This is the accepted manuscript version of the contribution published as:

Archidona-Yuste, A., Wiegand, T., Castillo, P., Navas-Cortés, J.A. (2020): Spatial structure and soil properties shape local community structure of plant-parasitic nematodes in cultivated olive trees in southern Spain Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 287, art. 106688

The publisher's version is available at:

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.106688

1	Spatial structure and soil properties shape local community structure
2	of plant-parasitic nematodes in cultivated olive trees in southern Spain
3	
4	Antonio Archidona-Yuste ^{a,b} , Thorsten Wiegand ^{b,c} , Pablo Castillo ^a and Juan A. Navas-
5	Cortés ^a *
6	
7	^a Instituto de Agricultura Sostenible (IAS), Consejo Superior de Investigaciones
8	Científicas (CSIC), Avenida Menéndez Pidal s/n, 14004 Córdoba, Spain.
9	^b Department of Ecological Modelling, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research -
10	UFZ, Permoserstrasse 15, 04318 Leipzig, Germany.
11	^c German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig,
12	Deutscher Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany
13	
14	*Corresponding author:
15	E-mail address: j.navas@csic.es (J.A. Navas-Cortés)
16	
17	
18	

19 ABSTRACT

20 Numerous studies have documented the distribution of plant and animal communities 21 with respect to spatial structure; however, relatively little is known about the 22 involvement of spatial structures in the diversity of soil organisms such as plant-23 parasitic nematodes (PPN). Host plants such as olive trees are of particular interest 24 because they host a large number of PPN and have a high economic and cultural 25 importance. In this study, we investigated how different aspects of the environment (i.e. 26 the factors soil, above-ground environment, and agricultural management) and spatial 27 structure shaped the variation of species composition (expressed as beta diversity) and 28 species richness of plant-parasitic nematodes infesting the soil rhizosphere in 376 29 commercial olive orchards in the south of Spain. We used variation partitioning to 30 assess the relative importance of the unique and shared contributions of the factors 31 describing the environment and spatial structure. To identify sites and species of 32 particular interest, we partitioned beta diversity into local and species contributions. 33 Contrary to our expectation that soil and agricultural management would largely 34 determine the community structure of PPN, more than two-thirds of the variation 35 remained unexplained. Spatial structure and soil were the most important factors 36 shaping species richness and beta diversity. Surprisingly, the effects of agricultural 37 management on species richness were lower than expected, and null [or nonexistent, or 38 nonsignificant] on beta diversity. We found relatively high levels of shared 39 contributions of the different factors, especially in combination with spatial structure, 40 indicating the presence of spatial gradients of the variables describing the environmental 41 factors. 42 Species contributions to beta diversity (SCBD) were positively correlated with

43 nematode prevalence and density range; thus, SCBD could be related to the niche

44	position as reported in other ecosystems. Local contributions to beta diversity (LCBD)
45	were mainly related with habitat filtering mechanisms (e.g. soil physiochemical and
46	agronomic management predictors), suggesting a relationship between nematode total
47	biomass and ecological gradients. Overall, we revealed novel insights into the spatial
48	structure of PPN communities and showed that its beta diversity is less structured by
49	spatial and environmental factors compared to other organism types.
50	
51	Kenwards
	Reywords.
52	below-ground ecosystems
52 53	below-ground ecosystems soil nematodes
52 53 54	below-ground ecosystems soil nematodes ecological uniqueness
52 53 54 55	below-ground ecosystems soil nematodes ecological uniqueness beta diversity

57 olive tree

59 **1. Introduction**

60 The diversity of soil organisms is enormous, with thousands of species often occurring within a single square metre, a single gram of soil may contain a diverse 61 62 range of nematodes, protozoa, earthworms, mites, molluscs, arthropods, and arachnids 63 among other soil fauna (Bardgett, 2005). However, while ecologists, long fascinated by 64 aboveground habitats (Bardgett and van der Putten, 2014), currently apply the emerging 65 focus on spatial structures in the distribution of plant and animal communities (beta 66 diversity; Soininen, 2016), relatively few studies have investigated such spatial 67 structures in communities of soil organism. 68 Nematodes are the most diverse metazoan taxa on Earth with approximately one million species (Bardgett and van der Putten, 2014). Indeed, a recent study revealed that 69 70 the total biomass of nematodes inhabiting soils across the world is about 0.3 gigatonnes 71 (van den Hoogen et al., 2019). They are the most common and diverse multicellular 72 terrestrial animals, and are found in all soil environments (Ferris et al., 2001). 73 Nematodes occupy all consumer trophic levels within the soil food web, which allows 74 them to play a central role in numerous soil functions, such as transferring energy 75 among members of ecological networks (Ferris et al., 2001). Nematodes are frequently 76 associated with other organisms including plants, fungi, bacteria, micro-arthropods and 77 other nematodes. Over 4,000 nematodes species have been identified as plant feeding or plant-parasitic nematodes (PPN) (Gaugler and Bilgrami, 2004). 78 79 Although 0.4% of the nematode species richness is identified as PPN, only a small 80 group of these are of economic importance because of the direct damage that they cause 81 or because they act as virus vectors (Nicol et al., 2011). An important example for this 82 is the olive tree (Olea europaea L.), both in wild and cultivated forms, that serves as a

83 host to a wide diversity of PPN, including endoparasitic and ectoparasitic species

84 (Castillo et al., 2010; Ali et al., 2014). Recent studies have shown an exceptional 85 diversity and prevalence of ectoparasitic PPN belonging to the family Longidoridae that infest the rhizosphere and can reduce growth in both natural (Freckman and Virginia, 86 87 1989) and agricultural ecosystems (Castillo et al., 2010). 88 Although studies on nematode ecology are numerous, relatively little attention has 89 been paid to the different ecological factors that control spatial variation in species 90 richness and community composition (i.e., beta diversity) of PPN. Traditionally, the 91 host plants are considered the most important driver of PPN populations (Norton, 1989; 92 Neher, 2010), with soil abiotic variables determining the distribution of PPN in natural 93 (Freckman and Virginia, 1989) and agricultural ecosystems (Duyck et al., 2012). 94 Studies of multiple gradients in the above-ground environment (e.g. climatic and 95 topographic variables) as drivers of PPN patterns at the regional scale have shown 96 contrasting results that make generalisations difficult (Duyck et al., 2012; Palomares-Rius et al., 2015). 97 98 Pure spatial structure, a spatial component that is independent of the measured environmental variables (Borcard et al., 1992), is an important factor driving beta 99 100 diversity in plant communities (Hubbell, 2001; De Cáceres et al., 2012; Amici et al., 101 2013; Baldeck et al., 2013a) and in other major organisms (Soininen, 2016). However, 102 it is not clear whether such effects occur in PPN. For example spatial structure may 103 result from limited dispersal, while PPN can be dispersed via the movement of farm 104 machinery, seeds, and animals or by water runoff and air movement (Castillo et al., 105 2010; Neher, 2010). Agronomic practices may reduce the distribution and/or the

106 diversity of the nematode community, such as when herbicides application under the

107 tree canopy reduces the soil nematode community in comparison to that in untreated

108 areas (Sánchez-Moreno et al., 2009). In plant communities, though, a considerable

109 proportion of variation in species composition (and species richness) remains 110 unexplained by the variables that describe pure spatial structure and the environment 111 (Baldeck et al., 2013b). Therefore we expect that a similar result might be true for PPN, 112 although we expect that soil and agricultural management factors may strongly 113 determine PPN community structure (Neher, 2010). 114 The variation of species composition among sites (i.e. beta diversity) (Whittaker, 115 1960; Anderson et al., 2011) can be partitioned in two different ways to obtain 116 additional information (Legendre and De Cáceres, 2013). First, beta diversity can be 117 partitioned into the contribution of single sites (local contributions to beta diversity; 118 LCBD) that allows us to assess the ecological uniqueness of sites in terms of 119 community composition. The LCBD patterns might be influenced by environmental 120 conditions and/or general characteristics of the PPN community as previously described 121 for other organisms and ecosystems (Heino and Grönroos, 2017). High LCBD values 122 might indicate sites with exceptional species composition (combinations of rare 123 species), degraded sites, or sites with particular ecological conditions (Legendre and 124 Gauthier, 2014). Second, beta diversity can be partitioned into the contribution of 125 individual species (species contributions to beta diversity, SCBD) allowing us to assess 126 the relative importance of each species in affecting beta diversity (Legendre and De 127 Cáceres, 2013). SCBD may indicate species of particular importance for beta diversity 128 and could be associated with special species characteristics (e.g. occupancy, abundance 129 and niche) (Heino and Grönroos, 2017). 130 The aim of the present study was to assess the relative contribution of different

factors in controlling the spatial variation in species composition and species richness of
PPN communities among sites. Our analysis included the factors (1) above-ground
environment (climate and topography), (2) soil, (3) agricultural management, and (4)

134 spatial structure, that is any non-random spatial organisation in the distribution of 135 communities (Peres-Neto and Legendre, 2010). As outlined above, we hypothesize that 136 the two factors soil and agricultural management will strongly determine spatial 137 variation in species composition and species richness of PPN (Neher, 2010), and that a 138 considerable proportion of the spatial variation will remain unexplained. To test our 139 hypotheses, we used a wide range of potential predictors in describing each of these 140 four factors. This allowed us to assess the role of each of these components and its 141 shared contributions in explaining the spatial variation of PPN communities.

142 More specifically, to assess the relative importance of these factors, we proceeded 143 as follows: (i) we applied redundancy analyses including a forward selection procedure 144 to select the explanatory variables representing the ecological factors that govern spatial 145 variation in species richness and composition (Blanchet et al., 2008); and in a second 146 step (ii) we applied variation partitioning (Borcard et al., 1992; Legendre and Legendre, 147 2012a) to assess the unique and shared contributions of the different environmental 148 factors and spatial structure in explaining the spatial variation of PPN species richness 149 and composition. In addition, we assessed local and species contributions to beta 150 diversity (LCBD and SCBD, respectively) to identify their particular importance and 151 potential drivers.

We selected the olive growing area of southern Spain as study area because of its high agriculture and socio-economic importance and because of the extensive distribution of cultivated olive trees in this region (Infante-Amate, 2012; MAGRAMA, 2016). Additionally, our study area includes a wide range of ecological gradients including climate, soil, and topographical components (Ortega et al., 2016), as well as a large variety of agronomic management practices covering the diversity of cropping

158 systems (from traditional to high-density and super-intensive orchards) (REDIAM,

159 2016).

