1 Habitat complexity in shallow lakes and ponds: importance, threats, and potential for restoration

- 2 Mariana Meerhoff^{1,2}, María de los Ángeles González-Sagrario³
- 3 1 Departamento de Ecología y Gestión Ambiental, Centro Universitario de Regional del Este-Universidad de la

4 República, Maldonado, Uruguay. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6482-1332

5 2 Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, Silkeborg, Denmark.

- 6 3 Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras (IIMYC), Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad
- 7 Nacional de Mar del Plata, CONICET, Mar del Plata, Argentina.https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6882-8547

8 E-mail: <u>mm@bios.au.dk</u>

9 Abstract

10 In this review we describe patterns and mechanisms by which habitat complexity is crucial for the functioning of 11 shallow lakes and ponds, and for the abundance and diversity of biological communities in these ecosystems. Habitat 12 complexity is affected by processes acting at different spatial scales, from the landscape scale to the ecosystem level 13 (i.e., morphometric attributes) generate different complexities, determining the potential for organisms to succeed and 14 processes to occur such as energy and nutrient transfer, fluxes of greenhouse gases, among others. At the local scale, the 15 three major habitats, pelagic, littoral, and benthic, are characterised by different degrees of structural complexity and a 16 particular set of organisms and processes. Direct and indirect effects of changes in within-lake habitat complexity can 17 either hinder or promote regime shifts in these systems. We also review several anthropogenic pressures 18 (eutrophication, urbanisation, introduction of exotic species, and climate change) that decrease lake resilience through 19 changes in habitat complexity and strategists for habitat complexity restoration. Overall, we emphasize the need to 20 preserve and restore habitat complexity as key challenges to account for ecosystem integrity, maintenance of 21 local/regional biodiversity, and provision of crucial ecosystem services (e.g., biodiversity, self-purification, and carbon 22 sequestration).

23 Keywords:

24 aquatic biodiversity, alternative states, habitat degradation, eutrophication, climate change.

26	Declarations		
27			
28	Funding		
29	Not applicable.		
30			
31	Conflicts of interest/Competing interests		
32	The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that		
33	could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.		
34			
35	Availability of data and material		
36	Not applicable.		
37			
38	Code availability		
39	Not applicable.		
40			
41	Authors' contributions		
42	MM conceptualized the study, MM and MAGS conducted literature review and wrote the article.		
43			
44	Ethics approval		
45	Not applicable.		
46			
47	Consent to participate		
48	Not applicable.		
49			
50	Consent for publication		
51	Not applicable.		
52			
53	Acknowledgements		
54	We thank the graphical help of Tinna Christensen (Aarhus University). We also thank the constructive comments by		
55	two anonymous reviewers. MM acknowledges the support of ANII (National Agency for Research and Innovation of		

- 56 Uruguay) and PEDECIBA (Program for the Development of Basic Sciences, Uruguay). MM is partly supported by the
- 57 project funded by the Sectorial Commission of Scientific Research of UDELAR, CSIC I+D 511 (Uruguay) and the
- 58 European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 869296 The
- 59 PONDERFUL Project. MAGS thanks the support by Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras (IIMYC)-
- 60 Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata, CONICET andbyMINCyT (Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation),
- 61 PICT 2016-378.

62 Introduction

63 Shallow lakes and ponds provide a myriad of ecosystem services (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005), 64 many of which depend, directly or indirectly, on habitat complexity. Physical and chemical processes, as well as 65 ecosystem properties such as nutrient cycling and food web structure, are also strongly affected by habitat complexity. 66 As in most, if not all ecosystems, the abundance and diversity of different shallow lake biological communities typically 67 increases with habitat complexity. The conceptual framework behind this pattern is that structural complexity potentially 68 increases the availability of resources (food, shelter, substrate) and of habitats/microhabitats, creating new niches and 69 supporting a higher number of taxa than similar systems with lower structural complexity. Niche partitioning allows 70 species co-existence within a given area due to reduced interspecific competition (Pianka 2000). Thus, structural 71 complexity influences interspecific relationships, reducing and stabilizing biotic interactions and facilitating food web 72 compartmentalization. The latter, in turn, increases community persistence and the co-existence of a larger number of 73 species (Stouffer & Bascompte, 2011), impacting ecosystem integrity and ecological functions and processes like 74 carbon sequestration and fluxes, nutrient cycling and translocation, among others.

75 Traditionally, limnological research focused on the biological communities and ecological processes 76 happening in the spatially homogeneous water column of large, deep, nutrient poor lakes (Wetzel, 2001). However, 77 most lakes in the world are small and shallow (Wetzel, 1990; Downing et al., 2006). Millions of water bodies smaller 78 than 1 km² occur on the planet, and small lakes and ponds (between 0.001 and 0.1 km²) represent most of the world's 79 lacustrine area (Downing et al., 2006). A shift of focus from the pelagic to incorporate other habitats such as the littoral 80 and benthic zones has given empirical support to several ecological theories (e.g., Scheffer et al., 1993) and has highlighted the importance of habitat complexity for the overall functioning of these ecosystems (e.g., Vadeboncoeur et 81 82 al., 2001; Vander Zanden & Vadeboncoeur, 2020). Several aspects connected to complexity are clearly identifiable in 83 aquatic ecosystems (Tokeshi & Arakaki, 2012). This explains that intensive research in the last 30 years has contributed 84 to understanding the connection between habitat complexity and the structure and functioning of shallow lake and pond 85 communities.

Habitat complexity has been defined in various ways but, following Tokeshi & Arakaki (2012), here it will be
interpreted as all different characteristics of structure, therefore including the spatial scale, size, density, spatial
arrangement and diversity (heterogeneity) of structural elements in an ecosystem. Habitat complexity in lakes and
ponds is affected by processing occurring at different spatial scales leading to a concomitant variation in the nature of
the structural elements that generate complexity (Tokeshi & Arakaki, 2012).

91 In this review, we aim at synthesizing the importance of habitat complexity for the functioning of shallow 92 lakes and ponds. Shallow lake and pond integrity rely on biodiversity, which is affected by spatial complexity and 93 connectivity, and largely sustained by within system habitat complexity, in particular by the presence, diversity, and 94 density of aquatic plants. A large part of this review deals with aquatic plants, since macrophytes are the most important 95 structural element creating habitat complexity in these ecosystems. We then focus on the connection between habitat 96 complexity and biodiversity and several ecosystem services, as well as on the major current anthropogenic direct and 97 indirect threats to complexity and its restoration potential. Finally, we propose some lines for future research that 98 emerged from the review.

99 Shallow lake habitats and habitat complexity

100 The structure of biological communities is defined by interactive processes (speciation, drift, selection and 101 dispersal) operating at different spatial scales, from regional processes that regulate the movement of organisms and materials (e.g., nutrients, seeds, water) and of information (genetic variation) (Vellend, 2010), to biotic and abiotic local 102 103 factors, including system morphometry, patterns of disturbance, and habitat complexity. At the local scale, i.e., inside a lake, three major zones or habitats are typically considered: the 'pelagic', the 'benthic' and the 'littoral' zones, each 104 105 characterised by particular communities (Fig. 1). Among other characteristics, each habitat typically has different 106 degrees of structural complexity. Particularly in shallow lakes and ponds, information (genetic variation), matter, and 107 energy are widely exchanged between these habitats (Schindler & Scheuerell, 2002), in direction and degree often 108 determined by the level of complexity within each of them.

109 The pelagic or water column is the least complex zone in terms of physical structure (Fig. 1). This habitat is 110 mostly inhabited by plankton, with quite restricted movement capacity. The success of zooplankton grazing on 111 phytoplankton, and of fish predation on zooplankton depend, among other factors, on the probability of encounter and 112 mutual recognition of consumers and prey. Under turbid water conditions some prey may minimize predation. 113 However, under clear water conditions, the poor complexity in the pelagic habitat prevents the use of physical refuges 114 by prey that have no other option than moving to avoid being eaten. Consequently, the likelihood of over-exploitation 115 of prey resources by predators and grazers can potentially be high in this habitat (Scheffer & De Boer, 1995) 116 The benthos or lake bottom can vary quite largely in its degree of complexity. Lake depth, water colour, and 117 the amount of suspended matter determine whether light reaching the bottom is enough to allow photosynthesis by 118 benthic vegetation and, with them, an increase in physical complexity generated by these biological elements. Thus,

turbid lakes and ponds often lack primary production of importance in the benthic zone, and most of its complexity is a

result of the variability in sediment particle sizes and accumulated debris from other lake habitats or from the
 surrounding terrestrial environment. Sediment physical characteristics, besides lake trophic state and the outcome of

biotic interactions, largely determine the densities and taxonomic richness of macroinvertebrates to a large extent (Free
et al., 2009). Benthic complexity, given by sediment structure, the development of periphyton and submerged plants, or
by structure-generating animals such as sessile mussels, can either facilitate or hinder sediment resuspension by wind or
by benthic-dwelling organisms and fish. Even sandy sediments are only intermittently disturbed by water movements if
they are covered by large abundances of microalgae (such as diatoms) (Moss, 1998).

127 The littoral zone contributes disproportionately to the overall biodiversity and ecosystem processes in lakes, 128 mostly in shallow (e.g., Carpenter & Lodge, 1986; Scheffer et al., 1993; Jeppesen et al., 1998) but also in deep lakes 129 (Hampton et al., 2011). The littoral zone, defined as the lake area shallow enough as to allow the growth of submerged 130 plants, typically represents the highest habitat complexity in most lakes and ponds (Fig. 1). This complexity is mostly 131 given by aquatic macrophytes of different life forms and by debris, and, often to a lesser extent, by abiotic structures 132 such as rocks and stones. In large shallow lakes, sheltered bays and archipelagos offer a favourable environment for the 133 development of different macrophyte species that may generate different habitat complexities, such as reeds and water 134 lilies or free-floating plants, besides the typically more resistant submerged plants (Andersson, 2001). Lakes with a 135 larger shoreline development would expectedly host higher species richness than simple-shaped systems. This would be 136 the consequence of several processes, such as a stronger interaction with the surrounding terrestrial ecosystem, which 137 act as a source of structure such as debris, besides nutrients, organic matter, and organisms. In turn, on wind-exposed 138 shores, particularly in large lakes, scarce or negligible aquatic plants can grow (with consequent loss of associated 139 biota) due to constant sediment resuspension or erosion caused by wave action (Chambers, 1987; Crisci et al., 2017). 140 Also, longer fetches lead to stronger wave action that may promote the formation of coarse, rocky littoral habitats, 141 offering new spawning, nursery, or feeding habitats for many species that may not be present in otherwise smaller lakes 142 (Jackson et al., 2001), such as the maintenance of fish diversity and fisheries (Sass et al., 2006; Kauffmann et al., 2014). 143 Long shorelines have been related to an important growth of aquatic and amphibian plants in the land-water transition 144 (Anderson, 2001). This would be particularly expected in small lakes, since the perimeter: surface ratio is comparatively 145 higher than in large lakes. Riparian vegetation, be it fully terrestrial or amphibian, generates different types and number 146 of structural elements (e.g., roots, branches, debris of different sizes) and can modify physical aspects of the shore, such 147 as bank erosion, water depth and shoreline development.

Along natural lake shorelines, emergent aquatic plants are the most common life-form, often constituting the
 wetlands associated with shallow lakes and ponds. In highly turbid lakes, or very large lakes, emergent plants may drive

150 key lake processes such as the redistribution of sediment particles, thus affecting water clarity, sedimentation, and 151 resuspension rates with associated effects on the release of the internal phosphorus loading (Horppila & Nurminen, 152 2002; 2005). Structural complexity can explain more of the spatial distribution of juvenile fishes in the littoral area of 153 temperate lakes (e.g., roach, Rutilus rutilus (Linnaeus, 1758), and perch, Perca fluviatilis (Linnaeus, 1758)) than several 154 other factors, including the biomass of potential food items (Lewin et al., 2004). A comparison of the use of different 155 habitat complexities in the littoral zone (i.e., woody debris, reeds, and areas of different substratum size) by fish in a 156 shallow temperate lake suggested a strong diel component, with a predominant occurrence of fish in complex habitats 157 during the day and a partial migration of zooplanktivorous fish towards the less complex open habitats at night (Lewin 158 et al., 2004). In ponds and in shallow lakes with gentle slopes and with sufficient light reaching the bottom, the littoral 159 zone can extend further out from the shore into the lake with development of higher aquatic plants over large sections or 160 the entire basin.

161

162 Habitat complexity in the alternative equilibria hypothesis and other ecological theories

163 The paramount importance of habitat complexity was captured in the alternative stable states or alternative equilibria hypothesis for shallow lakes (Scheffer et al., 1993). In a nutshell, this hypothesis stated that shallow lakes, 164 165 over the same wide range of nutrient concentrations, may present contrasting regimes, dominated by either phytoplankton, with turbid water, or by submerged plants, with clear water. Biological and physical-chemical feedback 166 167 mechanisms related to the presence or absence of submerged macrophytes cause a hysteresis effect maintaining, 168 respectively, the clear water (with typically moderate to high complexity) or the turbid water (with low complexity) 169 regime (e.g., Balls et al., 1989; Scheffer et al., 1993). The original idea later expanded as to include other potentially 170 alternative regimes, such as the dominance of free-floating plants in the high end of nutrient concentrations (Scheffer et 171 al., 2003). Although competition for resources between submerged plants and phytoplankton, and their contrasting 172 reinforcing effects on water clarity lie at the core of the alternative equilibria hypothesis, several feedback mechanisms 173 are directly linked to the physical structure or complexity created by each dominant primary producer. 174 The structural complexity promoted by each dominant regime, i.e., submerged plants, free-floating plants, or 175 phytoplankton, varies enormously in terms of identity, density, diversity, size, and spatial arrangement of structural 176 elements. In particular, the spatial structure typically created by submerged plants can decrease the likelihood of 177 catastrophic shifts between alternative states (or regimes) when nutrient loading increases (van Nes & Scheffer, 2005). 178 Predator-prey interactions and trophic cascades are crucial for the maintenance of each regime (Genkai-Kato, 2007).

