Geographic Variation in Network Structure of a Nearctic Aquatic Food Web

Citation

Baiser, Benjamin, Nicholas J. Gotelli, Hannah L. Buckley, Thomas E. Miller, and Aaron M. Ellison. 2011. Geographic Variation in Network Structure of a Nearctic Aquatic Food Web. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*. doi: 10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00705.x.

Published Version

doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2011.00705.x

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:8298848>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Geographic Variation in Network Structure of a Nearctic Aquatic Food Web

Benjamin Baiser¹, Nicholas J. Gotelli², Hannah L. Buckley³, Thomas E. Miller⁴
Aaron M. Ellison¹

¹Harvard University, Harvard Forest, 324 N. Main St., Petersham, MA 01366, USA

²Department of Biology, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, USA

³Department of Ecology, P.O. Box 84, Lincoln University, Canterbury, New Zealand

⁴Department of Biological Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306-4295, USA

*Correspondence: Harvard University, Harvard Forest, 324 N. Main St., Petersham, MA 01366, USA

E-mail: bbaiser@fas.harvard.edu, Phone : 1-978-756-6155, Fax: 1-978-724-3595

Article type: Research Paper

Running title: Network structure in a cosmopolitan food web

ABSTRACT

Aim The network structure of food webs plays an important role in the maintenance of diversity and ecosystem functioning in ecological communities. Previous research has found that ecosystem size, resource availability, assembly history, and biotic interactions can potentially drive food web structure. However, the relative influence of climatic variables that drive broad-scale biogeographic patterns of species richness and composition has not been explored for food web structure. In this study, we assess the influence of broad-scale climatic variables in addition to known drivers of food web structure on replicate observations of a single aquatic food web, sampled from the leaves of the pitcher plant (*Sarracenia purpurea*), at different geographic sites across a broad latitudinal and climatic range.

Location Using standardized sampling methods, we conducted an extensive “snapshot” survey of 780 replicated aquatic food webs collected from the leaves of the pitcher plant *Sarracenia purpurea* at 39 sites from northern Florida to Newfoundland and westward to eastern British Columbia.

Methods We tested for correlations of 15 measures of food web structure at the pitcher and site scales with geographic variation in temperature and precipitation, concentrations of nutrients from atmospheric nitrogen deposition, resource availability, ecosystem size, and the abundances of the pitcher plant mosquito (*Wyeomyia smithii*), a potential keystone species.

Results At the scale of a single pitcher plant leaf, linkage density, species richness, measures of chain length, and the proportion of omnivores in a web increased with pitcher volume. Linkage density and species richness were greater at high latitude sites which experience lower mean temperatures and

precipitation, and higher annual variation in both of these variables. At the site scale, variation in eight of the 15 food web metrics decreased at higher latitudes and variation in measures of chain length increased with the abundance of mosquitoes.

Main Conclusions Ecosystem size and climatic variables related to latitude were most highly correlated with network structure of the *Sarracenia* food web. However, even the best-fitting models explained less than 40% of the variation in food web structure, in spite of large sample sizes, thorough standardized sampling, and the large geographic extent of the survey. In contrast to biogeographic patterns of species richness, food web structure was largely independent broad-scale climatic variables. The large proportion of unexplained variance in our analyses suggests that stochastic assembly may be an important determinant of local food web structure.

Key Words: Biogeography, chain length, food web, keystone predation, network structure, *Sarracenia purpurea*

INTRODUCTION

Understanding the causes and consequences of food web structure is a central focus of community ecology (Hairston *et al.*, 1960; May, 1973; Pimm, 1982; Fretwell, 1987; Beckerman *et al.*, 2006; Schmitz, 2010). Experimental studies have documented that food web structure is influenced by ecosystem size (Spencer & Warren, 1996; Post *et al.*, 2000; Takimoto *et al.*, 2008; McHugh *et al.*, 2010), the presence of keystone predators (Paine, 1969; Woodward *et al.*, 2008), disturbance (Power *et al.*, 1996; Marks *et al.*, 2000; McHugh *et al.*, 2010), productivity (Townsend *et al.*, 1998; Arim *et al.*, 2007), and the availability of nutrients and resources (Jenkins *et al.*, 1992; Kaunzinger & Morin, 1998). Literature compilations and meta-analyses of studies of food web structure also have demonstrated that many food web metrics are scale dependent (Schoener, 1989; Martinez, 1993; Martinez & Lawton, 1995), that web connectance (the proportion of possible links realized) is constrained between 0.03 and 0.33 (Dunne, 2002a), and that food webs generally do not exhibit small-world network properties (Comacho *et al.*, 2002; Dunne *et al.*, 2002b). However, it is difficult to infer general mechanisms from the results of single field experiments or meta-analyses because of differences in the spatial and temporal scale of the different studies, and differences in the collection, processing, and modeling of the raw data.

Here, we adopt a third strategy for understanding the control of food web structure. We test previously proposed correlations of food web structure with replicate observations of a single food web sampled at different geographic sites across a broad latitudinal and climatic range. We examine associations between metrics of food web structure, climatic variables related to precipitation and temperature that are strongly correlated to latitude, and potential causal variables such as nutrient inputs, ecosystem size, and the abundance of potential keystone species. Taking such an approach in North American lakes, Post *et al.* (2000) showed that food chain length is positively correlated with ecosystem size. Similarly, Schmitz (2006; 2010) used old-field food webs to show that trophic structure and adaptive foraging influence N mineralization rate, plant biomass production, and supply rate of solar radiation. Kitching (1987) found no relationship between tree-hole size and food web structure in Australian tree-

87 hole communities. However, this kind of replicated sampling of a single food web is uncommon because
88 the composition of food webs normally varies extensively across sites, the large spatial extent of most
89 food webs makes it difficult or even impossible to sample all the organisms and their feeding interactions
90 in replicated food webs, and the spatial boundaries of most local food webs are often arbitrary and poorly
91 defined.

92 We assessed variation in the structure of a single aquatic food web that can be effectively and
93 thoroughly sampled over a large geographic scale: the invertebrate food web associated with the pitcher
94 plant *Sarracenia purpurea* L. (Buckley *et al.*, 2003). Each of the cupped leaves of this plant holds up to
95 ~50 ml of water and supports a small, but fully-functional detritus-based food web of insect larvae, other
96 aquatic invertebrates (most commonly mites, rotifers, and copepods), protozoa, and microbes; captured
97 insect prey is the resource base for this donor-controlled food web (Addicott, 1974; Butler *et al.*, 2008).
98 The *Sarracenia* food web has been an ideal model system for experimental studies of the effects of prey
99 resources (Kneitel & Miller, 2002; Miller *et al.*, 2002; Butler *et al.*, 2008; Hoekman, 2010a), predators
100 (Addicott, 1974; Miller *et al.*, 2003; Kneitel, 2007), habitat structure (Ellison *et al.*, 2003), habitat volume
101 (Gotelli & Ellison, 2006), and climate change (Hoekman, 2010b) on food web dynamics. Perhaps most
102 importantly for the results presented here, the *Sarracenia* food web has remarkably high similarity in
103 species composition of macroinvertebrates across the entire range of the host plant (Buckley *et al.*, 2003;
104 2010). Finally, because this food web is spatially constrained within the small pools of rainwater that
105 collects in *Sarracenia* pitchers, it is easy to thoroughly sample the organisms in replicated webs.