160

161 **2. Materials and methods**

162

163 2.1. Study area, soil-sampling design

164

165 The study was conducted in Andalusia, southern Spain, and covered an area of 166 approximately 90,000 km² (extent: 35.9377° to 38.7289°; -1.6272° to -7.5226°) (Fig. 1). 167 Andalusia is a geomorphologically heterogeneous area characterised by high mountain 168 ranges surrounded by extensive lowlands of alluvial origin with elevation ranging 169 between 0 and 3,479 m above sea level (Sierra Nevada). The south of Spain is 170 characterized by a Mediterranean climate which also receives influences from the 171 Atlantic Ocean. Mean annual temperatures is 16°C, and mean annual rainfall is 350 mm, 172 showing strong seasonality (REDIAM, 2016). 173 In Andalusia, olive cultivation covers more than 1.6 million ha and accounts for 174 19% of the total surface area of the region (MAGRAMA, 2016). Based on a 175 classification of olive growing areas into biological zones (70 homogeneous areas based 176 on environmental and agricultural similarities such as climatic conditions, orography, 177 cultivars, hydrology and landscape; REDIAM, 2016), a total of 376 commercial olive 178 orchards were selected for the present study (Fig. 1). The number of orchards sampled 179 was proportional to the surface occupied by each biological zone (e.g. we conducted a 180 representative sampling) and arbitrarily selected in each zone. Permission to sample was 181 granted by the landowners.

182 Soil samples were collected between 2013 and 2016 during the spring season, when 183 soil environmental conditions are favourable for biological nematode activity (Norton, 184 1978). In each commercial olive orchard, soil samples were taken from four, or five, georeferenced olive trees that were arbitrarily chosen. Soil samples were collected with 185 186 a hoe discarding the upper 5cm soil profile, from 5 to 50cm depth using a pick in close 187 vicinity to the active olive tree roots. For each orchard, the soil sample was separated into two portions, one for nematode identification and the other for the measurement of 188 189 soil variables. We ensured that the roots from plants other than olive were not included 190 in the sample. All individual samples were mixed together to obtain a single sample for 191 each orchard before nematode extraction and measurement of physiochemical variables. Nematodes were extracted separately from two 250cm³ subsamples of soil using 192 193 the magnesium sulphate centrifugal-flotation method (Coolen, 1979; Castillo et al., 194 2010), then re-mixed for the diagnostic and identification of nematodes from 500 cm^3 of 195 soil. Nematodes were identified at the species level using an integrative approach 196 combining molecular and morphological techniques to obtain efficient and accurate 197 identification (Archidona-Yuste et al., 2016). For the estimation of beta diversity, 198 relative total biomass for each species present was determined and derived from the 199 abundance and nematode size among species. For each orchard, nematode abundance 200 was calculated as the total number of PPN per 500 cm^3 of soil and at least 100 nematodes were arbitrarily selected and identified. For samples containing less than 100 201 202 nematodes, all individuals were identified. Nematode individual fresh biomass was 203 calculated according to an adjusted Andrássy's (1986) formula, wherein relative biomass (μ g) = L x D² * 1,600,000⁻¹; where L is nematode body length (in μ m), and D 204 205 is nematode maximum body width (in µm). Nematode size was obtained using the 206 "Nematode-Plant Expert Information System" (Nemaplex;

207 <u>http://nemaplex.ucdavis.edu/</u>) and the original descriptions of nematode species.

208 Additionally, for each orchard we determined the number of nematode species found.

209

210 2.2. Explanatory variables

211

212 To meet our objectives, we measured a wide range of explanatory variables derived 213 from our hypotheses. These variables were grouped into four sets related to the factors 214 environment, soil, agronomic management, and spatial structure (Appendix A1, 215 Supplementary Information Table S1.1). The set of environmental variables included 216 climate and topographical variables; the set of soil variables included physiochemical, 217 textural, and edaphic properties; and the set of agronomic management variables was 218 represented by plant variables and the orchard management system. All explanatory 219 variables were recorded as continuous data (except for categorical phytoclimatic areas) 220 in raster layers from which individual values for each olive orchard were extracted 221 using the raster to point tool in QGIS (QGIS Development Team, 2016). 222 The environmental data set comprised 27 broad range abiotic variables including 223 bioclimatic predictors (BIOCLIM) based on temperature and precipitation (Nix, 1986), 224 explanatory variables related to topography such as aspect and slope, global solar 225 radiation (GR), annual average olive tree potential evapotranspiration (PET), a 226 standardised drought index (DI), and a categorical variable related to phytoclimatic 227 areas (CA). A description of each variable is given in Supporting Information Appendix 228 A. The topographical attributes were measured in the commercial olive orchards was 229 the mean of the values derived for each of four, or five, olive trees: slope with values 230 from 0.01 to 41.5°, and aspect, with values from 0.06 to 359.8°. Aspect refers to the 231 direction that a slope faces. Temperature and precipitation data were obtained from the

Environmental Information Network of Andalusia (REDIAM) for the period 1970-2016 232 233 at 100 m ground resolution (REDIAM, 2016), from which 19 bioclimatic variables were 234 derived using the R package dismo (Hijmans et al., 2016). GIS-derived topographical 235 variables included the continuous variables slope, aspect and the SAGA wetness index 236 (SWI). Each of these variables was derived in QGIS using a digital elevation model 237 (DEM) obtained from the Spanish National Geographic Institute at a 5 m ground 238 resolution (NGI, 2016). Slope and aspect variables were calculated from the DEM based 239 on the second-degree polynomial adjustment method using the library morphometry of 240 the open source GIS SAGA (Conrad et al., 2015). SWI, which predicts potential areas 241 with relatively higher soil moisture, was computed from elevation DEM using the 242 hydrology module in SAGA (Boehner and Selige, 2006). Since aspect is a circular 243 variable measured in degrees, aspect was transformed into a categorical variable with 244 six categories (i.e. northeast, east, southeast, southwest, west, and northwest) (Legendre 245 et al., 2009).

246 The second set of variables comprised soil physiochemical variables, texture and 247 edaphic type. Explanatory variables related to soil physiochemical variables comprised 248 12 variables including cation exchange capacity (CEC), Ca, Mg, exchangeable K, Na, 249 carbonate content (CO3), extractable P, soil organic matter (SOM), total organic carbon 250 (Corg) and nitrogen (Norg), C:N ratio, and pH (KCl). The edaphic type was obtained 251 from REDIAM by extracting information from each sampling point (Supporting 252 Information Table S1.3; (REDIAM, 2016). To avoid collinearity among texture 253 variables, soil texture from the 376 commercial olive orchards sampled was categorised 254 into 12 texture classes according to the USDA soil texture classification (Appendix A1, 255 Supporting Information Table S1.4). This analysis was performed using the package 256 soiltexture using the R software (Moeys, 2015). Soil texture was estimated by the

257	relative amounts of sand, clay and silt according to soil texture Bouyoucos method
258	(FAO, 1980), which values ranging 1.3-90.5%, 3.5-64.1% and 3.7-71.3%, respectively.

259 The third set of variables, agronomic management, included variables that were 260 related to either plant or orchard management. For the first subset, we used the age of 261 the olive tree plantation and the olive tree cultivars. The second subset comprised seven 262 categorical variables (olive plant density, irrigation pattern and system, source of 263 irrigation water, agronomic practices below the olive tree canopy and in the alley 264 between trees, and type of vegetation cover in the alley). Plant density data was 265 categorised into three classes, traditional, intensive and super high-density olive 266 orchards, based on Rallo et al. (2013). The landowner provided age and cultivar 267 information, which ranged from approximately 2 to 100 years and 21 cultivars. Further 268 details are provided in Appendix A1 (Table S1.5).

269 The fourth set included explanatory variables related to spatial structure. Spatial 270 predictors were computed across the locations of the 376 commercial olive orchard 271 using the distance-based Moran's eigenvector map (dbMEM) analysis (Borcard and 272 Legendre, 2002; Borcard et al., 2004; Dray et al., 2006). The spatial dbMEM 273 eigenvectors were obtained by computing a matrix of geographical distances among the 274 sites that were then truncated based on a distance threshold (Borcard and Legendre, 275 2002). A Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCoA) was performed using the truncated 276 (geographical) distance matrix, resulting in orthogonal variables of spatial structure with 277 high and low eigenvalues corresponding to broader and finer spatial scales, respectively. 278 In addition to the spatial eigenfunctions, this approach permits the computation and 279 testing of Moran's I coefficients associated with all dbMEMs, thereby allowing a pre-280 selection of eigenfunctions with positive and significant spatial autocorrelation (Dray et

281	al., 2006). A total of 101 MEM eigenvectors with positive correlation were retained
282	with a truncation distance of 26,953 m. The dbMEM analysis was performed using the
283	dbmem function implemented in the adespatial package (Dray et al., 2019) as described
284	by Dray et al. (2006).

For each diversity index, we mapped the fitted site scores of the final selected eigenvectors to discriminate among broad-, medium-, and fine-scale spatial patterns (Borcard et al., 2018). In order to interpret the spatial variation, we performed linear regression models using the most influent spatial variables and the selected explanatory variables in both diversity indexes (Borcard et al., 2018).

290

291 <i>2.3</i>	. Statistical	analyses
----------------	---------------	----------

292

293	Data analyses included the following four steps: calculation of observed beta-
294	diversity, selection of explanatory variables, variation partitioning, and determination of
295	the contribution of locations (LCBD) and species (SCBD) to beta diversity, as well as
296	their relationships with explanatory variables and the prevalence of PPN. All statistical
297	analyses were performed using the R v. 3.5.1 freeware (R_Core_Team, 2018).
298	Prior to the statistical analysis we transformed the biomass - site matrix data of the
299	PPN using a Hellinger transformation (Rao, 1995) that is recommended when the data
300	matrix contains zeros, extreme values, and double absences of species per site
301	(Legendre and Gallagher, 2001) as occurred in our study.
302	
303	2.3.1. Beta diversity computation
304	

305 Total beta diversity was estimated as the total variance of the transformed 306 abundance-biomass community data table following the methodology described by 307 Legendre et al. (2005). This approach allows for partitioning beta diversity into the sum 308 of the contributions of individual species (SCBD) and into the sum of the contribution 309 of individual sampling sites (LCBD) (Legendre and De Cáceres, 2013). LCBD values, 310 which sum to 1, were tested for significance by the random distribution of species 311 among sampling sites as null hypothesis (using 999 random permutations and 312 preserving species abundance data) (Legendre and De Cáceres, 2013). We mapped the 313 spatial variation of LCBD values among sampling sites. Beta diversity and its local and 314 species contributions were computed using the beta.div function implemented in the 315 adespatial software package (Dray et al., 2019).

