


# SCIENTIFIC REPORTS



OPEN

## Soil properties drive a negative correlation between species diversity and genetic diversity in a tropical seasonal rainforest

Received: 08 July 2015

Accepted: 06 January 2016

Published: 10 February 2016

Wumei Xu<sup>1,4</sup>, Lu Liu<sup>1,4</sup>, Tianhua He<sup>2</sup>, Min Cao<sup>3</sup>, Liqing Sha<sup>3</sup>, Yuehua Hu<sup>3</sup>, Qiaoming Li<sup>3</sup> & Jie Li<sup>1</sup>

A negative species-genetic diversity correlation (SGDC) could be predicted by the niche variation hypothesis, whereby an increase in species diversity within community reduces the genetic diversity of the co-occurring species because of the reduction in average niche breadth; alternatively, competition could reduce effective population size and therefore genetic diversity of the species within community. We tested these predictions within a 20 ha tropical forest dynamics plot (FDP) in the Xishuangbanna tropical seasonal rainforest. We established 15 plots within the FDP and investigated the soil properties, tree diversity, and genetic diversity of a common tree species *Beilschmiedia roxburghiana* within each plot. We observed a significant negative correlation between tree diversity and the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within the communities. Using structural equation modeling, we further determined that the inter-plot environmental characteristics (soil pH and phosphorus availability) directly affected tree diversity and that the tree diversity within the community determined the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana*. Increased soil pH and phosphorus availability might promote the coexistence of more tree species within community and reduce genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* for the reduced average niche breadth; alternatively, competition could reduce effective population size and therefore genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within community.

The relations between species diversity and genetic diversity have long been proposed and observed<sup>1</sup>; however, such correlations have only received increased attention over the last decade<sup>2–15</sup>. Species-genetic diversity correlations (SGDCs) could have important implications for the planning of biodiversity conservation because a positive correlation may result in one level of diversity becoming a surrogate for another level<sup>13,16</sup>. The majority of the research on SGDCs suggests that species diversity and the intra-population genetic diversity of co-occurring species within a community are positively correlated as result of parallel effects in the environment on both levels of diversity<sup>5,7,17</sup>. At a regional scale, the neutral ecological processes such as ecological/genetic drift and immigration of species and genes are likely to be the primary drivers of the positive correlation between species diversity and genetic diversity<sup>3,5,17,18</sup>. Moreover, natural or anthropogenic disturbances can have similar effects on species and genetic diversity within a community<sup>4,19–21</sup>, although in one recent study, the reaction was dissimilar to disturbance for species and genetic diversity in a riparian forest<sup>11</sup>.

When the local characteristics influence the two levels of diversity in parallel, a positive correlation occurs<sup>5</sup>. Negative SGDCs, however, are reported less frequently in the literature<sup>15</sup>. Vellend *et al.* summarized the causal effects between species and genetic diversity within communities, but more studies are required to investigate the mechanisms of how one level of diversity affects the other level<sup>5</sup>. The classical niche variation hypothesis (NVH) posits that the breadth of the niches of species should be greater in species-poor than species-rich communities; therefore, if greater niche breadth indicates greater genetic diversity, then an increase in species diversity will negatively affect the genetic diversity of co-occurring species within a community or vice versa<sup>5,8,22,23</sup>. Alternatively,

<sup>1</sup>Plant Phylogenetics and Conservation Group, Center for Integrative Conservation, Xishuangbanna Tropical Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming, Yunnan 650223, P. R. China. <sup>2</sup>Department of Environment and Agriculture, Curtin University, PO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845, Australia. <sup>3</sup>Key Laboratory of Tropical Forest Ecology, Xishuangbanna Tropical Botanical Garden, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Menglun, Yunnan 666303, P. R. China. <sup>4</sup>University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, P. R. China. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Q.L. (email: lqm@xtbg.ac.cn)

Code	PS ( $N_e$ )	Genetic diversity			Tree diversity		
		$R_a$	S_GD	SW_GD	TR ( $R_{TR}$ )	S_TD	SW_TD
P1	9 (1.1)	1.900	1.587	0.542	130 (124)	40.792	4.195
P2	7 (2.3)	3.156	2.252	0.966	123 (123)	44.625	4.239
P3	22 (2.8)	3.118	2.105	0.984	123(113)	25.748	3.983
P4	11 (6.8)	4.206	2.809	1.282	123 (114)	25.001	3.886
P5	18 (2.3)	2.892	2.101	0.924	107 (101)	16.469	3.611
P6	7 (3.7)	4.182	2.519	1.170	116 (106)	18.668	3.727
P7	8 (3.4)	3.675	2.545	1.105	117 (105)	16.284	3.635
P8	8 (13.1)	4.914	3.311	1.431	109 (97)	24.413	3.752
P9	9 (7.4)	4.882	3.378	1.454	110 (98)	8.863	3.170
P10	13 (4.8)	4.376	3.268	1.388	120 (105)	11.557	3.499
P11	13 (2.6)	3.332	2.849	1.138	111 (97)	6.358	3.093
P12	7 (3.5)	3.790	2.841	1.182	116 (95)	10.546	3.373
P13	7 (3.3)	3.878	2.976	1.218	111 (95)	6.333	3.068
P14	15 (3.9)	4.221	2.941	1.329	115 (92)	3.630	2.589
P15	14 (5.4)	4.480	3.058	1.390	105 (90)	6.636	3.022

