hildrew, 1998; Aberle & Wiltshire, 2006; Machová-Černá & Neustupa, 2009; Špačková et al., 2009), mainly in relationship to the

temporal variability of temperature, nutrient content, and light intensity. However, in our study, both localities had relatively stable and temporarily consistent community structures. These results were quite unexpected, since both localities were under relatively



Fig. 5 The Shannon diversity indices of samples from individual seasons within the lowland fen (a) and the raised bog (b)



Fig. 6 The relationship between maximum abundance and population persistence of desmid species within the lowland fen (a) and the raised bog (b). The linear correlation r and the P values are indicated in the graphs



thick snow cover and frozen to the bottom during winter seasons. However, it is worth mentioning that Heimans (1969) repeatedly observed the same desmid species in the same pools over time in the north temperate peatlands. In addition, Duthie (1964) reported the fact that desmid cells can withstand freezing for a considerable period without drastic reductions in their populations; and Burkholder &

Sheath (1984) observed a relatively large proportion of reproducing taxa during all seasons, even in the winter. The significant positive relationship between local population persistence and the local abundance of desmid species through the sampling period also supports this assumption, which suggests that a high local abundance may prevent local extinctions, which can primarily be achieved via efficient cell division at a site (Soininen & Heino, 2005).

The most plausible theoretical explanation of the strong spatial effect on the desmid communities, and their striking temporal consistency, is the monopolization hypothesis (De Meester et al., 2002; Urban & De Meester, 2009), in which the main forces driving community structure are local biotic processes, such as colonization and competition. Species composition of assemblages may be strongly influenced by a priority effect, whereby early colonization provides a species an advantage in its interactions with future colonists (Shulman et al., 1983). The priority effect often emerges because a species arrives early enough to increase in numbers, monopolize the available resources, and thereby gain a competitive advantage over late-arriving colonists (Shulman et al., 1983). Apart from that, assuming that some species may penetrate into the community, their local abundance at the starting point would be low, and thus the local extinction probability higher than for resident species with higher local abundances (MacArthur & Wilson, 1967). For example, Shurin (2000) found that almost all (>91%) artificially introduced zooplankton species became extinct after a short time when introduced into ponds with already established resident communities. These introduced species remained rare thorough the whole experiment, which indicated a minor role of the immigrants input on the community structure. The proportion of introduced species that successfully colonized pools was also negatively correlated with native species diversity, which pointed to the importance of interspecies interactions in the process of potential colonization (Shurin, 2000). Similar results were obtained by Lenzenweger (2003) when he tried unsuccessfully to artificially introduce various desmid species (e.g., Euastrum crassum Ralfs) into a different peatland, but with very similar environmental conditions. We think that the remarkable temporal stability of the desmid communities in our systems might also have been a result of species interactions, since already adapted resident species have potentially better ability to reject new immigrants. Furthermore, stochasticity in colonization can introduce noise into the match between community composition and environmental conditions, generating patterns that are superficially similar to those occurring through neutral dynamics (Urban & De Meester, 2009). This may result in a stronger effect of spatial parameters on the community structure at the expense of environmental conditions. The strong spatial autocorrelation in our data strongly supports this assumption, because it is very unlikely that desmids would be limited by their dispersal ability at such a small spatial scale as a single peatland.

The priority effect might also be enhanced when adaptation increases a resident population's performance in the local habitat (Urban & De Meester, 2009). Morphological plasticity increasing the fitness of organisms may represent such adaptation. For example, changes in cell morphology of desmids under various physicochemical conditions were observed in experimental studies (Neustupa et al., 2008; Černá & Neustupa, 2010), as well as in natural biotopes (Kouwets, 1988; Štěpánková et al., 2012). Moreover, Coesel & Krienitz (2008) stressed the assumption that desmids are effectively haploid organisms, thus potential mutation may be directly expressed in the phenotype; further, owing to the predominance of clonal reproduction, consequently also fixed in the population. Therefore, it is possible that such adaptations increasing fitness may help desmids to adapt to the local conditions and thus provide them a better competitive ability over the later colonizers.

In conclusion, we think that the monopolization hypothesis best describes the strong spatial autocorrelation and striking temporal consistency of benthic desmids, which we observed on a small spatial scale. The pattern was more or less similar at both localities, despite differences in their characteristics. This fact implies that this might be a general pattern, at least within well-established temperate peatlands. However, to the best of our knowledge, the priority effect and resource monopolization have not been considered in the case of microalgae so far. Therefore, future studies should use an appropriate experimental design to test the success of immigration, as well as the role of interactions between resident species and potential invaders, in order to examine the applicability of the monopolization hypothesis to the spatio-temporal community structure of the microphytobenthos.