106 We analyze an extensive “snapshot” data set of 780 *Sarracenia* webs sampled in 2001 from 39
107 sites throughout North America (western Canada to the Florida panhandle; Fig.1). Previous analyses of
108 this data set have established geographic trends in species richness, composition, and abundance of
109 individual taxa (Buckley *et al.*, 2003; 2010). Here, we turn our focus to network structure and metrics that
110 summarize linkages and interactions among species within the *Sarracenia* food web. We calculated four
111 categories of metrics: those related to complexity, food chain length, types of taxa, and variation in

112 trophic strategy (Table 1). We explore how the network structure of the *Sarracenia* food web varies
113 systematically with broad-scale climate variables that are correlated with latitudinal patterns of species
114 richness in this food web (e.g. mean temperature, annual precipitation), concentrations of nutrients from
115 atmospheric nitrogen deposition that limit plant (= food web habitat) growth (Ellison, 2006), plant size
116 and shape (Ellison & Gotelli, 2002; Ellison *et al.*, 2004), and three additional potential predictors of food
117 web structure (resource availability, ecosystem size, and the abundances of a potential keystone species).

118 We developed predictions of how food web structure would be related to known drivers (Post,
119 2002). Although Post's (2002) framework specifically addresses measures of food chain length, we
120 extended our analysis to several measures of food web complexity (Table 1). This is justified by the fact
121 that many of the secondary consumers and top predators in the *Sarracenia* food web are omnivores (Fig.
122 2) and as a result, measures of food chain length and complexity are highly correlated in this system
123 (Table 2, Fig. 3). Furthermore, in an analysis of 14 well-studied webs (Vermatt *et al.* 2009), food chain
124 length, the proportion of omnivores, and several measures of web complexity were positively correlated.
125 Our first prediction is that food chain length and complexity of the *Sarracenia* food web will increase
126 with potential resource availability (measured by microbial abundance, which is sensitive to prey inputs;
127 Kneitel & Miller, 2002; Miller *et al.*, 2002; Hoekman, 2010a). Second, chain length and complexity will
128 increase with habitat volume (measured as the volume of fluid in an individual pitcher plant leaf; Spencer
129 & Warren, 1996; Post *et al.*, 2000; Gotelli & Ellison, 2006). Third, atmospheric nitrogen deposition,
130 which alters leaf morphology such that pitchers have smaller openings and tubes (Ellison & Gotelli,
131 2002), will decrease chain length and complexity. Fourth, we predict that chain length and complexity
132 will increase with the presence of the larvae of the pitcher-plant mosquito, *Wyeomyia smithii* (Coq.), an
133 important filter-feeding predator in this system (Cochran-Stafira & von Ende, 1998; Kneitel & Miller,
134 2002; Gotelli & Ellison, 2006; Peterson *et al.*, 2008).

135 In addition to these predictors of food web structure, we also determined what percentage of the
136 variance in food web structure could be accounted for by a suite of broad-scale climatic variables (List

and definitions of climate variables available in appendix S1) that are highly correlated with latitude across our study sites. In the *Sarracenia* food web, total species richness is greater at higher latitudes that generally experience lower and more variable temperatures along with lower and more variable amounts of precipitation (Buckley *et al.*, 2003; 2010). We predict that food chain length and complexity will increase with latitude due to the greater probability of omnivore and top predator presence in high latitude species-rich webs. Our final prediction is based on the previous finding that within-site compositional turnover shows an inverse relationship with latitude (Buckley *et al.*, 2010). We predict that within-site variability in web structure will track compositional turnover and increase at lower latitudes due to the lack of trophic redundancy in the low latitude species-poor pools (Baiser & Lockwood 2011).

METHODS

The *Sarracenia* food web

The food web inhabiting the aquatic microhabitat in the leaves of the northern pitcher plant is comprised of microbes, protozoa, the bdelloid rotifer *Habrotrocha rosa* Donner (Bledzki & Ellison, 2003), and a suite of obligate arthropods: the mite *Sarraceniopus gibsoni* (Nesbitt), and aquatic larvae of the pitcher-plant mosquito *Wyeomyia smithii*, the midge *Metriocnemus knabi* (Coq.) and the sarcophagid fly *Fletcherimyia fletcheri* (Aldrich) (Addicott, 1974). Less common members of this assemblage include loricata rotifers, cladocerans, copepods, amphipods, nematodes, and multicellular algae (Addicott, 1974; Harvey & Miller, 1996; Hamilton *et al.*, 2000; Bledzki & Ellison, 2003).

Feeding interactions in the *Sarracenia* food web center on a detritus “processing chain” (Bradshaw and Creelman, 1984; Heard, 1994). Prey items that are captured by the plant are shredded by the midge and the sarcophagid fly into particulate organic matter (POM). Bacteria directly decompose prey items and also consume POM. Bacteria are preyed upon by a suite of intraguild predators including protozoa, rotifers, *Wyeomyia smithii*, and *Fletcherimyia fletcheri* (Fig. 2). *W. smithii*, and late instar *F. fletcheri* are the top predators in this 5-level food web (Fig. 2).

Data collection

We sampled 20 pitchers at each of 39 sites for a total of 780 pitchers across the range of *S. purpurea* (Fig. 1). We determined the abundances of invertebrates, rotifers, protozoa, and bacteria in each pitcher. We counted and identified all invertebrates in each pitcher and rotifers and protozoa in 0.1-mL sub-samples using a phase-contrast scope at 100 $\times$. Protozoa were identified to genus where possible and unidentified protozoa were not used in food web calculations (there were 16 unknown protozoa, 13 of which occurred in less than 2% of pitchers and three which occurred in 6-18 % of pitchers). Bacterial abundances were estimated using serial dilutions (10^{-5} and 10^{-7}) for each leaf and plating out samples on half-strength Luria broth agar. Thus, only plate culturable bacteria were included and identified by colony morphotypes. We calculated the density of the aforementioned taxonomic groups as abundance/mL in each pitcher. In total, 75 taxa were included in web calculations (see food web metrics below). We determined latitude for each site using the satellite global positioning system and recorded the total volume of pitcher fluid for each pitcher (see Buckley *et al.*, 2003 and 2010 for details on site selection, leaf selection, sampling protocol, and a complete list of species found in all food webs).

Food web metrics

Feeding interactions (hereafter links) between the species of the *Sarracenia* food web were assigned based on previous studies (Addicott, 1974; Forsyth & Robertson, 1975; Heard, 1994; Cochran-Stafira & von Ende, 1998; Miller *et al.*, 2002; Butler *et al.*, 2008) and direct observation. We constructed an $n \times 2$ matrix for each of the 780 food webs, where the n rows are the number links; the first column of the matrix contains the predator species identity and the second column contains the prey species identity for each link. We used Network3D (Williams, 2010) to calculate a suite of 15 metrics that characterize complexity, chain length, type of taxa, and variation in trophic strategy for the *Sarracenia* food web (Table 1). Because metrics for most well studied food webs co-vary to some degree (Vermatt *et al.*,

2009), we used principal components analysis (prcomp in R version 2.11.1; R Development Core Team, 2010) to account for covariance structure of the food web metrics.

