

Meter scale variation in shrub dominance and soil moisture structure Arctic arthropod communities (#10489)

1

First submission

Please read the **Important notes** below, and the **Review guidance** on the next page.
When ready [submit online](#). The manuscript starts on page 3.

Important notes

Editor and deadline

Dezene Huber / 24 May 2016

Files

7 Figure file(s)

3 Table file(s)

Please visit the overview page to [download and review](#) the files not included in this review pdf.

Declarations

No notable declarations are present



Please in full read before you begin

How to review

When ready [submit your review online](#). The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

- 1. BASIC REPORTING**
- 2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**
- 3. VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS**
4. General comments
5. Confidential notes to the editor

 You can also annotate this **pdf** and upload it as part of your review

To finish, enter your editorial recommendation (accept, revise or reject) and submit.

BASIC REPORTING

-  Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
-  Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
-  Structure conforms to [PeerJ standard](#), discipline norm, or improved for clarity.
-  Figures are relevant, high quality, well labelled & described.
-  Raw data supplied (See [PeerJ policy](#)).

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

-  Original primary research within [Scope of the journal](#).
-  Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how research fills an identified knowledge gap.
-  Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.
-  Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

-  Impact and novelty not assessed. Negative/inconclusive results accepted. *Meaningful* replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.
-  Data is robust, statistically sound, & controlled.
-  Conclusion well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.
-  Speculation is welcome, but should be identified as such.

The above is the editorial criteria summary. To view in full visit <https://peerj.com/about/editorial-criteria/>

Meter scale variation in shrub dominance and soil moisture structure Arctic arthropod communities

Rikke Reisner Hansen, Oskar Liset Pryds Hansen, Joseph J Bowden, Urs A Treier, Signe Normand, Toke Høye

The Arctic is warming at twice the rate of the rest of the world. This impacts Arctic species both directly, through increased temperatures, and indirectly, through structural changes in their habitats. Species are expected to exhibit idiosyncratic responses to structural change, which calls for detailed investigations at the species level and community level. Here, we investigate how arthropod assemblages of spiders and beetles respond to variation in habitat structure at small spatial scales. We sampled transitions in shrub dominance and soil moisture between three different habitats (fen, dwarf shrub heath and tall shrub tundra) at three different sites along a fjord gradient in southwest Greenland, using yellow pitfall cups. We identified 2547 individuals belonging to 47 species. We used species richness estimation, indicator species analysis and latent variable modeling to examine differences in arthropod community structure in response to habitat variation at local (within site) and regional scale (between sites). We estimated species responses to the environment by fitting species-specific generalized linear models with environmental covariates. Species assemblages were segregated at the habitat and site level. Each habitat hosted significant indicator species and species richness and diversity were significantly lower in fen habitats. Assemblage patterns were significantly linked to changes in soil moisture and vegetation height as well as geographic location. We show that meter-scale variation among Arctic habitats affects arthropod community structure, supporting the notion that the Arctic is a heterogenous environment. To gain sufficient insight into temporal biodiversity change, we require detailed studies on species distributions entailing species habitat preferences.

Meter scale variation in shrub dominance and soil moisture structure Arctic arthropod communities

Rikke Reisner Hansen ^{a, d*}, Oskar Liset Pryds Hansen ^{a, d}, Joseph James Bowden ^a, Urs Treier ^{a, b, e},
Signe Normand ^{a, b, e} & Toke Thomas Høye ^{a, c, d}

Arctic Research Centre, Aarhus University, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

Ecoinformatics & Biodiversity, Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, DK-8000 Aarhus C,
Denmark

Aarhus Institute of Advanced Studies, Aarhus University, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

Department of Bioscience, Kalø, Aarhus University, DK-8410 Rønde, Denmark

Swiss Federal Research Institute WSL, Birmensdorf, Switzerland

Corresponding author:

Rikke Reisner Hansen

Ny munkegade 116, 8000 Aarhus, Denmark

e-mail: rrh@bios.au.dk

23 Abstract

24 The Arctic is warming at twice the rate of the rest of the world. This impacts Arctic species both
 25 directly, through increased temperatures, and indirectly, through structural changes in their
 26 habitats. Species are expected to exhibit idiosyncratic responses to structural change, which calls
 27 for detailed investigations at the species level and community level. Here, we investigate how
 28 arthropod assemblages of spiders and beetles respond to variation in habitat structure at small
 29 spatial scales. We sampled transitions in shrub dominance and soil moisture between three
 30 different habitats (fen, dwarf shrub heath  tall shrub tundra) at three different sites along a
 31 fjord gradient in southwest Greenland, using yellow pitfall cups. We identified 2547 individuals
 32 belonging to 47 species. We used species richness estimation, indicator species analysis and
 33 latent variable modeling to examine differences in arthropod community structure in response to
 34 habitat variation at local (within site) and regional scale (between sites). We estimated species
 35 responses to the environment by fitting species-specific generalized linear models with
 36 environmental covariates. Species assemblages were segregated at the habitat and site level.
 37 Each habitat hosted significant indicator species and species richness and diversity were
 38 significantly lower in fen habitats. Assemblage patterns were significantly linked to changes in
 39 soil moisture and vegetation height as well as geographic location. We show that meter-scale
 40 variation among Arctic habitats affects arthropod community structure, supporting the notion
 41 that the Arctic is a heterogenous environment. To gain sufficient insight into temporal
 42 biodiversity change, we require detailed studies of  species distributions   species habitat
 43 preferences.

44 Keywords: Araneae, Coleoptera, biodiversity, habitat suitability, environmental gradients

45 Background

46 Understanding the factors that structure ecological communities on continental, regional 
 47 local scales provide the basis for understanding how global changes might affect species 
 48 composition and biodiversity (Vellend et al. 2013; Dornelas et al. 2014).

