Importance of species interactions to community heritability: a genetic basis to trophic-level interactions
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Abstract
Recent community genetics studies have shown that specific genotypes of a host plant support distinct arthropod communities. Building upon these findings, we examined the hypothesis that a trophic community consisting of cottonwood trees, a galling herbivore and avian predators could also be related to the genetics of the host tree. We found genetic correlations among phytochemistry of individual tree genotypes, the density of a galling herbivore, and the intensity of avian predation on these herbivores. We detected significant broad-sense heritability of these interactions that range from $H_B^2 = 0.70$ to 0.83. The genetic basis of these interactions tended to increase across trophic levels suggesting that small genetic changes in the cottonwood phenotype could have major consequences at higher trophic levels affecting species interactions and energy flow. These findings show a heritable basis to trophic-level interactions indicating that there is a significant genetic basis to community composition and energy flow that is predictable by plant genotype. Our data clearly link plant genetics to patterns of avian foraging and show that species interactions are important components of community heritability and ecosystem processes. Overall, these data support the hypothesis that evolution of plant traits can alter trophic-level interactions and community composition.
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INTRODUCTION
Linking genetics to population, community and ecosystem processes is fundamental to the field of community genetics and places population, community and ecosystem interactions and processes within an evolutionary context (Whitham et al. 2003). Although one might think that the effects of genetic variation or specific genetically based plant traits may have little effect on higher levels of organization (i.e. community and ecosystems), recent studies have shown that specific genetically based plant traits can have direct and indirect effects that extend beyond the individual or population to affect the dependent community (Hockwender & Fritz 2004; Wimp et al. 2004; Johnson & Agrawal 2005), and have ecosystem consequences (Driebé & Whitham 2000; Treseder & Vitousek 2001; Madritch & Hunter 2002; Schweitzer et al. 2004). Together these studies suggest that plant genetics can have strong organizational effects at the community and/or ecosystem level.

Tri-trophic-level interactions represent a model community of interacting species and ecosystem process in which to examine the direct and indirect effects of plant genetics. Since Lindeman (1942), understanding how energy availability changes across trophic groups has become a major area of ecological research at the community and ecosystem level (Odum 1957; Marquis & Whelan 1994; Price 1997). As Forkner & Hunter (2000) pointed out, since 1974 over 1000 studies have used bottom-up or top-down forces as keywords describing their research. The relative importance of bottom-up vs. top-down control of herbivore dynamics has been fundamental to trophic-level interactions (Hairston et al. 1960). In general, studies have shown that bottom-up factors such as productivity, phytochemistry, phenology as well as top-down impacts by predators affect herbivore...
population dynamics and community structure (Price et al. 1980; Hunter & Price 1992; Roininen et al. 1996; Dyer & Letourneau 1999; Abrahamson et al. 2003; Rudgers 2004). For example, Forkner & Hunter (2000) showed how environmental conditions that positively affected growth of oaks, also positively affected arthropod herbivore abundance and slightly increased predation. And while the generality of these studies is strong, they generally disregard the variation in trophic-level interactions that is present at the individual plant genotype level, which is fundamental to understanding the ecology and evolution of trophic-level interactions.

There is a precedent for understanding the genetic basis of trophic-level interactions, although direct tests are few (Price & Clancy 1986; Weis & Abrahamson 1986; Preszler & Boecklen 1994; Fritz 1995; Stiling & Rossi 1996; Fritz et al. 1997; Wimp & Whitham 2001). Plant genes interact with the environment to produce phenotypes that affect plant resistance to herbivores (Simchuk et al. 1999). These phenotypes can vary dramatically from one plant genotype to another (Berenaum et al. 1986; Marquis 1990; O’Reilly-Wapstra et al. 2002). Because predators depend on herbivores, predation could also vary by plant genotype. If plants show low within genotype variation and high among genotype variation for predation (Fritz 1995), then it could be a heritable plant trait and subject to natural selection (Falconer 1987) if predation were to feedback and affect plant fitness. Using existing quantitative genetic methods to measure the phenotypic covariance of genetically similar ecological interactions demonstrates that genetic interactions among species can produce distinct trophic-level phenotypes (Goodnight 1990a,b; Wade 2003).