Nitrogen data

Pitcher plants receive atmospheric N (in the form of NH_4 and NO_3) from rain and snowmelt that fill the pitchers. This atmospheric deposition can affect pitcher morphology and habitat structure for the food web (Ellison & Gotelli, 2002), and pitcher plant population dynamics (Gotelli & Ellison, 2002). We estimated deposition levels at each sampling site during the year of the survey to investigate these potential effects on food web structure. We used nitrogen deposition from National Atmospheric Deposition Data (NADP) monitoring stations that were closest to our sample sites in the United States (Fig. 1); deposition data for Canada are comparatively sparse and geographically distant from our sample sites. Therefore, for consistency, we estimated N deposition (total N = $\text{NH}_4 + \text{NO}_3$ as precipitation-weighted mean concentration in mg/L) at all our sites (i.e. United States + Canadian sites) in the summer quarter (July-September) using the AURAMS model (Moran *et al.*, 2008) and used this estimate as a predictor variable for all sites in our analyses of *Sarracenia* food webs. The estimates for United States sites were well-correlated with empirical NADP data ($r = 0.66$, $p < 0.0001$), and we assumed similar accuracy for Canadian sites. Further details on modeling N deposition are given in appendix S2.

Climate Data

Spatially referenced climate data for all sites were obtained using the program ANUSPLIN from the Landscape Analysis and Application Section of the Canadian Forest Service (McKenney *et al.*, 2006). Climate data for points nearest to the study site locations were queried in ArcGIS 9.0. We included 10 climate variables that quantify precipitation and temperature across our 39 sites (Appendix S1). The 10 climate variables and latitude were highly correlated (see appendix S3 for correlation matrix). To account for the interdependency of these measures, we conducted a principal components analysis (prcomp in R version 2.11.1; R Development Core Team, 2010) and used the first two principal components axis (PC1

and PC2) as predictor variables. Climate variables and latitude were transformed to standard deviation units for the principal components analysis. To insure that any one climate variable did not account for the majority of the variation in a given food web metric, we ran a set of preliminary univariate regressions with each climate variable, latitude, PC1, and PC 2 as predictor variables and food web metrics as response variables. We ranked models using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), and used the AIC score to select the best fitting model(s) among the candidate set (Burnham & Anderson, 2002). If any single climate variable had a $\Delta AIC < 2$ when compared to the first primary component axis (PC1), we selected that climate variable for further consideration in the regression models described below. If no single variable distinguished itself as a better fit ($\Delta AIC < 2$) than PC1, PC1 was selected for further consideration in the regression models described below. PC1 was the climate variable used in regression models for all but one case.

Data analyses

Pitcher scale

We used linear mixed effects models (function ‘lme’ in package ‘nlme’ in R v.2.11.1) to assess the influence of predictor variables on food web structure for the 780 individual pitchers (the pitcher scale of analysis). We used food web metrics as response variables, site as a random effect, and PC1, pitcher volume, nitrogen deposition, mosquito abundance, and bacterial abundance as fixed effects for the pitcher-scale analyses.

We built a set of candidate models for each response variable that included a null model (i.e. random intercept only), global model (with random intercept and all predictor variables entered), univariate models for each predictor variable, and all subsets of variables that had a P -value < 0.1 for the slope coefficient in both the global and univariate models (model structure is given in appendix S4). We ranked models using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), and used the AIC score to select the best

fitting model(s) among the candidate set (Burnham & Anderson, 2002). We calculated the variance explained (R^2) by the fixed effects in this mixed-effects model using Xu's (2003) method (see appendix S5 for calculation).

Site scale

Variation in species richness and compositional turnover are greater within sites than across sites in the *Sarracenia* food web (Buckley *et al.*, 2010). Therefore, to measure variation in food web structure within sites, we calculated the coefficient of variation (CV) of each web metric in the 20 webs at each of our 39 sites (site scale). We term this measure *structural turnover* and use it in the same sense as compositional turnover (i.e. β -diversity). High structural turnover means that when moving from one web to the next we are likely to encounter different network structure; high structural turnover results in a high CV at that site. Low structural turnover (measured as a low CV) means that web structure is similar from pitcher to pitcher within a single site.

We used linear models (lm in R v.2.11.1) to assess the influence of predictor variables on structural turnover at each of our 39 sites. We regressed structural turnover (the CV of each food web metric for the 20 pitchers at each of the 39 sites) on PC1, and the CVs of pitcher volume, mosquito abundance, and bacterial abundance. The model for the food web metric Top included the climate variable CV of precipitation instead of PC1 based on the climate variable model selection (See Climate Data). We used the CV of pitcher volume, mosquito abundance, and bacterial abundance for this analysis because we were interested in how pitcher-to-pitcher variation of predictor variables within each site was correlated with pitcher-to-pitcher variation in food web metrics across all pitchers within each site.

We built a set of candidate models for each response variable that included a global model, univariate models for each predictor variable, and all subsets of variables that had a P -value < 0.1 for the slope coefficient in both the global and univariate models. We ranked models using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), and used this score to select the best fitting model(s) among the candidate

set (Burnham & Anderson, 2002). We calculated the adjusted R^2 to determine the proportion of variance explained by each model.

Predictor variables

The correlations among predictor variables had correlation coefficients < 0.4 . All variables were transformed into standard deviation units (positive values indicate observations that were greater than the mean and negative values were less than the mean) for the pitcher-scale analyses except for PC1. N deposition was also transformed to standard deviation units for the site-scale analyses.

RESULTS

Principal components analysis of pitcher-scale variation in food web metrics

The first two principal components explained 70% of the variation in network structure for the set of 780 *Sarracenia* food webs. The first principal axis (PC1) explained 45% of the variation and was related to complexity and chain length. This axis was negatively correlated with metrics related to complexity (e.g. connectance, species richness, links per species) and chain length (e.g. mean trophic level, chain length) (Table 2). Percentage of omnivores and intermediate species were also negatively correlated with PC1 (Table 2). Webs with negative scores on PC1 were species-rich and contained many omnivores, which increased chain length, linkage density, and connectance (Fig 3a). PC1 was positively correlated with the percentage of top species in a web, the percentage of detritivores in the web, variation in the number of consumers and links per taxon, and the mean path length across the network (Table 2). An example of a web with a high positive PC1 score contains only detritivores (e.g. bacteria), which are all top species in this context (Fig. 3b). The second principal axis (PC2) explained 25% of the variation and was related to trophic redundancy and variation in prey and predator strategies. Webs with a positive score for PC2 (Fig. 3c) tended to have more species, and these species were intermediate detritivore species (i.e. bacteria) and

had higher trophic similarity and greater variation in the number of prey per taxon (Table 2). Webs on the negative side of this axis (Fig. 3d) had fewer species and the species that dropped out were bacteria.

Principal components analysis of climate variables and latitude

The first two principal components explained 92% of the climatic variation across our 39 sites. The first principal axis (PC1) explained 78% of the variation. Sites with high scores on this axis were at high latitudes, had short growing seasons with low mean temperatures and precipitation, and had high annual variation in both of these variables (Table 3). Sites representative of these conditions were located in the northern US and Canada (Fig. 1). Sites with low scores are located at low latitudes and experience higher mean temperatures and precipitation, but lower variability in both variables (Table 3). These sites are located in the south-eastern US. PC2 explained 14% the climatic variation across our 39 sites. Sites with positive scores had a high mean diurnal temperature range.