316 Species richness and community composition maps were produced to summarise 317 the spatial variation in the study area (Baldeck et al., 2013b). This approach involved a 318 non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) ordination analysis on the biomass-319 abundance matrix data using the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity index with three dimensions 320 and 100 random stars as arguments to obtain a low value of stress statistic index. Then, 321 scores from the three axes were translated to an RGB colour following the methodology 322 described by several authors (Thessler et al., 2005; Baldeck et al., 2013b). Sampling 323 sites with more similar species composition were represented by more similar colour 324 patterns, which were then interpreted by the prevalence level of PPN (rare and common 325 species) regarding the ordination axes of species scores from the NMDS analysis. The 326 NMDS ordination analysis was computed using the metaMDS function found in the 327 vegan software package (Oksanen et al., 2019).

328

329 2.3.2. Selection of explanatory variables

330

The selection of explanatory variables included the following three steps: (i) a forward selection procedure using all explanatory variables from each data-set, (ii) a collinearity test based on the values of the variance inflation factor (VIF), and (iii) a second forward selection procedure using the selected and non-correlated variables in each data-set to be used in the variation partitioning analysis.

336 As suggested by Borcard et al., (2018), we used first a forward selection procedure 337 using all explanatory variables in each data set (i.e., factor) before checking for 338 multicollinearity. This is because collinearity may affect (i.e. exclude) one or more 339 important variables that structure the PPN community spatial structure patterns we are 340 interested in (Borcard et al., 2018). In a second step we conducted a redundancy 341 analysis (RDA) on the remaining variables in each data-set, and the result object of the 342 RDA was subsequently tested for collinearity (Borcard et al., 2018). To minimise 343 collinearity effects, we used the VIF method that iteratively excludes numeric covariates 344 within each variable set that show VIF values > 10 as suggested by Montgomery and 345 Peck (1992). Finally, a second forward selection procedure was performed for each set 346 of explanatory variables to retain only those variables that were significantly correlated 347 with species richness (or community composition). For this step, categorical variables 348 were transformed as dummy variables. Overall, we used a modified forward selection 349 method (Blanchet et al., 2008) based on a permutation procedure with two stopping 350 criteria (using 9999 random permutations) combined into one that was evaluated 351 simultaneously; that is, variables were added to the selection set until it exceeded the critical p value (alpha threshold = 0.05), or the final model adjusted R^2 value did not 352 exceed that of the global model, which was performed using the *packfor* package 353 354 software (Dray, 2011).

355

356 2.3.3. Variation partitioning

357

358 Variation partitioning (Borcard et al., 1992; Peres-Neto et al., 2006) was based on 359 redundancy analysis for community composition of PPN (i.e., beta diversity) and on 360 multiple linear regression for species richness. This allowed us to quantify the relative 361 contribution (unique and joint fractions) of the four sets of explanatory variables to the 362 total variation of beta diversity and species richness (Borcard et al., 1992; Peres-Neto et 363 al., 2006). For easier comparison among analyses, we expressed the variance explained by unique and joint proportions in terms of the fractions of the total explained variance. 364 365 The significance of the unique and overall fractions (i.e. unique + joint fraction) was 366 tested by partial redundancy analysis (partial RDA) using 999 random permutations 367 (Borcard et al., 2018). Variation partitioning analysis was performed using the varpart 368 function implemented in the vegan software package (Oksanen et al., 2019). 369

370 2.3.4. LCBD and SCBD explanatory variables

371

372 Following the methodology described by Heino and Grönroos (2017), we used a 373 combination of multivariate methods to examine the variation in local (LCBD) and 374 species (SCBD) contributions to beta diversity. First, we performed multiple regression 375 to determine the drivers that correlate with LCBD and SCBD using community metrics 376 and species traits, respectively, as predictors. SCBD patterns were tested with the 377 following species traits: density range (e.g. range between maximum and minimum 378 abundance of each identified nematode species expressed as nematodes per 500 cm³ of soil) and prevalence (e.g. the ratio between the number of sites in which each nematode 379

380 species was detected and the total number of sites expressed as a percentage). The 381 variation of the LCBD index was tested with community metrics related to each 382 commercial olive orchard including total nematode abundance-biomass e.g. the total 383 nematode biomass detected ($\mu g/500 \text{ cm}^3$)], total nematode abundance-numeric [e.g. the total number of nematode specimens (nematodes/500cm³)], and species richness. 384 385 Additional details regarding the species and community metrics used as predictors can be found in the accompanying DATA in BRIEF article. For the relationship among 386 387 LCBD and SCBD and explanatory variables from each sampling site, we used a partial 388 linear regression based on the methodology described by Legendre and Gauthier (2014). 389 Patterns in LCBD could also be influenced by environmental predictors; therefore, 390 this index was tested with ecological predictors related to the factors aboveground 391 environment, soil, and agronomic management. To estimate the proportion of variation 392 of the dependent variable that could be assigned solely to one set of predictors, having 393 considered the effect of the other factor, we used partial linear regression (Legendre and 394 Legendre, 2012a). This analysis was performed by controlling the effects of the spatial 395 component of LCBD using dbMEM (i.e., the principal coordinates of neighbour 396 matrices) as variables, thereby determining the effect that could be exclusively 397 attributed to the ecological variables at each sampling site. We used all explanatory 398 variables included in the factors aboveground environment, soil, and agronomic 399 management together as ecological predictors. Then, we selected the most influential 400 variables that determined the LCBD patterns by forward selection using the same 401 criteria as described above (i.e. double stopping and 9999 random permutations) 402 (Blanchet et al., 2008).

403

404	3. Results
405	
406	3.1. Beta diversity of PPN
407	
408	In the soil samples the soil samples of the 376 commercial olive orchards 128 PPN
409	species from 13 families were identified. The total number of PPN in each olive orchard
410	ranged from 7 (site O031) to 19,796 (site O333) nematode specimens per 500 cm ³ of
411	soil, and the species prevalence ranged from 0.3% (several nematodes species detected
412	only at one sampling site) to 72.6% (Merlinius brevidens). Migratory ectoparasite PPN
413	such as Helicotylenchus oleae and Ogma rhombosquamatum showed the highest
414	abundance (19,720 and 9,800 nematodes per 500-cm ³ of soil, respectively). Rare
415	(usually having low prevalence) sedentary endoparasitic PPN species such as
416	Meloidogyne javanica were also detected at high abundance in many of the samples (i.e.
417	10,000 nematodes per 500-cm 3 of soil).
418	Overall, species richness showed high heterogeneity among the 376 sampling sites
419	(Fig. 2a). This resulted in a remarkable variation in community patterns, as visualised
420	by the beta diversity map (Fig. 2b). The grey sites on this map comprise generally
421	common PPN species (high prevalence) such as migratory ectoparasitic PPN, whereas
422	sites with a prevalence of rare species are shown by the radial gradient thorough the
423	RGB colour spectrum (Fig. 2b).
424	
425	3.2. Selection of explanatory variables

426

Overall, the total number of variables that were significantly related to the spatial 427 428 pattern variation of PPN communities was higher for beta diversity (15) than for species 429 richness (10). Approximately 10% of the variation in beta diversity was explained by 430 the four sets of variables, with soil and spatial variables, accounting for 5% each, 431 explaining that variation almost entirely (Table 1; Table S2.3 in Appendix A2). In 432 contrast, approximately 30% of the variation in species richness was explained by the 433 four sets of variables, with spatial variables accounting for 18% and soil and agronomic 434 management accounting for 12% each (Table 1; Table S2.3 in Appendix A2). 435 Thirteen spatial variables (i.e., distance-based Moran's eigenvector maps; dbMEM) 436 were retained to represent spatial structure for community composition and eight for 437 species richness (Table 1; Appendix A2). The most significant spatial variable detected 438 for beta diversity was associated with an eigenvector representing a fine-scale structure (MEM26; $R^2 adj = 0.0075$); Table S2.1). The spatial variable MEM2 was also included 439 in the model, but it also had a negligible influence ($R^2 adj = 0.0068$). In contrast, the 440 441 spatial variation of species richness was primarily determined by eigenvectors 442 modelling broad- and medium-scale structures (particularly MEM2; Table S2.2). Maps 443 of significant spatial community patterns, MEMs, were included as Supplementary data

444 (Appendix A3).

Soil physiochemical variables were the most influential soil variables for beta diversity and variation in species richness, followed by soil texture and edaphic type. Beta diversity was affected by chemical variables such as Ca, pH (KCl), Na, and total organic N (Table 1; Appendix A2, Supplementary Table S2.1), whereas variation in species richness was affected only by the two physiochemical variables Na and extractable P. Soil extractable P accounted for 7% of the variation in species richness

451 (Table 1; Appendix A2, Supplementary Table S2.2). Soil texture and edaphic type were
452 also important but with a lower effect than that of the physiochemical variables (Table
453 1; Appendix A2, Supplementary Tables S2.1 and S2.2).

454 Variables quantifying the factor aboveground environment explained only a low 455 proportion of beta diversity (3%) and variation in species richness (7%), with variables 456 closely related to climate being the most important ones (Table 1; Table S2.3 in 457 Appendix A2). The most important predictors within the environmental data set for beta 458 diversity were those describing temperature variability such as the mean temperature of 459 the wettest quarter (i.e. quarterly indices are based on running 3-month intervals) 460 (BIO8) and isothermality (BIO3), and the variation of species richness was related to 461 the precipitation of the wettest quarter (BIO16) and the rainfall deficit factor (RD). Both 462 metrics were also influenced by the phytoclimatic type.

Agronomic management accounted for 12% of the variation in species richness, with only 2% allocated to beta diversity (Table 1; Table S2.3 in Appendix A2). Only six management predictors accounted for that variation, with the irrigation class being the most important for beta diversity, and the age of the olive trees important for both metrics. The presence or absence of soil-vegetation cover affected both beta diversity (in the case of below canopy) and species richness (in the case of in the alley). Both metrics were also influenced by the olive tree cultivar.

470

471 *3.3. Variation partitioning*

472

473 Variation partitioning analysis revealed a high amount of unexplained variance of
474 PPN community composition and species richness. Approximately 10% of the variation

475 of community composition and 30% of species richness patterns were explained by all 476 four factors together (Table 1; Supplementary Table S2.3). Overall, we found a large 477 contribution of the unique fractions of the different sets of variables that represented 478 more than half of the total contribution of each predictor set (i.e. unique + joint 479 components). The contribution of the joint fractions of the different sets of variables 480 was close to 40% of the total contribution of each predictor set. In addition, the relative 481 (but not absolute) variance explained by the different sets of environmental variables 482 and their joint effects were relatively similar between beta diversity and species richness 483 (Fig. 3).