Cottonwoods are recognized as a dominant riparian forest tree that commonly hybridizes across many rivers in the western United States. Along the Weber River, Utah, the ranges of Fremont cottonwood (Populus fremontii) and narrowleaf cottonwood (P. angustifolia) overlap in a 13-km zone where the two species naturally hybridize and introgress unidirectionally towards narrowleaf cottonwoods (Martinsen et al. 2001). Because of this unidirectional genetic introgression, hybridization represents a genetic continuum between Fremont and narrowleaf cottonwoods that results in a large amount of genetic variation (Martinsen et al. 2001). Within this naturally hybridizing complex, Whitham (1989) showed a strong genetic basis to the resistance and susceptibility of backcross hybrids and narrowleaf cottonwoods to a common gall-forming aphid, Pemphigus betae (Aphidae, Homoptera). Dickson & Whitham (1996) also demonstrated that P. betae is an important food item for insectivorous birds, and phytochemistry has also been shown to be an important mechanistic link affecting herbivores (Bangert et al. 2005b) making this an ideal system to examine the genetic basis of tri-trophic-level interactions.

Based upon the above studies, we addressed three basic hypotheses: (1) phytochemistry, aphid gall density, avian predation and tri-trophic-level interactions differ among genotypes in a common garden; (2) phytochemistry, aphid gall density and avian predation are related; (3) tri-trophic-level interactions exhibit broad-sense heritability. Our results show that there is heritable genetic variation in plants for tri-trophic-level interactions. These findings contribute to the growing field of community genetics (Goodnight 1990a,b; Dungey et al. 2000; Hockwender & Fritz 2004; Johnson & Agrawal 2005) by suggesting that phytochemistry and genetically based species interactions are important components of community heritability and ecosystem processes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Common garden and surveys

We examined the genetic basis of tri-trophic-level interactions in a 13-year-old common garden with replicated clones of cottonwood genotypes whose genetic makeup had been quantified using RFLP analyses (Martinsen et al. 2001). Genotypes planted in the common garden were randomly selected from multiple populations of trees which show distinct population structure (Wimp et al. 2004) growing throughout the entire 201 km long Weber River drainage and planted in a random design. We randomly selected 11 genotypes of backcross hybrids and P. angustifolia. At least three replicates of each genotype were surveyed for a total of 41 replicates. F1 hybrids and P. fremontii do not host P. betae and were not used in this study.

To determine potential mechanistic relationships among cottonwoods, galls and birds we measured phytochemistry, gall density and avian predation. Concentrations of the principal secondary metabolites (phenolic glycosides and condensed tannin; Palo 1984; Lindroth & Hwang 1996) were quantified from the randomly selected replicate genotypes (see above). Leaves were collected on dry ice, lyophilized and ground to pass a 40-mesh screen in a Wiley Mill. The phenolic glycosides, salicortin and HCH-salicortin, were quantified using high-performance thin layer chromatography (Lindroth et al. 1993), using purified salicortin and HCH-salicortin as standards. Condensed tannin levels were measured on 70% acetone extracts of the leaf samples using the butanol-HCl method of Porter et al. (1986). Narrowleaf cottonwood condensed tannins purified by the method of Hagerman & Butler (1980) were used as the reference standard. Total nitrogen and carbon analyses were performed by combustion on a Carlo Erba CNS analyzer (Carlo Erba, Milan, Italy).
Pemphigus betae gall density was surveyed on 25 shoots of two randomly selected branches per replicate genotype for a total of 50 shoots per replicate (total of 2050 shoots). To determine the relationship between galls and birds we surveyed all P. betae galls on these shoots for avian predation. From these data we calculated predation pressure by dividing the number of galls attacked by the total number of galls. Avian predation of galls can be easily identified as a detectable peck mark, and/or slice of the gall (see also Dickson & Whitham 1996). Thus predation was characterized as the number of galls attacked. Feeding by Black-Headed Grosbeaks (*Pheucticus melanocephalus*), American Robin (*Turdus migratorius*) and Black-capped Chickadees (*Poecile atricapilla*) were observed making these conspicuous marks on the gall.