Resource availability, food chain length, and food web complexity

The hypothesized positive relationships between resource availability measured as bacterial abundance and measures of complexity and chain length were not observed. Bacterial abundance showed no relationship with any of the food web metrics at either the pitcher or site scale and was absent from all best-fit models (Tables 4 and 5).

Habitat size, food chain length, and food web complexity

Pitcher volume, which is a measure of ecosystem size, was positively correlated with the number of links per species, species richness, mean trophic level, chain length, and the percent of omnivores, and was negatively correlated with variation in links per species at the pitcher scale (Table 4). At the site scale, variation in pitcher volume was positively correlated with structural turnover in the clustering coefficient (Table 5; Fig. 4d). As predicted, we observed increases in several measures of web complexity with ecosystem size at the pitcher scale and increases in structural turnover with the CV of ecosystem size at

the site scale. However, chain length increased with ecosystem size only at the pitcher scale and showed no relationship with variation in pitcher volume at the site scale.

Nitrogen deposition, food chain length, and food web complexity

Nitrogen deposition, which was predicted to have a negative effect on complexity and chain length metrics, showed no relationship with food web metrics and was not a significant predictor in any of the best-fitting models.

Predator-prey interactions, food chain length, and food web complexity

Mosquito abundance was not correlated with food web structure at the pitcher scale. However, variation in mosquito abundance at the site scale was positively correlated with structural turnover in two measures of chain length – mean trophic level and mean chain length (Table 4; Fig 4 a, b). Although the hypothesized relationship between mosquito abundance and chain length was observed at the site scale, food web complexity did not increase with mosquito abundance at the pitcher scale and variation in mosquito abundance within site did not increase structural turnover in complexity metrics.

Biogeographic correlates of food chain length, and food web complexity

PC1, which is positively correlated with latitude (Table 3) was present in all of the best-fitting models that explained more than 5% of the variation in food web structure (Tables 4, 5). At the pitcher scale, PC1 was positively correlated with two measures of food web complexity – linkage density and species richness. Species richness was shown to follow the same patterns and increase with latitude in previous analyses of these data (Buckley *et al.*, 2003; 2010). Structural turnover at the site scale showed a consistent negative relationship with PC1 for more than half of the food web metrics measured (Table 5; Fig. 5). Thus, variation in food web structure within sites was greater at lower latitudes.

Overall, network structure of the *Sarracenia* food web was only weakly influenced by all predictor variables at the pitcher scale across 780 webs. The best-fit models left a large portion (> 95%)

of the variance in food web structure unexplained at the pitcher scale (Table 4). At the site scale, predictor variables explained more (8% –35%) variance in structural turnover in food webs (Table 5).

DISCUSSION

Ecosystem size has been associated with increased chain length in both aquatic (Spencer & Warren, 1996; Post, 2000; McHugh *et al.*, 2010) and terrestrial (Takimoto *et al.*, 2008) ecosystems. Our measure of ecosystems size, pitcher volume had a positive effect on both measures of chain length and measures of food web complexity, linkage density, species richness, and the percentage of omnivores in the web. Previous research on this data set has shown that species richness of arthropods, rotifers, and bacteria all increase with pitcher volume (Buckley *et al.*, 2010). Our results suggest that as species richness increases with pitcher volume, an increasing number of omnivores are added to the web. Omnivores feed on more than one trophic level resulting in a wider diet breadth which increases linkage density. Omnivore presence increases measures of chain length because the majority of omnivores in the *Sarracenia* food web feed at high trophic levels.

Resource availability showed no relationship with food web structure at the pitcher or site scales. One possibility why the predicted relationship was not observed is that bacterial abundance is not an appropriate measure for resource availability. The true resources are prey items that are captured by the plant. Although a bottom-up effect of prey abundance on bacterial abundance has been demonstrated repeatedly in the *Sarracenia* system (Kneitel & Miller, 2002; Miller *et al.*, 2002; Hoekman, 2010a), it is possible that bacterial abundance is a poor surrogate for resource availability due to sampling effects (i.e. only a fraction of the bacterial species can be cultured) or because abundance may not reflect productivity because of ongoing consumption of bacteria by higher trophic levels.

Although mosquito abundance had no effect on food web structure at the pitcher scale, increased variation in mosquito abundance between pitchers was positively correlated with structural turnover in chain length and mean trophic level within sites. Mosquito larval density varied from 0 to over 11 larvae

per ml. The simple presence of *W. smithii* can increase metrics related to chain length (Kitching, 2001; Post & Takimoto, 2007), or at high densities, extirpate intermediate consumers through predation (Addicott, 1974; Kneitel, 2007), concomitantly decreasing chain length. Mosquito abundance was not related to any measures of food web complexity, suggesting that the observed keystone effects of increased bacterial and protozoan diversity (Cochran-Stafira & von Ende, 1998; Peterson *et al.*, 2008) were not manifested in food web metrics related to complexity (consistent with Kneitel and Miller, 2002).

The ability to assess the influence of broad-scale climatic variables on food web structure was a novel aspect of this study. No single climate variable explained variation in food web structure due to colinearity among climate variables. Instead, PC1, which was derived from a suite of climate variables, captured latitudinal variation in temperature and precipitation across our sites and allowed us to specifically test predictions related to the biogeographic patterns of species richness and compositional turnover in the *Sarracenia* food web (Buckley *et al.*, 2003; 2010). Our original prediction was that metrics related to chain length and complexity would increase with latitude. Specifically, we found that the complexity metric linkage density increased with latitude and this was most likely due to higher species richness of arthropods and rotifers (which represent 75% of the omnivores in the species pool) at higher latitudes (Buckley *et al.*, 2003; 2010). We also confirmed the prediction that structural turnover would follow the same pattern as compositional turnover and have an inverse relationship with latitude (Buckley *et al.*, 2010). Increased compositional and structural turnover at lower latitudes implies that when certain species drop out of the web they are either replaced by a trophically different species, or not replaced at all. A positive correlation between compositional turnover and structural turnover is likely when communities are assembled from a species pool with low functional or trophic redundancy (Baiser & Lockwood, 2011). As a result, when a new species is added to a web it likely represents a new trophic strategy and hence an alteration in network structure.

Few other studies have examined broad-scale correlates of food web structure over such a large spatial scale. The *Sarracenia* web may be exceptional because the species pool of macroinvertebrates is

invariant over a large geographic area (Buckley et al., 2010). However, our results provide a general framework for understanding how patterns of compositional turnover and species richness influence variation in food web. If species are replaced by trophically unique species or not at all, as in the case of the low latitude *Sarracenia* food webs, compositional and structural turnover may be tightly linked. If a species pool has high trophic redundancy, species replacements will be trophically similar and food web structure may be conserved independent of compositional turnover. The degree to which both trophic redundancy is related to the richness of a species pool and patterns of species richness are correlated with broad-scale variables, are important factors in understanding the relationship between food web structure and biogeography. Trophic or functional redundancy within a given web mitigates against secondary extinctions (Borvall et al. 2000) and trophically redundant species are less vulnerable to cascading extinctions (Petchey et al. 2009). Trophic redundancy in the regional species pool may have a similarly stabilizing effect on food web structure as species composition turns over.