179 Habitat complexity, generated by submerged plants, can stabilise trophic interactions and modify expected outcomes of

trophic cascades by acting as anti-predation refuge for several keystone species or groups. The high structural
complexity given by submerged plants typically leads to a decrease in the foraging ability of predators, being
piscivorous fishes (Persson & Eklöv, 1995), zooplanktivorous fishes (Schriver et al., 1995) or macroinvertebrates
(Warfe & Barmuta, 2004), and to an increase in the total abundance and mean size of their respective prey. Predationdriven changes in prey community structure (biomass, density, and body-size distribution) are therefore mediated by
habitat structure (Crowder & Cooper, 1982).

186 In temperate shallow lakes, submerged plants thus often facilitate the survival of large-bodied cladoceran 187 zooplankton that can graze on phytoplankton (Timms & Moss, 1984) by offering a daytime refuge against visual 188 predatory fish (Lauridsen & Lodge, 1996; Lauridsen & Buenk, 1996). The refuge effect for zooplankton often depends 189 on complexity attributes, such as the plant architecture (e.g., Nurminen & Horppila, 2002; Meerhoff et al., 2006, 190 2007a), plant bed size or density (Lauridsen et al., 1996; Burks et al., 2001), and percent of the lake volume inhabited 191 by the submerged plants (Schriver et al., 1995) (reviewed by Burks et al., 2002). Habitat complexity thus decreases the 192 likelihood of over-exploitation of prey (Scheffer & De Boer, 1995), and increases the resilience of littoral communities 193 to fish predation (Kornijów et al., 2016), leading to the overall promotion of biodiversity associated with the clear 194 water, submerged- plant dominated regime in shallow lakes and ponds (Thomaz & Bini, 1998; Agostinho et al., 2003; 195 Declerck et al., 2005; Scheffer et al., 2006; Teixeira-de Mello et al., 2009; Thomaz & Cunha, 2010).

196 The positive effects of submerged plants on water clarity described above seem less evident in warm regions 197 (e.g., Bachmann et al., 2002; Jeppesen et al., 2007; Meerhoff et al., 2007 a; Kosten et al., 2011). Even with abundant 198 submerged macrophytes, a higher phytoplankton biomass at a given nutrient concentration occurred in shallow lakes in 199 the subtropical state of Florida (USA) than in Danish temperate lakes, according to comparative studies using a large 200 database (Jeppesen et al., 2007; Jeppesen et al., 2020). In particular, the refuge capacity of submerged plants for 201 zooplankton depends on local trophic dynamics and on climate-related community structure, with plant refuges being 202 far less effective in warm and Mediterranean climates (Iglesias et al., 2007; Meerhoff et al., 2007 a; González-Sagrario 203 & Balserio, 2010; Tavsanoğlu et al., 2012) due to the typical association of small fishes (Teixeira de Mello et al., 2009) 204 and macroinvertebrate predators (González-Sagrario et al., 2009; González-Sagrario & Balseiro, 2010) to aquatic 205 plants, reducing their refuge capacity.

Under high nutrient concentrations and mild or high temperatures, free-floating plants may also constitute an
alternative regime to submerged plants (Scheffer et al., 2003), and also to phytoplankton dominance (Roijackers et al.,
2004; de Tezanos Pinto & O'Farrell, 2014). Free-floating plants cover a large range in size, from very small taxa, such
as the genera *Azolla* and *Lemnas pp*, medium-sized taxa, such as *Salvinias* pp (water fern), and large-sized taxa, such as

210 Pistia stratiotes L. (water lettuce) and Pontederia crassipes Mart. (water hyacinth, formerly Eichhornia crassipes 211 (Mart.) Solms), the latter two being more common in warm areas (Sculthorpe, 1967). In contrast to submerged plants, 212 that grow inside the water column and are mostly anchored to the sediments, free-floating plants grow on the water 213 surface and are freely moved by currents, waves, and winds. The habitat complexity generated by this kind of plants is 214 indeed lower than that of submerged plants, but depends on the area covered and on the plant size. Large free-floating 215 plants have a dense and potentially long root network, and their shoots and leaves can shade the water column when the 216 area covered is large enough, thus limiting the growth of both submerged plants and phytoplankton (de Tezanos Pinto et 217 al., 2007). Massive covers of free-floating plants thus decrease habitat complexity by reducing the biomass of 218 submerged plants (mostly due to competition for light). Their impacts on aquatic biodiversity are quite contrasting to 219 those of submerged plants, largely due to the often anaerobic or anoxic conditions created under dense mats of freefloating plants. Massive covers of free-floating plants are usually followed by a simplification of food webs (Moi et al., 220 221 2021) and a general impoverishment of biodiversity, including fish and macroinvertebrates (Meerhoff et al., 2003), 222 zooplankton (Fontanarrosa et al., 2010), phytoplankton (O'Farrell et al., 2009), submerged plants (Janes et al., 1996), waterfowl, and often fish kills. Besides, the role of large free-floating plants as a potential anti predation refuge for 223 224 zooplankton seems weaker than that of submerged plants, according to comparative studies (Meerhoff et al., 2003; 2006; 2007a, b). The also floating but rooted plant, P. azurea Sw. (formerly Eichhornia azurea (Kunth)), has, in 225 226 contrast, been shown in experimental studies to act as refuge for macroinvertebrates against fish predation in tropical 227 areas (Padial et al., 2009).

228 Relevance of plant architecture for the generation of habitat complexity

229 As stated above, aquatic plants are the most important generators of habitat complexity in shallow lakes and 230 ponds. Emergent, floating-leaved, submerged, and free-floating plants represent different life strategies and promote 231 different habitat complexities due to variations in plant architecture, typical location within a lake, and their occupation 232 of the water column. The average size and interstitial spaces (filling spaces) along vertical and horizontal axes, i.e., the 233 space-size heterogeneity, is one of the most relevant drivers of taxonomical richness in aquatic environments (St. Pierre 234 & Kovalenko, 2014). Different macrophyte life forms differ in space-size heterogeneity, which can lead to contrasting 235 complexities and explain their different effects on biodiversity and ecosystem processes. Comparative studies on the 236 effects of emergent and floating-leaved plants (Nurminen & Horppila, 2002; Horppila & Nurminen, 2005) and of 237 submerged and free-floating plants (Janes et al., 1996; Meerhoff et al., 2003; 2006; 2007 a, b; Netten et al., 2010) have 238 highlighted the importance of plant architecture for biodiversity and several processes at the community level as was 239 discussed above. Studies that have manipulated habitat complexity by keeping surface area constant have found, for

240 instance, that macroinvertebrates respond to habitat structure independently of surface area (Warfe et al., 2008). 241 Similarly, in a study where artificial macrophytes with three levels of complexity (from low to high) but with constant 242 mass and surface area were introduced in experimental set-ups in a lake, microfaunal (mainly rotifers) abundance and 243 richness were generally greater on the most complex substrata (Lucena-Moya & Duggan, 2011). Different architectures 244 of aquatic plants, leading to different complexities (measured through fractal geometry), significantly affected taxon 245 richness and total densities of tropical invertebrates, although other variables such as plant identity and area were also 246 relevant (Thomaz et al., 2008). Moreover, a field experiment conducted in a series of temperate and subtropical shallow 247 lakes manipulating the spatial arrangement of the same amount and type of plastic structure mimicking aquatic plants of 248 different life forms (i.e., free-floating and submerged) found dramatic differences in the habitat use, richness, biomass 249 and density of most aquatic organisms (Meerhoff et al., 2007 a, b; Teixeira-de Mello et al., 2009; Brucet et al., 2010; 250 Clemente et al., 2019). Such field experiments also revealed that some of the effects generated by habitat complexity 251 differed in different climates, likely due to climate-related differences in the assemblage of fishes (Meerhoff et al., 2007 252 a; Teixeira-de Mello et al., 2009) (Fig. 2).

253 Taniguchi et al. (2003) suggested that the diversity or heterogeneity of habitable space, more than the quantity 254 of habitable space or food resources created by complexity, was the factor leading to higher taxonomic richness. In a 255 comparative study, these authors found that the abundance of macroinvertebrates on natural plants did not differ 256 between simple and complex forms, whereas on artificial plants more invertebrates occurred on complex than on simple 257 forms (Taniguchi et al., 2003). The heterogeneity or diversity of filling space at different scales promotes species co-258 existence by dividing the surface area into a large number of structural surfaces and microhabitats (Tokeshi & Arakaki, 259 2012), thus generating different niches for competitor, prey, and predator organisms. Space-size heterogeneity (i.e., 260 variable size spaces) permits the co-existence of organisms with a wide range of body sizes, potentially increasing the 261 number of pathways for resource utilization and stabilizing interspecific interactions (Kovalenko et al., 2012; Thomaz 262 & Cunha, 2010). The spatial segregation of different cohorts due to habitat complexity reduces the strength of 263 competition and intraguild predation (examples for fish species in Thomaz & Cunha, 2010). Equally important, space-264 size heterogeneity reduces the encounter rates between prey and predators, thus reducing forage efficiency and 265 stabilizing trophic food webs. The reduction of intra- and interspecific interactions between functional subgroups (e.g., 266 large versus small omnivores) allows the compartmentalization of community structure, leading to lower connectedness 267 and a stabilization of the food web (Stouffer & Bascompte, 2011; Kovalenko et al., 2012). A mathematical model 268 suggested that predator-prey interactions are unstable at low and high levels of habitat complexity, conditions where 269 populations are prone to extinction or declining (Jana & Bairagi, 2014). Field studies have demonstrated that the

- 270 increase of biodiversity with increasing space-size heterogeneity is the highest at intermediate complexity levels (St.
- 271 Pierre & Kovalenko, 2014); for example, highly complex habitats set limitations for fish movement and efficient
- 272 foraging, thus reducing fish growth (Thomaz & Cunha, 2010 and references therein).
- 273 Habitat complexity and ecosystem processes

274 Ecosystem processes can be directly or indirectly affected by habitat complexity. Submerged rooted plants can 275 reduce sediment resuspension and therefore abiotic turbidity (Fig. 3) (Madsen et al., 2001) and concomitantly nutrient 276 release may decrease (Horppila & Nurminen, 2003). On the other hand, plant respiration and accumulation, and 277 decomposition of settled organic matter can promote changes in the redox conditions towards anoxia and decreased 278 exchange of oxygen with the water column; thus, potentially increasing phosphorus release (Stephen et al., 1997) from 279 the sediments within plant stands (Fig. 3). In contrast, under low complexity conditions, sediment resuspension 280 promotes the release of nutrients and other accumulated substances to the water column regardless of oxygen concentration, increasing the availability of resources and particularly of reactive phosphorus for pelagic organisms, 281 282 such as phytoplankton, bacterioplankton, and free-floating plants if present. The release of phosphorus from the 283 sediments (called internal load) often takes place in summer in temperate shallow lakes (Søndergaard et al., 2003) and 284 potentially can occur all year round in warm lakes and ponds where anaerobic and anoxic conditions are more frequent. 285 Some greenhouse gases (GHG) can be generated in the sediments under anoxic conditions and be released by 286 diffusion or also by ebullition in the case of methane, or being transformed or released by the activity of benthic fauna 287 (Colina et al., 2021). Thus, the structural complexity of this particular habitat is crucial not only for the benthic biota but 288 also for the cycling of nutrients, GHG fluxes, and the overall linkage with other habitats. Rooted submerged plants may, 289 however, also oxygenate the sediment, decreasing methane (CH₄) production and promoting its consumption, leading to 290 an overall decrease in CH₄ emissions (Davidson et al., 2018; Davidson et al., 2015). Experimental studies have shown 291 that under free-floating plant mats, in contrast, CH₄ production can be boosted by high organic matter production 292 especially under anaerobic conditions; but also, a large amount of the CH₄ produced may become oxidized due to the 293 reduced gas exchange under the dense mats of plants, combined with a high activity of the rhizosphere microbiome 294 (Kosten et al., 2016). Local conditions may thus strongly modify CH4 emissions in lakes and ponds dominated by free-295 floating plants. In turn, emergent macrophytes can play an important role in CH₄ emissions and are superior with 296 respect to submerged and floating-leaved macrophytes in promoting CH₄ efflux. Due to their system of interconnected 297 internal gas lacunas, emergent plants act as chimneys transporting methane from the sediments to the atmosphere 298 (Laanbroek, 2010). Littoral areas of shallow lakes could also emit nitrous oxide (N₂O) if they receive excessive levels

types (Zhu et al., 2015). In contrast, shallow lakes dominated by abundant submerged plants can release less CO₂ than

301 similar clear water lakes with scarce plants, such as during initial phases of a restoration process. The efflux of CO_2 is

302 expectedly lower, or even often negative, in lakes dominated by phytoplankton (Jeppesen et al., 2016).