484 Most of the variation of PPN community metrics (e.g. beta diversity and species 485 richness) was spatially structured and the spatial variables explained 5.1% and 18.5% of 486 the variation in species composition and species richness, respectively, including unique 487 and joint fractions (Table 1; Table S2.3). For species richness the pure space component 488 [d] explained 7.9% (approximately 27% of the total variance explained); however, it 489 showed a lower unique contribution for beta diversity (2.3%). The soil variables 490 explained 12.5% of the variation in species richness and 5.3% of species composition, 491 being the most important factor for beta diversity and the third important factor for 492 species richness. The unique (non-spatial) contribution of soil variables [b] explained 493 2.9% of the variation of species composition and 3.5% of the variation of species 494 composition. Although the pure soil component explained 3.5% of the variation of 495 species richness, this had no significant effect. The pure environment component [a] had 496 no effect on species richness and showed a low explanatory contribution for beta 497 diversity because the environmental variables tended to be spatially structured and 498 related to patterns of the soil data set (Fig. 3; Appendix A2). Finally, agronomic 499 management variables explained 12% of the variation in species richness, but only

- 2.53% of species composition. The pure agronomic management component [c] had the
 second highest effect on species richness with 4.8%; however, it had a negligible effect
 on beta diversity.
- 503

504 *3.4. Species and local contributions to beta diversity*

505

Species contributions (SCBD) ranged from almost zero to 17%. Overall, migratory ectoparasitic PPN species including *Helicotylenchus digonicus* (SCBD = 0.1711), *H.* vulgaris (SCBD = 0.1164), *Xiphinema pachtaicum* (SCBD = 0.091476), and *H. oleae* (SCBD = 0.0792) showed the highest distribution heterogeneity in our study (DATA IN BRIEF). However, the majority of the remaining taxa were more homogeneously distributed (SCBD < 0.002). SCBD was significantly related with nematode prevalence and density range (Table 2).

513 Local contributions (LCBD) exhibited a heterogeneity pattern across space (Fig. 514 2c). Permutation test identified 27 orchard units with significant LCBD values. A 515 simple linear regression model showed that LCBD was not significantly linearly related 516 to the PPN community metrics such as species richness and total nematode abundance in each olive orchard (Table 2). Therefore, large LCBD values may indicate sites that 517 518 have rare species combinations or may occur due to the ecological requirements of 519 specific species. Partial linear regression and subsequent forward selection procedures 520 (Legendre and Gauthier, 2014) revealed that soil characteristics appeared to be more 521 important at explaining LCBD (Table 3). The contribution of agronomic management 522 characteristics was relatively moderate and additional environmental variables had only 523 a marginal influence on LCBD.

524

4. Discussion

4.1. The role of stochasticity on PPN community patterns

529	Variation partitioning has been used to assess the relative effect of deterministic
530	and stochastic processes in plant communities (Svenning et al., 2004; Legendre et al.,
531	2009; Amici et al., 2013; Baldeck et al., 2013a; Punchi-Manage et al., 2014),
532	amphibians (Luiz et al., 2016), and below-ground communities (Dumbrell et al., 2009).
533	For example, Baldeck et al. (2013a) found that 26% to 68% of the spatial variation in
534	species composition remained unexplained in 25-50 ha plots of tropical forests, and
535	Amici et al. (2013) found similar figures (28% to 58%) in Mediterranean forests. We
536	found an even more prominent role of unexplained variation in structuring PPN
537	communities, reaching 90% in species composition and 70% in species richness (Table
538	1). The lack of information about the relative importance of stochastic and deterministic
539	processes on the spatial distribution of soil biota is notable. Nonetheless, the large
540	faction of unexplained variation found here is consistent with results of a recent study
541	based on the overall community of soil nematodes in agricultural and natural
542	ecosystems (Quist et al., 2019). Frequent disturbance of soils in agricultural systems
543	might explain the relative low contribution of deterministic processes (Ferrenberg et al.,
544	2013), as opposed to the natural system where the spatial variation of nematode
545	communities is more dominated by deterministic rather than stochastic processes
546	(Moroenyane et al., 2016). The large proportion of unexplained variation may also be
547	due to the omission of exploratory variables and mechanisms such as species
548	interactions (De Cáceres et al., 2012). Additional factors influencing the relative
549	importance of different mechanisms on beta diversity may be the scale of the study as

- well as the spatial configuration and strength of ecological gradients used (Smith andLundholm, 2010).
- 552

553 4.2. Spatial structure of PPN community patterns

554

A recent meta-analysis by Soininen (2016) regarding major organism types and ecosystems showed that a mean of 11% of the variation in community composition was uniquely explained by spatial variables. However, the unique contribution of spatial variables observed in our study was somewhat lower for both beta diversity and species richness, with the spatial descriptors explaining a larger fraction of the variation in species richness than in beta diversity.

561 We found a significant influence of broad-scale structures on the spatial variation of 562 species richness, where the most influent spatial variables (MEM2) (Table 1; Appendix 563 A2, Supplementary Table S2.2; Appendix A3). Overall, spatial patterns of soil 564 communities likely reflect the outcome and interplay of multiple community processes, 565 In particular, the broad-scale trend in species richness could indicate spatial richness 566 gradients or 'hotspots' of species richness that in many cases can be explained by 567 habitat filtering processes (Legendre and Legendre, 2012b). In fact, we found a 568 significant influence of the soil edaphic type and climatic type explaining the broad-569 scaled spatial variation (MEM2) on the variation of PPN species richness (P < 0.001; 570 Appendix A3). Thus, habitat richness in PPN may be delimited by spatial homogeneity 571 at regional scale sustained through soil environment patterns (i.e. soil edaphic type) and 572 climate conditions (i.e. climate type area) but not by local environment gradients

573 (Nielsen et al., 2014; Godefroid et al., 2017). A similar pattern has been shown for other
574 soil organism such as collembolan (Widenfalk et al., 2016).

575 In contrast, spatial analysis showed that the overall variation of community 576 composition was mostly associated with fine-scale variation (MEM26) in combination 577 with broad-scale variation (MEM2) (Table 1; Appendix A2, Supplementary Table S2.1; 578 Appendix A3). However, the rather low influence of both these spatial variables (1.4% 579 of the variation) agrees with the large spatial heterogeneity (Fig. 2) and the important 580 role of stochasticity for beta diversity found here, and also previously reported for soil 581 nematodes (Quist et al., 2019). The fine-scale relationships (MEM26) were dominated 582 by local environmental gradients in combination with regional gradients. This does not 583 suggest a clear habitat pattern (Appendix 3) for beta diversity, which may rather be 584 influenced by small-scale environmental microhabitats (Nielsen et al., 2014).

585 Overall, the total contribution of the joint fractions detected by spatial variables in 586 both diversity indexes was higher than that of the total unique fractions (Fig. 3; 587 Appendix A2, Supplementary Table S2.3). Therefore, PPN communities showed 588 moderate levels of spatial structure caused by pure spatial structure and spatial gradients 589 in explanatory variables as discussed above. The pure spatial component might 590 represent the role of dispersal limitation of PPN within the soil ecosystem (De Cáceres 591 et al., 2012). Although the three-dimensional movement of soil nematodes is difficult to 592 assess, we can expect that they will actively move rather short distances due to their 593 small body size (Gaugler and Bilgrami, 2004). Movements over larger distances are 594 passive, and probably mostly due to agricultural activities (e.g. farm machinery, plant 595 propagation material, or seeds) (Castillo et al., 2010).

596

4.3. Role of soil on PPN community patterns

599	Our study highlights the influence of soil drivers in structuring PPN communities.
600	The unique contribution of soil was significant only for beta diversity but not for spatial
601	variation of species richness. Thus, gradients in soil properties induced changes in the
602	variation of PPN biomass and therefore, producing "habitat filtering" that reflected
603	assemblage patterns of PPN communities largely independent of the above-ground
604	environmental gradients (in climate and topography) as also suggested soil organisms in
605	general (Ettema and Wardle, 2002). However, the effect of soil variables on the
606	variation of species richness was spatially structured and/or shared with other
607	explanatory variables describing above-ground environment (e.g. climate, topography
608	or agronomic management), given the large relative contribution (unique and joint
609	fractions) of soil to species richness (12.5%) compared to beta diversity (5.3%).
610	Overall, soil chemical gradients showed the strongest influence on the distribution
611	of PPN communities among the soil properties (Table 1), especially for Ca, pH, Na
612	availability or extractable P in the case of species richness (Appendix A. Supplementary
613	data, Tables S2.1 and S2.2). The significant and strong influence of Ca on beta diversity
614	may result from its negative effect on PPN densities as a driver on the abundance of
615	nematodes (and therefore on nematode biomass), although the possible underlying
616	mechanisms are not as clear for the overall community of PPN as those suggested by
617	Wallace et al. (1993). In contrast to beta diversity, the variation of species richness was
618	strongly influenced by the availability of P (Appendix A. Supplementary data, Table
619	S1.); suggesting that this variable could play a key role in community patterns of PPN
620	infesting soils of olive orchards. Although P availability has been identified as a
621	determinant of PPN abundance (Norton, 1978), other studies have revealed filtering

622	effects by P gradients on the size of soil nematodes (Mulder, 2010). Specifically, the
623	variability of P concentration could structure PPN assemblages based on nematodes
624	presence to the entire community depending on the size of the PPN species (Gaugler
625	and Bilgrami, 2004).

626

627 4.4. Role of the environment on PPN community patterns

628

629 Overall, the variance explained by the unique contribution of environmental 630 climatic and topographic variables [a] was relatively small compared to that explained 631 by the other sets of variables, highlighting that in comparison to similar approaches in 632 above-ground ecosystems these variables did not influence species richness (Fig. 3; 633 Appendix A2). For example, studies on tropical forest (Baldeck et al., 2013a) and 634 amphibian species (Luiz et al., 2016), found that a higher portion of species 635 composition variation was mainly explained by topographical and geomorphical 636 variables, respectively. The relatively low contribution of environmental effects on PPN 637 communities may be partly attributed to the scale at which the present study was carried 638 out. For instance, Nielsen et al. (2014) found that climate was strongly related with 639 nematode assemblages at global scales but not with local diversity descriptors. The 640 negligible effect of topography may also be influenced by scale in relation to the range 641 of the elevation gradient (Dong et al., 2017). 642

643 *4.5. Role of agronomic management practices on PPN community patterns*644

645 Population dynamics of PPN in olive agroecosystems respond rapidly to
646 agricultural management practices (Sánchez-Moreno et al., 2009; Palomares-Rius et al.,

647 2015; Ali et al., 2017), yet our study unexpectedly indicated a negligible effect of the

648 pure management component [c] on beta diversity (Fig. 3; Appendix A2,

649 Supplementary Table S2.1). Previous information is limited as earlier studies have not

650 included spatial descriptors which would allow the effect of management practices to be

related to spatially structured (Vleminckx et al., 2017). Furthermore, the majority of

those studies were not based on beta diversity approaches but on alpha or gamma

653 diversity descriptors, which could show different trends.