Overall, our results show that the commonly observed relationship between ecosystem size and food chain length (Spencer & Warren, 1996; Post, 2000; Takimoto *et al.*, 2008; McHugh *et al.*, 2010) is extended to several measures of network structure in the *Sarracenia* food web and that biogeographic patterns of species richness and compositional turnover influence food web structure. However, our predictor variables leave a large portion of variability in food web structure unexplained. We suggest that stochastic assembly processes related to dispersal and arrival order and timing of propagules (Knietal and Miller, 2003; Chase, 2010) that are not captured in our snapshot data set may be the driving influence of food web structure in the *Sarracenia* system. A study assessing assembly trajectory is necessary to explicitly test the hypothesis that stochastic assembly processes are the main determinant of network structure in the *Sarracenia* food web.

399 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

400 We thank Mike Moran and Junhua Zhang (Environment Canada, Air Quality Research Division) for
401 providing nitrogen deposition estimates for our sites using their AURAMS model. Support for this
402 research was provided by NSF grants 0083617 to TEM, AME, and NJG, and 0541680 to AME.

403

REFERENCES

- Addicott, J.F. (1974) Predation and prey community structure: an experimental study of the effect of mosquito larvae on the protozoan communities of pitcher plants. *Ecology*, **55**, 475–492.
- Arim, M., Bozinovic, F. & Marquet, P.A. (2007) On the relationship between trophic position, body mass and temperature: reformulating the energy limitation hypothesis. *Oikos*, **116**, 1524–1530.
- Baiser, B. & Lockwood, J. L. (2011) The relationship between functional and taxonomic homogenization. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **20**, 134–144.
- Beckerman, A.P., Petchey, O.L. & Warren, P.H. (2006) Foraging biology predicts food web complexity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, **103**, 13745–13749.
- Bledzki, L.A. & Ellison, A.M. (2003) Diversity of rotifers from northeastern USA bogs with new species records for North America and New England. *Hydrobiologia*, **385**, 193–200.
- Bradshaw, W.E. & Creelman, R.A. (1984) Mutualism between the carnivorous purple pitcher plant *Sarracenia purpurea* and its inhabitants. *American Midland Naturalist*, **112**, 294–304.
- Bradshaw, W.E., Holzapfel, C.M., Kleckner, C.A. & Hard, J.J. (1997) Heritability of development time and protandry in the pitcher-plant mosquito, *Wyeomia smithii*. *Ecology*, **78**, 969–976.
- Buckley, H. L., Miller, T., Ellison, A. M. & Gotelli, N. J. (2003) Reverse latitudinal trends in species richness of pitcher-plant food webs. *Ecology Letters*, **6**, 825–829.
- Buckley, H. L., Miller, T. E., Ellison, A. M. and Gotelli, N. J. (2010) Local- to continental-scale variation in the richness and composition of an aquatic food web. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, **19**, 711–723.
- Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. (2002) *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: a Practical Information Theoretic Approach*, 2nd edn. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Butler, J. L., & Ellison, A. M. (2007) Nitrogen cycling dynamics in the carnivorous northern pitcher plant, *Sarracenia purpurea*. *Functional Ecology*, **21**, 835–843.

428 Butler, J.L., Gotelli, N.J. & Ellison, A.M. (2008) Linking the brown and green: nutrient transformation
 429 and fate in the *Sarracenia* microecosystem. *Ecology*, **89**, 898–904.

430 Camacho, J., Guimer`a, R. & Amaral, L.A.N. (2002) Robust patterns in food web structure. *Physical*
 431 *Review Letters*, **88**, 228102.

432 Chase, J.M. (2010). Stochastic community assembly causes higher biodiversity in more productive
 433 environments. *Science*, 328, 1388–1391.

434 Cochran-Stafira, D.L. & von Ende, C.N. (1998) Integrating bacteria into food webs: studies with
 435 *Sarracenia purpurea* inquilines. *Ecology*, **79**, 880–898.

436 Dunne, J.A. 2009. *Food webs. in the Complex Networks and Graph Theory section of the Encyclopedia of*
 437 *Complexity and Systems Science*, (ed. Meyers, R.A.) Springer, NewYork. Pages 3661-3682.

438 Dunne, J. A., Williams, R. J. & Martinez, N. D. (2002a) Network structure and biodiversity loss in food
 439 webs: robustness increases with connectance. *Ecology Letters*, **5**, 558–567

440 Dunne, J. A., Williams, R. J. & Martinez, N. D. (2002b) Food-web structure and network theory: the role
 441 of connectance and size. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, **99**, 12917–
 442 12922.

443 Ellison, A.M. (2006) Nutrient limitation and stoichiometry of carnivorous plants. *Plant Biology*, **8**, 740–
 444 747.

445 Ellison, A.M. & Gotelli, N.J. (2002) Nitrogen availability alters the expression of carnivory in the
 446 northern pitcher plant, *Sarracenia purpurea*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
 447 *USA*, **99**, 4409–4412.

448 Ellison, A.M., Gotelli, N.J., Brewer, J.S., Cochran-Stafira, L., Kneitel, J., Miller, T.E., Worley, A.S. &
 449 Zamora, R. (2003) The evolutionary ecology of carnivorous plants. *Advances in Ecological*.
 450 *Research*, **33**, 1–74.

451 Ellison, A.M., Buckley, H.L., Miller, T.E. & Gotelli, N.J. (2004). Morphological variation in *Sarracenia*
 452 *purpurea* (Sarraceniaceae): geographic, environmental, and taxonomic correlates. *American*
 453 *Journal of Botany*, **91**, 1930–1935.

454 Forsyth, A.B. & Robertson, R.J. (1975) *K* reproductive strategy and larval behaviour of the pitcher plant
 455 sarcopagid fly, *Blaesoxipha fletcheri*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, **53**, 174–179.

456 Fretwell, S.D. (1987) Food-chain dynamics: the central theory of ecology. *Oikos*, **50**, 291–301.

457 Gotelli, N.J. & Ellison, A.M. (2002) Nitrogen deposition and extinction risk in the northern pitcher plant,
 458 *Sarracenia purpurea*. *Ecology*, **83**, 2758–2765.

459 Gotelli, N.J. & Ellison, A.M. (2006) Food-web models predict species abundance in response to habitat
 460 change. *PLoS Biology*, **44**, e324.

461 Hairston, N. G., Smith, F. E. & Slobodkin, L. B. (1960) Community structure, population control, and
 462 competition. *American Naturalist*, **94**, 421–425.

463 Hamilton, R., Reid, J. W. & Duffield, R. M. (2000) Rare copepod, *Paracyclops canadensis* (Willey),
 464 common in leaves of *Sarracenia purpurea* L. *Northeastern Naturalist*, **7**, 17–25.

465 Harvey, E. & Miller, T. E. (1996) Variance in composition of inquiline communities in leaves of
 466 *Sarracenia purpurea* L on multiple spatial scales. *Oecologia*, **108**, 562–566.

467 Heard, S. B. (1994) Pitcher plant midges and mosquitoes: a processing chain commensalism. *Ecology*, **75**,
 468 1647–1660.