We considered phytochemistry, gall density and predation on cottonwood genotypes as quantitative traits because they are likely to arise from genetic and environmental factors similar to that which produces other plant phenotypes displaying quantitative inheritance (Bradshaw & Stettler 1987). Thus predation was characterized as the number of galls attacked. Feeding by Black-Headed Grosbeaks (*Pheucticus melanocephalus*), American Robin (*Turdus migratorius*) and Black-capped Chickadees (*Poecile atricapilla*) were observed making these conspicuous marks on the gall.

We considered phytochemistry, gall density and predation on cottonwood genotypes as quantitative traits because they are likely to arise from genetic and environmental factors similar to that which produces other plant phenotypes displaying quantitative inheritance (Bradshaw & Stettler 1995; Bailey *et al.* 2004a,b). When these estimates are generated according to standard breeding designs (e.g. among lineages of clones grown in a common environment), standard quantitative genetic methods are appropriate for relating the observable components of phenotypic variance to the measurable components of genetic variance (Falconer 1987).

**Statistical analysis**

In order to examine how the presence and interactions among galls and birds varied by cottonwood genotype we used Non-metric Multidimensional Scaling ordination (NMDS; Minchin 1987). NMDS is a robust multivariate statistical approach that places samples with similar phenotypes close together in ordination space and dissimilar samples far away in ordination space based on the standard Bray–Curtis distance (Faith *et al.* 1987). We used two traits from each replicate clone for our data matrix: gall density and avian predation. Each NMDS score represents the combined cottonwood gall density, and avian predation for each clonal replicate of each tree genotype. Because tri-trophic-level interactions represent a simple community of interacting ‘species’ in a particular location and by definition is concerned with how energy flows among organisms in an ecosystem (Lindeman 1942; Odum 1957; Marquis & Whelan 1994; Price 1997), these analyses are important because they address three major questions: (1) is there genetically based variation in community composition? (2) Are species interactions important components of community heritability? (3) Is there genetically based variation in the way energy flows among organisms in an ecosystem?

These NMDS scores, as well as the independent surveys for phytochemistry, gall abundance and avian predation, were analysed using a one-way ANOVA model with genotype as a random effect. All data were transformed to meet assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance. We used simple linear regression for genetic correlations to relate genotype means of phytochemistry, gall density and predation. Regression was used because we were interested in whether host plant genotype predicted the associated gall density and predation. Additionally, we used a multiple regression approach to specifically examine if the effects of plant genotype on avian predation were direct or indirect. We used a standard least squares model with partial (type III sums of squares) error structure and genotype and the number of galls attacked as our factors.

We calculated the broad-sense heritability ($H^2_B$) of tree phytochemistry, gall density, bird predation, and their interaction as the among-lineage component of variation in the phenotype, $H^2_S$, divided by the total variance in the phenotype for all trees, $H^2_{total}$, or $H^2_B = H^2_S / H^2_{total}$. Calculations of mean squares and methods for partitioning within-, among- and total phenotypic variance from ANOVA results are described in detail (Falconer 1987). Broad-sense heritability measurements were made for backcross hybrids, *P. angustifolia*, and both tree classes together.

**RESULTS**

Because phytochemistry is often associated with a plants’ resistance to herbivory and herbivore density is commonly related to predator abundance we examined how these traits varied by plant genotype. In agreement with our hypothesis that phytochemistry, aphid gall density, avian predation, predation pressure and tri-trophic interactions vary within and among genotypes in a common garden, we found significant differences among cottonwood genotypes in all traits examined except % foliar nitrogen and % foliar carbon (Table 1). Average gall density on individual tree genotypes ranged from 0 to 44 galls per 50 shoots, and avian predation of these galls varied from 0 to 36 galls attacked.