654 The variation in species richness was associated with the pure management 655 component (Fig. 3; Appendix A2, Supplementary Table S2.2) and was related to the age 656 of the olive tree plantation and absence of soil-vegetation cover below the canopy, with 657 the irrigation pattern in the orchard as the most important predictor for beta diversity 658 (Table 1; Appendix A2, Supplementary Table S2.2). These results tend to agree with 659 previous studies showing changes in nematode community patterns related to forest 660 stand ages (Zhang et al., 2015). That is, if conditions are suitable, more nematode 661 species will accumulate over longer periods of time, indicated by olive trees age. 662 Additionally, larger canopies of older trees and optimum soil moisture may improve the 663 soil environmental conditions, influencing PPN diversity as suggested in other types of 664 ecosystems for overall above- and below-ground organisms (Caldeira et al., 2014). The 665 soil-vegetation cover was also important for structuring the patterns of PPN 666 communities for species richness (Table 1; Appendix A2, Supplementary Table S2.3). 667 The influence on species richness caused by natural herbaceous plants composing the 668 soil cover below the tree canopy supports that plant species affect the relative selection 669 of PPN at the species level (Palomares-Rius et al., 2015). 670

671 *4.6. Contrast between species richness and species composition*

672

673	Our study revealed substantial differences between the effects of overall
674	environmental variables on beta diversity and on spatial variation in species richness.
675	First, the variation explained in species richness was higher than that of beta diversity,
676	which is contrary to the general pattern detected in above-ground systems where it was
677	similar or showed the opposite trend (Legendre et al., 2009; Punchi-Manage et al.,
678	2014). Habitat gradients influencing nematode abundance are exceptionally
679	heterogeneous in soil ecosystems which are strongly dominated by stochasticity. Thus,
680	different numbers of species among sampling points may be more influenced by soil
681	heterogeneity, whereas neutral processes may strongly influence nematode abundance.
682	Second, whereas the pure management component had a negligible effect on beta
683	diversity, it influenced the variation of species richness. This is not surprising because
684	some of the PPN genera or specific species groups have shown particular sensitivity to
685	agronomic practices (Sánchez-Moreno et al., 2009; Palomares-Rius et al., 2012;2015).
686	For instance, agricultural practices such as vegetation cover and irrigation causes a
687	notable effect on the diversity of root-knot nematodes (Meloidogyne spp.) spatial
688	structure in commercial olive tree orchards (Archidona-Yuste et al., 2018).
689	
690	4.7. Ecological uniqueness of sites and species contributions to overall beta
691	diversity of PPN
692	
693	The species contributions to beta diversity (SCBD) was positively correlated with

694 nematode occupancy, that is, nematode prevalence and density range ($R^2 = 57\%$; Table 695 2). Thus, SCBD could be related to niche position (Heino and Grönroos, 2017). This

696 relationship would also allow the dominant PPN species that showed the largest

697	abundance variation among sites to be used as suitable indicators of fluctuations of
698	specific environmental properties in agroecosystems (Heino and Grönroos, 2017). We
699	found that the PPN species with the highest SCBD index belonged to the genera
700	Helicotylenchus and Xiphinema (DATA IN BRIEF), which have been characterised as
701	having wide distributions and high prevalence as well as large abundance (Archidona-
702	Yuste et al., 2016; Palomares-Rius et al., 2018). In addition, the fact that most of these
703	species are migratory ectoparasities and yet are also characterised as "persister"
704	nematodes make them suitable indicators to predict fluctuations of soil ecological
705	properties or stable habitats (Bongers, 1990).
706	We expected that the local contributions to beta diversity (LCBD) would be
707	associated primarily with species richness and nematode abundance (Heino and
708	Grönroos, 2017), however, this was not the case. We found, instead, that LCBD was
709	positively related to total nematode biomass at each site, although this relationship was
710	weak (adjusted $R^2 = 0.02$; Table 2). Sites with significant values (highest LCBD index)
711	showed communities composed of rare species (Fig. 2b, c) as reported by Legendre and
712	De Cáceres (2013). Most of the sampling sites with large and significant LCBD values
713	were mainly grouped into separate geographical areas (Fig. 2c). The highest and
714	significant LCBD values were mainly found in olive orchards located in the western
715	middle area and close to the downstream course of the Guadalquivir River (Fig. 2c).
716	However significant LCBD values were also observed in the south-east area,
717	characterised by a semi-arid climate and is markedly different from the rest of the study
718	area (Rodrigo et al., 2012). These geographically-related differences may suggest that
719	habitat filtering mechanisms underlie some of the variation of LCBD (Table 3), while
720	the role of stochasticity in driving LCBD was also prominent, as was seen in beta
721	diversity and species richness (Table 3).

722	Overall, soil variables, particularly soil texture, pH and soil type, showed the
723	strongest influence on the variation of LCBD. Nonetheless, some variables describing
724	management, such as olive tree age and cultivars, were also important. These findings
725	agree with previous results and hypotheses regarding the filtering effect of agronomic
726	practices on PPN community composition in agroecosystems, especially in olive
727	orchards (Palomares-Rius et al., 2015; Sánchez-Moreno et al., 2015). Futures studies
728	based on spatial-temporal variation in LCBD (Legendre and Gauthier, 2014) may reveal
729	novel insights as to the influence of different agronomic practices on PPN community
730	assemblages.

731

732 **5.** Conclusion

733

734 Although numerous studies have documented the distribution of plant and animal 735 communities with respect to spatial structure (Soininen, 2016), relative little attention 736 has been paid to the involvement of spatial structure in the diversity of soil organisms. 737 We found that PPN communities in olive orchards showed moderate levels of spatial 738 correlation in the variation in species composition and species richness, as indicated by 739 the fractions of beta diversity and species richness variation explained by spatial 740 descriptors. Soil was the following most influential factor driving communities of PPN. 741 Agronomic management practices, however, showed less influence than expected. We 742 found that more than two thirds of the variation remained unexplained, which contrasts 743 with common expectations that soil and management would primarily determine PPN 744 community variation among sites. Future studies should examine whether PPN 745 associated with wild forms of olive trees show more spatial structure in beta diversity 746 than that found here in the olive orchards. Our findings revealed novel insights

regarding the spatial variation diversity and distribution of PPN infesting soils from
agricultural ecosystems, and showed that their beta diversity was less structured by the
factors space and environment compared to other organism types such as plants or
amphibian.

751

752 Acknowledgements

753 This research was supported by grant AGL2012-37521 from Ministerio de Economía y

754 Competitividad of Spain, grant 219262 ArimNET-ERANET FP7 2012-2015 Project

755 PESTOLIVE and grant P12AGR 1486 Consejería de Economía, Innvovación y Ciencia

756 of the Junta de Andalucía, and Union Europea, Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo regional,

⁷⁵⁷ 'Una manera de hacer Europa'. A. Archidona-Yuste was a recipient of research contract

758 BES-2013063495 from Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Spain; and at present

759 is a recipient of Humboldt Research Fellowship for Postdoctoral Researchers at

760 Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research-UFZ, Leipzig, Germany. The authors

761 thank J. Martín-Barbarroja, C. Cantalapiedra-Navarrete and G. León Ropero (IAS-

762 CSIC) for the excellent technical assistance, H.F. Rapoport (IAS-CSIC) for her

review of the manuscript and suggestions for improving the English

style, and four anonymous reviewers for comments that greatly improved the

765 manuscript.

766

767 Appendix A. Supplementary data

768 Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at

769 https://doi.org/xxxxxxxxxx/.

770

771 **References**

- Ali, N., Chapuis, E., Tavoillot, J., Mateille, T., 2014. Plant-parasitic nematodes
 associated with olive tree (*Olea europaea* L.) with a focus on the Mediterranean
 Basin: A review. Comptes Rendus Biologies 337, 423-442.
- Ali, N., Tavoillot, J., Besnard, G., Khadari, B., Dmowska, E., Winiszewska, G., FossatiGaschignard, O., Ater, M., Aït Hamza, M., El Mousadik, A., El Oualkadi, A.,
 Moukhli, A., Essalouh, L., El Bakkali, A., Chapuis, E., Mateille, T., 2017. How
 anthropogenic changes may affect soil-borne parasite diversity? Plant-parasitic
 nematode communities associated with olive trees in Morocco as a case study.
 BMC Ecology 17, 4.
- Amici, V., Santi, E., Filibeck, G., Diekmann, M., Geri, F., Landi, S., Scoppola, A.,
 Chiarucci, A., 2013. Influence of secondary forest succession on plant diversity
 patterns in a Mediterranean landscape. Journal of Biogeography 40, 2335-2347.
- Anderson, M.J., Crist, T.O., Chase, J.M., Vellend, M., Inouye, B.D., Freestone, A.L.,
 Sanders, N.J., Cornell, H.V., Comita, L.S., Davies, K.F., Harrison, S.P., Kraft,
 N.J.B., Stegen, J.C., Swenson, N.G., 2011. Navigating the multiple meanings of β
 diversity: a roadmap for the practicing ecologist. Ecology Letters 14, 19-28.
- Archidona-Yuste, A., Cantalapiedra-Navarrete, C., Liébanas, G., Rapoport, H.F.,
 Castillo, P., Palomares-Rius, J.E., 2018. Diversity of root-knot nematodes of the
 genus Meloidogyne Göeldi, 1892 (Nematoda: Meloidogynidae) associated with
 olive plants and environmental cues regarding their distribution in southern Spain.
 PLoS ONE 13, e0198236.
- Archidona-Yuste, A., Navas-Cortés, J.A., Cantalapiedra-Navarrete, C., Palomares-Rius,
 J.E., Castillo, P., 2016. Remarkable diversity and prevalence of dagger nematodes
 of the genus *Xiphinema* Cobb, 1913 (Nematoda: Longidoridae) in olives revealed
 by integrative approaches. PLoS ONE 11, e0165412.
- Baldeck, C.A., Harms, K.E., Yavitt, J.B., John, R., Turner, B.L., Valencia, R.,
 Navarrete, H., Bunyavejchewin, S., Kiratiprayoon, S., Yaacob, A., Supardi,
 M.N.N., Davies, S.J., Hubbell, S.P., Chuyong, G.B., Kenfack, D., Thomas, D.W.,
- Bulling, J.W., 2013a. Habitat filtering across tree life stages in tropical forest
 Bulling, J.W., 2013a. Habitat filtering across tree life stages in tropical forest
- communities. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 280.
 Baldeck, C.A., Harms, K.E., Yavitt, J.B., John, R., Turner, B.L., Valencia, R.,
- Baldeck, C.A., Harms, K.E., Yavitt, J.B., John, R., Turner, B.L., Valencia, R.,
 Navarrete, H., Davies, S.J., Chuyong, G.B., Kenfack, D., Thomas, D.W.,
- 804 Madawala, S., Gunatilleke, N., Gunatilleke, S., Bunyavejchewin, S., Kiratiprayoon,
- 805 S., Yaacob, A., Supardi, M.N.N., Dalling, J.W., 2013b. Soil resources and
- topography shape local tree community structure in tropical forests. Proceedings of
 the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 280.
- Bardgett, R., 2005. The Biology of Soil: A Community and Ecosystem Approach. OUP
 Oxford.
- Bardgett, R.D., van der Putten, W.H., 2014. Belowground biodiversity and ecosystem
 functioning. Nature 515, 505-511.
- Blanchet, F.G., Legendre, P., Borcard, D., 2008. Forward selection of explanatory
 variables. Ecology 89, 2623-2632.
- Boehner, J., Selige, T., 2006. Spatial prediction of soil attributes using terraing analysis
 and climate regionalisation. In: Boehner, J., McCloy, K.R., Strobl, J. [Ed.]: SAGA Analysis and Modelling Applications, Goettinger Geoprahische Abhandlungen,
 Goettingen: 13-28.
- 818 Bongers, T., 1990. The maturity index: an ecological measure of environmental
- 819 disturbance based on nematode species composition. Oecologia 83, 14-19.