469 Hoekman, D. (2010a) Relative importance of top-down and bottom-up forces in food webs of *Sarracenia*
 470 pitcher communities at a northern and a southern site. *Oecologia*, DOI: 10.1007/s00442-010-
 471 1802-2.

472 Hoekman, D. (2010b) Turning up the heat: Temperature influences the relative importance of top-down
 473 and bottom-up effects. *Ecology*, **91**, 2819–2825.

474 Jenkins, B., Kitching, R.L. & Pimm S.L. (1992) Productivity, disturbance and food web structure at a
 475 local spatial scale in experimental container habitats. *Oikos*, **65**, 249–255

476 Kaunzinger, C.M.K. & Morin, P.J. (1998) Productivity controls food-chain properties in microbial
 477 communities. *Nature*, **395**, 495–497.

478 Kitching, R.L. (2000) Food webs and container habitats: the natural history and ecology of phytotelmata,
 479 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

480 Kitching, R.L. (2001) Food webs in phytotelmata: ‘bottom-up’ and ‘top-down’ explanations for
 481 community structure. *Annual Review of Entomology*, **46**, 729–760.

482 Kneitel J.M. (2007) Intermediate-consumer identity and resources alter a food web with omnivory.
 483 *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **76**, 651–659.

484 Kneitel J.M. & Miller, T.E. (2002) Resource and top-predator regulation in the pitcher plant (*Sarracenia*
 485 *purpurea*) inquiline community. *Ecology*, **83**, 680–688.

486 Kneitel J.M. & Miller, T.E. (2003) Dispersal rates affect species composition in metacommunities of
 487 *Sarracenia purpurea* inquilines. *American Naturalist*, **162**, 165–171.

488 Koopman, M.M., Fuselier, D.M., Hird, S. & Carstens, B.C. (2010) The carnivorous pale pitcher plant
 489 harbors diverse, distinct, and time-dependent bacterial communities. *Applied and Environmental*
 490 *Microbiology*, **76**, 1851–1860.

491 Marks, J.C., Power, M.E. & Parker, M.S. (2000) Flood disturbance, algal productivity, and interannual
 492 variation in food chain length. *Oikos*, **90**, 20–27.

493 Martinez, N.D. (1994) Scale-dependent constraints on food-web structure. *American Naturalist*, **144**, 935–
 494 953.

495 Martinez, N. D. & Lawton, J. H. (1995) Scale and food-web Structure—from local to global. *Oikos*, **73**,
 496 148–154.

497 May, R.M. (1973) *Stability and Complexity in Model Ecosystems*. Princeton University Press, Princeton
 498 NJ.

499 McHugh, P.A., McIntosh, A.R. & Jellyman, P.G. (2010) Dual influences of ecosystem size and
 500 disturbance on food chain length in streams. *Ecology Letters*, **13**, 881–890.

501 McKenney, D., Papadopol, P., Campbell, K., Lawrence, K. & Hutchinson, M. (2006) *Spatial models of*
 502 *Canada– and North America–wide 1971/2000 minimum and maximum temperature, total*
 503 *precipitation and derived bioclimatic variables*. Forestry Research Applications Technical Note
 504 No. 106. Canadian Forest Service, Great Lakes Forestry Centre, Sault Ste. Marie, Canada.

505 Miller, T.E., Horth, L., & Reeves, R.H. (2002) Trophic interactions in the phytotelmata communities of
 506 the pitcher plant, *Sarracenia purpurea*. *Community Ecology*, **3**, 109–116.

507 Miller, T. E. & Kneitel, J. M. (2005) *Inquiline communities in pitcher plants as a prototypical*
 508 *metacommunity*. In *Metacommunities: Spatial Dynamics and Ecological Communities*. (eds.
 509 Holyoak, M., Leibold, M. A. & Holt, R. D) University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 122–145.

510 Moran, M. D., Zheng, Q., Pavlovic, R., Cousineau, S., Bouchet, V. S., Sassi, M., Makar, P. A., Gong, W.
 511 & Stroud, C. (2008) Predicted acid deposition critical-load exceedances across Canada from a
 512 one-year simulation with a regional particulate-matter model. Proc. 15th Joint AMS/A&WMA
 513 Conf. on Applications of Air Pollution Meteorology, 21–24 January, New Orleans, American
 514 Meteorological Society, Boston, 20 pp., online available at: [http://ams.confex.com/](http://ams.confex.com/ams/pdfpapers/132916.pdf)
 515 [ams/pdfpapers/132916.pdf](http://ams.confex.com/ams/pdfpapers/132916.pdf).

516 Paine, R. T. (1969) The *Pisaster-Tegula* interaction: prey patches, predator food preferences and intertidal
 517 community structure. *Ecology*, **50**, 950–61.

518 Peterson, C.N., Day S., Wolfe, B.E., Ellison, A.M., Kolter R. & Pringle A. (2008) A keystone predator
 519 controls bacterial diversity in the pitcher-plant (*Sarracenia purpurea*) microecosystem.
 520 *Environmental Microbiology*, **10**, 2257–2266.

521 Pimm, S.L. (1982) *Food Webs*. Chapman & Hall, London.

522 Post, D.M. (2002) The long and short of food-chain length. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **17**, 269–
 523 277.

524 Post, D.M. & Takimoto, G. (2007) Proximate structural mechanisms for variation in food-chain length.
 525 *Oikos*, **116**, 775–782.

526 Post, D.M., Pace, M.L. & Hairston, N.G. (2000) Ecosystem size determines food-chain length in lakes.
 527 *Nature*, **405**, 1047–1049.

528 Power, M.E., Parker, M.S. & Wootton, J.T. (1996) *Food webs in space: an island biogeographic*
 529 *perspective*. In: *Food Webs* (eds Polis, G.A. & Winemiller, K.O.). Chapman & Hall, New York,
 530 pp. 286–297.

- Schmitz, O.J. (2006) Predators have large effects on ecosystem properties by changing plant diversity, not plant biomass. *Ecology*, **87**, 1432–1437.
- Schmitz, O.J. (2010) *Resolving Ecosystem Complexity*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Schoener, T.W. (1989) Food webs from the small to the large. *Ecology*, **70**, 1559–1589.
- Spencer, M. & Warren, P.H. (1996) The effects of habitat size and productivity on food web structure in small aquatic microcosms. *Oikos*, **75**, 419–430.
- Srivastava, D.S., Kolasa, J., Bengtsson, J., Gonzalez, A., Lawler, S.P., Miller, T.E., Munguia, P., Romanuk, T., Schneider, D.C. & Trzcinski, M.K. (2004) Are natural microcosms useful model systems for ecology? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **19**, 379–384.
- Takimoto, G., Spiller, D.A. & Post, D.M. (2008) Ecosystem size, but not disturbance, determines food-chain length on islands of the Bahamas. *Ecology*, **89**, 3001–3007.
- Townsend, C.R., Thompson, R.M., McIntosh, A.R., Kilroy, C., Edwards, E. & Scarsbrook, M.R. (1998) Disturbance, resource supply, and food-web architecture in streams. *Ecology Letters*, **1**, 200–209.
- Vermaat, J.E., Dunne, J.A. & Gilbert, A.J. (2009) Major dimensions in foodweb structure properties. *Ecology*, **90**, 278–282.
- Williams, R. J. (2010) Network 3D Software. Microsoft Research, Cambridge, UK.
- Woodward, G., Papantoniou, G., Edwards, F. & Lauridsen, R. B. (2008) Trophic trickles and cascades in a complex food web: impacts of a keystone predator on stream community structure and ecosystem processes. *Oikos*, **117**, 683–692.
- Xu, R. (2003) Measuring explained variation in linear mixed effects models. *Statistics in Medicine*, **22**, 3527–3541.