**Table 1. Summary of the genetic diversity of the 15 populations of *B. roxburghiana* and the tree diversity with DBH > 1 cm within each plot.** PS, census population size of *B. roxburghiana* in each plot;  $N_e$ , effective population size;  $R_a$ , number of alleles per locus (rarefacted to the smallest sample size of seven); TR, tree richness;  $R_{TR}$ , rarefied tree richness (rarefacted to the smallest sample size of 680); S\_GD & S\_TD and SW\_GD & SW\_TD, inverse Simpson index and Shannon-Wiener index, respectively, for genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* and tree diversity within the plots, respectively. Additionally, see Methods for details of the calculations for the biodiversity measures.

adding species to a community could intensify competition and consequently reduce average effective population size of the component species. If the reduction in effective population size is severe, genetic drift alone could lead to a decrease of genetic diversity at both neutral and non-neutral traits<sup>5</sup>.

Over the last decade, the majority of research on SGDCs concentrated on how neutral processes or disturbances affect parallel species diversity and genetic diversity<sup>3,17–21</sup>, whereas the research on the influence of deterministic processes on biodiversity potentially have provided significant insight into the origin and the maintenance of different levels of biodiversity<sup>7</sup>. The relationships between the distributions of plants and soil properties have long attracted the interest of ecologists<sup>24–29</sup>; however, relatively little is known about the effect of soil properties on the genetic diversity of a population of a focal species. Research that addresses this gap in our understanding could provide new perspectives on the consequences of global ecological issues such as atmospheric nitrogen deposition and eutrophication on the biodiversity of diverse ecosystems.

In this study, we established 15 plots (40 m × 40 m) within a 20 ha forest dynamics plot (FDP) in the Xishuangbanna tropical seasonal rainforest (Fig. S1). We surveyed the tree diversity of the community, evaluated the genetic diversity of a common tree species *Beilschmiedia roxburghiana* (Lauraceae) using microsatellite DNA markers, and measured the environmental properties (soil nutrients and topography) of each plot. Our goal was to answer two fundamental questions: 1) Are the tree diversity of a community and the genetic diversity of a common tree species correlated? 2) What are the possible drivers of the SGDC pattern in these species-diverse communities?

## Results

Across the 15 plots, the soil properties were highly variable (Table S1). The content of extractable phosphorus (EP) varied sixfold and ranged from 1.78 to 10.06 mg/kg. A total of 311 tree species with DBH (diameter at 1.3 m height) > 1 cm were recorded within the 15 plots of 1600 m<sup>2</sup> each (Appendix S1). The total tree abundance among the plots varied from 680 to 1186 with an average of 902 trees per plot. An average of 116 tree species were recorded in each plot and the rarefied tree species richness ranging from 90 to 124. The rarefied allelic richness ( $R_a$ ) varied from 1.90 to 4.48 across the 15 plots (Table 1). The genetic differentiation of *B. roxburghiana* was significant among the plots ( $F_{ST} = 0.097$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ). The soil properties within each plot were not correlated with the effective population size of *B. roxburghiana* (Table 2, Fig. S2a, b); while the rarefied tree richness and effective population size of *B. roxburghiana* was negative ( $P = 0.063$ ) within each plot (Fig. S2c).

From the Pearson correlation analysis, a significant negative correlation was found between the specific pair of indexes at the species and the genetic levels (Fig. 1). From further analysis, the availability of soil phosphorus and the pH had contrasting effects on the tree diversity and genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within the community (Table 2, Fig. 2). Plots with increased soil phosphorus availability, had significantly increased tree species diversity (Fig. 2a), whereas the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* decreased (Fig. 2c). A similar effect of soil pH on species and genetic diversity was also observed (Fig. 2b,d). The topography of the plot primarily influenced the soil pH ( $r = -0.735$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ), whereas the soil pH was correlated with phosphorus availability ( $r = 0.778$ ,  $P < 0.01$ ) (Table S2, Fig. S3). None of the biodiversity measures were significantly correlated with the topographical variables (Table S3).

Diversity Soil properties	$N_e$	$R_a$	S_GD	SW_GD	PC1_GD	$R_{TR}$	S_TD	SW_TD	PC1_TD
AN (mg/kg)	-0.120	-0.145	-0.167	-0.187	-0.169	0.291	0.143	0.184	0.212
EP (mg/kg)	-0.214	-0.416	-0.596*	-0.545*	-0.527*	0.668**	0.765**	0.791**	0.765**
EK (mg/kg)	0.388	0.224	0.149	0.195	0.192	0.133	0.038	0.193	0.145
OM (g/kg)	-0.102	-0.078	0.031	0.093	0.048	0.056	-0.111	-0.048	0.036
pH	-0.263	-0.447	-0.636*	-0.527*	-0.545*	0.755**	0.783**	0.835**	0.817**
TN (g/kg)	-0.353	-0.350	-0.307	-0.336	-0.336	0.293	0.055	0.171	0.178
TP (g/kg)	-0.102	-0.342	-0.540*	-0.443	-0.448	0.741**	0.759**	0.809**	0.794**
TK (g/kg)	0.154	0.020	-0.153	0.011	-0.048	0.240	0.049	0.174	0.178
BD (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )	-0.161	-0.312	-0.316	0.286	-0.309	0.159	0.324	0.239	0.249
PCS_Soil properties	-0.224	-0.414	-0.559*	-0.507	-0.501	0.711**	0.661**	0.739**	0.726**