820	Borcard, D., Gillet, F., Legendre, P., 2018. Numerical Ecology with R. Springer New
821	York.
822	Borcard, D., Legendre, P., 2002. All-scale spatial analysis of ecological data by means
823	of principal coordinates of neighbour matrices. Ecological Modelling 153, 51-68.
824	Borcard, D., Legendre, P., Avois-Jacquet, C., Tuomisto, H., 2004. Dissecting the spatial
825	structure of ecological data at multiple scales. Ecology 85, 1826-1832.
826	Borcard, D., Legendre, P., Drapeau, P., 1992. Partialling out the spatial component of
827	ecological variation. Ecology 73, 1045-1055.
828	Caldeira, M.C., Ibáñez, I., Nogueira, C., Bugalho, M.N., Lecomte, X., Moreira, A.,
829	Pereira, J.S., 2014. Direct and indirect effects of tree canopy facilitation in the
830	recruitment of Mediterranean oaks. Journal of Applied Ecology 51, 349-358.
831	Castillo, P., Nico, A.I., Navas-Cortés, J.A., Landa, B.B., Jiménez-Díaz, R.M., Vovlas,
832	N., 2010. Plant-Parasitic Nematodes Attacking Olive Trees and their Management.
833	Plant Disease 94, 148-162.
834	Conrad, O., Bechtel, B., Bock, M., Dietrich, H., Fischer, E., Gerlitz, L., Wehberg, J.,
835	Wichmann, V., Böhner, J., 2015. System for Automated Geoscientific Analyses
836	(SAGA) v. 2.1.4. Geosci. Model Dev. 8, 1991-2007.
837	Coolen, W.A., 1979. Methods for the extraction of <i>Meloidogyne</i> spp. and other
838	nematodes from roots and soil. In: Lamberti, F., Taylor, C.E. (Eds.), Root-Knot
839	Nematodes (Meloidogyne species). Academic Press, pp.317-330., pp. 317-330.
840	De Cáceres, M., Legendre, P., Valencia, R., Cao, M., Chang, LW., Chuyong, G.,
841	Condit, R., Hao, Z., Hsieh, CF., Hubbell, S., Kenfack, D., Ma, K., Mi, X., Supardi
842	Noor, M.N., Kassim, A.R., Ren, H., Su, SH., Sun, I.F., Thomas, D., Ye, W., He,
843	F., 2012. The variation of tree beta diversity across a global network of forest plots.
844	Global Ecology and Biogeography 21, 1191-1202.
845	Dong, K., Moroenyane, I., Tripathi, B., Kerfahi, D., Takahashi, K., Yamamoto, N., An,
846	C., Cho, H., Adams, J., 2017. Soil nematodes show a mid-elevation diversity
847	maximum and elevational zonation on Mt. Norikura, Japan. Sci Rep 7, 3028.
848	Dray, S., 2011. packfor: forward selection with permutation (Canoco p.46).
849	Dray, S., Bauman, D., Blanchet, G., Bocard, D., Clappe, S., Guenard, G., Jombart, T.,
850	Larocque, G., Legendre, P., Madi, N., Wagner, H.H., 2019. adespatial: Multivariate
851	Multiscale Spatial Analysis.
852	Dray, S., Legendre, P., Peres-Neto, P.R., 2006. Spatial modelling: a comprehensive
853	framework for principal coordinate analysis of neighbour matrices (PCNM).
854	Ecological Modelling 196, 483-493.
855	Dumbrell, A.J., Nelson, M., Helgason, T., Dytham, C., Fitter, A.H., 2009. Relative roles
856	of niche and neutral processes in structuring a soil microbial community. ISME J 4,
857	337-345.
858	Duyck, PF., Dortel, E., Tixier, P., Vinatier, F., Loubana, PM., Chabrier, C.,
859	Quénéhervé, P., 2012. Niche partitioning based on soil type and climate at the
860	landscape scale in a community of plant-feeding nematodes. Soil Biology and
861	Biochemistry 44, 49-55.
862	Ettema, C.H., Wardle, D.A., 2002. Spatial soil ecology. Trends in Ecology & Evolution
863	17, 177-183.
864	FAO, 1980. Soil and Plant Testing and Analysis: Report of an Expert Consultation Held
865	in Rome, 13-17 June 1977. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
866	Nations.
867	Ferrenberg, S., O'Neill, S.P., Knelman, J.E., Todd, B., Duggan, S., Bradley, D.,
868	Robinson, T., Schmidt, S.K., Townsend, A.R., Williams, M.W., Cleveland, C.C.,
869	Melbourne, B.A., Jiang, L., Nemergut, D.R., 2013. Changes in assembly processes

870 in soil bacterial communities following a wildfire disturbance. ISME J 7, 1102-871 1111. 872 Ferris, H., Bongers, T., de Goede, R.G.M., 2001. A framework for soil food web 873 diagnostics: extension of the nematode faunal analysis concept. Applied Soil 874 Ecology 18, 13-29. 875 Freckman, D.W., Virginia, R.A., 1989. Plant-Feeding Nematodes in Deep-Rooting 876 Desert Ecosystems. Ecology 70, 1665-1678. 877 Gaugler, R., Bilgrami, A.L., 2004. Nematode Behaviour. CABI. 878 Godefroid, M., Tixier, P., Chabrier, C., Djigal, D., Quénéhervé, P., 2017. Associations of soil type and previous crop with plant-feeding nematode communities in plantain 879 880 agrosystems. Applied Soil Ecology 113, 63-70. 881 Heino, J., Grönroos, M., 2017. Exploring species and site contributions to beta diversity 882 in stream insect assemblages. Oecologia 183, 151-160. 883 Hijmans, R.J., Phillips, S., Leathwick, J., Elith, J., 2016. dismo: Species Distribution 884 Modelling. 885 Hubbell, S.P., 2001. The Unified Neutral Theory of Biodiversity and Biogeography 886 (MPB-32). Princeton University Press. 887 Infante-Amate, J., 2012. The Ecology and History of the Mediterranean Olive Grove: 888 The Spanish Great Expansion, 1750-2000. Rural History 23, 161-184. 889 Legendre, P., Borcard, D., Peres-Neto, P.R., 2005. Analyzing beta diversity: 890 partitioning the spatial variation of community composition data. . Ecological 891 Monographs 75, 435-450. Legendre, P., De Cáceres, M., 2013. Beta diversity as the variance of community data: 892 893 dissimilarity coefficients and partitioning. Ecology Letters 16, 951-963. 894 Legendre, P., Gallagher, E.D., 2001. Ecologically meaningful transformations for 895 ordination of species data. Oecologia 129, 271-280. 896 Legendre, P., Gauthier, O., 2014. Statistical methods for temporal and space-time 897 analysis of community composition data. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: 898 **Biological Sciences 281.** 899 Legendre, P., Legendre, L., 2012a. Chapter 10 - Interpretation of ecological structures. 900 In: Pierre, L., Louis, L. (Eds.), Developments in Environmental Modelling. 901 Elsevier, pp. 521-624. 902 Legendre, P., Legendre, L., 2012b. Chapter 13 - Spatial analysis. In: Legendre, P., 903 Legendre, L. (Eds.), Developments in Environmental Modelling. Elsevier, pp. 785-904 858. 905 Legendre, P., Mi, X., Ren, H., Ma, K., Yu, M., Sun, I.F., He, F., 2009. Partitioning beta 906 diversity in a subtropical broad-leaved forest of China. Ecology 90, 663-674. 907 Luiz, A.M., Leão-Pires, T.A., Sawaya, R.J., 2016. Geomorphology Drives Amphibian 908 Beta Diversity in Atlantic Forest Lowlands of Southeastern Brazil. PLOS ONE 11, 909 e0153977. 910 MAGRAMA, 2016. Estadísticas agrarias (Agricultural Statistics for Spain). Ministerio 911 de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente. Available at: 912 http://www.magrama.gob.es/es/estadistica/temas/estadisticas-agrarias/agricultura/. 913 Moeys, J., 2015. soiltexture: Functions for Soil Texture Plot, Classification and 914 Transformation. R package version 1.3.3. 915 Montgomery, D.C., Peck, E.A., 1992. Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis. 916 Wiley. 917 Moroenyane, I., Dong, K., Singh, D., Chimphango, S.B.M., Adams, J.M., 2016. 918 Deterministic processes dominate nematode community structure in the Fynbos 919 Mediterranean heathland of South Africa. Evolutionary Ecology 30, 685-701.