557

558

559

560

561 **BIOSKETCH**

562 **Ben Baiser** is a Postdoctoral Research Associate at Harvard Forest. He has interests in community
563 ecology, conservation biology, invasion ecology, and understanding the impact of global change on
564 biodiversity.

565

566

TABLES

Table 1. Definitions of food web metrics. Each metric is assigned a metric “type”. Complexity metrics relate to the number of nodes (i.e. species) and links. Chain length metrics relate to the number of trophic levels in a web. Type of taxa describes the proportions of taxa found in a given trophic role. Trophic strategy relates to variation in the number and similarity of predators and prey among species in a web.

Metric	Type	Definition*
C	Complexity	connectance, or the proportion of possible links realized. $C = L/S^2$, where L is number of links and S is the number of species
S	Complexity	species richness
LS	Complexity	linkage density = L/S , number of links per species
Clust	Complexity	clustering coefficient, probability that two taxa linked to the same taxon are also linked
Path	Complexity [§]	characteristic path length, the mean shortest set of links (where links are treated as undirected) between species pairs
ChLen	Chain length	mean food chain length, averaged over all species
TL	Chain length	short-weighted trophic level averaged across taxa
Top	Type of taxa	percentage of top species in a web (taxa have no predators)
Int	Type of taxa	percentage of intermediate species in a web (taxa with both predators and prey)
Omn	Type of taxa	percentage of omnivores in a web (taxa that feed on more than one trophic level)
Det	Type of taxa	percentage of detritivores in a web (taxa that feed on Basal resources)
GenSD	Strategy	normalized standard deviation of generality (# resources per taxon)
VulSD	Strategy	normalized standard deviation of vulnerability (# consumers per taxon)
LinkSD	Strategy	normalized standard deviation of links (# links per taxon)
MaxSim	Strategy	mean across taxa of the maximum trophic similarity of each taxon to other taxa

*Definitions are taken from Dunn *et al.* (2009) and Vermatt *et al.* (2009). For further information on food web metrics, see Dunn *et al.* (2009) and sources therein.

[§]Path is negatively correlated with complexity.

580 Table 2. Factor loadings for the first two principal components axis (PC1 and PC2) describing variation in
 581 food web structure. PC1 explained 45% of the variation and PC2 explained 25%. See Table 1 for web
 582 metric definitions.

Web Metric	PC1	PC2
S	-0.21	0.31
LS	-0.30	0.20
C	-0.33	-0.18
Top	0.20	-0.32
Int	-0.23	0.36
Det	0.27	0.33
Omn	-0.29	-0.02
GenSD	0.06	0.45
VulSD	0.32	-0.10
LinkSD	0.29	0.24
TL	-0.33	-0.03
MaxSim	-0.10	0.36
Path	0.25	0.30
Clust	-0.25	0.01
ChLen	-0.28	0.001

583

Table 3. Factor loadings for the first two principal components axis (PC1 and PC2) describing climatic variation across our 39 sites. PC1 explained 78% of the variation and PC2 explained 14%. PC1 describes latitudinal variation in temperature and precipitation. Sites with high scores on this axis were at high latitudes, had short growing seasons with low mean temperatures and precipitation, and had high annual variation in both of these variables. Sites representative of these conditions were located in the northern US and Canada (Fig. 1). Sites with low scores are located at low latitudes and experience higher mean temperatures and precipitation, but lower variability in both variables. Climate variables are defined in Appendix S1.

Variable	PC1	PC2
MDT	-0.04304	0.722233
CVMT	0.334351	0.06211
ATR	0.32642	0.141781
Ap	-0.30974	-0.24194
CVp	0.219126	0.425786
GR	-0.32155	0.209303
MT	-0.33032	0.176812
MMINT	-0.33329	0.118973
MMXT	-0.32543	0.230974
MMONP	-0.30975	-0.2419
Lat	0.332285	-0.11618

599

600 Table 4. Top ranked mixed models with site as a random effect describing network structure for the
 601 *Sarracenia* food web. Metrics for which the top model was the null model (intercept only) or where the
 602 $\Delta AIC < 2$ between the null model and the top model are not included. See Table 1 for web metric
 603 definitions.

Web Metric	Variable	Estimate (SE)	t-value	p-value	R ² *
LS	Intercept	2.95 (0.05)	55.19	<0.001	0.05
	PC1	0.07 (0.02)	3.57	<0.01	
	Vol	0.26 (0.04)	7.26	<0.001	
S	Intercept	10.76 (0.18)	59.19	<0.001	0.05
	PC1	0.24 (0.06)	3.85	<0.001	
	Vol	0.82 (0.12)	7.01	<0.001	
TL	Intercept	2.12 (0.008)	256.07	<0.001	0.04
	Vol	0.03 (0.005)	6.02	<0.001	
ChLen	Intercept	2.08 (0.007)	277.73	<0.001	0.04
	Vol	0.03 (0.005)	5.93	<0.001	
Omn	Intercept	0.27 (0.007)	35.96	<0.001	0.04
	Vol	0.03 (0.005)	5.78	<0.001	
LinkSD	Intercept	0.29 (0.01)	32.02	<0.001	0.02
	Vol	-0.03 (0.007)	3.82	<0.001	

604

605 * R² calculated using the methods of Xu (2003) for assessing the fit of mixed models.

606

Table 5. Top ranked linear models describing structural turnover (CV of food web metrics) for the *Sarracenia* food web. Only models significant at a P-value of 0.05 with an adjusted $R^2 \geq 0.05$ are shown. See Table 1 for web metric definitions.

Web Metric	Variable	Estimate (SE)	t-value	p-value	adj- R^2
ChLen	Intercept	0.04 (0.004)	10.0	<0.001	0.35
	PC1	-0.003 (0.004)	-3.86	<0.001	
	Mosq	0.008 (0.002)	3.43	<0.01	
TL	Intercept	0.05 (0.005)	10.15	<0.001	0.33
	PC1	-0.003 (0.001)	-3.98	<0.001	
	Mosq	0.008 (0.003)	2.93	<0.01	
Clust	Intercept	0.18 (0.09)	2.07	<0.05	0.33
	PC1	-0.03 (0.008)	-3.24	<0.01	
	Vol	0.34 (0.14)	2.40	<0.05	
Omn	Intercept	0.44 (0.02)	18.17	<0.001	0.18
	PC1	-0.03 (0.008)	-3.03	<0.01	
LS	Intercept	0.31 (0.01)	24.63	<0.001	0.15
	PC1	-0.01 (0.004)	-2.75	<0.01	
Int	Intercept	0.20 (0.01)	14.58	<0.001	0.12
	PC1	-0.01 (0.005)	2.47	<0.05	
Det	Intercept	0.20 (0.007)	29.89	<0.001	0.11
	PC1	-0.006 (0.002)	-2.40	<0.05	
S	Intercept	0.27 (0.01)	26.82	<0.001	0.09
	PC1	-0.008 (0.004)	2.19	<0.05	
MaxSim	Intercept	0.06(0.004)	13.68	<0.001	0.08
	PC1	-0.003(0.001)	-2.05	<0.05	

FIGURE LEDGENDS

Figure 1. Map showing the 39 sites where *Sarracenia* food webs were sampled (solid circles) and National Atmospheric Deposition (NADP) sites (open circles) used for modeling nitrogen deposition.