**Table 2. Pairwise coefficients of correlation showing the effects of soil properties on the tree diversity and the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within each plot.** AN, ammonium nitrogen; EP, extractable phosphorus; EK, exchangeable potassium; OM, organic matter; TN, total nitrogen; TP, total phosphorus; TK, total potassium; and BD, soil bulk density.  $N_e$  and TK were log-transformed to improve normality. PCS\_Soil properties were calculated as the measure of soil nutrient availability within each plot using only the first three components in the PCA analysis with eigenvalues above 1 (88.50% of the variance explained, also see Methods). All significance was determined for the Bonferroni corrections. \*Correlation is significant at 0.05, \*\*Correlation is significant at 0.01 (2-tailed).

A hierarchical effect among the environmental properties, tree diversity and genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within the plots was identified with the structural equation modeling (SEM) analysis. A number of SEM models were tested in our study, and the best-fit model (RMSEA < 0.01; CFI = 1.0; and GFI = 0.951) was selected (Figs 3 and S4). The best-fit model suggested that the increase in tree diversity within a plot was directly affected by the elevated soil pH and available phosphorus, whereas the increase in species diversity directly depleted the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* (Fig. 3). The SEM analysis also revealed that the variation in soil pH was a direct consequence of the topographic variation and that soil pH determined the availability of phosphorus (Fig. 3).


## Discussion

A positive SGDC was the typical result found in previous studies that examined the parallel effects of the environment on the two levels of diversity<sup>4,5,7,15,19</sup>; however, negative SGDCs are observed less often, and the drivers of negative SGDCs are rarely discussed in the literature on empirical studies<sup>13</sup>. In our study, a negative correlation was found between the tree diversity and the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* (Fig. 1). Based on SEM analysis, the environmental characteristics (soil pH and phosphorus availability) effected tree diversity within the community and ultimately led to the negative SGDC that was observed in our study (Fig. 3). A negative SGDC driven by environmental characteristics was also previously reported<sup>8</sup>.

The “humped-back curve” predicts the relationship between resource availability and species diversity<sup>30,31</sup>; species richness is low at low nutrient levels, increases to a peak at intermediate levels and then declines gradually at high nutrient levels. We observed significant positive relationships among phosphorus availability, soil pH and tree diversity within our plots. The phosphorus deficiency and the strong acidity of the soil were likely important factors that limited the survival of many tree species in the Xishuangbanna tropical seasonal rainforest. Xue *et al.* found that phosphorus is the most limiting nutrient in the Xishuangbanna tropical seasonal rainforest and that the acidic soils further limit phosphorus availability<sup>32</sup>. Based on the SEM analysis, the soil pH was primarily determined by the topography within our plots, and the plots that were in the valley (lower elevation and convex) generally had relatively high soil pH values (Table S2, Figs 3 and S3). The topography can influence the hydrology and the soil pH within a community<sup>33,34</sup>. An increase in the pH of the acidic soils could release more of the phosphorus that was fixed by iron or aluminum ions when the soil pH was relatively low<sup>32,35</sup>. Moreover, soil pH also directly effects plant growth<sup>35</sup>.

From the pairwise correlation analyses, negative correlations were found between the soil factors (soil pH and phosphorus availability) and the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* (Table 2). An increase in the soil pH and phosphorus availability could have direct and negative effects on the individual *B. roxburghiana*, with fewer individuals surviving in an environment with relatively high phosphorus availability and soil pH values. Such a reduction in the effective population size could therefore decrease the genetic diversity. However, this explanation was less likely in our study because the effective population size of *B. roxburghiana* was not correlated with the soil pH ( $r = -0.263$ ,  $P = 0.344$ ) or EP ( $r = -0.214$ ,  $P = 0.444$ ) (Fig. S2a, b), whereas the soil factors and tree richness were positively correlated (Table 2). Thus, to explain the negative correlations between the two soil factors and the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana*, other mechanisms must be examined.

The best-fit SEM model further indicated that increases in the soil pH and phosphorus availability promoted tree diversity, and the increase in tree diversity within the community resulted in a decrease in the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* (Fig. 3). An increase in tree diversity within a community could decrease the effective population sizes of the component species, because the carrying capacity of the system might be limited. Consequently, a small-sized population of *B. roxburghiana* could contain less genetic diversity<sup>5</sup>. We revealed