Because galls were virtually absent from some genotypes, we conducted a separate more conservative survey of predation to confirm that insectivorous birds were visiting all trees and tracking gall density. We searched trees that were low in gall density for 10 galls and randomly selected 10 galls on genotypes where they were common. We found that similar to the first survey these data also showed that avian predation differed by cottonwood genotype ($d.f. = 10,40$, $F = 5.56, P < 0.0001$), which confirmed that insectivorous birds visited all trees.
In support of the hypothesis that phytochemistry, aphid gall density, avian predation and tri-trophic interactions are related, we found that average % foliar condensed tannins was significantly related to gall density (Fig. 1a; d.f.(1,10), $F = 6.86$, $r^2 = 0.43$, $P < 0.05$) the number of galls attacked by birds (Fig. 1b; d.f.(1,10), $F = 5.74$, $r^2 = 0.39$, $P < 0.05$) and the interaction of galls and birds (Fig. 1c; d.f.(4,10), $F = 5.74$, $r^2 = 0.39$, $P < 0.05$). As mean foliar condensed tannins among tree genotypes increased from 5% to 16% dry weight, gall density also increased from 0 to 15 galls per 50 shoots. Foliar condensed tannins also indirectly affected avian predators through this galling herbivore. As condensed tannins increased, avian predation also increased from 0 to 10 galls being attacked. When genotype 1012 is removed from the analysis, condensed tannins were still positively related to gall density (Fig. 1a; d.f.(1,9), $F = 5.66$, $r^2 = 0.42$, $P = 0.045$) and avian predation (Fig. 1b; d.f.(1,9), $F = 5.44$, $r^2 = 0.40$, $P = 0.048$). These genetic correlations show that phytochemistry affects gall density, avian predation, and demonstrate a genetically based bottom-up organizing effect in this system.

When the relationship between gall density and avian predation was examined, there was a strong positive relationship where birds selectively foraged on tree genotypes where aphid gall densities were greatest (d.f.(1,10), $r^2 = 0.98$, $F = 621.7$, $P < 0.0001$, Fig. 2). Cottonwood genotypes with low gall density had low avian predation, whereas genotypes with high gall density had high avian predation. These data strongly suggest that the effects of plant genotype on avian predation are indirect.

To test this hypothesis that host plant genetic effects on avian predators are indirect we used a multiple regression approach with plant genotype and gall density to predict the number of galls attacked. Overall, genotype was not a significant predictor of avian predation when gall density was included in the model (Table 2). When gall density was removed from the model, genotype emerged demonstrating that the effects of plant genetics on avian predators are indirect (Table 2). Because genetically based resistance to dominant herbivores can extend to the next trophic level, these data suggest that this interaction may be heritable.

In agreement with our hypothesis that phytochemistry, aphid gall density, avian predation and tri-trophic interactions show heritable variation, there was significant broad-sense heritability of all traits examined except % foliar nitrogen and % foliar carbon (Table 1). Overall, $37\%$ of the variation in foliar condensed tannins, $80\%$ of the variation in gall density, $82\%$ of the variation in avian predation, and $80\%$ of the variation in tri-trophic interactions was related to host plant genetics. Even when the backcross hybrid or