Acknowledgments Financial support for this study was provided by a grant from the Charles University Science Foundation (B Bio 432311/2011). We thank the two anonymous reviewers for their useful comments that led us to the improvement of the manuscript.

## References

- Aberle, N. & K. H. Wiltshire, 2006. Seasonality and diversity patterns of microphytobenthos in a mesotrophic lake. Archiv für Hydrobiologie 167: 447–465.
- Anderson, M. J. & N. A. Gribble, 1998. Partitioning the variation among spatial, temporal and environmental components in a multivariate data set. Australian Journal of Ecology 23: 158–167.
- Anderson, M. J., R. N. Gorley & R. K. Clarke, 2008. PER-MANOVA+ for PRIMER: Guide to Software and Statistical Methods. PRIMER-E, Plymouth.
- Azovsky, A. I., 2002. Size-dependent species–area relationships in benthos: is the world more diverse for microbes? Ecography 25: 273–282.
- Becking, L. G. M., 1934. Geobiologie of inleiding tot de milieukunde. WP Van Stockum & Zoon, Hauge.
- Benedetti-Cecchi, L., 2001. Variability in abundance of algae and invertebrates at different spatial scales on rocky sea shores. Marine Ecology Progress Series 215: 79–92.
- Bonnet, E. & Y. Van der Peer, 2002. zt: a software tool for simple and partial Mantel tests. Journal of Statistical Software 7: 1–12.
- Borcard, D., P. Legendre & P. Drapeau, 1992. Partialling out the spatial component of ecological variation. Ecology 73: 1045–1055.
- Bray, J. R. & J. T. Curtis, 1957. An ordination of the upland forest communities of southern Wisconsin. Ecological Monographs 27: 326–349.
- Burkholder, J. M. & R. G. Sheath, 1984. The seasonal distribution, abundance and diversity of desmids (Chlorophyta) in a softwater, north temperate stream. Journal of Phycology 20: 159–172.
- Černá, K., 2010. Small-scale spatial variation of benthic algal assemblages in a peat bog. Limnologica 40: 315–321.
- Černá, K. & J. Neustupa, 2010. The pH-related morphological variations of two acidophilic species of Desmidiales (Viridiplantae) isolated from a lowland peat bog, Czech Republic. Aquatic Ecology 44: 409–419.
- Charles, D. F., F. W. Acker, D. D. Hart, C. W. Reimer & P. B. Cotter, 2006. Large-scale regional variation in diatom– water chemistry relationships: rivers of the eastern United States. Hydrobiologia 561: 27–57.
- Coesel, P. F. M., 1975. The relevance of desmids in the biological typology and evaluation of fresh waters. Hydrobiological Bulletin 9: 93–101.
- Coesel, P. F. M., 1982. Structural characteristics and adaptations of desmid communities. Journal of Ecology 70: 163–177.
- Coesel, P. F. M., 2001. A method for quantifying conservation value in lentic freshwater habitats using desmids as indicator organisms. Biodiversity and Conservation 10: 177–187.

- Coesel, P. F. M. & L. Krienitz, 2008. Diversity and geographic distribution of desmids and other coccoid green algae. Biodiversity and Conservation 17: 381–392.
- Coesel, P. F. M. & K. J. Meesters, 2007. Desmids of the Lowlands—Mesoteniaceae and Desmidiaceae of the European Lowlands. KNNV Publishing, Zeist.
- Coleman, M. A., 2002. Small-scale spatial variability in intertidal and subtidal turfing algal assemblages and the temporal generality of these patterns. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 267: 53–74.
- Coleman, M. A., 2003. The role of recruitment in structuring patterns of small-scale spatial variability in intertidal and subtidal algal turfs. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 291: 131–145.
- De Meester, L., A. Gomez, B. Okamura & K. Schwenk, 2002. The Monopolization hypothesis and the dispersal-gene flow paradox in aquatic organisms. Acta Oecologica-International Journal of Ecology 23: 121–135.
- Domozych, D. S. & C. R. Domozych, 2008. Desmids and biofilms of freshwater wetlands: development and microarchitecture. Microbial Ecology 55: 81–93.
- Duthie, H. C., 1964. The survival of desmids in ice. British Phycological Bulletin 2: 376–377.
- Finlay, B. J. & K. J. Clarke, 1999. Ubiquitous dispersal of microbial species. Nature 400: 828.
- Foissner, W., 2006. Biogeography and dispersal of microorganisms: a review emphasizing protists. Acta Protozoologica 45: 111–136.
- Gell, P. A., I. R. Sluiter & J. Fluin, 2002. Seasonal and interannual variations in diatom assemblages in Murray River connected wetlands in north-west Victoria, Australia. Marine and Freshwater Research 53: 981–992.
- Hammer, Ø., D. A. T. Harper & P. D. Ryan, 2001. PAST: Paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. Palaentologia Electronica 4: 1–9.
- Heimans, J., 1969. Ecological, phytogeographical and taxonomic problems with desmids. Vegetatio 17: 50–82.
- Kaplan, L. A. & T. L. Bott, 1982. Diel fluctuations of DOC generated by algae in a piedmont stream. Limnology and Oceanography 27: 1091–1100.
- Keithan, E. D. & R. L. Lowe, 1985. Primary productivity and spatial structure of phytolithic growth in streams in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Tennessee. Hydrobiologia 123: 59–67.
- Kolayli, S. & B. Sahin, 2009. Benthic algae (except Bacillariophyta) and their seasonal variations in Karagol Lake (Borcka, Artvin-Turkey). Turkish Journal of Botany 33: 27–32.
- Korhonen, J. J., J. Soininen & H. Hillebrand, 2010. A quantitative analysis of temporal turnover in aquatic species assemblages across ecosystems. Ecology 91: 508–517.
- Kouwets, F. A. C., 1988. Remarkable forms in the desmid flora of a small mountain bog in the French Jura. Cryptogamie Algologie 9: 289–309.
- Krasznai, E., G. Fehér, G. Borics, G. Várbíró, I. Grigorszky & B. Tóthmérész, 2008. Use of desmids to assess the natural conservation value of a Hungarian oxbow (Malom-Tisza, NE-Hungary). Biologia 63: 928–935.
- Kruskal, J. B., 1964. Multidimensional-scaling by optimising goodness of fit to a nonmetric hypothesis. Psychometrika 29: 1–27.