The empirical evidence strongly supports the idea that, more than the species identity and effects related to plant physiology and metabolism (such as the production of allelochemicals), it is the structural complexity given by the different macrophyte life- forms that affects lake functioning the most.

306

307 Current threats to shallow lakes: changes in habitat complexity and its impacts on ecosystem services

Freshwater ecosystems are hotspots of biodiversity (Dudgeon, 2019) as they harbour about 6% of global 308 309 biodiversity and even up to 35% of total vertebrate diversity, sustaining high numbers of endemic species (Rinke et al., 2019). Freshwater ecosystems are amongst the most impacted ecosystems in the world (Dudgeon et al., 2005; Carpenter 310 311 et al., 2011; Rinke et al., 2019). Besides supporting a disproportionate share of biodiversity, shallow lakes and ponds 312 provide a wide range of critical benefits for humanity (regulating, provisioning, supporting, or cultural services), such 313 as flood control, food and water provision, water filtration, and carbon sequestration. The provision of these different 314 ecosystem services depends on lake integrity, which in turn is determined by the combination of species inhabiting a 315 lake and the dominant regime (Janssen et al., 2021).

A shift from submerged macrophyte to phytoplankton dominance, regimes that support the highest and lowest biodiversity, respectively, affects the quantity and type of ecosystem services provided. A lake with high habitat complexity, i.e.dominated by submerged macrophytes, supply ca. 86% of regulating and 63% of cultural potential services, while a low habitat complexity lake, i.e., dominated by phytoplankton, deliver few services, mostly restricted to provisioning ones (42%) (Janssen et al., 2021).

Habitat destruction or degradation is one of the main causes of the loss of biodiversity in freshwater ecosystems (Collen et al., 2014; Dudgeon, 2019; Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005; IPBES, 2019). Several global threats but also local activities at the catchment or lake level can strongly affect habitat complexity and, consequently, ecosystem functioning (Table 1). The primary direct causes of habitat complexity degradation include land conversion, eutrophication and pollution, infrastructure development, water withdrawal, introduction of invasive exotic species, and uses such as aquaculture, energy production, and reception of sewage. Below, some of the current

- 327 threats to shallow lakes and ponds are summarised, in particular focusing on their direct and indirect impacts on habitat
- 328 complexity and the associated changes on the provision of ecosystem services.
- 329 Eutrophication and other agriculture-driven impacts

330 The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) emphasized that regulating services are likely the most 331 valuable ones. The buffering and control effect of lake margin wetlands is an important regulating service (self-332 purification), boosted by littoral macrophytes, periphyton, and riparian vegetation (Bayley et al., 2013; Walton et al., 333 2020). Overgrazing by livestock, drainage of wetlands and aquatic ecosystems to gain land for crop fields and 334 rangelands (Moomaw et al., 2018; Hoffmann et al., 2020), and intensive land use cause physical habitat destruction or 335 simplification of the lakeshore and the riparian and floodplain vegetation (Bayley et al., 2013; Jabłońska et al. 2020; 336 Hughes &Vadas, 2021). Riparian and wetland vegetation are lost or have strongly diminished in many locations, with a 337 concomitant decrease and impoverishment of habitat complexity at the landscape and ecosystem levels (Bayley et al., 338 2013; Hughes &Vadas, 2021).

339 Together with habitat fragmentation, eutrophication is the most widely spread impact on shallow lakes and 340 ponds and is largely associated to productive uses in the catchments. Not least due to the loss of wetlands and riparian 341 areas, agriculture has strongly modified lake surroundings and changed the flow of organic matter and nutrients to water 342 bodies. Eutrophication may occur as a gradual process. In the early phases, eutrophication usually promotes an increase 343 in density, diversity, and size of structural elements (such as emergent, submerged, or free-floating macrophytes), which 344 may increase complexity with positive effects on the richness and abundance of manybiological communities. Due to a 345 sustained external input of nutrients, many lakes and ponds have generated widespread and productive stands of 346 emergent macrophytes along the margins and submerged as well as floating-leaved plants within the lake. At advanced 347 phases of the eutrophication process, habitat complexity likely decreases or disappears with the collapse of submerged 348 plants in the most eutrophic and hypertrophic shallow lakes due to out shading by phytoplankton and/or epiphytes 349 which are no longer controlled by their respective grazers (Phillips et al., 1978; Jones & Sayer, 2003; Phillips et al., 350 2016). The system is then characterised by a high phytoplankton biomass resulting in highly turbid waters and often 351 blooms of potentially toxic cyanobacteria, and lower biodiversity (Moss et al., 1990). Overgrowth by reeds has become 352 a serious problem in many large temperate eutrophic lakes since the late 1960s (Andersson, 2001). In warm regions, 353 large free-floating plants can also respond with a dramatic increase in biomass and rapid reproduction, potentially 354 covering large areas and promoting the collapse of submerged plants due to out shading (de Tezanos Pinto & O'Farrell, 355 2014).

356 Thus, eutrophication produces a simplification of habitat complexity and consequently, diversity loss,

357 homogenization towards nutrient-tolerant species and reduction of refuge, nursing, and feeding areas. As pointed out in 358 Kovalenko et al. (2012), the initially positive effect of increased complexity is likely to level off when eutrophication 359 increases the density of more uniform structures even further (Tokeshi & Arakaki, 2011). For example, once established 360 in meso-eutrophic lakes, non-native shade-tolerant *Elodea* species can quickly replace native species and form a dense 361 and close canopy (Zehnsdorf et al., 2015). The uniformity of small structures thus increases, but the lake become 362 "homogenously diverse" (sensu Hutchinson, 1961). In this sense, the analysis of macrophyte fossil and contemporary 363 data from connected lakes indicates that eutrophication has reduced macrophyte and invertebrate diversity over space 364 and time, promoting homogenization of the assemblages (Salgado et al., 2018).

365 Some ecosystem processes can also be affected by the eutrophication-driven decrease in habitat complexity 366 (Table 1). Shallow eutrophic-hypereutrophic (i.e., phytoplankton-dominated) lakes can often behave as sinks of CO₂, 367 especially those that are very productive (Pacheco et al., 2014; Jeppesen et al., 2016; Morales-Williams et al., 2020; 368 Zagarese et al., 2021) and have low watershed-to-lake area and lack watershed wetland cover (Morales-Williams et al., 369 2020). Instead, efflux of CO_2 can prevail in eutrophic lakes with a high watershed-to-lake area and high nitrogen 370 loading (Morales-Williams et al., 2020). Eutrophication is, however, an important driver of CH₄ and N₂O emissions 371 (Zhu et al., 2015; Beaulieu et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2021). Eutrophication can often promote carbon sequestration in 372 open areas of shallow lakes, but overall, most frequently contributes to net emission of GHG. Other agriculture-related 373 effects may also include the removal of riparian vegetation and water consumption or drainage. As the bulk of 374 sequestered carbon by wetlands is in the soils rather than in the plant biomass, wetland and lake drainage allows the 375 oxidation of soil organic matter boosting the release of CO₂ into the atmosphere (Moomaw et al., 2018). Thus, draining 376 shallow lakes, ponds, and lake margin wetlands cause the loss of several ecosystem services, especially the crucial ones 377 related to food and water provision, and self-purification and carbon sequestration (regulating services), and contribute 378 to global emission of GHG.

379 Urbanisation

Urbanisation competes with agriculture for land, exerting extra pressures on transitional natural ecosystems
 such as floodplains and wetlands. Chemical pollution, habitat destruction through landfilling, drainage and water
 regulation, and sealing of soils with consequent changes in hydrological cycles are immediate environmental
 consequences of urbanisation on aquatic ecosystems. As lakes shorelines are urbanised, the land–water interface
 degrades (Kaufmann et al., 2014). Even under conditions of relatively modest disturbance, the effects of residential

development are strongly localised near to shores, leading to large changes in habitat complexity and associated biota (Hampton et al., 2011). At the local scale, property owners often reduce tree, shrubs, and reed densities along shorelines and remove natural structures from the littoral zone of lakes, leading to a dramatic reduction of fish richness and fisheries (provisioning service) (Sass et al., 2006). Extensive and intensive shoreline human activities simplify habitat structure and increase the richness and abundance of tolerant fish and bird species, reducing the richness of sensitive taxa and of native taxa in general (Kaufmann et al., 2014).

391 Urban lakes are typically shallow, highly artificial, and often hypertrophic, and yet receive more attention by 392 the public than most rural, natural lakes and ponds (Birch & McCaskie, 1999), due to their important aesthetic, 393 recreational, and cultural value. In extreme cases, urban water bodies are polluted by industrial waste, domestic sewage 394 and drainage systems. Such ecosystems are also extremely simplified in both their structural and biological 395 complexities with a consequent loss of recreational and conservation value (Scasso et al., 2001). Large oscillations 396 between enormous fish biomass and massive fish kills are often common due to anoxia under warm weather conditions 397 (Iglesias et al., 2011). Strong interventions are normally needed to recover ecosystem functions and cultural services, 398 and the reconstruction of habitat complexity is among the most recommended measures (Moss et al., 1996; Birch & 399 McCaskie, 1999; Scasso et al., 2001).

400 *Invasive species*

401 Many exotic species exert a large variety of impacts on native communities, some of which occur through 402 direct changes in habitat complexity, such as complexity increase, decrease, or transformation, or through direct or 403 indirect biological interactions such as predation, herbivory, competition, hybridisation, and the transmission of 404 pathogens to native biota (Carpenter et al., 2011). Despite their generally positive effect on biodiversity and ecosystem 405 function, many macrophyte species of different life forms have become invasive and are considered weeds across the 406 world. Submerged plants such as Egeria densa Planch., Elodea canadensis Michx., Hydrilla verticillata (L.f.) Royleand 407 Myriophyllum aquaticum (Vell.) Verdc. have become a serious nuisance in many lakes and ponds, and so have large 408 free-floating plants such as Salvinia molesta D.S. Mitch., P. stratiotes and P. crassipes, to mention just a few (Bolpagni, 409 2021).

Environmental heterogeneity is typically associated with high diversity of native macrophytes. As with the early phases of eutrophication, initial arrival of an exotic species may increase habitat complexity by adding density and diversity of structural elements, whereas the establishment phase of such exotic species may end up in habitat homogenization with the development of extensive monocultures (Zehnsdorf et al., 2015). Changes in native 414 macrophyte composition, increased architectural similarity in the plant mats, and a general decline in biodiversity at 415 local and regional levels, are often recorded after the expansion of an exotic plant (e.g., Michelan et al., 2010). Thus, the 416 systems may shift from a status of high habitat complexity (with environmental and space-size heterogeneity) at early 417 phases of colonization to one of low habitat complexity due a decrease of species richness and the dominance of 418 similar space-sizes (i.e., filling spaces) at the establishment phase when the system ends up homogenized (Salgado et 419 al., 2018). Several anthropogenic changes (e.g., eutrophication, channelization) can favour exotic macrophytes that 420 reduce local-scale diversity via competitive exclusion (Muthukrishnan et al., 2018; Salgado et al., 2019); on the 421 contrary, connectivity at the watershed level and dense native plant cover may prevent biotic homogeneization (Salgado 422 et al., 2021). Particularly, connected lakes act as sources of macrophyte species providing resistence to the invader 423 species and counteracting the homogenization produced by the exotic plants (Salgado et al., 2021). For example, in a 424 survey of 1,102 Minnesota (USA) shallow lakes, the presence of invasive macrophytes did not impact species richness, 425 however, it was associated with greater similarity in the plant community composition (i.e., biotic homogenization), 426 eroding spatial and temporal ecological distinctiveness across the landscape (Muthukrishnan & Larkin, 2020); thus 427 reducing the overall complexity level of lakes. Regarding biotic interactions, Grutters et al. (2015) found that the 428 replacement of native by structurally similar non-native vegetation was unlikely to affect predator-prey interactions in 429 an important way. These authors proposed that changes in predator-prey interactions via aquatic plant invasions may 430 only occur when the invading plants are very different in density, growth form and rigidity compared to native plants. Invasions by macrophytes such as *P.crassipes* may strongly modify underwater structural heterogeneity. 431 432 Originally from the Caspian and Black seas, the zebra mussel (Dreissena polymorpha (Pallas, 1771)) can 433 reproduce and grow extremely fast, potentially covering the lake bottom or any other hard surfaces in relatively short 434 times. Zebra mussel increases structural complexity in the sediments, thereby facilitating other benthic 435 macroinvertebrates by offering substrate and refuge from predation at initial phases of colonisation (Stewart et al., 436 1998). It can also lead to the collapse of native mussels due to competition for space and resources. Zebra mussels can 437 filter huge volumes of water (sometimes the whole lake volume several times a day), increasing water transparency and 438 thus opening a window of opportunity for submerged plants to grow (reviewed in Jeppesen et al., 2012). The effects of 439 the invasion by this mussel are therefore contradictory; while it promotes the loss of native fauna also an overall 440 increase in habitat complexity can be expected due to the physical changes that occur after invasion. In contrast, other 441 invasive species such as the red swamp crayfish (Procambarus clarkii Girard 1852) can promote a shift from a clear 442 water state to a turbid water, low biodiversity state due to the consumption and mechanical destruction of aquatic plants

443 (Gherardi & Acquistapace, 2007) and the consequent changes in sediment characteristics and loss of feeding grounds444 and habitat for other species.