**Figure 1. Negative correlation between the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* and the tree species diversity within each plot.**  $R_a$ , rarefied number of alleles per locus (rarefacted to the smallest sample size of seven);  $R_{TR}$ , rarefied tree richness (rarefacted to the smallest sample size of 680);  $S_{GD}$  &  $S_{TD}$  and  $SW_{GD}$  &  $SW_{TD}$ , inverse Simpson index and Shannon-Wiener index, respectively, for genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* and tree diversity within the plots, respectively.  $PC1_{TD}$  represents the first component (93.87% of the variance explained) from the PCA analysis that was based on the correlation matrix of  $R_{TR}$ ,  $SW_{TD}$  and  $S_{TD}$ ; and  $PC1_{GD}$  represents the first component (96.91% of the variance explained) from the PCA analysis that was based on the correlation matrix of  $R_a$ ,  $SW_{GD}$  and  $S_{GD}$ . Both  $PC1_{TD}$  and  $PC1_{GD}$  were positively correlated with the primary variables, with  $P < 0.001$ . The  $PC1_{TD}$  and  $PC1_{GD}$  were used as comprehensive measures to represent the tree diversity and the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within each plot, respectively.


a negative correlation ( $P = 0.063$ ) between the tree richness in the plot and the effective population size of *B. roxburghiana* within community, and also a significant positive correlation between effective population size of *B. roxburghiana* and its genetic diversity (Fig. S2c, d); With increased tree species diversity, competition could reduce the effective population size and therefore genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within community<sup>5</sup>.

The third explanation for the negative SGDC is found in the niche variation hypothesis<sup>5,8,22</sup>. With increases in the soil pH and phosphorus availability, more tree species coexisted within the community, and with more tree species, the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* decreased because the average niche breadth was reduced. Recently, Yang *et al.*<sup>36</sup> reported that a the deterministic processes could be the primary driver in the assembly of communities within the FDP. The connections between the environment and the trees, as well as species interactions, likely played large roles in the assembly of the forest community within the FDP.

Using the niche variation hypothesis to explain a negative SGDC typically assumes that high genetic diversity is an indication of large niche breadth<sup>5,22</sup>. The SSR markers are generally assumed to be neutral, and it is notable that the individual SSR alleles may not be related to niche breadth. The genetic diversity of a focal species, particularly the dominant species as measured by neutral molecular markers, might have important ecological consequences<sup>37–39</sup>. In a recent study, the different SSR genotypes were also related to morphological and physiological variation in *Zostera marina*<sup>37</sup>. It is likely that neutral genetic diversity may substitute for the level of adaptive genetic variation within a population, and different genotypes may prefer to survive within a specific environment. However, the recent meta-analysis revealed that there was no overall association between neutral genetic diversity and measures of ecological structure<sup>40</sup>; thus, invoking niche variation hypothesis as an alternative mechanism to explain the current negative SGDC, further studies are needed to link the neutral genetic diversity and



**Figure 2.** Contrasting patterns of the soil pH and EP on the tree diversity and the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within each plot.



**Figure 3.** Optimized structural model showing the effect network among the topography, soil properties, tree diversity and genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within each plot. The numbers next to the arrows are the standardized direct effects. All connection pathways are significant at  $P < 0.05$ .  $N = 15$ ,  $df = 5$ ,  $\chi^2 = 1.915$ , and  $P = 0.861$ ; CFI (comparative fit index) = 1; GFI (goodness of fit index) = 0.951; and RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation)  $< 0.01$ . The PCS\_Topography was calculated as the measure of topography using only the two components with eigenvalues above 1 (79.38% of the variance explained; the first principle component primarily explained elevation, slope and aspect, and the second principle component explained convex; also see Methods) in the PCA analysis. PC1\_TD represents the tree diversity and PC1\_GD represents the genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within each plot.

niche breadth of *B. roxburghiana* along an environmental gradient within the Xishuangbanna tropical seasonal rainforest.

In the previous studies on SGDCs, the general assumption is that the forces that maintain species diversity and genetic diversity are similar, as first proposed by Antonovics<sup>1</sup>, and positive patterns are reported that are consistent with this assumption. The neutral processes such as ecological/genetic drift and immigration of species

and genes likely drive the positive SGDCs within the discrete sampling units such as islands, forest fragments and ponds<sup>3,14,18,20</sup>. However, environmental characteristics can also cause a positive SGDC<sup>7,9,41</sup>. For example, Marshall & Camp concluded that environmental characteristics were positively correlated with both the richness of lungless salamander species (Plethodontidae) and the respective allelic richness<sup>41</sup>. However, based on our results, environmental characteristics can also generate a negative SGDC (Table 2, Figs 1 and 2). Taberlet *et al.* argued that environmental characteristics in glacial refugia likely contribute to the negative and zero SGDCs in the flora of European alpine regions<sup>16</sup>. The topographic variation in the glacial refugia might have promoted species diversity by increasing the coexistence of species, but the topographic variation might also have caused limited gene flow and led to population genetic drift<sup>42</sup>. The results of our study are consistent with the hypothesis that environmental characteristics are important drivers of SGDCs, and whether the pattern is positive or negative depends on the ecosystem context and the community composition<sup>13</sup>.

The connections between species and genetic diversity were first discussed four decades ago<sup>1</sup>, but such connections have only received renewed interest within the last ten years or so, partially because the correlation between the two levels of diversity has important implications for the conservation of biodiversity<sup>13</sup>. A positive SGDC is considered the typical relationship and is based on the tenet of Antonovics that the forces that maintain species diversity and genetic diversity are similar<sup>1</sup>. However, based on recent research and the results of our current study, negative SGDCs also occur<sup>6,8,23</sup>. As Taberlet *et al.* noted, any type of correlation may be found when testing the genetic diversity of a single species within a community in a SGDC analysis<sup>16</sup>. Consequently, we cannot take it for granted to use species diversity as a surrogate for genetic diversity, or vice versa, in conservation planning<sup>13</sup>.