---

**Table 1** Plant genotype effects on phytochemistry and trophic-level interactions and broad-sense heritability of these traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree class</th>
<th>Backcross hybrids</th>
<th><em>Populus angustifolia</em></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1979 1012 1017 11 10 18</td>
<td>1008 T15 RM2 WC5 1020</td>
<td>$F_{(d.f.)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>2.04 2.02 1.73 1.96 2.07 2.08</td>
<td>2.06 1.83 1.79 2.11 1.79</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_N$</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.34</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>43.8 44.8 45.0 46.2 42.1</td>
<td>46.0 43.7 44.1 45.7 45.6</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_C$</td>
<td>0.06 ± 0.35</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.53</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condensed tannin</td>
<td>1.91 1.19 1.43 1.12 1.54 5.57</td>
<td>7.86 8.14 5.63 15.5 5.86</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_C$</td>
<td>0.43 ± 0.33</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.42</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salicortin</td>
<td>8.37 8.69 6.70 8.67 3.71</td>
<td>14.8 15.3 14.3 8.74 12.0</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_S$</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.34</td>
<td>0.18 ± 0.45</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCH-salicortin</td>
<td>2.12 0.0 0.38 0.0 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 1.33 0.0 0.0 4.63</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_H$</td>
<td>0.62 ± 0.32</td>
<td>0.79 ± 0.34</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall density</td>
<td>0.0 43.67 21.3 10.75 4.8 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 12.3 7.33 3.0 0.0</td>
<td>15.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_G$</td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.27</td>
<td>0.60 ± 0.41</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galls attacked</td>
<td>0.0 35.67 14.0 8.5 2.4 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 7.0 4.67 1.0 0.0</td>
<td>17.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_G$</td>
<td>0.83 ± 0.25</td>
<td>0.53 ± 0.42</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galls attacked/total</td>
<td>0.0 0.83 0.67 0.71 0.34</td>
<td>0.0 0.55 0.0 0.0 0.40</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_G$</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.28</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.48</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galls removed</td>
<td>0.0 8.0 7.33 2.23 2.40</td>
<td>0.0 5.33 2.67 2.0 0.0</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_G$</td>
<td>0.62 ± 0.32</td>
<td>0.82 ± 0.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMD score</td>
<td>−1.08 1.72 1.05 0.53 −0.07 −1.08 −1.08 0.69 0.07 −0.38 −1.08</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^2_N$</td>
<td>0.83 ± 0.25</td>
<td>0.70 ± 0.38</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All phytochemical trait values are expressed as mean % dry weight ($\mu$g mg$^{-1}$). HCH-salicortin is hydroxy-hexenoyl-ene salicortin. Items in bold show significant differences among genotypes as well as significant broad-sense heritability.
P. angustifolia tree class were analysed separately there was significant broad-sense heritability for all traits measured except % foliar salicortin (Table 1). This is important because it demonstrates that heritability is not driven by the mixing of hybrids and a pure parental species; heritable variation is observed within a pure species as well as a hybridizing complex. Thus, our findings are important for understanding tri-trophic-level interactions in individual species of plants as well as in hybridizing complexes.

DISCUSSION

Recent studies have shown that there are genetic components that can determine community structure (e.g. Dungey et al. 2000; Wade 2003; Hockwender & Fritz 2004; Wimp et al. 2004, 2005, Bangert et al. 2005a,b; Johnson & Agrawal 2005). Johnson & Agrawal (2005) showed that intraspecific genetic differences in the evening primrose (Oenothera biennis) accounted for as much as 41% of the variation in arthropod diversity. Although the community is small, our data also show relatively high levels of phenotypic variation for tri-trophic-level interactions (i.e. cottonwoods, an aphid herbivore and avian predators; $H_B^2 = 0.70–0.83\%$) and demonstrates the importance of species interactions to community heritability and ecosystem processes such as energy flow. For example, our data show that the direct and indirect interactions among species result in distinct community composition that is predictable by cottonwood genotype. Because there is variation in the interactions among cottonwoods, galls and avian predators that does result in functionally organized communities, our results also show that ‘populations of communities’ can persist on the...
landscape (sensu Wilson 1997) and that how these interactions vary affects energy flow in this forest ecosystem.

It has been proposed that associated communities can change as a result of natural selection that acts on plants (Whitham et al. 2003) if there are genetic correlations between those plant traits and associated communities. Our data showed genetic correlations among condensed tannins, gall density and avian predation and support the hypothesis that the evolution of *Populus* could result in changes to community composition by altering the interactions among species. Condensed tannins have also been shown to impact microbial communities (Bailey et al. 2005) and mammalian herbivores (Bailey et al. 2004a; O’Reilly-Wapstra et al. 2004). Although we showed that condensed tannins can affect avian predators, it is clear that the effects of plant genetics on avian predation are indirect (see Table 2). Gall density explained 98% of the variation in attack by avian predators demonstrating that the effects of plant genetics are indirect and strongly mediated through the effects of herbivory.