445 Many species of fish are also invasive and may cause serious problems to the colonised environment, by, 446 again, a variety of physical and biological effects that affect habitat complexity, such as the disturbance of sediments 447 and uprooting of plants by benthivorous species and the consumption of plants by herbivorous fishes. Rather than 448 altering habitat complexity, the modulating effects provided by macrophytes on trophic dynamics (see above) 449 maybelost when invasive predators are involved. As found for the piscivore peacock bass (Cichla kelberi Kullander & 450 Ferreira, 2006) in tropical regions, aquatic plants provide very limited protection to native prey probably due to the 451 highly aggressive nature of this fish, and therefore vegetated habitats are unlikely to buffer the decline in biodiversity 452 caused by this species (Kovalenko et al., 2010).

Invasive species could affect multiple ecosystem functions and significantly impact or change the properties of invaded (or newly created) communities, thus opening new trophic paths (Bolpagni, 2021; and references therein). As a result, invaders could either increase or decrease ecosystem services depending on how they affect different atributes of habitat heterogeneity and trophic interactions.

457 *Climate change*

458 Expectedly, climate change can affect habitat complexity through a series of direct and indirect processes. This 459 topic is subject of intensive research, and we are only starting to identify the pieces of the puzzle (e.g., Netten et al., 460 2010; Kosten et al., 2011; Moss et al., 2011; Meerhoff et al., 2012, Short et al., 2016). Climate change, through 461 warming and higher frequency of droughts/floods and storms or cyclones, affects water level and nutrient loading and 462 concentrations through increasing (precipitations, storms) or decreasing (dry periods) runoff from the basins. The 463 chances for shallow lakes and ponds to recover from stochastic disturbances (e.g., storms, hurricanes) is related with 464 antecedent lake conditions (e.g., turbidity, trophic state, macrophyte cover) which shape lake resistance and resilience 465 (Havens et al., 2016; Thayne et al., 2021).

Given their contrasting effects on habitat complexity, biodiversity, and ecosystem processes, it is key to understand the responses of the main aquatic primary producers (e.g., phytoplankton, benthic algae, submerged and floating plants) to changes in the climate regime and climate variability. The interaction of the factors affected by climate change can directly and indirectly control plant growth, and can have overall opposing effects (Havens et al., 2016; Ersoy et al., 2020). Climate change can affect the competition between phytoplankton and aquatic plants and lead to dramatic changes in habitat complexity. Phytoplankton and particularly cyanobacteria seem to be favoured by climate warming (e.g., Paerl & Huisman, 2008; Paerl & Paul, 2012; Kosten et al., 2012; Davidson et al., 2015). In
addition, heatwaves, hurricanes, and low lake water levels due to increased temperature/dry periods, often lead to the
collapse of aquatic plants and to high phytoplankton and cyanobacteria productivity in systems with high nutrient
loading (Rigosi et al., 2014; Havens et al., 2016; Ersoy et al., 2020), maintaining the lake in a poor complexity, low
biodiversity, and turbid water regime.

477 Under eutrophic conditions, warming may favour not only phytoplankton but also free-floating macrophytes 478 (Short et al., 2016). Because of increasing winter minimum air temperatures, tropical and subtropical free-floating 479 plants will probably expand their biogeographic distribution polewards (Bolpagni, 2021). This would imply dramatic 480 changes in habitat complexity and negative impacts on lake and pond trophic dynamics (e.g., Meerhoff et al., 2007 a; de 481 Tezanos Pinto & O'Farrell, 2014), besides the already described negative effects on general biodiversity and water 482 quality (Fig. 3). In contrast, submerged macrophytes may increase under low nutrient loads, moderate water levels, and 483 rising temperatures as predicted by models and mesocosm experiments (Davidson et al., 2015; Coopers et al., 2020; 484 Ersoy et al., 2020). According to field studies in north temperate lakes, earlier start of growing seasons due to climate 485 warming would result in greater biomass and distribution of submerged macrophytes (Rooney & Kalff, 2000). A 486 potentialenhancement of submerged plants would increase the amount and likely the diversity of structural elements 487 within a lake ecosystem. Emergent macrophytes seem more affected by hydrological alterations (Short et al., 2016). 488 Climate change promotes a range of potentially interacting processes (i.e., nutrient loads, water level, 489 temperature, light climate) that will favour the dominance of a particular primary producer, with direct consequences on 490 habitat structure and complexity. Climate warming, in particular, can also interact with the expansion of exotic species 491 (Rahel & Olden, 2008). Identification of climate impacts on habitat heterogeneity and the formulation of a generalized 492 and global pattern is thus complicated, not least because climate change affects different regions in different manners 493 and intensities and interacts with other anthropogenic impacts and activities.

494 Restoration of degraded lakes via enhancement of habitat complexity

Artificial manipulation of structural complexity is one of the restoration measures often applied in degraded ecosystems (Cooke et al., 2005). Trees, rocks, and stones have been introduced to increase heterogeneity in streams and rivers, often accompanying re-meandering of stream channels (Hoffmann et al., 2020). Although habitat coupling between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems is critical for maintaining diverse and productive riparian and stream and river ecosystems (Naiman et al., 2000), lake ecologists seldom incorporate riparian habitats into models of ecosystem dynamics and management (Schindler & Scheuerell, 2002). Shoreline habitats degraded by urban development and loss 501 of riparian vegetation are, however, often reconstructed in a variety of ways, including the transplantation of emergent 502 plants and the addition of rock riprap or retaining walls to control erosion and recreate littoral complexity (although 503 such artificial structures can be homogeneously complex). Artificial reefs (made up of wooden branches) have been 504 tested in Amazonian floodplain lakes, finding that although overall diversity was not enhanced, rare species occurred 505 more frequently in the more complex habitats (Yamamoto et al., 2014). Comparative studies in lakes with manmade 506 littoral complexity have shown that fish species richness is positively correlated with local habitat complexity (being 507 higher in riprap sites). However, the structure of the fish assemblage, assessed as the proportion of intolerant or tolerant 508 species, responds to cumulative effects of small habitat modifications (Jennings et al., 1999). In urban shallow lakes and 509 ponds, restoration strategies also include promoting larger pond sizes, modifying pond margins with indentation, 510 constructing different-angled slopes and with large drawdown zones, permitting hydroperiods to mimic natural changes, 511 and eliminating non-native or invasive species while promoting the presence of aquatic plants (emergent, submersed, or 512 floating) (Oertli & Parris, 2019).

513 Submerged macrophytes can return after the implementation of restoration measures that increase water 514 clarity; however, restored shallow lakes typically have a different community composition with fewer species compared 515 with the situation 20-100 years before eutrophication worsened, according to a review by Bakker et al. (2013). 516 Sometimes submerged vegetation may not return naturally even when clear water conditions have been re-established 517 (Marklund et al., 2002; Lauridsen et al., 2003). Since the early 1990's, the reintroduction of aquatic plants is thus one of 518 the recommended measures to speed up the recovery of eutrophic lakes once nutrient loading has been reduced (Moss, 519 1990; Moss et al., 1996; Jeppesen et al., 2012). For this purpose, plants are often transplanted or spread as seeds and 520 propagules (Moss et al., 1996). Studies in temperate European shallow lakes (e.g., Lauridsen et al., 2003; Hilt et al., 521 2006; Chaichana et al., 2011) have shown higher survival and number of plants and longer total shoot length when they 522 are introduced in enclosures that prevent waterfowl access. Most of the experiences of aquatic plant introduction so far 523 are from temperate lakes, but examples from subtropical and tropical areas are increasing. For instance, in subtropical 524 China, several studies suggest that transplantation of submerged plants, even exotic ones, as a restoration tool might be 525 successful, as long as plants are protected against fish herbivory (Chen et al., 2009; Ye et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2016; 526 Bai et al., 2020; Gao et al., 2020). In other cases, macrophyte transplantation is combined with fish removal and /or 527 introduction of mussels (Yu et al., 2016; Gao et al., 2017; Zeng et al., 2017). The establishment and protection of plants 528 as a lake restoration method, alone and in combination with other approaches, will remain an important measure in the 529 future, although many unsolved issues remain, such as how to assure long term effects (Jeppesen et al., 2012). For 530 example, the continuous control of omnivorous and herbivorous fish is recommended in warm lakes to protect

submerged macrophytes (Yu et al., 2016). These or other measures are likely not useful for all lakes since there might
be conflicts between biodiversity conservation and other uses (such as irrigation, navigation, aquaculture, etc.).

533 Sometimes, artificial macrophytes have been used when natural plants do not respond as fast as required. 534 Although direct chemical effects (e.g., uptake of nutrients and excretion of allelopathic substances that potentially 535 control phytoplankton) will not occur, the generation of physical complexity can lead to strong changes in the lake 536 function by affecting trophic interactions, and the stability of the water column and decrease of incoming light. 537 Artificial plants may initially help to create and stabilise a clear water state by serving as a daytime refuge for 538 zooplankton against predation by fish, as well as substrate for plant-associated macroinvertebrates (Skov & Berg, 1999; 539 Boll et al., 2012). A cover by artificial plants of just 3-5% of the lake area can double zooplankton densities, as found in 540 a shallow temperate lake in Denmark (Schou et al., 2009). Artificial recreation of habitat structural complexity seems, 541 however, not sufficient to mimic the whole array of effects associated with natural habitat complexity. Interestingly, in 542 streams where restoration efforts have been more widely applied than in lentic systems, restoring habitat heterogeneity 543 has seldom promoted an increase in macroinvertebrate diversity (as shown in a meta-analysis by Palmer et al., 2010), 544 indicating that the ultimate processes behind the effects of habitat complexity on biodiversity and fauna abundance have 545 not been completely elucidated (Kovalenko et al., 2012). The advantage of using artificial structures is that they can be 546 introduced all year round and are much less sensitive to environmental conditions and grazing by herbivorous fishes and 547 waterfowl, although unfortunate cases of waterfowl consuming plastic structures, likely trying to catch the associated 548 macroinvertebrates, have occurred (M. Meerhoff pers. obs.). The potential release of chemical substances and micro 549 and nanoplastics from the artificial plants should also be thoroughly analysed and weighted against the potential 550 benefits.

The examination of the effectiveness of several active restoration measures has resulted in different outcomes: ecosystem and submerged macrophyte recovery, no improvement, or initial improvement and then a return to eutrophic conditions (McCrackim et al., 2017). On top of that, restored lakes and ponds in warm regions recover more slowly than those in cold areas (Jeppesen et al., 2007; 2012). Thus, under any restoration scenario, it is still key to decrease the nutrient load to aquatic ecosystems (Moss et al., 2011; McCrackim et al., 2017; Hoffmann et al., 2020).

556 Future directions

In this section we review a series of topics that, in our view, deserve deeper studies due to their potential
impact on our understanting on shallow lakes and pond functioning, and on conservation or restoration strategies.

1.Space-size heterogeneity and food web stability. Heterogeneity in space-filling offers a variation of refuge
sizes that might decouple trophic interactions and promote the compartmentalization of food webs; as pointed out by
Kovalenko et al., (2012). This is still a line of research not yet sufficiently explored.

2. Relevance of different atributes of habitat complexity to sustain biodiversity. The exact mechanism by which
habitat complexity impacts taxon richness or density, and with those, impact ecosystem processes, is still not fully
elucidated despite that several experimental studies have addressed the topic. For instance, space-size heterogeneity
(i.e., variation in space sizes) has been highlighted as more important for macroinvertebrate taxonomic richness than
overall complexity, and than other complexity attributes, plant biomass, and density of stems (St. Pierre & Kovalenko,
2014).

3. Interacting effects of habitat complexity and food web structure. Interestingly, habitat complexity interacts with lake characteristics such as water transparency (Snickars et al., 2004; Pekcan-Hekim et al., 2010) and trophic web characteristics. Rennie & Jackson (2005) demonstrated that small-scale variation in littoral microhabitat complexity shapes patterns of macroinvertebrate distribution but also that such effects were systematically different in the presence or absence of fish (i.e., greater complexity promoted higher density of invertebrates only in the presence of fish), suggesting that habitat complexity effects are mediated through top-down mechanisms. Climate-related differences in trophic web structure should also be considered here.

4. Habitat complexity and fluxes of greenhouse gases (GHG). In this growing field of investigation, studies have yielded contradictory results about the role of different lake zones with contrasting habitat complexity on GHG fluxes (e.g., Zhu et al., 2015; Kosten et al., 2016; Janssen et al., 2021). Habitat complexity may interact with nutrient loads and with trophic structure of lakes and ponds, among other factors, thus influencing net GHG influx or efflux (Zhu et al., 2015; Morales-Williams et al., 2021). Thus, it is necessary to understand the mechanisms that may transform different lake zones (littoral, benthic, or pelagic) or whole ecosystems under different regimes with contrasting habitat complexity on "hotspots" of GHG emissions and its connection to whole lake budget.

5. Connection between habitat complexity and spatial complexity at the landscape level. Despite historically being treated as relatively discrete microcosms (Forbes, 1887), shallow lakes and ponds are open ecosystems that are inseparable from their catchments (Moss, 1998). The importance of spatial complexity at the catchment and landscape level for regional but also for local richness has been recently highlighted (Fahrig, 2013), not least through interactive effects with in-lake habitat complexity. In pondscapes, individual pond size and isolation (habitat patchiness), together with the presence of emergent vegetation (within-lake complexity), can, for instance, significantly influence waterfowl
diversity, as found in a series of Mediterranean ponds (Paracuellos & Tellería, 2004). Connectedness in heterogeneous
landscapes may lead to high local biodiversity and resilience via a spatial insurance effect (Loreau et al., 2003).
However, higher richness at the regional level may be expected when the lakes and ponds in a waterscape show
different degrees of connectivity, due to stochastic events, ecological interactions, and different in-lake complexity
(Scheffer et al., 2006).