## Methods

**Study site and focal species.** Fifteen plots, each 1600 m<sup>2</sup> (40 × 40 m), were established within the 20 ha (400 m × 500 m) FDP in the Xishuangbanna tropical seasonal rainforest in south-western China (centred at 21°37'08" N, 101°35'07" E)<sup>43</sup>. The FDP is situated within the Indo-Burma biodiversity hot spot<sup>44</sup> (Fig. S1). The average annual rainfall of the region is 1493 mm. The FDP has a laterite soil that developed from siliceous rocks<sup>45</sup>. The elevation of the 15 plots ranges from 725 to 837 m. The location of each plot was chosen to include the maximum number of *B. roxburghiana* within the plot.

*Beilschmiedia roxburghiana* Nees is an evergreen, small- to medium-sized tree that grows in the tropical, evergreen, broad leaf forests in south-eastern Xizang Province and Yunnan Province, China, and in north-eastern Myanmar and India. This tree is typically a forest-dwelling species that generally occupies the second and third layers of the canopy and that can reach 20 m in height. Insects pollinate the hermaphroditic flowers, and gravity and vertebrates, such as birds and small mammals, disperse the seeds<sup>46</sup>. The populations of *B. roxburghiana* have become increasingly fragmented in recent years because of the deforestation that is a consequence of the development of rubber tree plantations. In addition to *B. roxburghiana*, the common tree species in the plots include *Pittosporopsis kerrii* (Icacinaeae), *Parashorea chinensis* (Dipterocarpaceae), *Knema furfuracea* (Myristicaceae) and *Garcinia cowa* (Clusiaceae).

**Topography, soil nutrient analyses and species diversity survey.** For each of the 15 plots, the elevation, aspect, slope and convex were calculated using the procedures described in Liu *et al.*<sup>47</sup>. The soil nutrients and properties that were measured were ammonium nitrogen (AN), extractable phosphorus (EP), exchangeable potassium (EK), pH, organic matter (OM), total nitrogen (TN), total phosphorus (TP), total potassium (TK) and soil bulk density (BD). The soil nutrient analyses followed the protocols in Hu *et al.*<sup>48</sup>. In each plot, all trees with a DBH > 1 cm were surveyed and recorded. Three species diversity indices (Tree richness = TR, number of tree species within community; the Shannon-Wiener index = SW\_TD, calculated as  $-\sum f_i \ln f_i$ , where  $f_i$  is the number of the focal tree species divided by the number of samples within the community; and the inverse Simpson index = S\_TD, calculated as  $1/\sum f_i^2$ ) were calculated<sup>49</sup>. The rarefied tree species richness ( $R_{TR}$ ) was calculated using a rarefaction procedure implemented with R statistical software package (R Development Core Team 2013). The Xishuangbanna Station for Tropical Rain Forest Ecosystem Studies of the Chinese Academy of Sciences provided all primary data for this section of the FDP.

**Genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana*.** The genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* in each of the 15 plots was measured using ten pairs of microsatellite DNA primers. We considered each plot a "population", although the distribution of *B. roxburghiana* is more or less continuous in the FDP. An average of 11 samples (7–22) were genotyped. The protocols for the microsatellite genotyping and the primer sequences were described in Liu *et al.*<sup>50</sup>. Briefly, the total genomic DNA was extracted using a modified cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB) method<sup>51</sup>. Following PCRs, the PCR products were separated in an ABI 3730 sequencer (Applied Biosystems, Carlsbad, CA, USA), and the fragment lengths were analysed using ABI GeneMapper software version 3.7 (Applied Biosystems). To measure the genetic diversity in each plot, the allelic richness ( $N_a$ ), the Shannon-Wiener index (SW\_GD, calculated as  $-\sum f_i \ln f_i$ , where  $f_i$  is the frequency of the  $i$ th allele for the population), and the inverse Simpson index (S\_GD,  $1/\sum f_i^2$ ) were calculated using GenAEx6.5<sup>52</sup>. To eliminate the effect of uneven sample size on the measurement of  $N_a$ , we calculated the rarefied allelic richness ( $R_a$ ) using a rarefaction procedure implemented with HP-rare1.0<sup>53</sup>, and this procedure resampled individuals from populations with sample sizes larger than the minimum to calculate the allelic richness expected when the smallest samples were taken from each population. We estimated effective population size ( $N_e$ ) of *B. roxburghiana* within each plot using an updated version of the heterozygote-excess method<sup>54</sup>, as implemented in NeEstimator V2<sup>55</sup>; We assumed a random mating model and calculated the estimates using the threshold allele frequencies of  $P_{crit} = 0.05$  for excluding

rare alleles. To clarify the degree of genetic differentiation among the populations, the  $F_{ST}$  was calculated, and the significance was obtained with 999 permutations using GenAlEx6.5<sup>52</sup>.