These results support previous data (Dickson & Whitham 1996) demonstrating that *P. betae* is an important food resource for birds and show that direct and indirect genetically based species interactions are important components of community heritability. Because animals tend to accumulate in shelters, predators such as insectivorous birds may identify them as an easy and reliable food resource (Bailey & Whitham 2003). For example, Heinrich & Collins (1983) showed that birds used leaf morphology (including leaf-folds) as foraging clues. Dickson & Whitham (1996) showed a positive association between Black-capped chickadees and *P. betae*. Still, very few studies have linked bird foraging to plant quality. Mäntylä et al. (2004) found that birds may use olfaction or UV vision to detect their prey after plants induce phytochemical compounds to defend against herbivores. Bailey & Whitham (2003) showed that elk browsing on aspen negatively affected plant quality, herbivore abundance and avian predation. When the direct effects of genetically based plant traits on dominant herbivores are predictable, they may also extend to the next trophic level indirectly impacting predators and parasitoids.

We found moderate to large estimates of broad-sense heritability for many phytochemical traits, gall density and avian predation. In general, genetically based phenotypic variation was lowest in the plant phenotype \( H^2_B = 0.37 \), and greatest at the second \( H^2_A = 0.80 \) and third trophic levels \( H^2_C = 0.82 \). Because heritability is an estimate of the amount of variation in a trait that is explained by underlying genetic factors, and genetic variation is related to the evolutionary potential of a trait, these data suggest that small evolutionary changes in *Populus* could result in large changes in community composition and species interactions. If small evolutionary changes in plant phenotype do result in strong selection on associated community members, then relatively tight ecological associations and functionally organized communities could emerge (Wilson 1997).

Our data showed that predation of aphid galls was a predictable consequence of plant genetics. Evolutionarily these data suggest that if reductions in herbivore density lead to an increase in plant fitness, then genes that negatively affect herbivores may be less likely to introgress from *P. fremontii* into *P. angustifolia* than genes that are neutral or positively affect herbivores. For example, backcrossed hybrids carrying resistance genes effective at reducing aphid density would have lower fitness relative to non-resistant genotypes, suggesting that there may be benefits to susceptibility and that avian predators may represent a ‘low cost’ defence for plants (Kearsley & Whitham 1992). Other studies have shown linkages between bird foraging, herbivore density and plant traits that in some cases do affect plant growth (Heinrich & Collins 1983; Greenberg 1987; Atlegrim 1992; Marquis & Whelan 1994; Dickson & Whitham 1996; Sipura 1999; Bailey & Whitham 2003). For example, Marquis & Whelan (1994) showed that predation of herbivorous insects by insectivorous birds resulted in a one-third increase in biomass of white oak relative to plants where birds were excluded. If the effects of predators are related to the indirect effects of host plant genetics then predators could provide a general selective force affecting herbivore resistance in these systems. Our study provides results consistent with this idea, but does not provide a definitive test of whether predators are acting as extended defensive traits of the plant.

Plant genetics also affect how energy flows from one trophic level to another and clearly link genetically based plant traits to the foraging patterns of vertebrates. Eighty percent of the variation in how energy flowed from plants to galls to avian predators was explained by underlying genetic factors in this common garden (Table 1). Because energy flow is related to the laws of thermodynamics (Price 1997), and there is high genetic variation in this trait, Fisher’s fundamental theorem suggests then that natural selection and evolution may act easily on those traits that affect energy flow in forest ecosystems. With the rapid loss of biodiversity and unknown consequences of genetically modified crop, pulp, and lumber species on communities and ecosystem processes these data expose our need for a genetic perspective in conservation policy, particularly in light of recent studies showing that host plant genetic factors impact terrestrial and aquatic arthropod (Bangert et al. 2005a,b; LeRoy et al. 2005) and microbial communities (Bailey et al. 2005), mammalian foraging (Bailey et al. 2004a), leaf litter decomposition (Driese & Whitham 2000; Schweitzer et al. 2004, 2005a,b) and soil nitrogen mineralization rates (Schweitzer et al. 2004).
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