593

594 Conclusions

595 Organizational elements that promote habitat complexity differ across spatial scales from the landscape to 596 within-lake microhabitats; nevertheless, all organizational elements and certain characteristics (e.g., lake connectivity, 597 number, size and shape, shoreline development, within-lake complexity, etc.) contribute to determining ecosystem processes, functions, and services. Despite the importance of the effects produced by the physical structure of aquatic 598 599 plants, there are no standardised methods to measure plant complexity, limiting comparisons among different plant 600 species and among ecosystems (reviewed in Kovalenko et al., 2012). Besides, determining the effects strictly associated 601 with habitat complexitycan be difficult as different potentially explanatory variables are often highly associated, as is 602 the case of plant cover and lake trophic state (Declerck et al., 2005).

603 Several anthropogenic threats to lake and pond complexity often operate simultaneously at different spatial 604 scales, promoting habitat destruction or alteration and/or decoupling between lakes and their riparian areas or with other 605 aquatic systems. Some of such threats against habitat integrity occur at the landscape level (e.g., disruption of natural 606 hydrological cycles through channelization and dam construction, changing or preventing connectivity among lake and 607 pond systems), while others affect the lake and within-lake microhabitat levels. In addition, lake and within-lake 608 microhabitats are severely affected by the destruction of riparian vegetation and lake/pond shore margins, point or 609 diffuse nutrient pollution, drainage or water overexploitation, introduction of exotic species and/or fluctuations in water 610 levels induced by climate change. Eutrophication, largely due to nutrient inputs from agricultural areas, despite not 611 being a linear process, most often ends up with a major loss in complexity with negative implications for biodiversity, 612 nutrient cycles, and emissions of greenhouse gases. Climate change impacts on habitat complexity largely depends on 613 antecedent lake conditions which, on the other hand, may contribute to lake resilience and resistance to climatic 614 disturbances such as storms, hurricanes, drought and flood periods. The loss or degradation of riparian and littoral 615 vegetation of shallow lakes and ponds translates into an alteration of ecosystem functions, such as heavily reduced

capacity to provide food, refuge and nursing areas for aquatic and amphibious species, recycle nutrients and purifywater, sequester carbon, flood and hazards mitigation, and soil formation.

618 The recognition of these impacts has promoted the implementation of mitigation measures to improve habitat 619 quality, targeting at different components and spatial scales (e.g., nutrient transport and drainage control, re-620 establishment of riparian and buffer zones, restoration of shallow lakes, reconstruction of ghost ponds). Particularly, 621 large re-establishment of wetland buffer zones is an effective action to reduce N and P pollution in agricultural 622 catchments. Its implementation seems mostly related to policy priorities rather than to financial impossibilities 623 (Jabłońska et al., 2020) and it is an action currently applied in different parts of the world (e.g., Hoffmann et al., 2020; 624 Walton et al., 2020). At the lake scale, the current evidence highlights that different active measures applied, such as 625 macrophyte transplantation, fish removal, and exotic mussel/macrophyte introductions have different outcomes. 626 Reviews considering lake recovery from eutrophication, particularly those evaluating the re-establishment of 627 submerged macrophytes, have mostly focused on temperate systems (e.g., Søndergaard et al., 2005; McCrackim et al., 628 2017; although see Jeppesen et al., 2012). So far, it seems that in subtropical lakes greater efforts are necessary to 629 maintain or speed up the recovery of littoral habitats, by performing continuous fish removal and combining this with 630 major nutrient reduction (Yu et al., 2016). More examples from Mediterranean, tropical, and subtropical areas are 631 needed to understand the effectiveness of different restoration measures across a broad range of climates and conditions. 632 Until more information is synthesized, reduction of nutrient loads and preservation of the existing natural habitat 633 complexity at different spatial scales seems to be one of the key measures to maintain the resilience of lake and pond ecosystems against global and local anthropogenic impacts. Habitat complexity, from the landscape to the within-634 635 system levels, needs to be prioritized by environmental managers and policymakers, as it impacts directly on 636 biodiversity and several ecosystem services supplied by lakes and ponds.

637 References

- Agostinho, A. A., L. C. Gomes & H. J. Ferreira, Jr., 2003. Relationship between aquatic macrophytes and fish fauna. In
 S. M. Thomaz& L. M. Bini (eds.), Ecology and Management of Aquatic Macrophytes. EDUEM, Maringá: 261-279.
 (In Portuguese).
- Andersson, B., 2001. Macrophyte development and habitat characteristics in Sweden's large lakes. AMBIO 30: 503513.
- Bachmann, R. W., C. A. Horsburgh, M. V. Hoyer, L. K. Mataraza& D. E. Canfield, Jr., 2002. Relations between trophic
 state indicators and plant biomass in Florida lakes. Hydrobiologia 470: 219-234.

- Bai, G., Y. Zhang, P. Yan, W. Yan, L. Kong, L. Wang, C. Wang, Z. Liu, B. Liu, J. Ma, J. Zuo, J. Li, J. Bao, S. Xia, Q.
- 246 Zhou, D. Xu, F. He & Z. Wu, 2020. Spatial and seasonal variation of water parameters, sediment properties, and
- submerged macrophytes after ecological restoration in a long-term (6 year) study in Hangzhou west lake in China:

648 Submerged macrophyte distribution influenced by environmental variables. Water Research 186: 116379.

- Bakker, E.S., J.M. Sarneel, R.D. Gulati, Z. Liu & E. van Donk, 2013. Restoring macrophyte diversity in shallow
 temperate lakes: biotic versus abiotic constraints. Hydrobiologia 710: 23-37.
- Balls, H., B. Moss & K. Irvine, 1989. The loss of submerged plants with eutrophication I. Experimental design, water
- chemistry, aquatic plant and phytoplankton biomass in experiments carried out in ponds in the Norfolk Broadland.
 Freshwater Biology22: 71-87.
- Bayley, S. E., A. S. Wong & J. E. Thompson, 2013. Effects of agricultural encroachment and drought on wetlands and
 shallow lakes in the boreal transition zone of Canada. Wetlands 33:17-28.
- Bolpagni, R., 2021. Towards global dominance of invasive alien plants in freshwater ecosystems: the dawn of the
 Exocene? Hydrobiologia 848: 2259-2279.
- Beaulieu, J. J., T. DelSontro& J. A. Downing, 2019. Eutrophication will increase methane emissions from lakes and
 impoundments during the 21st century. Nature Communications 10: 1375.
- Birch, S. & J. McCaskie, 1999. Shallow urban lakes: a challenge for lake management. Hydrobiologia395-396: 365377.
- 662 Boll, T., D. Balayla, F. Ø. Andersen & E. Jeppesen, 2012. Can artificial plant beds be used to enhance
- 663 macroinvertebrate food resources for perch (*Percafluviatilis* L.) during the initial phase of lake restoration by
- 664 cyprinid removal? Hydrobiologia 679: 175-186.
- Brucet, S., D. Boix, X. D. Quintana, E.Jensen, L. W. Nathansen, C. Trochine, M. Meerhoff, S. Gascón & E.
 Jeppesen, 2010. Factors influencing zooplankton size structure at contrasting temperatures in coastal
 shallow lakes: implications for effects of climate change. Limnology and Oceanography 55: 16971711.
- Burks, R. L., E. Jeppesen & D. M. Lodge, 2001. Littoral zone structures as refugia for *Daphnia* against fish predation.
 Limnology and Oceanography 46: 230-237.
- Burks, R. L., D. M. Lodge, E. Jeppesen & T. L. Lauridsen, 2002. Diel horizontal migration of zooplankton: costs and
 benefits of inhabiting littoral zones. Freshwater Biology 47: 343-365.
- 673 Carpenter, S. R. & D. M. Lodge, 1986. Effects of submersed macrophytes on ecosystem processes. Aquatic Botany 26:
- **674** 341-370.

- 675 Carpenter, S. R., E. H. Stanley & M. J. Vander Zanden, 2011. State of the world's freshwater ecosystems: physical,
- 676 chemical, and biological changes. Annual Review of Environmental Resources 36: 75-99.
- 677 Chaichana, R., R. Leah & B. Moss, 2011. Seasonal impact of waterfowl on communities of macrophytes in a shallow
 678 lake. Aquatic Botany 95: 39-44.
- 679 Chambers, P. A., 1987. Nearshore occurrence of submerged aquatic macrophytes in relation to wave action. Canadian
 680 Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 44: 1666-1669.
- 681 Chen, K. N., C. H. Bao & W. B. Zhou, 2009. Ecological restoration in eutrophic Lake Wuli: A large enclosure
- experiment. Ecological Engineering 35: 1646-1655.
- 683 Clemente, J. M., Boll, T., Teixeira-de Mello, F., Iglesias, C., Pedersen, A. R., Jeppesen, E., & Meerhoff, M.
- 684 (2019). Role of plant architecture on littoral macroinvertebrates in temperate and subtropical shallow
- lakes: a comparative manipulative field experiment. Limnetica 38: 759-772.
- 686 Collen, B., F. Whitton, E. E. Dyer, J. E. M. Baillie, N. Cumberlidge, W. R. T. Darwall, C. Pollock, N. I. Richman, A.-
- 687 M. Soulsby& M. Böhm, 2014. Global patterns of freshwater species diversity, threat and endemism. Global Ecology
 688 and Biogeography 23: 40-51.
- 689 Colina M., M. Meerhoff, G. Pérez, A. J. Veraart, P. Bodelier, A. van der Horst& S. Kosten, 2021. Trophic and non-
- trophic effects of fish and macroinvertebrates on carbon emissions. Freshwater Biology. doi: 10.1111/fwb.13795
- 691 Cooke, G. D., Welch, E. B., Peterson, S. & S. A. Nichols, 2005. Restoration and Management of Lakes and Reservoirs,
 692 CRC press.
- 693 Coppens, J., D. Trolle, E. Jeppesen & M. Beklioğlu, 2020. The impact of climate change on a Mediterranean shallow
 694 lake: insights based on catchment and lake modelling. Regional Environmental Change 20: 62.
- 695 Crisci, C., R. Terra, J. P. Pacheco, B. Ghattas, M. Bidegain, G. Goyenola, J. J. Lagomarsino, G. Méndez & N. Mazzeo,
- 696 2017. Multi-model approach to predict phytoplankton biomass and composition dynamics in a eutrophic shallow
- 697 lake governed by extreme meteorological events. Ecological Modelling 360: 80-93.
- 698 Crowder, L. B., & Cooper, W. E. (1982). Habitat structural complexity and the interaction between bluegills
 699 and their prey. *Ecology*, *63*, 1802-1813.
- 700 Davidson, T. A., J. Audet, E. Jeppesen, F. Landkildehus, T. L. Lauridsen, M. Søndergaard& J. Syväranta, 2018.
- 701 Synergy between nutrients and warming enhances methane ebullition from experimental lakes. Nature Climate
- 702 Change8: 156-160.

- 703 Davidson, T. A., J. Audet, J. C. Svenning, T. L. Lauridsen, M. Søndergaard, F. Landkildehus, S. E. Larsen & E.
- Jeppesen, 2015. Eutrophication effects on greenhouse gas fluxes from shallow-lake mesocosms override those of
 climate warming. Global Change Biology 21: 4449-4463.
- 706 Declerck, S., J. Vandekerkhove, L. Johansson, K. Muylaert, J.M. Conde-Porcuna, K. Van der Gucht, C. Pérez-Martínez,
- 707 T. L. Lauridsen, K. Schwenk, G. Zwart, W. Rommens, J. López-Ramos, E. Jeppesen, W. Vyverman, L.
- 708 Brendonck& L. De Meester, 2005. Multi-group biodiversity in shallow lakes along gradients of phosphorus and
- water plant cover. Ecology 86: 1905-1915.
- de Tezanos Pinto, P., L. Allende & I. O'Farrell, 2007. Influence of free-floating plants on the structure of a natural
 phytoplankton assemblage: an experimental approach. Journal of Plankton Research 29: 47-56.
- de Tezanos Pinto, P. & I. O'Farrell, 2014. Regime shifts between free-floating plants and phytoplankton: a review.
- 713 Hydrobiologia 740: 13-24.
- Downing, J. A., Y. T. Prairie, J. J. Cole, C. M. Duarte, L. J. Tranvik, R. G. Striegl, W. H. McDowell, P. Kortelainen, N.
- F. Caraco, J. M. Melack& J. J. Middelburg, 2006. The global abundance and size distribution of lakes, ponds, and
 impoundments. Limnology and Oceanography 51: 2388-2397.
- Dudgeon, D., 2019. Multiple threats imperil freshwater biodiversity in the Anthropocene. Current Biology 29:R960R967 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.08.002.
- 719 Dudgeon, D., A. H. Arthington, M. O. Gessner, Z.-I. Kawabata, D. J. Knowler, C. Lévêque, R. J. Naiman, A.-H. Prieur-
- Richard, D. Soto, M. L. J. Stiassny& C. A. Sullivan, 2006. Freshwater biodiversity: importance, threats, status and
 conservation challenges. Biological Reviews 81:163-182.
- 722 Ersoy, Z., U. Scharfenberger, D. L. Baho, T. Bucak, T. Feldmann, J. Hejzlar, E. E. Levi, A. Mahdy, T. Nõges, E.
- 723 Papastergiadou, K. Stefanidis, M. Šorf, M. Søndergaard, C. Trigal, E. Jeppesen & M. Beklioğlu, 2020. Impact of
- nutrients and water level changes on submerged macrophytes along a temperature gradient: A pan-European
- mesocosm experiment. Global Change Biology 26: 6831-6851.
- Fahrig, L., 2013. Rethinking patch size and isolation effects: the habitat amount hypothesis. Journal of Biogeography
 40: 1649-1663.
- 728 Fontanarrosa, M. S., G. Chaparro, P. de Tezanos Pinto, P. Rodríguez & I. O'Farrell, 2010. Zooplankton response to the
- environmental conditions engineered by free-floating plants. Hydrobiologia 646: 231-242.
- 730 Forbes, S.A., 1887. The lake as a microcosm. Bulletin of the Peoria Scientific Association 77-87, reprinted as Forbes
- 731 (1925) by the Illinois Natural History Survey Bulletin 15: 537-550.