**Statistical analyses.** The Shapiro-Wilk test was first implemented to evaluate the normal distribution of all variables; TK and  $N_e$  were consequently log-transformed to improve normality. In our study, four data sets were developed (topography, soil nutrients, tree diversity and genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within the plots), and each data set contained several variables that were possibly correlated with one another. Therefore, we analysed these data sets with principal component analysis (PCA) based on their correlation matrices. The principal components score (PCS) was calculated for the topographical variables and the soil nutrients because two or three principal components had eigenvalues above 1 during the PCA analysis. The PCS was calculated as follows:  $PCS = (\lambda_1/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)) \times F_1 + (\lambda_2/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)) \times F_2 + (\lambda_3/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3)) \times F_3$ , where  $\lambda_1$ ,  $\lambda_2$ , and  $\lambda_3$  are the eigenvalues of the three components and  $F_1$ ,  $F_2$ , and  $F_3$  are the first three components;  $\lambda_3$  and  $F_3$  equal zero when only two components have eigenvalues above 1 during a PCA analysis. We first explored the pairwise correlations between topography, soil nutrients, tree diversity and genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* in the plots using simple Pearson correlation analysis, and the significance differences were corrected for multiple comparisons following the Bonferroni procedure. An analysis with SEM was used to further generate and explore the model and to infer the causal correlations among topography, soil nutrients, tree diversity and genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana*. To begin, we constructed three conceptual SEM models of the expected multivariate relationships based on theoretically developed hypotheses of the interactions among the variables (Fig. S4)<sup>5</sup>. The best-fit model in this study included all significant connecting pathways with CFI (comparative fit index) > 0.9; GFI (goodness of fit index) > 0.9 and RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) < 0.02. The Shapiro-Wilk test, PCA and Pearson correlation analyses were implemented using the SPSS statistical software package 16.0, and the SEM analysis was conducted using Amos 20.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). The Bonferroni corrections were conducted using the R statistical software package (R Development Core Team 2013). The significance level was  $P < 0.05$ .

## References

- Antonovics, J. The input from population genetics: “the new ecological genetics”. *Syst. Bot.* **1**, 233–245 (1976).
- Antonovics, J. Toward community genomics? *Ecology* **84**, 598–601 (2003).
- Vellend, M. Island biogeography of genes and species. *Am. Nat.* **162**, 358–365 (2003).
- Vellend, M. Parallel effects of land-use history on species diversity and genetic diversity of forest herbs. *Ecology* **85**, 3043–3055 (2004).
- Vellend, M. & Geber, M. A. Connections between species diversity and genetic diversity. *Ecol. Lett.* **8**, 767–781 (2005).
- Wehenkel, C., Bergmann, F. & Gregorius, H.-R. Is there a trade-off between species diversity and genetic diversity in forest tree communities? *Plant Ecol.* **185**, 151–161 (2006).
- He, T., Lamont, B. B., Krauss, S. L., Enright, N. J. & Miller, B. P. Covariation between intraspecific genetic diversity and species diversity within a plant functional group. *J. Ecol.* **96**, 956–961 (2008).
- Silvertown, J., Biss, P. M. & Freeland, J. Community genetics: resource addition has opposing effects on genetic and species diversity in a 150-year experiment. *Ecol. Lett.* **12**, 165–170 (2009).
- Odat, N., Hellwig, F. H., Jetschke, G. & Fischer, M. On the relationship between plant species diversity and genetic diversity of *Plantago lanceolata* (Plantaginaceae) within and between grassland communities. *J. Plant Ecol.* **3**, 41–48 (2009).
- He, T. & Lamont, B. B. Species versus genotypic diversity of a nitrogen-fixing plant functional group in a metacommunity. *Popul. Ecol.* **52**, 337–345 (2010).
- Wei, X. & Jiang, M. Contrasting relationships between species diversity and genetic diversity in natural and disturbed forest tree communities. *New Phytol.* **193**, 779–786 (2012).
- Avolio, M. L. & Smith, M. D. Correlations between genetic and species diversity: effects of resource quantity and heterogeneity. *J. Veg. Sci.* **24**, 1185–1194 (2013).
- Kahilainen, A., Puurtinen, M. & Kotiaho, J. S. Conservation implications of species-genetic diversity correlations. *Global Ecol. Conserv.* **2**, 315–323 (2014).
- Vellend, M. *et al.* Drawing ecological inferences from coincident patterns of population- and community-level biodiversity. *Mol. Ecol.* **23**, 2890–2901 (2014).
- Laroche, F., Jarne, P., Lamy, T., David, P. & Massol, F. A neutral theory for interpreting correlations between species and genetic diversity in communities. *Am. Nat.* **185**, 59–69 (2015).
- Taberlet, P. *et al.* Genetic diversity in widespread species is not congruent with species richness in alpine plant communities. *Ecol. Lett.* **15**, 1439–1448 (2012).
- Baselga, A. *et al.* Whole-community DNA barcoding reveals a spatio-temporal continuum of biodiversity at species and genetic levels. *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 1–7 (2013).
- Lamy, T. *et al.* Variation in habitat connectivity generates positive correlations between species and genetic diversity in a metacommunity. *Mol. Ecol.* **22**, 4445–4456 (2013).
- Cleary, D. F., Fauvelot, C., Genner, M. J., Menken, S. B. & Mooers, A. O. Parallel responses of species and genetic diversity to El Niño Southern Oscillation-induced environmental destruction. *Ecol. Lett.* **9**, 304–310 (2006).
- Strubbig, M. J. *et al.* Parallel declines in species and genetic diversity in tropical forest fragments. *Ecol. Lett.* **14**, 582–590 (2011).
- Blum, M. J. *et al.* Genetic diversity and species diversity of stream fishes covary across a land-use gradient. *Oecologia* **168**, 83–95 (2012).
- Van Valen, L. Morphological variation and width of ecological niche. *Am. Nat.* **99**, 377–390 (1965).
- Karlin, A. A., Guttman, S. I. & Rathbun, S. L. Spatial auto-correlation analysis of heterozygosity and geographic-distribution in populations of *Desmognathus fuscus* (Amphibia, Plethodontidae). *Copeia* **1984**, 343–356 (1984).
- Huston, M. Soil nutrients and tree species richness in Costa Rican forests. *J. Biogeogr.* **7**, 147–157 (1980).
- Gusewell, S., Bailey, K. M., Roem, W. J. & Bedford, B. L. Nutrient limitation and botanical diversity in wetlands: can fertilisation raise species richness? *Oikos* **109**, 71–80 (2005).
- Wassen, M. J., Venterink, H. O., Lapshina, E. D. & Tanneberger, F. Endangered plants persist under phosphorus limitation. *Nature* **437**, 547–550 (2005).
- Harpole, W. S. & Tilman, D. Grassland species loss resulting from reduced niche dimension. *Nature* **446**, 791–793 (2007).
- Clark, C. M. & Tilman, D. Loss of plant species after chronic low-level nitrogen deposition to prairie grasslands. *Nature* **451**, 712–715 (2008).
- Laliberte, E. *et al.* How does pedogenesis drive plant diversity? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **28**, 331–340 (2013).
- Grime, J. P. *Plant Strategies and Vegetation Processes* (J. Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1979).