- Lane, C. R., K. C. Reiss, S. DeCelles & M. T. Brown, 2009. Benthic diatom composition in isolated forested wetlands subject to drying: implications for monitoring and assessment. Ecological Indicators 9: 1121–1128.
- Ledger, M. E. & A. G. Hildrew, 1998. Temporal and spatial variation in the epilithic biofilm of an acid stream. Freshwater Biology 40: 655–670.
- Legendre, P. & M. J. Anderson, 1999. Distance-based redundancy analysis: testing multispecies responses in multifactorial ecological experiments. Ecological Monographs 69: 1–24.
- Legendre, P. & L. Legendre, 1998. Numerical Ecology. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Lenzenweger, R., 1996. Desmidiaceenflora von Österreich, Teil 1. J. Cramer, Berlin.
- Lenzenweger, R., 1997. Desmidiaceenflora von Österreich, Teil 2. J. Cramer, Berlin.
- Lenzenweger, R., 1999. Desmidiaceenflora von Österreich, Teil 3. J. Cramer, Berlin.
- Lenzenweger, R., 2003. Desmidiaceenflora von Österreich, Teil 4. J. Cramer, Berlin.
- MacArthur, R. H. & E. O. Wilson, 1963. An equilibrium theory of insular zoogeography. Evolution 17: 363–387.
- MacArthur, R. H. & E. O. Wilson, 1967. The Theory of Island Biogeography. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Machová-Černá, K. & J. Neustupa, 2009. Spatial distribution of algal assemblages in a temperate lowland peat bog. International Review of Hydrobiology 94: 40–56.
- Mann, H. B. & D. R. Whitney, 1947. On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics 18: 50–60.
- Mantel, N., 1967. Detection of disease clustering and a generalized regression approach. Cancer Research 27: 209–220.
- McCune, B. & J. B. Grace, 2002. Analysis of Ecological Communities. MjM Software Design, Gleneden Beach.
- Micheli, F., K. L. Cottingham, J. Bascompte, O. N. Bjornstad, G. L. Eckert, J. M. Fischer, T. H. Keitt, B. E. Kendall, J. L. Klug & J. A. Rusak, 1999. The dual nature of community variability. Oikos 85: 161–169.
- Negro, A. I., C. De Hoyos & J. J. Aldasoro, 2003. Diatom and desmid relationships with the environment in mountain lakes and mires of NW Spain. Hydrobiologia 505: 1–13.
- Neustupa, J., J. Šťastný & L. Hodač, 2008. Temperature-related phenotypic plasticity in the green microalga *Micrasterias rotata*. Aquatic Microbial Ecology 51: 77–86.
- Neustupa, J., K. Černá & J. Št'astný, 2009. Diversity and morphological disparity of desmid assemblages in Central European peatlands. Hydrobiologia 630: 243–256.
- Neustupa, J., K. Černá & J. Šťastný, 2012. Spatio-temporal community structure of peat bog benthic desmids on a microscale. Aquatic Ecology 46: 229–239.
- Nováková, S., 2003. Ecological distribution patterns of desmid species in subalpine regions of the Krkonoše Mts (Czech Republic). Biologia 58: 697–700.
- O'Reilly, C. M., 2006. Seasonal dynamics of periphyton in a large tropical lake. Hydrobiologia 553: 293–301.
- Potapova, M. G. & D. F. Charles, 2002. Benthic diatoms in USA rivers: distributions along spatial and environmental gradients. Journal of Biogeography 29: 167–187.