- 732 Free, G., A. G. Solimini, B. Rossaro, L. Marziali, R. Giacchini, B. Paracchini, M. Ghiani, S. Vaccaro, B. M. Gawlik, R.
- 733 Fresner, G. Santner, M. Schönhuber & A. C. Cardoso, 2009. Modelling lake macroinvertebrate species in the
- shallow sublittoral: relative roles of habitat, lake morphology, aquatic chemistry and sediment composition.

735 Hydrobiologia 633:123-136.

- 736 Gao, H., X. Qian, H. Wu, H. Li, H. Pan & C. Han, 2017. Combined effects of submerged macrophytes and aquatic
- animals on the restoration of a eutrophic water body—A case study of Gonghu Bay, Lake Taihu. Ecological

738 Engineering 102:15-23.

- 739 Gao, Y., C. Yin, Y. Zhao, Z. Liu, P. Liu, W. Zhen, Y. Hu, J. Yu, Z. Wang & B. Guan, 2020. Effects of diversity,
- 740 coverage and biomass of submerged macrophytes on nutrient concentrations, water clarity and phytoplankton

biomass in two restored shallow lakes. Water 12:1425.

- Genkai-Kato, M., 2007. Macrophyte refuges, prey behaviour and trophic interactions: consequences for lake water
 clarity. Ecology Letters 10: 105–114.
- Gherardi, F. & P. Acquistapace, 2007. Invasive crayfish in Europe: the impact of *Procambarus clarkii* on the littoral
 community of a Mediterranean lake. Freshwater Biology 52: 1249-1259.
- 746 González-Sagrario, M.A., E. Balseiro, R. Ituarte & E. Spivak, 2009. Macrophytes as refuge or risky area for
- zooplankton: a balance set by littoral predacious macroinvertebrates. Freshwater Biology 54:1042-1053.
- 748 González-Sagrario, M. A. & E. Balseiro, 2010. The role of macroinvertebrates and fish in regulating the provision by

macrophytes of refugia for zooplankton in a warm temperate shallow lake. Freshwater Biology 55: 2153-2166.

- 750 Grutters, B. M. C., B. J. A. Pollux, W. C. E. P. Verberk & E. S. Bakker, 2015. Native and non-native plants provide
- similar refuge to invertebrate prey, but less than artificial plants. PLOS ONE | DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0124455.
- Hampton, S. E., S.C. Fradkin, P. R. Leavitt & E. E. Rosenberger, 2011. Disproportionate importance of nearshore
- habitat for the food web of a deep oligotrophic lake. Marine and Freshwater Research 62: 350-358.
- Havens, K., H. Paerl, E. Phlips, M. Zhu, J. Beaver & A. Srifa, 2016. Extreme weather events and climate variability
 provide a lens to how shallow lakes may respond to climate change. Water 8: 229.
- 756 Hilt, S., E. M. Gross, M. Hupfer, H. Morscheid, J. Mählmann, A. Melzer, J. Poltz, S. Sandrock, E. M. Scharf, S.
- 757 Schneider & K. van de Weyer, 2006. Restoration of submerged vegetation in shallow eutrophic lakes A guideline
 758 and state of the art in Germany. Limnologica 36: 155-171.
- 759 Hoffmann, C. C., D. Zak, B. Kronvang, C. Kjaergaard, M. V. Carstensen & J. Audet, 2020. An overview of nutrient
- transport mitigation measures for improvement of water quality in Denmark. Ecological Engineering 155:105863.

- 761 Horppila, J. & L. Nurminen, 2002. The effect of an emergent macrophyte (*Typha angustifolia*) on sediment
- resuspension in a shallow north temperate lake. Freshwater Biology 46: 1447-1455.
- 763 Horppila, J. & L. Nurminen, 2003. Effects of submerged macrophytes on sediment resuspension and internal

764 phosphorus loading in Lake Hiidenvesi (southern Finland). Water Research 37: 4468-4474.

- Horppila, J. & L. Nurminen, 2005. Effects of different macrophyte growth forms on sediment and P resuspension in a
 shallow lake. Hydrobiologia 545: 167-175.
- Hughes, R. M. & R. L. Vadas, 2021. Agricultural effects on streams and rivers: a western USA focus. Water 13:1901.
- 768 Hutchinson, G. E., 1961. The paradox of the plankton. American Naturalist 95: 137-145.
- 769 Iglesias, C., G. Goyenola, N. Mazzeo, M. Meerhoff, E. Rodó & E. Jeppesen, 2007. Horizontal dynamics of zooplankton
- in subtropical Lake Blanca (Uruguay) hosting multiple zooplankton predators and aquatic plant refuges.
- 771 Hydrobiologia 584: 179-189.
- 772 Iglesias, C., N. Mazzeo, M. Meerhoff, G. Lacerot, J. M. Clemente, F. Scasso, C. Kruk, G. Goyenola, J. García, S. L.

773 Amsinck, J.C. Paggi, S. José de Paggi & E. Jeppesen, 2011. High predation is the key factor for dominance of small-

- bodied zooplankton in warm lakes evidence from lakes, fish exclosures and surface sediment. Hydrobiologia 667:
 133-147.
- 776 IPBES, 2019. Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the
- 777 Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. IPBES secretariat, Bonn,

Germany.

- Jabłońska, E., M. Wiśniewska, P. Marcinkowski, M. Grygoruk, C. R. Walton, D. Zak, C. C. Hoffmann, S. E. Larsen,
- 780 M. Trepel & W. Kotowski, 2020. Catchment-scale analysis reveals high cost-effectiveness of wetland buffer zones
 781 as a remedy to non-point nutrient pollution in north-eastern Poland. Water 12: 629.
- 782 Jackson, D. A., Peres-Neto, P. R. & J. D. Olden, 2001. What controls who is where in freshwater fish communities the
- roles of biotic, abiotic, and spatial factors. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 58: 157-170.
- Jana, D. & N. Bairagi, 2014. Habitat complexity, dispersal and metapopulations: Macroscopic study of a predator-prey
 system. Ecological Complexity 17:131-139.
- 786 Janes, R. A., J. W. Eaton & K. Hardwick, 1996. The effects of floating mats of *Azolla filiculoides* Lam. and *Lemna*
- 787 *minuta* Kunth on the growth of submerged macrophytes. Hydrobiologia 340: 23-26.
- 788 Janssen, A. B. G., S. Hilt, S. Kosten, J. J. M. de Klein, H. W. Paerl & D. B. Van de Waal, 2021. Shifting states, shifting
- services: Linking regime shifts to changes in ecosystem services of shallow lakes. Freshwater Biology 66: 1-12.

- Jennings, M. J., M. A. Bozek, G. R. Hatzenbeler, E. E. Emmons & M. D. Staggs, 1999. Cumulative effects of
- incremental shoreline habitat modification on fish assemblages in north temperate lakes. North American Journal of

792 Fisheries Management 19: 18-27.

- Jeppesen, E., M. Søndergaard, M. Søndergaard & K. Christoffersen, 1998. The structuring role of submerged
 macrophytes in lakes. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Jeppesen, E, M. Søndergaard, M. Meerhoff, T.L. Lauridsen & J.P. Jensen, 2007. Shallow lake restoration by nutrient
 loading reduction- some recent findings and challenges ahead. Hydrobiologia 584: 239-252.
- 797 Jeppesen, E., Trolle, D., Davidson, T.A., Bjerring, R., Søndergaard, M., Johansson, L.S., Lauridsen, T.L., Nielsen, A.,
- Larsen, S.E., & M. Meerhoff, 2016. Major changes in CO₂ efflux when shallow lakes shift from a turbid to a clear
 water state. Hydrobiologia. 778(1): 33-44.
- BOO Jeppesen, E., M. Søndergaard, T. L. Lauridsen, T. A. Davidson, Z. Liu, , N. Mazzeo, C. Trochine, K. Ozkan, H. S.
- 801 Jensen, D. Trolle, F. Landkildehus, F. Starling, S. E. Larsen, X. Lazzaro & M. Meerhoff, 2012. Biomanipulation as
- a restoration tool to combat eutrophication- recent advances and future challenges. Advances in Ecological Research

803 47: 411-488.

- Jeppesen, E., Canfield, D. E., Bachmann, R. W., Søndergaard, M., Havens, K. E., Johansson, L. S., Lauridsen, T. L.,
- Sh, T., Rutter, R. P., & G. Warren, 2020. Toward predicting climate change effects on lakes: a comparison of 1656
 shallow lakes from Florida and Denmark reveals substantial differences in nutrient dynamics, metabolism, trophic
 structure, and top-down control. Inland Waters 10: 197-211.
- Jones, J. I. & C. D. Sayer, 2003. Does the fish-invertebrate-periphyton cascade precipitate plant loss in shallow lakes?
 Ecology 84: 2155-2167.
- Kaufmann, P. R., R. M. Hughes, T. R. Whittier, S. A. Bryce & S. G. Paulsen, 2014. Relevance of lake physical habitat
 indices to fish and riparian birds. Lake and Reservoir Management 30: 177-191.
- Kornijów, R., Measey, G. J., & Moss, B. (2016). The structure of the littoral: effects of waterlily density and perch
 predation on sediment and plant-associated macroinvertebrate communities. Freshwater biology 61: 32-50.
- 814 Kosten, S., E. Jeppesen, V. L. M. Huszar, N. Mazzeo, E. van Nes, E. T. H. M. Peeters& M. Scheffer, 2011. Ambiguous
- 815 climate impacts on competition between submerged macrophytes and phytoplankton in shallow lakes. Freshwater
- **Biology** 56: 1540-1553.
- 817 Kosten, S., V. L. M. Huszar, E. Bécares, L. S. Costa, E. van Donk, L.-A. Hansson, E. Jeppesen, C. Kruk, G. Lacerot, N.
- 818 Mazzeo, L. De Meester, B. Moss, M. Lürling, T. Nõges, S. Romo & M. Scheffer, 2012. Warmer climates boost
- 819 cyanobacterial dominance in shallow lakes. Global Change Biology 18: 118-126.

- Kosten, S. & M. Meerhoff, 2014. Lake communities. Encyclopedia of Life Sciences. John Wiley & sons. Chichester.
 Online.
- Kosten, S., M. Piñeiro, E. Goede, J. de Klein, L. P. Lamers, & K. Ettwig, 2016. Fate of methane in aquatic systems
 dominated by free-floating plants. Water Research104: 200-207.
- 824 Kovalenko, K. E., E. D. Dibble, A. A. Agostinho, G. Cantanhede& R. Fugi, 2010. Direct and indirect effects of an
- introduced piscivore, *Cichlakelberi* and their modification by aquatic plants. Hydrobiologia 638: 245-253.
- 826 Kovalenko, K.E., S. M. Thomaz & D. M. Warfe, 2012. Habitat complexity: approaches and future directions.

827 Hydrobiologia 685:1-17.

- Laanbroek, H. J., 2009. Methane emission from natural wetlands: interplay between emergent macrophytes and soil
 microbial processes. A mini-review. Annals of Botany 105:141-153.
- Lauridsen, T. L. & I. Buenk, 1996. Diel changes in the horizontal distribution of zooplankton in the littoral zone of two
 shallow eutrophic lakes. Archivfür Hydrobiologie 137: 161-176.
- 832 Lauridsen, T. L. & D. M. Lodge, 1996. Avoidance by *Daphnia magna* of fish and macrophytes: Chemical cues and
- predator-mediated use of macrophyte habitat. Limnology and Oceanography 41: 794-798.
- 834 Lauridsen, T. L., L. J. Pedersen, E. Jeppesen & M. Søndergaard, 1996. The importance of macrophyte bed size for
- cladoceran composition and horizontal migration in a shallow lake. Journal of Plankton Research 18: 2283-2294.
- 836 Lauridsen, T. L., Sandsten, H. & P. H. Møller, 2003. The restoration of a shallow lake by introducing *Potamogeton* spp.
- 837 The impact of waterfowl grazing. Lakes and Reservoirs: Research and Management 8: 177-187.
- Lewin, W. C., N. Okun & T. Mehner, 2004. Determinants of the distribution of juvenile fish in the littoral area of a
 shallow lake. Freshwater Biology 49: 410-424.
- 840 Loreau, M., Mouquet, N., & A. Gonzalez, 2003. Biodiversity as spatial insurance in heterogeneous landscapes.
- Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 100(22):12765-12770.
- Lucena-Moya, P. & I. C. Duggan, 2011. Macrophyte architecture affects the abundance and diversity of littoral
 microfauna. Aquatic Ecology 45: 279-287.
- Madsen, J.D., P. A. Chambers, W. F. James, E. W. Koch & D. F. Westlake, 2001. The interaction between water
 movement, sediment dynamics and submersed macrophytes. Hydrobiologia 444: 71-84.
- Marklund, O., H. Sandsten, L.-A. Hansson & I. Blindow, 2002. Effects of waterfowl and fish on submerged vegetation
 and macroinvertebrates. Freshwater Biology 47: 2049-2059.
- 848 Meerhoff, M., N. Mazzeo, B. Moss & L. Rodríguez-Gallego, 2003. The structuring role of free-floating versus
- submerged plants in a shallow subtropical lake. Aquatic Ecology 37: 377-391.