49 Climate change is happening at an accelerated pace in the Arctic (Callaghan et al. 2004;
 50 IPCC 2014) and altered moisture regimes and shrub expansion are two of the most prominent
 51 habitat  ring phenomena caused by these changes (Rouse et al. 1997; Tape et al. 2006; Myers-

Smith et al. 2011; Elmendorf et al. 2012). Shrub expansion and altered moisture regimes represent considerable consequences of climate change to the Arctic tundra; altering unique habitats such as open heath, wetlands and grasslands (ACIA 2004). Firstly, warming in the Arctic has led to accelerated plant growth, particular for woody plants, causing a shift towards greater shrub cover, and a northward migration of the tree line (Callaghan et al. 2011), increased biomass (Epstein et al. 2012) and changes in plant species composition (Walker et al. 2012). These trends are expected to continue during future climate change (Normand et al. 2013; Pearson et al. 2013). Secondly, a changing Arctic climate with changes in precipitation, glacial melt and permafrost degradation may alter the spatial extent of wetlands (Avis et al. 2011). In areas with continuous permafrost soils become wetter due to the impermeable strata that prevent infiltration and percolation (Woo & Young 2006). Some areas with discontinuous permafrost, however, become drier due to increased net evapotranspiration and increased drainage due to permafrost thaw (Zona et al. 2009; Perreault et al. 2015). The long term persistence of Arctic wetlands is debated, but models using projected climate changes coupled with field studies indicate deterioration and ultimate destruction of Arctic wetlands (Woo & Young 2006). These habitat changes, both shrubification and wetland deterioration, will trigger several feedback loops within the climate system (Chapin et al. 2005) and may have profound effects on ecosystems (Post et al. 2009). In order to understand how these habitat changes affect Arctic biodiversity, we need to adequately describe how arctic species composition respond to changes in the environment.

The alteration of habitats, due to e.g., shrub expansion into open tundra and changing wetland hydrology, likely to affect habitat availability for many organisms, through changes in species distribution, diversity and composition. Terrestrial arthropods (e.g. insects and spiders) in particular, are associated with specific habitat types and likely respond strongly to habitat changes in the Arctic (Bowden & Buddle 2010; Rich et al. 2013). Arthropods have long been recognized as valuable indicators of changing environments because of their relatively short lifecycles and their physiology being directly driven by the external environment (ectothermic). Studies of the impacts of habitat changes upon Arctic arthropod communities are, however, only beginning to emerge (Bowden & Buddle 2010; Rich et al. 2013; Sikes et al. 2013; Sweet et al. 2014; Hansen et al. 2016). In spite of the common conception of the Arctic as a species poor and relatively homogenous environment, studies have shown that arthropod assemblages vary

substantially over short distances (Hansen et al. 2016), with species responding to local and regional climatic gradients (OLP. Hansen, unpublished work). Arthropod communities are expected to change in response to the direct effects of increasing temperatures and prolonged growing seasons (Høye et al. 2013; Høye et al. 2014), but also indirectly through changes in soil moisture and vegetation structure (Bowden & Buddle 2010; Hansen et al. 2016), changes to snowmelt dynamics (Høye et al. 2009; Bowden et al. 2015b) and shrub expansion (Rich et al. 2013). Several studies indicate direct effects of temperature change on arthropods (Post et al. 2009; Høye et al. 2013; Bowden et al. 2015a), but we do not yet fully comprehend the distribution of, or habitat requirements for the majority of Arctic arthropod species.

Arctic and alpine tundra areas are vast, and the knowledge of geographical variation associated with recent environmental and ecosystem change is limited. In this study, we explore the influence of moisture regime and habitat structure on the composition and diversity of Arctic arthropod communities and investigate the site specific effects on the drivers of change. We propose the following hypothesis: Arctic arthropod assemblages and diversity vary with soil moisture and vegetation height at very small spatial scales (10 - 20 meters). Specifically, we compare beetle and spider communities sampled in different habitats (fen, dwarf shrub heath, and tall shrub tundra) at three sites along a large scale gradient.

Methods

Study area and sampling design

Arthropods were sampled with pitfall traps from the 29th of June to the 23rd of July 2013 at three sites (1, 2 and 3) along the Godthaabsfjord in West Greenland (Fig 1). Site 1 was situated at the mouth of the fjord and thus characterized by a coastal climate with relatively high precipitation, narrow annual temperature range and topographic variation (app. 0 - 300 m.a.s.l.). The shrub community at site 1 was dominated by dwarf shrubs and a very sparse cover of tall shrub species like *Salix glauca*. Site 2 was low lying and flat and characterized by a mosaic of low shrub vegetation (<50 cm), dominated by *S. glauca*, mixed with *Betula nana*, *Vaccinium uliginosum*, *Rhododendron groenlandicum* and *Empetrum nigrum*. Site 3 was characterized by a continental climate and pronounced topographic variation (app. 0 – 600 m.a.s.l.) with well-defined tall shrub patches dominated by high growth of *S. glauca* and *Alnus crispa* (>50cm). These patches were

mainly located at south facing slopes below 100 m.a.s.l. All dwarf shrub species at site 2 were also present at site 3.

Moisture transitions (fen-heath) were sampled at sites 1 and 2, while transitions in vegetation height and cover of tall shrubs (heath-shrub) were sampled at sites 2 and 3. Four fen-heath plots were established, two at site 1 and two at site 2. Each fen-heath plot consisted of two sub-plots placed ten meters apart and with each five meters to a distinct fen-heath transition zone (Fig. 2). Twelve heath-shrub plots were established at site 2 and site 3 (six at each site). Each heath-shrub plot consisted of two sub-plots 20 meters apart; one located at the center of a patch of tall shrubs and one in the adjacent open dwarf shrub heath. Each sub-plot was delineated by a circle with a five meter radius. At the center of each sub-plot, two yellow pitfall traps (nine cm diameter) were placed 50 centimeters apart (Fig 2). The traps were dug down such that the rim was flush with the surface. Pitfall traps were emptied twice, once halfway through and once at the end of the sampling period. Samples were stored separately.

The following structural and environmental parameters were measured in each sub-plot: (i) percent cover of shrubs, herbs, graminoids and bare ground in six categories: 0%, 1–20%, 21–40%, 41–60%, 61–80%, and 81–100%, (ii) height (to the nearest 5 cm) of the most frequent vegetation height in the sub-plot. (iii) presence of plant species, (iv) slope in vertical meters between the highest and lowest point of the sub-plot, (v) aspect recorded using a handheld GPS and classified to nearest cardinal direction (North, South, East, and West), (vi) pH measured directly with a soil pH measurement kit, model HI 99121, (vii) soil type recorded as humus or sand.

Specimens and Data

All spiders and beetles were sorted from the samples and the adult specimens were identified (by RRH) to species based on morphological characters using a Wild® M5A stereo microscope. Spiders were identified using the available literature through The World Spider Catalog (World Spider Catalog 2016) and Spiders of North America (Paquin & Dupérré 2003). Beetles were identified using both Scandinavian and North American literature (Lindroth 1985; Lindroth 1986; Böcher 1988) and consulting the collection at the Natural History Museum Aarhus, Denmark. Specimens are preserved in 75% ethanol at the Natural History Museum Aarhus. The

dataset is available through the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF 2016). Not all juveniles could be assigned to species, so only adult specimens were included in the analysis.