920 Mulder, C., 2010. Soil fertility controls the size-specific distribution of eukaryotes. 921 Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 1195, E74-E81. 922 Neher, D.A., 2010. Ecology of Plant and Free-Living Nematodes in Natural and 923 Agricultural Soil. Annual Review of Phytopathology 48, 371-394. 924 NGI, 2016. National Geographic Insitute of Spain. Available at: 925 http://www.ign.es/ign/main/index.do?locale=en. Nicol, J.M., Turner, S.J., Coyne, D.L., Nijs, L.d., Hockland, S., Maafi, Z.T., 2011. 926 927 Current Nematode Threats to World Agriculture. In: Jones, J., Gheysen, G., Fenoll, 928 C. (Eds.), Genomics and Molecular Genetics of Plant-Nematode Interactions. 929 Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 21-43. 930 Nielsen, U.N., Ayres, E., Wall, D.H., Li, G., Bardgett, R.D., Wu, T., Garey, J.R., 2014. 931 Global-scale patterns of assemblage structure of soil nematodes in relation to 932 climate and ecosystem properties. Global Ecology and Biogeography 23, 968-978. 933 Norton, D.C., 1978. Ecology of plant-parasitic nematodes. Wiley. 934 Norton, D.C., 1989. Abiotic Soil Factors and Plant-parasitic Nematode Communities. 935 Journal of Nematology 21, 299-307. 936 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Friendly, M., Kind, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D.M., 937 Minchin, P.R., O"Hara, R.B., Simpson, G.L.S., Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., 938 Szoecs, E., Wagner, H., 2019. vegan: Community Ecology Package. 939 Ortega, E., Lozano, F.J., Martínez, F.J., Bienes, R., Gallardo, J.F., Asensio, C., 2016. 940 Soils of the Mediterranean Areas. In: Gallardo, J.F. (Ed.), The Soils of Spain. 941 Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 163-187. 942 Palomares-Rius, J.E., Cantalapiedra-Navarrete, C., Archidona-Yuste, A., Vovlas, N., 943 Tzortzakakis, E.A., Castillo, P., 2018. Molecular and morphological 944 characterization of the spiral nematode Helicotylenchus oleae Inserra, Vovlas & 945 Golden, 1979 (Nematoda: Hoplolaimidae) in the Mediterranean Basin. European 946 Journal of Plant Pathology 150, 881-891. 947 Palomares-Rius, J.E., Castillo, P., Montes-Borrego, M., Müller, H., Landa, B.B., 2012. 948 Nematode community populations in the rhizosphere of cultivated olive differs 949 according to the plant genotype. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 45, 168-171. 950 Palomares-Rius, J.E., Castillo, P., Montes-Borrego, M., Navas-Cortés, J.A., Landa, 951 B.B., 2015. Soil Properties and Olive Cultivar Determine the Structure and 952 Diversity of Plant-Parasitic Nematode Communities Infesting Olive Orchards Soils 953 in Southern Spain. PLOS ONE 10, e0116890. 954 Peres-Neto, P.R., Legendre, P., 2010. Estimating and controlling for spatial structure in 955 the study of ecological communities. Global Ecology and Biogeography 19, 174-956 184. 957 Peres-Neto, P.R., Legendre, P., Dray, S., Borcard, D., 2006. Variation partitioning of 958 species data matrices: estimation and comparison of fractions. Ecology 87, 2614-959 2625. 960 Punchi-Manage, R., Wiegand, T., Wiegand, K., Getzin, S., Gunatilleke, C.V.S., 961 Gunatilleke, I.A.U.N., 2014. Effect of spatial processes and topography on structuring species assemblages in a Sri Lankan dipterocarp forest. Ecology 95, 962 963 376-386. QGIS Development Team, 2016. QGIS Geographic Inofrmation System. Open Source 964 965 Geospatial Foundation Project. Quist, C.W., Gort, G., Mooijman, P., Brus, D.J., van den Elsen, S., Kostenko, O., 966 Vervoort, M., Bakker, J., van der Putten, W.H., Helder, J., 2019. Spatial 967 968 distribution of soil nematodes relates to soil organic matter and life strategy. Soil 969 Biology and Biochemistry 136, 107542.

970 R Core Team, 2016. R: a lenguage and environment for statistical computing. R 971 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. . 972 R Core Team, 2018. R: a lenguage and environment for statistical computing. R 973 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. . 974 Rallo, L., Barranco, D., Castro-García, S., Connor, D.J., Gómez del Campo, M., Rallo, 975 P., 2013. High-Density Olive Plantations. Horticultural Reviews Volume 41. John 976 Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp. 303-384. 977 Rao, C.R., 1995. A review of canonical coordinates and an alternative to 978 correspondence analysis using Hellinger distance. Qüestiió 19, 23-63. 979 REDIAM, 2016. Red de Informacion Ambiental de Andalucia (Andalucia 980 Environmental Information Network). Consejería de Medio Ambiente y 981 Ordenacion del Territorio, Junta de Andalucía, Sevilla, Spain. . 982 Rodrigo, F.S., Gómez-Navarro, J.J., Montávez Gómez, J.P., 2012. Climate variability in 983 Andalusia (sourthen Spain) during the period 1701-1850 based on documentary 984 sources: evaluation and comparison with climate model simulations. Climate of the 985 Past 8, 117-133. 986 Sánchez-Moreno, S., Castro, J., Alonso-Prados, E., Alonso-Prados, J.L., García-Baudín, 987 J.M., Talavera, M., Durán-Zuazo, V.H., 2015. Tillage and herbicide decrease soil 988 biodiversity in olive orchards. Agronomy for Sustainable Development 35, 691-989 700. 990 Sánchez-Moreno, S., Nicola, N.L., Ferris, H., Zalom, F.G., 2009. Effects of agricultural 991 management on nematode-mite assemblages: Soil food web indices as predictors of 992 mite community composition. Applied Soil Ecology 41, 107-117. 993 Smith, T.W., Lundholm, J.T., 2010. Variation partitioning as a tool to distinguish 994 between niche and neutral processes. Ecography 33, 648-655. 995 Soininen, J., 2016. Spatial structure in ecological communities – a quantitative analysis. 996 Oikos 125, 160-166. Svenning, J.C., Kinner, D.A., Stallard, R.F., Engelbrecht, B.M.J., Wright, S.J., 2004. 997 998 Ecological determinism in plant community structure across a tropical forest 999 landscape. Ecology 85, 2526-2538. Thessler, S., Ruokolainen, K., Tuomisto, H., Tomppo, E., 2005. Mapping gradual 1000 1001 landscape-scale floristic changes in Amazonian primary rain forests by combining 1002 ordination and remote sensing. Global Ecology and Biogeography 14, 315-325. 1003 van den Hoogen, J., Geisen, S., Routh, et al., 2019. Soil nematode abundance and 1004 functional group composition at a global scale. Nature. 1005 Vleminckx, J., Doucet, J.-L., Morin-Rivat, J., Biwolé, A.B., Bauman, D., Hardy, O.J., 1006 Favolle, A., Gillet, J.-F., Daïnou, K., Gorel, A., Drouet, T., 2017. The influence of 1007 spatially structured soil properties on tree community assemblages at a landscape 1008 scale in the tropical forests of southern Cameroon. Journal of Ecology 105, 354-1009 366. 1010 Whittaker, R.H., 1960. Vegetation of the Siskiyou Mountains, Oregon and California. 1011 Ecological Monographs 30, 279-338. Widenfalk, L.A., Malmström, A., Berg, M.P., Bengtsson, J., 2016. Small-scale 1012 1013 Collembola community composition in a pine forest soil – Overdispersion in 1014 functional traits indicates the importance of species interactions. Soil Biology and 1015 Biochemistry 103, 52-62. 1016 Wiegand, T., Moloney, K., 2014. A Handbook of spatial point pattern analysis in 1017 ecology. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman and Hall/CRC Press. . 1018 Zhang, X., Guan, P., Wang, Y., Li, Q., Zhang, S., Zhang, Z., Bezemer, T.M., Liang, W., 1019 2015. Community composition, diversity and metabolic footprints of soil

- nematodes in differently-aged temperate forests. Soil Biology and Biochemistry 80,118-126.
- Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Elphick, C.S., 2010. A protocol for data exploration to avoid
 common statistical problems. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 1, 3-14.

1024

1026 **Table 1**

- 1027 Explanatory variables significantly related to the spatial variation of community composition
- 1028 and species richness of plant-parasitic nematodes (PPN).