- Meerhoff, M., 2006. The structuring role of macrophytes on trophic dynamics of shallow lakes under a climate warming
 scenario. PhD Thesis, Aarhus University, Aarhus.
- 852 Meerhoff, M., Fosalba C., Bruzzone C., Mazzeo N., Noordoven W. & E. Jeppesen, 2006. An experimental study of
- habitat choice by *Daphnia*: plants signal danger more than refuge in subtropical lakes. Freshwater Biology 51: 13201330.
- 855 Meerhoff, M., C. Iglesias, F. Teixeira-de Mello, J. M. Clemente, E. Jensen, T. L. Lauridsen & E. Jeppesen, 2007 a.
- 856 Effects of habitat complexity on community structure and predator avoidance behaviour of littoral zooplankton in
- temperate versus subtropical shallow lakes. Freshwater Biology 52: 1009-1021.
- 858 Meerhoff, M., J. M. Clemente, F. Teixeira-de Mello, C. Iglesias, A. R. Pedersen & E. Jeppesen 2007 b. Can warm
- 859 climate-related structure of littoral predator assemblies weaken the clear water state in shallow lakes? Global860 Change Biology 13: 1888-1897.
- 861 Meerhoff, M., F. Teixeira-de Mello, C. Kruk, C. Alonso, I. González-Bergonzoni, J. P. Pacheco, G. Lacerot, M. Arim,
- 862 M. Beklioğlu, S. Brucet, G. Goyenola, C. Iglesias, N. Mazzeo, S. Kosten & E. Jeppesen, 2012. Environmental
- warming in shallow lakes: a review of potential changes in community structure as evidenced from space-for-time
 substitution approaches. Advances in Ecological Research 46: 259-349.
- Michelan, T. S., S. M. Thomaz, R. P. Mormul & P. Carvalho, 2010. Effects of an exotic invasive macrophyte (tropical signalgrass) on native plant community composition, species richness and functional diversity. Freshwater Biology 55: 1315-1326.
- 868 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005. Ecosystems and Human Well-Being. Current State and Trends. Island Press,
 869 Washington D.C.
- Moi, D. A., D. C. Alves, P. A. P. Antiqueira, S. M. Thomaz, F. Teixeira de Mello, C. C. Bonecker, L. C. Rodrigues, R.
 Garcia-Rios & R. P. Mormul, 2021. Ecosystem shift from submerged to floating plants simplifying the food web in
- a tropical shallow lake. Ecosystems 24: 628-639.
- 873 Moomaw, W. R., G. L. Chmura, G. T. Davies, C. M. Finlayson, B. A. Middleton, S. M. Natali, J. E. Perry, N. Roulet&
- A. E. Sutton-Grier, 2018. Wetlands in a changing climate: Science, policy and management. Wetlands 38:183-205.
- 875 Morales-Williams, A. M., A. D. Wanamaker, C. J. Williams & J. A. Downing, 2021. Eutrophication drives extreme
- seasonal CO₂ flux in lake ecosystems. Ecosystems 24:434-450.
- 877 Moss, B., 1998. Ecology of Fresh Waters: Man and Medium, Past to Future, John Wiley & Sons. 3rd Ed. Singapore.

- 878 Moss, B., J. Stansfield & K. Irvine, 1990. Problems in the restoration of a hypertrophic lake by diversion of a nutrient-
- 879 rich inflow. Verhandlungen der Internationale VereinigungfürTheoretische und AngewandteLimnologie 24: 568880 572.
- 881 Moss, B., Madgwick, J. & G. Phillips, 1996. A Guide to the Restoration of Nutrient-Enriched Shallow Lakes. Broads
 882 Authority. Norwich.
- 883 Moss, B., S. Kosten, M. Meerhoff, R. W, Battarbee, E. Jeppesen, N. Mazzeo, K. Havens, G. Lacerot, Z. Liu, L. De
- Meester, H. Paerl& M. Scheffer, 2011. Allied attack: climate change and nutrient pollution. Inland Waters 1: 101105.
- 886 Muthukrishnan, R., N. Hansel-Welch & D. J. Larkin, 2018. Environmental filtering and competitive exclusion drive
- biodiversity-invasibility relationships in shallow lake plant communities. Journal of Ecology 106: 2058-2070.
- 888 Muthukrishnan, R. & D. J. Larkin, 2020. Invasive species and biotic homogenization in temperate aquatic plant
- communities. Global Ecology and Biogeography 29: 656-667.
- Naiman, R.J., Bilby, R.E. and Bisson, P.A., 2000. Riparian ecology and management in the Pacific coastal rain
 forest. BioScience, 50(11), pp.996-1011.
- 892 Netten, J. J. C., G. H. P. Arts, R. Gylstra, E. H. van Nes, M. Scheffer & R. M. M. Roijackers, 2010. Effect of
- temperature and nutrients on the competition between free-floating *Salvinia natans* and submerged *Elodea nuttallii*in mesocosms. Fundamental and Applied Limnology 177, 125-132.
- Nurminen, L. & J. Horppila, 2002. A diurnal study on the distribution of filter feeding zooplankton: Effect of emergent
 macrophytes, pH and lake trophy. Aquatic Sciences 64: 198-206.
- 897 Oertli, B. & K. M. Parris, 2019. Toward management of urban ponds for freshwater biodiversity. Ecosphere 10:
 898 e02810.
- 899 O'Farrell, I., De Tezanos Pinto, P., Rodriguez, P.L., Chaparro, G. & H.N. Pizarro, 2009. Experimental evidence of the
- 900 dynamic effect of free-floating plants on phytoplankton ecology. Freshwater Biology, 54: 363-375.
- 901 Pacheco, F. S., F. Roland & J. A. Downing, 2014. Eutrophication reverses whole-lake carbon budgets. Inland Waters 4:
 902 41-48.
- 903 Paerl, H.W.& J. Huisman, 2008. Blooms like it hot. Science 320: 57-58.
- 904 Paerl, H. W. & V. J. Paul, 2012. Climate change: links to global expansion of harmful cyanobacteria. Water Research
 905 46: 1349-1363.

- 906 Padial, A. A., S. M. Thomaz & A. A. Agostinho, 2009. Effects of structural heterogeneity provided by the floating
- 907 macrophyte *Eichhornia azurea* on the predation efficiency and habitat use of the small Neotropical fish
- 908 Moenkhausia sanctaefilomenae. Hydrobiologia 624: 161-170.
- 909 Palmer, M. A., H. L. Menninger & E. Bernhardt, 2010. River restoration, habitat heterogeneity and biodiversity: a
- failure of theory or practice? Freshwater Biology 55: 205-222.
- 911 Paracuellos, M. & J. L. Tellería, 2004. Factors affecting the distribution of a waterbird community: the role of habitat
- 912 configuration and bird abundance. Waterbirds 27: 446-453.
- 913 Pekcan-Hekim, Z., L. Nurminen, T. Ojala, M. Olin, J. Ruuhijärvi& J. Horppila, 2010. Reversed diel horizontal
- 914 migration of fish: turbidity versus structural complexity as refuge. Journal of Freshwater Ecology 25: 649-656.
- Persson, L. & P. Eklöv, 1995. Prey refuges affecting interactions between piscivorous perch and juvenile perch and
 roach Ecology 76: 70-81.
- 917 Phillips, G.L., Eminson, D. & B. Moss, 1978. A mechanism to account for macrophyte decline in progressively
- eutrophicated freshwaters. Aquatic Botany, 4:103-126.
- Phillips, G.L, Willby, N. & B. Moss, 2016. Submerged macrophyte decline in shallow lakes: what have we learnt in the
 last forty years?. Aquatic Botany, 135: 37-45.
- 921 Pianka E. R. 2000. Evolutionary Ecology. Benjamin Cummings, San Francisco.
- Rahel, F. J. & J. D. Olden, 2008. Assessing the effects of climate change on aquatic invasive species. Conservation
 Biology 22: 521-533.
- 924 Rennie, M. D. & L. J. Jackson, 2005. The influence of habitat complexity on littoral invertebrate distributions: patterns
- 925 differ in shallow prairie lakes with and without fish.Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 62: 2088926 2099.
- 927 Rigosi, A., C. C. Carey, B. W. Ibelings& J. D. Brookes, 2014. The interaction between climate warming and
- 928 eutrophication to promote cyanobacteria is dependent on trophic state and varies among taxa. Limnology and929 Oceanography 59: 99-114.
- 930 Rinke K., K. P. S., Kong X., Borchardt D. & M. Weitere, 2019. Ecosystem Services from Inland Waters and Their
- 931 Aquatic Ecosystems. In: Schröter M., B. A., Klotz S., Seppelt R. & C. Baessler (ed), Atlas of Ecosystem Services.
 932 Springer, Cham.
- 933 Roijackers, R., S. Szabo & M. Scheffer, 2004. Experimental analysis of the competition between algae and duckweed.
- Archiv für Hydrobiologie 160: 401-412.

- 935 Rooney, D. J. & J. Kalff, 2000. Inter-annual variation in submerged macrophyte community biomass and distribution:
- The influence of temperature and lake morphometry. Aquatic Botany 68: 321-335.
- 937 Salgado, J., C. D. Sayer, S. J. Brooks, T. A. Davidson & B. Okamura, 2018. Eutrophication erodes inter-basin variation
- 938 in macrophytes and co-occurring invertebrates in a shallow lake: combining ecology and palaeoecology. Journal of
 939 Paleolimnology 60: 311-328.
- 940 Salgado, J., C. D. Sayer, N. Willby, A. G. Baker, B. Goldsmith, S. McGowan, T. A. Davidson, P. Bexell, I. R. Patmore
- 841 & B. Okamura, 2021. Habitat heterogeneity enables spatial and temporal coexistence of native and invasive
- 942 macrophytes in shallow lake landscapes. River Research and Applications (n/a).
- 943 Salgado, J., M. I. Vélez, L. C. Caceres-Torres, J. A. Villegas-Ibagon, L. C. Bernal-Gonzalez, L. Lopera-Congote, N. M.
- 944 Martinez-Medina & C. González-Arango, 2019. Long-term habitat degradation drives neotropical macrophyte
- species loss while assisting the spread of invasive plant species. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution 7.
- 946 Sass, G. G., J. F. Kitchell, S. R. Carpenter, T. R. Hrabik, A. E. Marburg & M. G. Turner, 2006. Fish community and
- food web responses to a whole-lake removal of coarse woody habitat. Fisheries 31: 321-330.
- 948 Scasso, F., N. Mazzeo, J. Gorga, C. Kruk, G. Lacerot, J. M. Clemente, D. Fabián & S. Bonilla, 2001. Limnological
- 949 changes of a subtropical shallow hypertrophic lake during its restoration. Two years of whole-lake experiments.
- 950 Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 11: 31-44.
- Scheffer, M., S. H. Hosper, M. L. Meijer, B. Moss & E. Jeppesen, 1993. Alternative equilibria in shallow lakes. Trends
 in Ecology and Evolution 8: 275-279.
- Scheffer, M. & R. J. De Boer, 1995. Implications of spatial heterogeneity for the paradox of enrichment. Ecology 76:
 2270-2277.
- 955 Scheffer, M., S. Szabó, A. Gragnani, E. H. van Nes, S. Rinaldi, N. Kautsky, J. Norberg, R. Roijackers & R. Franken,
- 956 2003. Floating plant dominance as an alternative stable state. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of
 957 USA 100: 4040-4045.
- 958 Scheffer, M., G. J. Van Geest, K. Zimmer, E. Jeppesen, M. Søndergaard, M. G. Butler, M. A. Hanson, S. Declerck & L.
- 959 De Meester, 2006. Small habitat size and isolation can promote species richness: second-order effects on
- biodiversity in shallow lakes and ponds. Oikos 112: 227–231.
- 961 Schindler, D. E. & M. D. Scheuerell, 2002. Habitat coupling in lake ecosystems. Oikos 98: 177-189.
- 962 Schou, M. O., C. Risholt, T.L. Lauridsen, M. Søndergaard, P. Grønkjær & E. Jeppesen, 2009. Habitat selection of
- 2009 zooplankton in a clear and a turbid shallow lake: effects of introducing artificial plants as refuge against predation.
- **964** Freshwater Biology 54: 1520-1531.