Data analysis

Sub-plots placed in dwarf shrub heath could potentially differ depending on the transition examined (fen-heath or shrub-heath). Therefore we created latent variable (LV) plots in the R package ‘boral’ (Hui 2016) for both plants and arthropods to visually assess if the heath sub-plots in the fen-heath and shrub-heath plots groups were distinguishable. In the latent variable plot for plant species composition, heath sub-plots were not segregated (Fig. S1) and all heath plots were hereafter treated as one category.

The mean and standard error were calculated for significant environmental variables across all habitats at each separate site. We tested whether the variables used in the models differed significantly between sites and habitats with a Tukey test and ran a correlation analysis, based on Pearson’s correlation coefficient, of all potential variables. To counteract effects of potential under-sampling, all analyses were carried out excluding singletons, thus also reducing effects of source-sink dynamics between habitats. All analyses were carried out in R version 3.2.2.

Species diversity

Species diversity was rarefied and extrapolated for investigation across habitats based on Hill numbers ($q=0$; species richness, $q=1$; Shannon diversity, $q=2$; Simpson diversity) and standardized by sample coverage (Chao & Jost 2012; Chao et al. 2014) using the iNEXT R-package (Hsieh et al. 2014). We extrapolated to double the reference sample of the habitat with the smallest sample coverage (shrub). Samples were compared at base-coverage, estimated as a minimum of C_a and C_b , where C_a is maximum coverage at reference sample size and C_b is minimum coverage at two times reference sample size. iNEXT computes bootstrap confidence bands around the sampling curves, facilitating the comparisons of diversities across multiple assemblages. We then visually assessed if diversity measures differed across habitats.

We ran a species indicator analysis to assess the strength and statistical significance of the relationship between species abundance and the specific habitats. We used the function

‘multipatt’ in the R package ‘indicspecies’ (De Cáceres et al. 2010). This analysis provides a specificity value ‘A’(0-1), which indicates the probability of a certain species occurring in a certain habitat as well as a sensitivity value ‘B’(0-1), which indicates how many of the plots belonging to a certain habitat the target species is located in. Significance ($P < 0.05$) is assessed based on the A and B values (Cáceres & Legendre 2009). In order to appoint habitat categories to more species than significant indicator species, we described the habitat preferences of our target species, by assigning all species with an A value for a given habitat larger than 0.8 and a B value larger than 0.1 to that specific habitat. In this way the importance of the sensitivity value is downplayed and we describe habitat preferences more broadly.

Species composition

Traditional methods to visually investigate how arthropod species composition varies between habitats, such as non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) have been shown to confound trends in location with changes in dispersion, leading to potentially misleading results (Warton et al. 2012). To avoid these issues while still enabling visualization, we employed LV modelling. LV modelling is a modelled approach that explains community composition through a set of underlying latent variables to account for residual correlation, for example due to biotic interaction. This method offers the possibility to adjust the distribution family to accommodate count data via negative binomial distribution and better account for over-dispersion in count data. Thus, it accounts for the increasing mean-variance relationship without confounding location with dispersion (Hui et al. 2015). We modelled species distribution with two latent variables to enable visualization comparable to a two dimensional NMDS. From the latent variable model, we extracted the median values which we used as coordinates on ordination axes to represent species composition at plot level (Hui et al. 2015). We then tested the difference in local species composition between the paired samples (fen-heath or shrub-heath) for each transect using paired T-tests. We further studied how well the entire assemblage (both species abundance and composition) is explained by the environment. Again using latent variable modelling, we included the spatial variable ‘site’ and two environmental variables, ‘graminoid cover’ and ‘height class’, and account for the expected species correlation, for example due to biotic interactions, we included two latent variables in the models. This way we ensured that our results remain valid even in the presence of residual variation (Warton et al. 2015). Vegetation

height and graminoid cover have higher resolutions compared to the classifications ‘fen’ and ‘shrub’ as these are measured on a continuous scale. We used vegetation height as a proxy for shrub treatment effects and cover of graminoids as a proxy for soil moisture. The gradients in these variables are representative of the moisture transition of fen-heath plot groups and the shrub dominance transition of the shrub-heath plot groups (Fig S2). In order to visualize how species correlations clustered due to the selected variables, a correlation matrix was drawn showing only the significant species correlations, as based on the 95% credible intervals excluding zero. We cross checked the species correlations with the results from the species indicator analysis to see if species correlations clustered in specific habitats. The model assumptions of mean-variance and log-linearity were examined with residual vs. fit plots and a normal quantile plot and no transformation were needed.

To test the significance of interactions between environmental variables, we used a multivariate extension of General Linear Models (GLM) using the function ‘manyglm’ in the package ‘mvabund’ (Wang et al. 2012). This recently developed method offers the possibility to model distributions based on count data by assuming a negative binomial distribution. We tested for main effects of all measured variables and for an interaction between variables. Backwards selection based on Akaike’s Information Criteria (AIC) was employed to find the simplest model explaining the highest amount of variation in arthropod assemblages. We added the variable ‘site’ as a block effect to resample within site.

Results

A total of 2547 individuals, constituting 45 species and 13 families were identified within the two orders: Araneae (2223 individuals, 7 families, 37 species) and Coleoptera (324 individuals, 6 families, 8 species). We found a species of sheet web spider [*Wabasso cacuminatus* (Millidge, 1984)] not previously known from Greenland, represented by one individual. One species [*Pelecopsis menzei*, (Simon, 1884)], represented in our samples by individuals, remained unknown from Greenland until recently (Marusik 2015; Hansen et al. 2016) (Table 1).

Extrapolated species richness ($q = 0$) did not differ significantly due to overlapping confidence intervals but there was a trend towards higher species richness in heath sub-plots, lower in shrub sub-plots and lowest in fen sub-plots (Fig. 3). The same pattern was observed for

228 Shannon diversity ($q = 1$) as well as for Simpson diversity ($q = 2$) however both these indices
229 differed significantly between habitats (Fig. 3).

230 The three species significantly ($P < 0.05$) associated with fen habitats were all sheet web
231 spiders. *Erigone whymperi*, *Mecynargus paetulus* and *Wabasso quaesti* just one species, the
232 ladybug *Coccinella transversoguttata*, was significant in the heath plots. Shrub habitats housed
233 six significant species and all of them were spider species: the comb-footed spider *Ohlertidion*
234 *lundbecki* (Sørensen, 1894), and five species of sheet web spiders: *Dismodicus decemoculatus*,
235 *Improphantes complicates*, *Pocadicnemis americana*, *Semljicola obtusus*, *Sisicus apertus* (Table
236 1).