A) EnvironmentX-BIO3X-BIO4X-BIO16-XBIO18X-AspectSoutheast-Rainfall deficit-XClimatic areas7, 87, 85B) SoilCaXCaX-CaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XPext-XSoil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSaCILoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigatedCanopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns MEM variables26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Variable	Community composition	Species richness		
BIO3X-BIO4X-BIO16-XBIO18X-AspectSoutheast-Rainfall deficit-XClimatic areas7,8D Soil-XCaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XpH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 56Soil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 56AgeXXIrrigationIrrigatedCacopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 2, 2, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.534, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	A) Environment				
BIO8X-BIO16-XBIO18X-AspectSoutheast-Rainfall deficit-XClimatic areas7, 8B) SoilCaXCaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XpH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSaCILoSoil daphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic management-XCultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	BIO3	Х	-		
BIO16-XBIO18X-AspectSoutheast-Rainfall deficit-XClimatic areas7,85B) SoilCaX-CaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XpH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSaCILoSoil daphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic managementCultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín" Age"Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns MEM variables26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0, 7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0, 5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	BIO8	Х	-		
BI018X-AspectSoutheast-Rainfall deficit-XClimatic areas7, 8B) Soil-CaX-CaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XpH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSaCILoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic managementCultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9MEM variables26, 2, 5, 33, 4, 12, 5Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0, 7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.53.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	BIO16	-	Х		
AspectSoutheast-Rainfall deficit-XClimatic areas7, 85B) Soil-XCaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XPH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaClLo, SaLoSaClLoSoil daphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic managementCultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín" Y"Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	BIO18	X	-		
Rainfall deficit-XClimatic areas7, 85B) SoilCaX-CaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XpH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaClLo, SaLoSaClLoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic management"Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Aspect	Southeast	-		
Climate areas7, 85B) SoilCaX-NaXXNorgPext-XPett-XpH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaClLo, SaLoSaClLoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Rainfall deficit	-	X 5		
B) SoilCaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XpH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSaCILoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic managementCultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Climatic areas	7,8	3		
CaX-NaXXNorgX-Pext-XPext-XSoil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSaCILoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic management"Manzanilla"ManzanillaCultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	B) Soil				
NaXXXNorgX-Pext-XPH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSaCILoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXIrrigatedCanopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractions29, 5.33.4, 12.5Favo0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Ca	Х	-		
NorgX-Pext-XPH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaClLo, SaLoSaClLoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Na	Х	Х		
Pext-XpH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaClLo, SaLoSaClLoSoil edaphic unit3, 44, 49, 52, 5637, 47C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechin""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns MEM variables26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 32, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractions2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Env0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Norg	Х	-		
pH (KCl)X-Soil TextureSaClLo, SaLoSaClLoSoil edaphic unit $3, 44, 49, 52, 56$ $37, 47$ C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín" X"Manzanilla Sevilla"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Lechín" Serrana", "Lechín" X"Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns MEM variables $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractions $0.7, 2.9$ -, 6.6Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	Pext	-	Х		
Soil TextureSaCILo, SaLoSaCILoSoil edaphic unit $3, 44, 49, 52, 56$ $37, 47$ C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractions $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Env $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	pH (KCl)	X	-		
Soil edaphic unit $3, 44, 49, 52, 56$ $37, 47$ C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ MEM variables $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractions $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	Soil Texture	SaCILo, SaLo	SaCILo		
C) Agronomic management"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ 2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv $0.7, 2.9$ -, 6.6Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	Soil edaphic unit	3, 44, 49, 52, 56	37,47		
Cultivar"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana", "Lechín""Manzanilla Sevilla"AgeXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ 2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractions $0.7, 2.9$ -, 6.6Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	C) Agronomic management				
AgeXXIrrigationIrrigated-Canopy-NothingAlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ 2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9MEM variables $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ 2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9Summary $\%$ variation explained (unique, total) $\%$ variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv $0.7, 2.9$ -, 6.6Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	Cultivar	"Arberquina", "Manzanilla Serrana" "Lechín"	"Manzanilla Sevilla"		
Interpret in the second sec	Age	X	Х		
Canopy Canopy Alley-NothingD) Spatial patterns MEM variables $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ $23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ Summary $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ Summary $\%$ variation explained (unique, total) $\%$ variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractions $0.7, 2.9$ $-, 6.6$ Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	Irrigation	Irrigated	-		
AlleyVegetative cover-D) Spatial patterns $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ MEM variables $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ Summary $\sqrt{variation explained}$ (unique, total) $\sqrt{variation explained}$ (unique, total)Unique fractions $0.7, 2.9$ $-, 6.6$ Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	Canopy	-	Nothing		
D) Spatial patterns MEM variables $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ Summary $\%$ variation explained (unique, total) $\%$ variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv $0.7, 2.9$ $-, 6.6$ Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	Alley	Vegetative cover	-		
MEM variables $26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7, 23, 25, 44, 3$ $2, 14, 10, 6, 90, 51, 42, 9$ Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv $0.7, 2.9$ -, 6.6Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$	D) Spatial patterns				
Summary % variation explained (unique, total) % variation explained (unique, total) Unique fractions Env 0.7, 2.9 -, 6.6 Soil 2.9, 5.3 3.4, 12.5 Mana 0.5, 2.5 4.8, 12.5 Spa 2.3, 5.1 8.0, 15.5	MEM voriables	26, 2, 6, 1, 16, 19, 14, 31, 7,	2 14 10 6 00 51 42 0		
Summary% variation explained (unique, total)% variation explained (unique, total)Unique fractionsEnv $0.7, 2.9$ -, 6.6Soil $2.9, 5.3$ $3.4, 12.5$ Mana $0.5, 2.5$ $4.8, 12.5$ Spa $2.3, 5.1$ $8.0, 15.5$		23, 25, 44, 3	2, 14, 10, 0, 90, 51, 42, 9		
Unique fractions 0.7, 2.9 -, 6.6 Soil 2.9, 5.3 3.4, 12.5 Mana 0.5, 2.5 4.8, 12.5 Spa 2.3, 5.1 8.0, 15.5	Summary	% variation explained	% variation explained		
Env0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5		(unique, total)	(unique, total)		
Env0.7, 2.9-, 6.6Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Unique fractions				
Soil2.9, 5.33.4, 12.5Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Env	0.7, 2.9	-, 6.6		
Mana0.5, 2.54.8, 12.5Spa2.3, 5.18.0, 15.5	Soil	2.9, 5.3	3.4, 12.5		
Spa 2.3, 5.1 8.0, 15.5	Mana	0.5, 2.5	4.8, 12.5		
	Spa	2.3, 5.1	8.0, 15.5		
Joint fractions	Joint fractions				
Env Soil 0.2 0.1	Env Soil	0.2	0.1		
Soil Mana 0.6 2.8	Soil Mana	0.6	2.8		
Env Mana 0.1 -	Env Mana	0.1	-		
Env Spa 0.9 3.1	Env Spa	0.9	3.1		
Soil Spa 0.5 2.1	Soil Spa	0.5	2.1		
Mana Spa 0.3 0.4	Mana Spa	0.3	0.4		

Unexplained	89.7	70.3
Total	10.3	29.7
Env_Soil_Mana_Spa	0.1	1.4
Env_Mana_Spa	0.2	1.1
Soil_Mana_Spa	0.3	1.4
Env_Soil_Mana	0.2	0.2
Env_Soil_Spa	0.5	0.9

1029

1030 Notes: Significant explanatory variables are indicated by X. For categorical variables

1031 (Appendix A1), selected predictors are indicated by each significant variable. Spatial patterns

1032 are described by MEM variables (see Materials and Methods), indicating only the significant

1033 MEM variables for community composition and species richness.

1035 Table 2

1036 Results of the regression analysis to explain the species contributions to beta diversity (SCBD)

1037 and the local contributions to beta diversity (LCBD) by PPN community indices.

1038

	Estimate	SE	t value	P value		R^2	R^2_{adj}
A) $SCBD^1$							
(Intercept)	2.3 e-04	1.4 e-03	0.17	0.87			
Density range ² (nem/500 cm ³)	2.5 e-06	5.6 e-07	4.5	1.6 e-05	***		
Prevalence $(\%)^3$	1.2e-03	1.2 e-04	10.3	< 2 e-16	***		
Model				< 2 e-16	***	0.58	0.57
B) LCBD ⁴							
(Intercept)	2.7 e-03	1.9 e-04	14.1	< 2 e-06	***		
Total nematode							
biomass	2.5 e-05	8.7 e-06	2.9	0.004	**		
$(\mu g/500 cm^3)$							
Total nematode							
Abundance	-6.0 e-06	4.3 e-06	-1.4	0.16			
$(nem/500cm^3)$							
Species richness	-1.3 e-04	1.1 e-04	-1.2	0.23			
Model				0.01		0.03	0.02

1039

1040

1041 data form each PPN species.

² Density range index includes minimum and maximum density (nematodes/500 cm³) detected 1042 for each PPN species. 1043

³ Prevalence was calculated by dividing the number of samples in which PPN species was 1044

detected by the total number of samples and expressed as a percentage. 1045

⁴ Results from the linear regression model based on Hellinger transformed abundance data from 1046 1047 each site.

1049 **Table 3**

1050 Results of the forward selection procedure of ecological predictors in explaining

1051 variation of LCBD (local contributions to beta diversity) of plant-parasitic nematodes

- 1052 (PPN).
- 1053

	LCBD			
Ecological predictors 1, 2,3,4	R^2	$R^2_{adj\ cum}$	P value	
Soil texture				
LoSa (loamy sand)	0.0552994	0.0527734	< 0.0001	
pH (KCl)	0.0251797	0.0755487	0.0018	
Soil edaphic unit				
I Re Lc Be	0.0133137	0.0864847	0.0129	
Age of olive orchards	0.0150989	0.0993963	0.0119	
Cultivar of olive orchards				
"Gordal"	0.0121414	0.1092668	0.0212	
Soil edaphic unit				
Bv Vc Bk Rc	0.0119632	0.1190115	0.0225	
Bk Bg Rc	0.0116259	0.1284646	0.0224	
Cultivar of olive orchards				
"Lechín Granada"	0.0096819	0.1359829	0.0383	
Climatic areas				
Sub-humid Atlantic Mediterranean	0.0098059	0.1436692	0.0367	
Soil texture				
Sa (sand)	0.0096629	0.1512507	0.0382	

1054

¹We used as ecological predictors the explanatory variables included in the

1056 environment, soil, and agronomic management data sets as whole.

1057 ² Order of explanatory variables is based on the R^2 values.

³ See Supporting Information Appendix A for details of explanatory variables.

⁴ Forward selection procedure was performed by controlling the effects of spatial

1060 component from the LCBD patterns using the dbMEM variables as predictor set using

1061 partial linear regression with the indications described by Legendre and Gauthier, 2014.

1062 For more details, see Materials and Methods section.

1063 Figure legends

1064

Fig. 1. Map of Andalusia (Southern Spain) showing the olive growing area including
the location of the sampled commercial olive orchards (376 sampling sites) and the

1067 Guadalquivir River and tributaries.

1068

1069 Fig. 2. Maps of diversity indices used in the analysis. (a) Species richness, ranging from

1070 2 (cyan) to 14 (dark blue). (b) Beta diversity map. Similar colours indicate similar

1071 species composition based on Bray-Curtis dissimilarity. (c) LCBD values map. LCBD

1072 values ranging from 0.0012 (small circles) to 0.0044 (large circles). Nonsignificant sites

1073 are indicated by black circles, and significant sites (P < 0.005) are indicated by red

1074 circles. In all maps the River Guadalquivir is indicated by a blue line.

1075

1076 Fig. 3. Variation partitioning to explain the variation in community composition and 1077 species richness of plant-parasitic nematodes (PPN) based on variables describing the 1078 environment (Env), soil (Soil), agronomic management (Mana) and spatial patterns 1079 (Spa). The PPN infest soils from cultivated olive trees in Andalusia (Southern Spain). 1080 The relative proportion of variation explained by Env, Soil, Mana and Spa, split into 1081 unique and joint fractions (Env Soil Mana represent the joint fraction of environment, 1082 soil and agronomic management variables) is show as a Venn diagram. The proportions 1083 of individual fractions sum to 100%. For clarity, the fractions with less than 1.5% of 1084 relative variance explained are not shown. Levels of significance: P < 0.001 (***), P <1085 0.01 (**), P < 0.05 (*), and no mark (no significant).



Figure_2_September_2019 Click here to download high resolution image





Pure fractions



Supplementary Material for publication online only Click here to download Supplementary Material for publication online only: AEE_Archidona Yuste et al_Appendix A_R4.docx

Data in Brief Click here to download Data in Brief: Data in Brief.rar