Figure 2. Main components of the *Sarracenia* food web. Captured prey is shredded by both midge (*Metriocnemus knabi*) and flesh fly (*Fletcherimyia fletcheri*) larvae into particulate organic matter (POM) and directly decomposed by Bacteria. Bacteria also feed on POM along with mites (*Sarraceniopus gibsoni*) and rotifers (*Habrotrocha rosa*). Bacteria is consumed by protozoa, rotifers (which also prey on protozoa), all of which are preyed upon by the top predators the larvae of the mosquito *Wyeomyia smithii* and the sarcophagid fly *F. fletcheri*. *Fletcherimyia* larvae are cannibalistic and also prey upon on first- and second-instar *W. smithii* larvae. This is an aggregated general version of the pitcher plant web. For topological representation of actual webs see the inlay of Fig. 3.

Figure 3. Principal components analysis of food web metrics (See Table 1 for web metric definitions.) calculated for 780 *Sarracenia* food webs. Component 1 is related to complexity and chain length and component 2 is related to trophic redundancy and variation in prey and predator strategies. These two components explain 70% of the variation in *Sarracenia* food web structure. Inlay, four networks (a,b,c,d) representing the extremes of each axis. For these four food webs, arrows are drawn from their position in the PCA plot to the food web. White nodes represent the resource (dead prey items), grey nodes represent bacteria, and black nodes represent consumers.

Figure 4. Univariate models showing the relationship between variables (other than latitude) and structural turnover (CV of food web metrics) for the *Sarracenia* food web at the site-scale ($P < 0.05$ for all models). See Table 1 for web metric definitions.

Figure 5. Univariate models showing the relationship between PC1 and structural turnover (i.e. variation in network structure between webs within each site as measured by the CV of each food web metric) for the *Sarracenia* food web at the site-scale. Structural turnover significantly decreased ($P < 0.05$) with PC1 and thus latitude for a) Chain Length, b) Mean Trophic Level, c) Clustering Coefficient, d) % Omnivores, e) Linkage Density, f) % Intermediate species, g) % Detritivores, h) Species Richness, and i) Maximum Trophic Similarity.

655 Figure 1.

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667 Figure 2.

668

669

670

671

672

673 Figure 3.

680 Figure 4.

Figure 5

693 **Appendix S1**

694 **Climate variables (and latitude) used in climate variable principal components analysis and**
695 **regressions. See <http://cres.anu.edu.au/outputs/anuclim.php> for further information about climate**
696 **variables.**

697 MT = Annual Mean Temperature

698 MDTR = Mean Diurnal Range (Mean of monthly (max temp - min temp))

699 CVMT = Temperature Seasonality (Coefficient of Variation)

700 MMXT = Mean Max Temperature

701 MMINT = Mean Min Temperature

702 ATR = Temperature Annual Range

703 GR- Growing Season Days

704 AP = Annual Precipitation

705 MMONP= Mean Monthly Precipitation

706 CVP = Precipitation Seasonality (Coefficient of Variation)

707 Lat= Latitude

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

Appendix S2

Methods for modeling nitrogen deposition.

Data on nitrogen deposition were available through National Atmospheric Deposition Data (NADP) network only for sites in the United States (Fig. 1). Therefore, we used modeled depositional data for all sites (i.e. including Canadian sites) provided by the AURAMS model (Moran *et al.* 2008). To estimate the accuracy of the modeled data, we used linear regression to compare available empirical data from the NADP sites with the modeled data. Where possible, NADP data were from 2001, the year in which sampling occurred. When stations were not active during 2001, we used the closest full calendar year data. Modeled data are for 2002 since NADP data ranged from 2001-2004. NADP and modeled depositional data are quarterly totals of NH_4 and NO_3 in mg/L (precipitation-weighted mean concentration). We used the total nitrogen deposition ($\text{N} = \text{NH}_4 + \text{NO}_3$) for the summer quarter (July-September) as a predictor variable in our analyses of *S. purpurea* food webs. The modeled data was a good fit to the NADP data ($R^2=0.43$, p-value <0.0001).

Figure 1. Quarterly/seasonal comparison of observed NAPD data for pitcher plant sites in the US with modeled data from the AURAMS model (Moran *et al.* 2008). The observed regression line is solid and the dotted line is a 1:1 relationship.

Appendix S3

Correlations among climate variables and latitude. Analysis conducted using function ‘r.corr.test’ in package ‘ltm’ in R v.2.11.1. The upper diagonal part contains correlation coefficient estimates and the lower diagonal part contains corresponding p-values. Climate variables are defined in Appendix S1.

	MT	MDT	CVMT	MMINT	MMXT	GR	ATR	Ap	CVp	MMONP	Lat
MT	*****	0.274	-0.926	0.997	0.997	0.987	-0.891	0.783	-0.488	0.783	-0.974
MDT	0.091	*****	-0.051	0.195	0.348	0.28	0.082	-0.093	0.231	-0.092	-0.255
CVMT	<0.001	0.759	*****	-0.94	-0.907	-0.892	0.987	-0.9	0.644	-0.9	0.927
MMINT	<0.001	0.234	<0.001	*****	0.987	0.982	-0.916	0.807	-0.518	0.807	-0.972
MMXT	<0.001	0.03	<0.001	<0.001	*****	0.985	-0.862	0.755	-0.457	0.755	-0.97
GR	<0.001	0.084	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	*****	-0.863	0.748	-0.418	0.748	-0.946
ATR	<0.001	0.619	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	*****	-0.898	0.634	-0.898	0.881
Ap	<0.001	0.575	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	*****	-0.708	1	-0.833
CVp	0.002	0.158	<0.001	0.001	0.003	0.008	<0.001	<0.001	*****	-0.708	0.577
MMONP	<0.001	0.576	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	*****	-0.833
Lat	<0.001	0.117	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	*****

760

761

762 **Appendix S4**

763 **Mixed effect models for the pitcher-scale analysis using function ‘lme’ in package ‘nlme’ in R**

764 **v.2.11.1.**

765 Random intercept only model (null model):

766 • summary(Null <- lme(webmetric~1 , random = ~1|Site, data = web))

767 Global Model:

768 • summary(Global <- lme(webmetric~ Lat + Long + Elev + Vol + N + Mosq + Bact, random =
769 ~1|Site,data = web))

770 Univariate Model:

771 • summary(Univariate <- lme(webmetric~ Vol, random = ~1|Site,data = web))

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783 **Appendix S5**

784 Xu's (2003) method for calculating the variance explained (R^2) by the fixed effects in a mixed-effects

785 model. The residual variance from the model with fixed effects (Var_{fixed}) is divided by residual variance of

786 a model containing only the random effect (i.e. null model) (Var_{null}). This quotient is subtracted from one.

787

$$R^2 = 1 - \left(\frac{Var_{fixed}}{Var_{null}} \right)$$