237 The LV plots showed that the plant species composition of the shrub sub-plots
238 overlapped with the composition of the heath plots (Fig. S1), but vegetation height was
239 significantly different (Table 2). The plant species composition of the fen plots was different
240 from both the heath and shrub sub-plots (Fig. S1). Arthropod species composition was
241 segregated both at site and habitat level, but the distribution of sub-plots in the LV arthropod plot
242 indicated interaction between site and treatment (Fig. 4).

243 Vegetation height in the shrub sub-plots at site 2 was significantly lower than at site 3
244 ($T_{30} = -2.75$, $P = 0.02$), while the cover of graminoids did not differ significantly from the fen
245 sub-plots at site 1 to the fen sub-plots at site 2 ($T_{30} = -0.44$, $P = 0.66$). Cover of graminoids was
246 significantly lower for heath sub-plots compared to fen sub-plots both at site 1 ($T_{30} = -4.99$, $P =$
247 0.0002) and at site 2 ($T_{30} = -3.23$, $P = 0.005$). Vegetation height differed significantly between
248 shrub and heath treatments both at site 2 ($T_{30} = -4.09$, $P = 0.008$) and at site 3 ($T_{30} = -6.14$, $P =$
249 0.002) with lower vegetation height in the heath sub-plots compared to shrub sub-plots (Table 2
250 and Fig. S2).

251 Arthropod species composition differed significantly due to different moisture regimes
252 ($Dev_{1,55} = 110.3$, $P = 0.001$) and different height classes ($Dev_{1,55} = 117.9$, $P = 0.001$). Without
253 resampling at the site level, there was a significant interaction between cover of graminoid
254 species and site ($Dev_{2,53} = 88.9$, $P = 0.002$), but no significant interaction between height class
255 and site ($Dev_{2,53} = 37.9$, $P = 0.46$). Arthropod species compositions differed significantly
256 between the local fen-heath transitions, but for site 2 only one latent variable axis differed

significantly between fen-heath transitions. The local shrub-heath transects differed significantly for both axes and both sites (Table 3). The latent variable model, which included site and treatment effects, showed that species were highly correlated as an effect of site, vegetation height and graminoid cover. When compared to the indicator species analysis, the clusters of species could be assigned to specific habitats (Fig 5). There were no significant residual species correlations.

Discussion

Although Arctic tundra is often perceived as a relative homogenous biome, it consists of a wide range of habitat types due to strong environmental transitions occurring over short spatial scales. In this study, we have demonstrated clear effects of vegetation height and soil moisture on diversity and composition of spiders and beetles in low Arctic Greenland. This effect is evident within 10 - 20 meters. Fens, heath and shrub vegetation hosted distinct arthropod communities differing in both composition and diversity. While previous studies have emphasized the importance of vegetation structure as predictors of Arctic arthropod communities (Bowden & Buddle 2010; Rich et al. 2013; Sweet et al. 2014), it has not been demonstrated that such effects are visible at the scale of meters.

Existing literature generally agrees with the habitat classifications we have assigned the species in this study. According to existing descriptions of habitat preferences, the wetland species we find in this study are found strictly in wet open habitats, whereas both shrub and heathland species mostly have a more general distribution (Böcher 2015; Marusik 2015), indicating a higher degree of habitat specialization in the fens. The sheet web spider *Dugesiella arctica* is significantly linked to wet fen habitats in an alpine study site in West Greenland (Hansen et al. 2016) and in this study *E. arctica* were also linked to fen plots further suggesting habitat specialization. We found the lowest diversity in the fens, which are spatially limited, compared to much more widespread heathland habitats. Both tall shrub tundra and dwarf shrub heath are comprised of different habitats with open patches, moist areas and varying vegetation structure. Such variation in habitat structure likely leads to higher diversity compared to the fen

habitats, which are rather homogenous. This also became evident in the correlation plot where most of the species clusters could be assigned to tall shrub or heath habitats.

This particular study area is characterized as low Arctic with discontinuous permafrost unaffected by glacial meltwater. Models for this region suggests increased evapotranspiration and precipitation (Rawlins et al. 2010). Increased drainage due to permafrost melt coupled with evapotranspiration is likely to lead to wetland deterioration. Shrubification has been forecasted to be most pronounced at the boundary between high and low Arctic where permafrost is melting and in areas where soil moisture is greatest (Myers-Smith et al. 2015). In the Godthåbsfjord, it is therefore likely that shrub expansion will be most notable in the fens and snow-beds. With shrubification (Myers-Smith et al. 2011; Elmendorf et al. 2012), as well as, increased land use such as forestry and agriculture (ACIA 2004), wetland habitats are at risk (CAFF 2013). Our results suggest that wetland deterioration as well as shrubification will strongly affect arthropod communities and may compromise the living conditions of individual specialized species.

We found an interaction between site and treatment for fen habitats, suggesting that the fens differ between sites. Wetlands with coastal proximity are known to be impacted by salt influx from the sea (Woo & Young 2006). This is a likely explanation for the difference in arthropod composition in the fens between the coastal (site 1) and intermediate site (site 2) as graminoid cover does not change significantly between sites. There are, however, many factors influencing wetland hydrology (Woo & Winter 1993) and salinity may not be the only difference. Even though plant species composition showed clear segregation of wet and dry plots, conditions may be drier at the intermediate site than at the coastal site, where summer precipitation is higher. Plant species composition reflects an integration of seasonal variation in soil moisture conditions (Daniels et al. 2011), such that they may not reflect sudden soil moisture changes. The variation in moisture regime only partially explained arthropod species composition at the intermediate site and supports the idea of drier conditions at the intermediate site.

We expected the effect of vegetation height to be less pronounced at the intermediate site due to the patchiness structure of the shrubs and overall lower vegetation. Yet, we did not find an interaction between site and treatment. We studied mostly mobile predator species. The few herbivores like the weevils *Otiorynchus arcticus* (O. Fabricius, 1780) and *Otiorynchus nodosus*

(Müller, 1764), are mostly found in open heath plots with low vegetation. It is conceivable to think that even a small change in vegetation height has an effect on the surface active predator species. The web builders, like sheet web spiders, require some amount of vegetation structure to form webs, but even low shrubs provide structure and shelter. Rich et al. (2013) found that overall arthropod abundance and species richness increased in shrub plots in arctic Alaska, but suggested that for groups like wolf spiders and other active hunters, full shrub encroachment of open habitats could be detrimental. Our results support this notion.