- R Development Core Team, 2012. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, ver. 2.14.2. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna.
- Ricklefs, R. E. & D. Schluter, 1993. Species diversity: regional and historical influences. In Ricklefs, R. E. & D. Schluter (eds), Species Diversity: Historical and Geographical Perspectives. University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 350–363.
- Rindi, F. & F. Cinelli, 2000. Phenology and small-scale distribution of some rhodomelacean red algae on a western Mediterranean rocky shore. European Journal of Phycology 35: 115–125.
- Růžička, J., 1977. Die Desmidiaceen Mitteleuropas, Band 1, Lieferung 1. E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart.
- Růžička, J., 1981. Die Desmidiaceen Mitteleuropas, Band 1, Lieferung 2. E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart.
- Saburova, M. A., I. G. Polikarpov & I. V. Burkovsky, 1995. Spatial structure of an intertidal sandflat microphytobenthic community as related to different spatial scales. Marine Ecology Progress Series 129: 229–239.
- Shannon, C. E. & W. Weaver, 1949. The Mathematical Theory of Communication. The University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Shulman, M. J., J. C. Ogden, J. P. Ebersole, W. N. McFarland, S. L. Miller & N. G. Wolf, 1983. Priority effects in the recruitment of juvenile coral-reef fishes. Ecology 64: 1508–1513.
- Shurin, J., 2000. Dispersal limitation, invasion resistance, and the structure of pond zooplankton communities. Ecology 81: 3074–3086.
- Smouse, P. E., J. C. Long & R. R. Sokal, 1986. Multiple regression and correlation extensions of the Mantel test of matrix correspondence. Systematic Zoology 35: 627–632.
- Soininen, J., 2007. Environmental and spatial control of freshwater diatoms—a review. Diatom Research 22: 473–490.
- Soininen, J. & J. Heino, 2005. Relationships between local population persistence, local abundance and regional occupancy of species: distribution patterns of diatoms in boreal streams. Journal of Biogeography 32: 1971–1978.
- Soininen, J., R. Paavola & T. Muotka, 2004. Benthic diatom communities in boreal streams: community structure in relation to environmental and spatial gradients. Ecography 27: 330–342.
- Špačková, J., P. Hašler, J. Štěpánková & A. Poulíčková, 2009. Seasonal succession of epipelic algae: a case study on a mesotrophic pond in a temperate climate. Fottea 9: 121–133.
- Št'astný, J., 2010. Desmids (Conjugatophyceae, Viridiplantae) from the Czech Republic; new and rare taxa, distribution, ecology. Fottea 10: 1–74.
- Steinbauer, M. J., K. Dolos, B. Reineking & C. Beierkuhnlein, 2012. Current measures for distance decay in similarity of species composition are influenced by study extent and grain size. Global Ecology and Biogeography 21: 1203–1212.
- Štěpánková, J., P. Hašler, M. Hladká & A. Poulíčková, 2012. Diversity and ecology of desmids of peat bogs in the Jeseníky Mts: spatial distribution, remarkable finds. Fottea 12: 111–126.

- Talling, J. F., 1976. Depletion of carbon-dioxide from lake water by phytoplankton. Journal of Ecology 64: 79–121.
- Talling, J. F. & J. E. Parker, 2002. Seasonal dynamics of phytoplankton and phytobenthos, and associated chemical interactions, in a shallow upland lake (Malham Tarn, northern England). Hydrobiologia 487: 167–181.
- Telford, R. J., V. Vandvik & H. J. B. Birks, 2006. Dispersal limitations matter for microbial morphospecies. Science 312: 1015.
- Urban, M. C. & L. De Meester, 2009. Community monopolization: local adaptation enhances priority effects in an evolving metacommunity. Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences 276: 4129–4138.
- Vadeboncoeur, Y., M. J. Vander Zanden & D. M. Lodge, 2002. Putting the lake back together: reintegrating benthic pathways into lake food web models. Bioscience 52: 44–54.
- Weilhoefer, C. L. & Y. D. Pan, 2006. Diatom-based bioassessment in wetlands: how many samples do we need to characterize the diatom assemblage in a wetland adequately? Wetlands 26: 793–802.
- Wilkinson, L., 2012. Venneuler: Venn and Euler Diagrams. R package version 1.1-0 [available on Internet at http://cran. r-project.org/package=venneuler].
- Zalack, J. T., D. A. Casamatta, R. G. Verb & M. L. Vis, 2006. A two-year survey of the algal community in a woodland stream from southeastern Ohio. Northeastern Naturalist 13: 301–318.