- 965 Schriver, P., J. Bøgestrand, E. Jeppesen & M. Søndergaard, 1995. Impact of submerged macrophytes on fish-
- 2009 zooplankton-phytoplankton interactions: Large-scale enclosure experiments in a shallow eutrophic lake. Freshwater
 Biology 33: 255-270.
- 968 Sculthorpe, C. D., 1967. The Biology of Aquatic Vascular Plants. Edward Arnold Publishers, London, UK.
- 969 Short, F. T., S. Kosten, P. A. Morgan, S. Malone & G. E. Moore, 2016. Impacts of climate change on submerged and
- 970 emergent wetland plants. Aquatic Botany 135: 3-17.
- 971 Skov, C. & S. Berg, 1999. Utilization of natural and artificial habitats by YOY pike in a biomanipulated lake.
- **972** Hydrobiologia 408-409: 115-122.
- 973 Snickars, M., A. Sandstrom & J. Mattila, 2004. Antipredator behaviour of 0+ year *Perca fluviatilis*: effect of vegetation
 974 density and turbidity. Journal of Fish Biology 65: 1604-1613.
- 975 St. Pierre, J. I. & K. E. Kovalenko, 2014. Effect of habitat complexity attributes on species richness. Ecosphere 5: 22.
- 976 Stewart, T. W., J. G. Miner & R. L. Lowe, 1998. Quantifying mechanisms for zebra mussel effects on benthic
- 977 macroinvertebrates: organic matter production and shell-generated habitat. Journal of the North American
- Benthological Society 17: 81-94.
- 979 Søndergaard, M., J. Jensen & E. Jeppesen, 2003. Role of sediment and internal loading of phosphorus in shallow lakes.
 980 Hydrobiologia 506-509: 135-145.
- 981 Søndergaard, M., E. Jeppesen & J. Jensen, 2005. Pond or lake: does it make any difference? ArchivfürHydrobiologie
 982 162: 143-165.
- 983 Stephen, D., B. Moss & G. Phillips, 1997. Do rooted macrophytes increase sediment phosphorus release?
- 984 Hydrobiologia 342-343: 27-34.
- Stouffer, D. B. & J. Bascompte, 2011. Compartmentalization increases food-web persistence. Proceedings of the
 National Academy of Sciences 108:3648-3652.
- Sun, H., X. Lu, R. Yu, J. Yang, X. Liu, Z. Cao, Z. Zhang, M. Li & Y. Geng, 2021. Eutrophication decreased CO₂ but
 increased CH₄ emissions from lake: A case study of a shallow Lake Ulansuhai. Water Research 201:117363.
- 989 Taniguchi, H., S. Nakano & M. Tokeshi, 2003. Influences of habitat complexity on the diversity and abundance of
- epiphytic invertebrates on plants. Freshwater Biology 48: 718-728.
- 991 Tavsanoğlu, Ü. N., A. I. Çakıroğlu, S. Erdoğan, M. Meerhoff, E. Jeppesen & M. Beklioğlu, 2012. Sediment -not plants
- -offer the preferred refuge for *Daphnia* against fish predation in Mediterranean shallow lakes: an experimental
- demonstration. Freshwater Biology 57: 795-802.

- 994 Teixeira-de Mello, F., M. Meerhoff, Z. Pekcan-Hekim& E. Jeppesen, 2009. Substantial differences in littoral fish
- community structure and dynamics in subtropical and temperate shallow lakes. Freshwater Biology 54: 1202-1215.
- 996 Thayne, M. W., B. M. Kraemer, J. P. Mesman, B. W. Ibelings & R. Adrian, 2021. Antecedent lake conditions shape
- 997 resistance and resilience of a shallow lake ecosystem following extreme wind storms. Limnology and Oceanography998 (n/a).
- 999 Thomaz, S.M. & L.M. Bini, 1998. Ecologia e manejo de macrófitas aquáticas em reservatórios.
- 1000 Thomaz, S. M., E. D. Dibble, L. R. Evangelista, J. Higuti & L. M. Bini, 2008. Influence of aquatic macrophyte habitat
- 1001 complexity on invertebrate abundance and richness in tropical lagoons. Freshwater Biology 53: 358-367.
- Thomaz, S.M., P. Carvalho, R. P. Mormul, F. A. Ferreira, M. J. Silveira & T. S. Michelan, 2009. Temporal trends and
 effects of diversity on occurrence of exotic macrophytes in a large reservoir. Acta Oecologica 35: 614-620.
- 1004 Thomaz, S. M. & E. R. da Cunha, 2010. The role of macrophytes in habitat structuring in aquatic ecosystems: methods
- of measurement, causes and consequences on animal assemblages' composition and biodiversity. Acta Limnologica
 Brasiliensia 22:218-236.
- 1007 Timms, R. & B. Moss, 1984. Prevention of growth of potentially dense phytoplankton populations by zooplankton
- grazing, in the presence of zooplanktivorous fish, in a shallow wetland ecosystem. Limnology and Oceanography29: 472-486.
- Tokeshi, M. & S. Arakaki, 2012. Habitat complexity in aquatic systems: fractals and beyond. Hydrobiologia 685: 2747.
- 1012 Vadeboncoeur, Y., M. J. Vander Zanden & D. M. Lodge, 2002. Putting the lake back together: Reintegrating benthic
 1013 pathways into lake food web models. BioScience 52: 44-54.
- 1014 Vander Zanden, M.J. & Y. Vadeboncoeur, 2020. Putting the lake back together 20 years later: what in the benthos have
 1015 we learned about habitat linkages in lakes?. Inland Waters 10(3): 305-321.
- 1016 van Nes, E. H. & M. Scheffer, 2005. Implications of spatial heterogeneity for catastrophic regime shifts in ecosystems.
 1017 Ecology 86: 1797-1807.
- 1018 Vellend, M., 2010. Conceptual synthesis in community ecology. The Quarterly Review of Biology 85: 183-206.
- 1019 Walton, C. R., D. Zak, J. Audet, R. J. Petersen, J. Lange, C. Oehmke, W. Wichtmann, J. Kreyling, M. Grygoruk, E.
- 1020 Jabłońska, W. Kotowski, M. M. Wiśniewska, R. Ziegler & C. C. Hoffmann, 2020. Wetland buffer zones for
- 1021 nitrogen and phosphorus retention: Impacts of soil type, hydrology and vegetation. Science of The Total
- **1022** Environment 727: 138709.

- Warfe, D. M. & L. A. Barmuta, 2004. Habitat structural complexity mediates the foraging success of multiple predator
 species. Oecologia 141: 171-178.
- Warfe, D. M., L. A. Barmuta& S. Wotherspoon, 2008. Quantifying habitat structure: surface convolution and living
 space for species in complex environments. Oikos 117: 1764-1773.
- 1027 Wetzel, R. G., 1990. Land-water interfaces: metabolic and limnological regulators. Verhandlungen des
- 1028 InternationalLimnologie 24: 6-24.
- 1029 Wetzel, R. G., 2001. Limnology: Lake and River Ecosystems. Academic Press. New York.
- 1030 Yamamoto, K. C., C. E. de Carvalho Freitasa, J. Zuanonb & L. E. Hurd, 2014. Fish diversity and species composition in
- small-scale artificial reefs in Amazonian floodplain lakes: refugia for rare species? Ecological Engineering 67: 1651032 170.
- Ye, C., C. H. Li, H. C. Yu, X. F. Song, G. Y. Zou & J. Liu, 2011. Study on ecological restoration in near shore zone of
 a eutrophic lake; Wuli Bay, Taihu Lake. Ecological Engineering 37: 1434-1437.
- 1035 Yu, J., Z. Liu, K. Li, F. Chen, B. Guan, Y. Hu, P. Zhong, Y. Tang, X. Zhao, H. He, H. Zeng & E. Jeppesen, 2016.
- 1036 Restoration of shallow lakes in subtropical and tropical China: response of nutrients and water clarity to
- biomanipulation by fish removal and submerged plant transplantation. Water 8: 438.
- 1038 Zagarese, H. E., M. d. l. Á. González Sagrario, D. Wolf-Gladrow, P. Nõges, T. Nõges, K. Kangur, S.-I. S. Matsuzaki,
- 1039 A. Kohzu, M. J. Vanni, D. Özkundakci, S. A. Echaniz, A. Vignatti, F. Grosman, P. Sanzano, B. Van Dam & L. B.
- 1040 Knoll, 2021. Patterns of CO₂ concentration and inorganic carbon limitation of phytoplankton biomass in
- agriculturally eutrophic lakes. Water Research 190:116715.
- 1042 Zeng, L., F. He, Z. Dai, D. Xu, B. Liu, Q. Zhou & Z. Wu, 2017. Effect of submerged macrophyte restoration on
- improving aquatic ecosystem in a subtropical, shallow lake. Ecological Engineering 106: 578-587.
- 1044 Zhang, Z., Z. Wang, Z. Zhang, J. Zhang, J. Guo, E. Li, X. Wang, H. Liu & S. Yan, 2016. Effects of engineered
- 1045 application of Eichhornia crassipes on the benthic macroinvertebrate diversity in Lake Dianchi, an ultra-eutrophic
- 1046 lake in China. Environmental Science and Pollution Research 23:8388-8397.
- 1047 Zehnsdorf, A., Hussner, A., Eismann, F., Rönicke, H., & Melzer, A. (2015). Management options of invasive Elodea
 1048 nuttallii and Elodea canadensis. Limnologica, 51, 110–117.
- 1049 Zhu, D., Y. Wu, N. Wu, H. Chen, Y. He, Y. Zhang, C. Peng & Q. A Zhu, 2015. Nitrous oxide emission from
- 1050 infralittoral zone and pelagic zone in a shallow lake: Implications for whole lake flux estimation and lake
- restoration. Ecological Engineering 82:368-375.

- **Table 1**. Anthropogenic activities that can directly or indirectly affect habitat complexity in shallow lakes and ponds,
- and some of the expected effects on lake processes and overall functioning. Based on Schindler & Scheuerell (2002).
- 1056 See the text for further description of the effects of some of these activities and the mechanisms involved.

Activities	Effects on shallow lakes and ponds
Deforestation of catchments	Increased erosion with consequent deterioration of light regime.
due to changes in land use	Increased nutrient and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) loading
	to lakes.
	Loss of source of large woody debris that represents habitat
	structure in littoral and benthic habitats.
Wetland drainage	Potential changes in shoreline development, slope and depth of
to gain land for agriculture, rangelands, or	ponds and lakes
urbanisation	Loss of buffer zone between terrestrial and aquatic systems
	(nutrients, DOC loading).
	Decreased complexity of littoral structure and loss of
	nursery/refuge/feeding areas for invertebrates, fishes, and
	waterfowl.
Removal of large woody debris and rocks or	Decreased complexity of littoral habitat.
stones from lakeshores for urbanisation or other	Loss of foraging and nesting habitat, predation refuges, etc.
uses	
Macrophyte removal	Depending on initial cover and degree of biomass removal:
to facilitate navigation, enhance aesthetics, etc.	Decreased complexity of littoral habitat.
	Loss of foraging habitat, predation refuges for zooplankton and
	small fishes, etc.
	Decreased resilience of shallow clear water lakes against other
	external perturbations.
Non sustainable agriculture	Diffuse nutrient (eutrophication) and agrochemical
	contamination.

	1
	Loss of riparian buffer zones and simplification of lake littoral
	areas.
	Increased phytoplankton biomass and light attenuation, limiting
	benthic algae and submerged aquatic plants with consequent
	reduction in littoral and benthic habitat complexity.
	Promotion of turbidity-tolerant aquatic plants leading to habitat
	homogenisation.
	Consequent changes in productivity in each lake habitat.
	Habitat simplification and overall loss of
	biodiversity.Expectedly higher net GHG emissions.
Exotic species introduction	Effects vary depending on species:
	Some species may increase benthic or littoral habitat complexity
	and productivity (of a particular habitat or the whole lake),
	while others may lead to habitat homogenization and decreased
	complexity.
Water level managementfor irrigation,	Lowered water level fluctuations may reduce seasonal flooding
human consumption or after construction of	that is important to nutrient regeneration and riparian/littoral
reservoirs	vegetation.
	Changes in water level may either facilitate or prevent the
OX	establishment and development of submerged or free-floating
	aquatic plants, thereby changing habitat complexity.
	Lower system resilience against other pressures such as
	eutrophication.

1058 Figure legends

1059 Fig. 1 Habitat complexity in lakes at the ecosystem level. Three major within-lake habitats are recognized: the pelagic,

1060 the benthic and the littoral zone, all interacting with the adjacent terrestrial ecosystem through the riparian zone. Each

1061 lake habitat is characterised by different assemblages of organisms and different levels of complexity. Drawn by

1062 M.Meerhoff and Tinna Christensen. From Kosten & Meerhoff, 2014

1063 Fig. 2 The effects of plant architecture vary with regional climate and associated structure of classic trophic webs. In

1064 this field experiment, the same amount of artificial material mimicked submerged and free-floating plants and was

1065 placed in a series of ten similar shallow lakes under contrasting climates (temperate and subtropical). The modulating

1066 effects of aquatic plants on littoral (shown) lake communities is affected by climate, likely because of differences in

1067 local trophic web structure and in the spatial behavior of fish (depicted in the sketch below). Note the different scales

used for each climate region. Modified from Meerhoff (2006)

1069 Fig. 3 Effects of aquatic plants on physical, chemical and biological processes in shallow lakes and ponds, and

1070 ecosystem services. The processes that are directly related to the habitat complexity created by the plants are

1071 highlighted. All processes are relevant for submerged plants, and many are shared with some other plant life-forms,

1072 please see the text for elaboration. Modified with permission from Moss et al. (1996)

1073