Conclusion

We have established a baseline of species occurrence in relation to transition in soil moisture and shrub dominance which will facilitate future assessment of changes in Arctic arthropod communities, where these transitions in habitat structure are likely to change. The variation in community composition at the scales of meters was surprising and suggests drastic changes in arthropod species compositions given continuation of shrubification and wetland deterioration. We found that the strength of the environmental predictor variables varied among sites. Understanding the sources of such site variation is an important topic for future studies. Two important steps are needed to further the knowledge of arthropod responses to changing habitats. Primarily, we need information on species occurrence across multiple taxa and multiple environmental gradients. Secondly, we need further studies quantifying spatial variability and change in the primary environmental gradients.

Acknowledgements

This work is a contribution to the Arctic Science Partnership (ASP) asp-net.org. We would also like to thank the Natural History Museum Aarhus for use of laboratory and equipment during the identification process.

References

- ACIA. 2004. Impacts of a Warming Arctic: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. ACIA Overview report. Cambridge. p 140.
- Avis CA, Weaver AJ, and Meissner KJ. 2011. Reduction in areal extent of high-latitude wetlands in response to permafrost thaw. *Nature Geoscience* 4:444-448 DOI: 10.1038/ngeo1160.
- Böcher J. 1988. *The coleoptera of Greenland*. Copenhagen: Bioscience.

- 344 Böcher J. 2015. Coleoptera. In: Böcher J, Kristensen NP, and Wilhelmsen L, eds. *The Greenland*
345 *Entomofauna An Identification Manual of Insects, Spiders and Their Allies*. Leiden, The
346 Netherlands: Brill, 259-292.
- 347 Bowden JJ, and Buddle CM. 2010. Determinants of ground-dwelling spider assemblages at a regional
348 scale in the Yukon Territory, Canada. *Ecoscience* 17:287-297 DOI: 10.2980/17-3-3308.
- 349 Bowden JJ, Eskildsen A, Hansen RR, Olsen K, Kurle CM, and Høye TT. 2015a. High-Arctic butterflies
350 become smaller with rising temperatures. *Biology Letters* 11 DOI: 10.1098/rsbl.2015.0574.
- 351 Bowden JJ, Hansen RR, Olsen K, and Høye TT. 2015b. Habitat-specific effects of climate change on a low-
352 mobility Arctic spider species. *Polar Biology* 38:559-568 DOI: 10.1007/s00300-014-1622-7.
- 353 Cáceres MD, and Legendre P. 2009. Associations between species and groups of sites: indices and
354 statistical inference. *Ecology* 90:3566-3574 DOI: 10.1890/08-1823.1.
- 355 CAFF. 2013. *Arctic Biodiversity Assessment. Status and trends in Arctic biodiversity*. Akureyri.
- 356 Callaghan TV, Johansson M, Heal OW, Saelthun NR, Barkved LJ, Bayfield N, Brandt O, Brooker R,
357 Christiansen HH, Forchhammer M, Høye TT, Humlum O, Jarvinen A, Jonasson C, Kohler J,
358 Magnusson B, Meltofte H, Mortensen L, Neuvonen S, Pearce I, Rasch M, Turner L, Hasholt B,
359 Huhta E, Leskinen E, Nielsen N, and Siikamäki P. 2004. Environmental changes in the North
360 Atlantic Region: SCANNET as a collaborative approach for documenting, understanding and
361 predicting changes. *Ambio*:39-50
- 362 Callaghan TV, Tweedie CE, and Webber PJ. 2011. Multi-decadal Changes in Tundra Environments and
363 Ecosystems: The International Polar Year-Back to the Future Project (IPY-BTF). *Ambio* 40:555-
364 557 DOI: 10.1007/s13280-011-0162-4.
- 365 Chao A, Gotelli NJ, Hsieh TC, Sander EL, Ma KH, Colwell RK, and Ellison AM. 2014. Rarefaction and
366 extrapolation with Hill numbers: a framework for sampling and estimation in species diversity
367 studies. *Ecological Monographs* 84:45-67 DOI: 10.1890/13-0133.1.
- 368 Chao A, and Jost L. 2012. Coverage-based rarefaction and extrapolation: standardizing samples by
369 completeness rather than size. *Ecology* 93:2533-2547 DOI: 10.1890/11-1952.1.
- 370 Chapin FS, Sturm M, Serreze MC, McFadden JP, Key JR, Lloyd AH, McGuire AD, Rupp TS, Lynch AH,
371 Schimel JP, Beringer J, Chapman WL, Epstein HE, Euskirchen ES, Hinzman LD, Jia G, Ping CL, Tape
372 KD, Thompson CDC, Walker DA, and Welker JM. 2005. Role of Land-Surface Changes in Arctic
373 Summer Warming. *Science* 310:657-660 DOI: 10.1126/science.1117368.
- 374 Daniels FJA, de Molenaar JG, Chytrý M, and Tichý L. 2011. Vegetation change in Southeast Greenland?
375 Tasiilaq revisited after 40 years. *Applied Vegetation Science* 14:230-241 DOI: 10.1111/j.1654-
376 109X.2010.01107.x.
- 377 De Cáceres M, Legendre P, and Moretti M. 2010. Improving indicator species analysis by combining
378 groups of sites. *Oikos* 119:1674-1684 DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18334.x.
- 379 Dornelas M, Gotelli NJ, McGill B, Shimadzu H, Moyes F, Sievers C, and Magurran AE. 2014. Assemblage
380 Time Series Reveal Biodiversity Change but Not Systematic Loss. *Science* 344:296-299 DOI:
381 10.1126/science.1248484.
- 382 Elmendorf SC, Henry GHR, Hollister RD, Björk RG, Boulanger-Lapointe N, Cooper EJ, Cornelissen JHC, Day
383 TA, Dorrepaal E, Elumeeva TG, Gill M, Gould WA, Harte J, Hik DS, Hofgaard A, Johnson DR,
384 Johnstone JF, Jonsdóttir IS, Jorgenson JC, Klanderud K, Klein JA, Koh S, Kudo G, Lara M, Levesque
385 E, Magnusson B, May JL, Mercado-Díaz JA, Michelsen A, Molau U, Myers-Smith IH, Oberbauer
386 SF, Onipchenko VG, Rixen C, Schmidt NM, Shaver GR, Spasojević MJ, Porhallsdóttir PE, Tolvanen
387 A, Troxler T, Tweedie CE, Villareal S, Wahren CH, Walker X, Webber PJ, Welker JM, and Wipf S.
388 2012. Plot-scale evidence of tundra vegetation change and links to recent summer warming.
389 *Nature Climate Change* 2:453-457 DOI: 10.1038/Nclimate1465.

- Epstein HE, Raynolds MK, Walker DA, Bhatt US, Tucker CJ, and Pinzon JE. 2012. Dynamics of aboveground phytomass of the circumpolar Arctic tundra during the past three decades. *Environmental Research Letters* 7:015506 DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/7/1/015506.
- GBIF. 2016. Macroarthropods, Godthåbsfjorden (Nuup Kangerlua) 2013, Greenland. Global Biodiversity Information Facility.
- Hansen RR, Hansen OLP, Bowden JJ, Normand S, Bay C, Sørensen JG, and Høye TT. 2016. High spatial variation in terrestrial arthropod species diversity and composition near the Greenland ice cap. *Polar Biology*:1-10 DOI: 10.1007/s00300-016-1893-2.
- Høye TT, Eskildsen A, Hansen RR, Bowden JJ, Schmidt NM, and Kissling WD. 2014. Phenology of high-arctic butterflies and their floral resources: Species-specific responses to climate change. *Current Zoology* 60:243-251
- Høye TT, Hammel JU, Fuchs T, and Toft S. 2009. Climate change and sexual size dimorphism in an Arctic spider. *Biology Letters* 5:542-544 DOI: 10.1098/rsbl.2009.0169.
- Høye TT, Post E, Schmidt NM, Trojelsgaard K, and Forchhammer MC. 2013. Shorter flowering seasons and declining abundance of flower visitors in a warmer Arctic. *Nature Climate Change* 3:759-763 DOI: 10.1038/Nclimate1909.
- Hsieh TC, Ma KH, and Chao A. 2014. iNEXT: An R package for interpolation and extrapolation in measuring species diversity. *Unpublished manuscript*
- Hui FKC. 2016. boral – Bayesian Ordination and Regression Analysis of Multivariate Abundance Data in R. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*:n/a-n/a DOI: 10.1111/2041-210X.12514.
- Hui FKC, Taskinen S, Pledger S, Foster SD, and Warton DI. 2015. Model-based approaches to unconstrained ordination. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 6:399-411 DOI: 10.1111/2041-210X.12236.
- IPCC. 2014. Summary for Policymakers. In: Field CB, Barros VR, Dokken DJ, Mach KJ, Mastrandrea MD, Bilir TE, Chatterjee M, Ebi KL, Estrada YO, Genova RC, Girma B, Kissel ES, Levy AN, MacCracken S, Mastrandrea PR, and White LL, eds. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge, United Kingdom, and New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1-32.
- Lindroth CH. 1985. *The Carabidae (Coleoptera) of Fennoscandia and Denmark*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lindroth CH. 1986. *The Carabidae (Coleoptera) of Fennoscandia and Denmark*. Leiden: Brill.
- Loecher M, and Ropkins K. 2015. RgoogleMaps and loa: Unleashing R Graphics Power on Map Tiles. 2015 63:18 DOI: 10.18637/jss.v063.i04.
- Marusik YM. 2015. Araneae. In: Böcher J, Kristensen NP, and Wilhelmsen L, eds. *The Greenland Entomofauna An Identification Manual of Insects, Spiders and Their Allies*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 666-703.
- Myers-Smith IH, Elmendorf SC, Beck PSA, Wilmking M, Hallinger M, Blok D, Tape KD, Rayback SA, Macias-Fauria M, Forbes BC, Speed JDM, Boulanger-Lapointe N, Rixen C, Levesque E, Schmidt NM, Baittinger C, Trant AJ, Hermanutz L, Collier LS, Dawes MA, Lantz TC, Weijers S, Jorgensen RH, Buchwal A, Buras A, Naito AT, Ravolainen V, Schaepman-Strub G, Wheeler JA, Wipf S, Guay KC, Hik DS, and Vellend M. 2015. Climate sensitivity of shrub growth across the tundra biome. *Nature Climate Change* 5:887-+ DOI: 10.1038/nclimate2697.
- Myers-Smith IH, Forbes BC, Wilmking M, Hallinger M, Lantz T, Blok D, Tape KD, Macias-Fauria M, Sass-Klaassen U, Levesque E, Boudreau S, Ropars P, Hermanutz L, Trant A, Collier LS, Weijers S, Rozema J, Rayback SA, Schmidt NM, Schaepman-Strub G, Wipf S, Rixen C, Menard CB, Venn S, Goetz S, Andreu-Hayles L, Elmendorf S, Ravolainen V, Welker J, Grogan P, Epstein HE, and Hik DS. 2011. Shrub expansion in tundra ecosystems: dynamics, impacts and research priorities. *Environmental Research Letters* 6 DOI: 10.1088/1748-9326/6/4/045509.

- Normand S, Randin C, Ohlemuller R, Bay C, Høye TT, Kjaer ED, Korner C, Lischke H, Maiorano L, Paulsen J, Pearman PB, Psomas A, Treier UA, Zimmermann NE, and Svenning JC. 2013. A greener Greenland? Climatic potential and long-term constraints on future expansions of trees and shrubs. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* 368 DOI: 10.1098/Rstb.2012.0479.
- Paquin P, and Dupérré N. 2003. *Guide d'identification des araignées de Québec*. Varennes, Québec: Association des entomologistes amateurs du Québec.
- Pearson RG, Phillips SJ, Lorant MM, Beck PSA, Damoulas T, Knight SJ, and Goetz SJ. 2013. Shifts in Arctic vegetation and associated feedbacks under climate change. *Nature Clim Change* 3:673-677 DOI: 10.1038/nclimate1858.
- Perreault N, Lévesque E, Fortier D, and Lamarque LJ. 2015. Thermo-erosion gullies boost the transition from wet to mesic vegetation. *Biogeosciences Discuss* 12:12191-12228 DOI: 10.5194/bgd-12-12191-2015.
- Post E, Forchhammer MC, Bret-Harte MS, Callaghan TV, Christensen TR, Elberling B, Fox AD, Gilg O, Hik DS, Høye TT, Ims RA, Jeppesen E, Klein DR, Madsen J, McGuire AD, Rysgaard S, Schindler DE, Stirling I, Tamstorf MP, Tyler NJC, van der Wal R, Welker J, Wookey PA, Schmidt NM, and Aastrup P. 2009. Ecological Dynamics Across the Arctic Associated with Recent Climate Change. *Science* 325:1355-1358 DOI: 10.1126/science.1173113.
- Rawlins MA, Steele M, Holland MM, Adam JC, Cherry JE, Francis JA, Groisman PY, Hinzman LD, Huntington TG, Kane DL, Kimball JS, Kwok R, Lammers RB, Lee CM, Lettenmaier DP, McDonald KC, Podest E, Pundsack JW, Rudels B, Serreze MC, Shiklomanov A, Skagseth Ø, Troy TJ, Vörösmarty CJ, Wensnahan M, Wood EF, Woodgate R, Yang D, Zhang K, and Zhang T. 2010. Analysis of the Arctic System for Freshwater Cycle Intensification: Observations and Expectations. *Journal of Climate* 23:5715-5737 DOI: doi:10.1175/2010JCLI3421.1.
- Rich ME, Gough L, and Boelman NT. 2013. Arctic arthropod assemblages in habitats of differing shrub dominance. *Ecography* 36:994-1003 DOI: 10.1111/j.1600-0587.2012.00078.x.
- Rouse WR, Douglas MSV, Hecky RE, Hershey AE, Kling GW, Lesack L, Marsh P, McDonald M, Nicholson BJ, Roulet NT, and Smol JP. 1997. Effects of climate change on the freshwaters of Arctic and Subarctic North America. *Hydrological Processes* 11:873-902 DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1085(19970630)11:8<873::AID-HYP510>3.0.CO;2-6.
- Sikes DS, Draney ML, and Fleshman B. 2013. Unexpectedly high among-habitat spider (Araneae) faunal diversity from the Arctic Long-Term Experimental Research (LTER) field station at Toolik Lake, Alaska, United States of America. *Canadian Entomologist* 145:219-226 DOI: 10.4039/tce.2013.5.
- Sweet SK, Asmus A, Rich ME, Wingfield J, Gough L, and Boelman NT. 2014. NDVI as a predictor of canopy arthropod biomass in the Alaskan arctic tundra. *Ecological Applications* 25:779-790 DOI: 10.1890/14-0632.1.
- Tape K, Sturm M, and Racine C. 2006. The evidence for shrub expansion in Northern Alaska and the Pan-Arctic. *Global Change Biology* 12:686-702 DOI: DOI 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2006.01128.x.
- Vellend M, Baeten L, Myers-Smith IH, Elmendorf SC, Beauséjour R, Brown CD, De Frenne P, Verheyen K, and Wipf S. 2013. Global meta-analysis reveals no net change in local-scale plant biodiversity over time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110:19456-19459 DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1312779110.
- Walker DA, Epstein HE, Raynolds MK, Kuss P, Kopecky MA, Frost GV, Daniëls FJA, Leibman MO, Moskalenko NG, Matyshak GV, Khitun OV, Khomutov AV, Forbes BC, Bhatt US, Kade AN, Vonlanthen CM, and Tichý L. 2012. Environment, vegetation and greenness (NDVI) along the North America and Eurasia Arctic transects. *Environmental Research Letters* 7:015504

- Wang Y, Naumann U, Wright ST, and Warton DI. 2012. mvabund— an R package for model-based analysis of multivariate abundance data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3:471-474 DOI: 10.1111/j.2041-210X.2012.00190.x.
- Warton DI, Blanchet FG, O’Hara RB, Ovaskainen O, Taskinen S, Walker SC, and Hui FKC. 2015. So Many Variables: Joint Modeling in Community Ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 30:766-779 DOI: 10.1016/j.tree.2015.09.007.
- Warton DI, Wright ST, and Wang Y. 2012. Distance-based multivariate analyses confound location and dispersion effects. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3:89-101 DOI: 10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00127.x.
- Woo M-K, and Winter TC. 1993. The role of permafrost and seasonal frost in the hydrology of northern wetlands in North America. *Journal of Hydrology* 141:5-31 DOI: 10.1016/0022-1694(93)90043-9.
- Woo M-k, and Young KL. 2006. High Arctic wetlands: Their occurrence, hydrological characteristics and sustainability. *Journal of Hydrology* 320:432-450 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2005.07.025.
- World Spider Catalog. 2016. <http://wsc.nmbe.ch>. Available at <http://wsc.nmbe.ch> (accessed 1. February 2014).
- Zona D, Oechel WC, Kochendorfer J, U KTP, Salyuk AN, Olivas PC, Oberbauer SF, and Lipson DA. 2009. Methane fluxes during the initiation of a large-scale water table manipulation experiment in the Alaskan Arctic tundra. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 23 DOI: 10.1029/2009gb003487.

518

519

520

521 Tables

522 Table 1: List of arthropod species sampled and their abundance in three habitats; fen, dwarf
523 shrub heath, and tall shrub tundra at three sites along the Nuuk fiord in Western Greenland. The
524 last column shows the results of a species indicator analysis (for details see main text). Species
525 were assigned to one of the three habitats if A (specificity value) > 0.8 and B (sensitivity value)
526 > 0.1. Significance ($p < 0.05$) is indicated with an *. The table is sorted by order, family, and
527 species, respectively.

Order	Family	Species	Abundance			Habitat
			Fen	Heath	Shrub	
Araneae	Dictynidae	<i>Dictyna major</i> (Menge, 1869)			1	No classification
	Gnaphosidae	<i>Haplodrassus signifer</i> (C.L. Koch, 1839)		1		No classification
	Hahniidae	<i>Hahn timer glacialis</i> (Sørensen, 1898)	1	7	1	No classification
	Linyphiidae	<i>Agyneta jacksoni</i> (Simon, 1884)	3	8	1	No classification
		<i>Agyneta nigripes</i> (Brændegård, 1937)	2	3		Fen and heath
		<i>Bathypantes similimus</i> (L. Koch, 1879)			1	No classification
		<i>Dismodicus decemoculatus</i> (Emerton, 1852)	1	2	10	Shrub*
		<i>Erigone arctica</i> (White, 1852)	6			Fen
		<i>Erigone psycrophila</i> (Thorell, 1871)	1			No classification
		<i>Erigone whymperi</i> (O.P. Cambridge, 1877)	8			Fen*
		<i>Hilaira herniosa</i> (Thorell, 1875)		1		No classification
		<i>Hybauchenidium gibbosum</i> (Sørensen, 1898)		5	3	Heath and shrub
		<i>Hypsosinga groenlandica</i> (Simon, 1889)	2	2	4	Heath and shrub
		<i>Impropantes complicatus</i> (Emerton, 1882)		2	8	Shrub*
		<i>Lepthyphantes turbatrix</i> (O.P. Cambridge, 1877)			1	No classification
		<i>Mecynargus borealis</i> (Jackson, 1930)		4		Heath
		<i>Mecynargus morulus</i> (O.P. Cambridge, 1873)		2	1	Heath and shrub
		<i>Mecynargus paetulus</i> (O.P. Cambridge, 1875)	33			Fen*
		<i>Oreonetides vaginatus</i> (Thorell, 1872)			1	No classification
		<i>Pelecopsis mengei</i> (Simon, 1884)		2	1	Heath and shrub
		<i>Pocadicnemis americana</i> (Millidge, 1976)		6	18	Shrub*
		<i>Scias tes extremus</i> (Holm, 1967)		1		No classification
		<i>Scotinotylus sacer</i> (Crosby, 1929)			5	Shrub
		<i>Semljicola obtusus</i> (Emerton, 1914)	3	6	15	Shrub*
		<i>Sisicus apertus</i> (Holm, 1939)		1	3	Shrub*
		<i>Tiso aestivus</i> (L. Koch, 1872)	1	31	1	Heath
		<i>Wabasso cacuminatus</i> (Millidge, 1984)		1		No classification
		<i>Wabasso quaestio</i> (Chamberlin, 1948)	12			Fen*
		<i>Walckenaeria karpinskii</i> (O.P. Cambridge, 1873)	6	21		Fen and heath*
	Thomisidae	<i>Xysticus durus</i> (Sørensen, 1898)		17		Heath
	Lycosidae	<i>Arctosa insignita</i> (Thorell, 1872)	17	29	2	Fen and heath*
		<i>Pardosa furcifera</i> (Thorell, 1875)	524	552	257	No classification
		<i>Pardosa groenlandica</i> (Thorell, 1872)	17	23	8	No classification
		<i>Pardosa hyperborea</i> (Thorell, 1872)	6	347	140	Heath and shrub*
		<i>Thanatus arcticus</i> (Thorell, 1872)	2	10		Fen and heath
	Philodromidae	<i>Robertus fuscus</i> (Emerton, 1894)			1	No classification
	Theridiidae	<i>Ohlertidion lundbecki</i> (Sørensen, 1898)			2	Shrub
Coleoptera	Byrrhidae	<i>Byrrhus fasciatus</i> (Forster, 1771)	1	11		Heath
	Carabidae	<i>Patrob us septentrionis</i> (Dejean, 1821)	50	17	23	Fen and shrub*
	Coccinellidae	<i>Coccinella transversoguttata</i> (Falderman, 1835)		51	2	Heath*
	Cryptophagidae	<i>Caenoscelis ferruginea</i> (Sahlberg, 1820)		38	2	Heath and shrub
	Curculionidae	<i>Otiorynchus arcticus</i> (O. Fabricius, 1780)	1	20	1	Heath
		<i>Otiorynchus nodosus</i> (Müller, 1764)	18	66	19	No classification
	Staphylinidae	<i>Mycetoporus nigrans</i> (Mäklin, 1853)		2		No classification
		<i>Quedius fellmanni</i> (Zetterstedt, 1838)		2		No classification

Table 2: Mean ($\pm$ S.E) of the environmental variables included in GLM's and latent variable models, showing the difference between sites and treatments. Graminoid cover was measured in six categories: 0%, 1–20%, 21–40%, 41–60%, 61–80%, and 81–100%. Vegetation height was measured (classified to the nearest 5 cm) as the height of the most frequent vegetation height in the sub-plot.

Site	Habitat	Vegetation height (height classes)	Graminoid (percent cover)
Site 1	Heath	2.6 (0.2)	15 (5)
	Fen	2.5 (0.2)	55 (6.3)
Site 2	Heath	2.4 (0.2)	18.6 (3.7)
	Fen	2.3 (0.3)	75 (6.3)
	Shrub	7.5 (1.2)	10.3 (3.5)
Site 3	Heath	3.2 (0.4)	12.7 (11.4)
	Shrub	28.5 (4.1)	4 (1.9)

548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564

Table 3: Paired T-test of the local transitions in soil moisture and shrub dominance. LV1 and LV2 represent the first and second coordinate of the latent variable.

Model	Residual degrees of freedom	Estimates	T	P
Fen transect site 1 LV1	7	- 0.86	- 5.32	0.001
Fen transect site 1 LV2	7	- 0.43	- 4.78	0.002
Fen transect site 2 LV1	7	- 1.70	- 0.26	0.13
Fen transect site 2 LV2	7	- 0.37	- 3.21	0.02
Shrub transect site 2 LV1	5	- 0.72	- 3.90	0.01
Shrub transect site 2 LV2	5	- 0.35	- 3.10	0.03
Shrub transect site 3 LV1	5	- 1.16	- 5.50	0.003
Shrub transect site 3 LV2	5	- 0.62	- 3.28	0.02

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578 Figures

579 Fig. 1: Map of the Godthåbsfjord area, South-West Greenland ($64^{\circ} 11' \text{ N}$, $51^{\circ} 44' \text{ W}$), showing
 580 the three study sites (1, 2, and 3) depicted with a circle and the capital Nuuk depicted with a
 581 diamond. The inset figure in the lower right corner shows Greenland with the study area framed
 582 in a square. The map was created with the R package ‘RgoogleMaps’ (Loecher & Ropkins
 583 2015).

584





Fig. 2: Conceptual figure of the sampling design showing fen transects in the right panel and shrub transects in the left panel

599



600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

Fig. 3: Diversity profiles for species richness, Shannon diversity and Simpson diversity coloured by habitat. Error bars represent 95 percent confidence intervals





Fig. 4: Species distribution plot of the best fitted latent variable model showing the mean of the latent variable with a negative binomial distribution. Ellipses represent 95 percent confidence intervals around the centroids of each habitat



640

641

642

643

644


645

646

647


648

649 Fig 5: Plot of the correlations between species due to the environmental responses. Only the
 650 significant correlations, based on the 95% credible intervals excluding zero, are plotted. There
 651 were no significant residual correlations, based on the correlated response model. The
 652 environmental variables included in the model were vegetation height, cover of graminoid
 653 site. The colour blue shows positive correlation and the colour red shows negative correlation.
 654 The la  the circle, the higher the correlation.



Supplement figures


Fig S1: Plot of the best fitted latent variable model for plant species showing the mean of the latent variable in two dimensions with a negative binomial distribution. The different colours indicate different habitat types



681

682

683 Fig S2: Boxplot showing how the variables are distributed among habitats



684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691