31. Tilman, D. *Resource Competition and Community Structure* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1982).
32. Xue, J. Y., Tang, J. W., Sha, L. Q. & Meng, Y. Soil nutrient contents and their characteristics of seasonal changes under *Shorea chinensis* forest in Xishuangbanna. *Acta Phytocol. Sin.* **27**, 373–379 (2003).
33. Xia, S. W., Chen, J., Schaefer, D. & Detto, M. Scale-dependent soil macronutrient heterogeneity reveals effects of litterfall in a tropical rainforest. *Plant Soil*, **391**, 51–61 (2015).
34. Sollins, P. Factors influencing species composition in tropical lowland rain forest: does soil matter? *Ecology* **79**, 23–30 (1998).
35. Tyler, G. & Falkengren-Grerup, U. Soil chemistry and plant performance-ecological consideration. *Progress in Botany* **59**, 634–658 (1998).
36. Yang, J. *et al.* Functional and phylogenetic assembly in a Chinese tropical tree community across size classes, spatial scales and habitats. *Funct. Ecol.* **28**, 520–529 (2014).
37. Hughes, A. R., Stachowicz, J. J. & Williams, S. L. Morphological and physiological variation among seagrass (*Zostera marina*) genotypes. *Oecologia* **159**, 725–733 (2009).
38. Hughes, A. R., Inouye, B. D., Johnson, M. T., Underwood, N. & Vellend, M. Ecological consequences of genetic diversity. *Ecol. Lett.* **11**, 609–623 (2008).
39. Hughes, A. R. & Stachowicz, J. J. Genetic diversity enhances the resistance of a seagrass ecosystem to disturbance. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **101**, 8998–9002 (2004).
40. Whitlock, R. Relationships between adaptive and neutral genetic diversity and ecological structure and functioning: a meta-analysis. *J. Ecol.* **102**, 857–872 (2014).
41. Marshall, J. L. & Camp, C. D. Environmental correlates of species and genetic richness in lungless salamanders (family Plethodontidae). *Acta Oecol.* **29**, 33–44 (2006).
42. Allouche, O., Kalyuzhny, M., Moreno-Rueda, G., Pizarro, M. & Kadmon, R. Area-heterogeneity tradeoff and the diversity of ecological communities. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 17495–17500 (2012).
43. Lan, G. Y. *et al.* Establishment of Xishuangbanna tropical forest dynamics plot: species compositions and spatial distribution patterns. *J. Plant Ecol.* (Chinese version) **32**, 287–298 (2008).
44. Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., da Fonseca, G. A. B. & Kent, J. Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* **403**, 853–858 (2000).
45. Cao, M., Zou, X. M., Warren, M. & Zhu, H. Tropical forests of Xishuangbanna, China. *Biotropica* **38**, 306–309 (2006).
46. Li, H. W. *Flora Reipublicae Popularis Sinicae* (Science Press, Beijing, 1982).
47. Liu, J., Tan, Y. H. & Slik, J. W. F. Topography related habitat associations of tree species traits, composition and diversity in a Chinese tropical forest. *Forest Ecol. Manag.* **330**, 75–81 (2014).
48. Hu, Y. H. *et al.* Dominant species and dispersal limitation regulate tree species distributions in a 20-ha plot in Xishuangbanna, southwest China. *Oikos* **121**, 952–960 (2012).
49. Magurran, A. E. *Ecological Diversity and its Measurement* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1988).
50. Liu, L. *et al.* Isolation and characterization of microsatellite markers in *Beilschmiedia roxburghiana* (Lauraceae). *Applications Plant Sci.* **1**, 1200549 (2013).
51. Doyle, J. J. *DNA protocols for plants-CTAB total DNA isolation* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).
52. Peakall, R. & Smouse, P. E. GenAlEx 6.5: genetic analysis in Excel. Population genetic software for teaching and research—an update. *Bioinformatics* **28**, 2537–2539 (2012).
53. Kalinowski, S. T. HP-RARE 1.0: a computer program for performing rarefaction on measures of allelic richness. *Mol. Ecol. Notes* **5**, 187–189 (2005).
54. Zhdanova, O. L. & Pudovkin, A. I. Nb\_HetEx: A program to estimate the effective number of breeders. *J. Hered.* **99**, 694–695 (2008).
55. Do, C. *et al.* NEESTIMATOR v2: re-implementation of software for the estimation of contemporary effective population size ( $N_e$ ) from genetic data. *Mol. Ecol. Resour.* **14**, 209–214 (2014).

## Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant number 31370267) and the CAS 135 program (XTBG-T01). The authors would like to thank the Xishuangbanna Station for Tropical Rain Forest Ecosystem Studies for logistics assistance during the fieldwork, Luxiang Lin & Wusheng Xiang for advice on data analysis, William Fowler for cleaning English, Thomas Lamy and an anonymous referee for insightful comments on the earlier version of the manuscript.

## Author Contributions

Q.L. and W.X. designed the study; W.X., L.L., J.L., M.C., L.S. and Y.H. collected the data; W.X. and T.H. performed analyses; W.X. and T.H. wrote the first draft of the manuscript; and all authors contributed substantially to revisions.

## Additional Information

**Supplementary information** accompanies this paper at <http://www.nature.com/srep>

**Competing financial interests:** The authors declare no competing financial interests.

**How to cite this article:** Xu, W. *et al.* Soil properties drive a negative correlation between species diversity and genetic diversity in a tropical seasonal rainforest. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 20652; doi: 10.1038/srep20652 (2016).



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in the credit line; if the material is not included under the Creative Commons license, users will need to obtain permission from the license holder to reproduce the material. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



1 **Soil properties drive a negative correlation between species diversity and**  
2 **genetic diversity in a tropical seasonal rainforest**

3

4 Wumei Xu, Lu Liu, Tianhua He, Min Cao, Liqing Sha, Yuehua Hu, Qiaoming Li, Jie Li

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 **Supplementary information:**

28 **Table S1** Soil nutrients and pH of the 15 plots within the FDP.

Code	AN (mg/kg)	EP (mg/kg)	EK (mg/kg)	OM (g/kg)	pH	TN(g/kg)	TP (g/kg)	TK (g/kg)	BD (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )
P1	202.871	10.597	177.840	20.497	5.521	2.031	0.456	9.452	1.162
P2	165.731	6.336	140.289	15.917	5.394	1.702	0.394	8.998	1.181
P3	173.523	10.194	204.579	16.579	5.756	1.803	0.420	11.364	1.238
P4	201.980	5.678	304.415	19.001	5.222	2.038	0.504	18.713	1.123
P5	161.111	3.638	158.177	17.191	5.238	1.826	0.363	11.101	1.168
P6	173.745	6.446	169.916	16.890	5.241	1.760	0.340	11.731	1.155
P7	194.782	6.647	254.104	19.287	4.740	2.013	0.389	12.442	1.067
P8	162.390	8.236	203.091	16.734	5.136	1.554	0.372	8.479	1.222
P9	181.558	3.309	230.422	19.203	4.713	1.806	0.303	10.414	1.082
P10	178.943	3.591	179.225	19.337	5.103	1.910	0.309	8.626	1.106
P11	169.403	2.211	198.868	17.147	4.668	1.778	0.247	9.506	1.213
P12	195.227	5.775	213.366	19.774	4.768	2.033	0.345	10.684	1.126
P13	164.637	1.783	112.716	17.989	4.350	1.742	0.215	9.201	1.130
P14	174.831	2.973	159.261	17.707	4.589	1.771	0.274	10.576	1.167
P15	182.820	3.661	170.558	17.619	4.935	1.798	0.319	9.274	1.127

29

30 AN, ammonium nitrogen; EP, extractable phosphorus; EK, exchangeable potassium; OM,  
 31 organic matter; TN, total nitrogen; TP, total phosphorus; TK, total potassium; and BD, soil  
 32 bulk density.

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43 **Table S2** Pairwise coefficients of correlation between topography and soil properties of each  
 44 plot.

Topography Soil properties	Elevation (m)	Slope	Convex	Aspect	PCS_Topography
AN (mg/kg)	-0.060	0.065	0.001	-0.372	-0.172
EP (mg/kg)	-0.231	-0.128	-0.431	-0.370	-0.470
EK (mg/kg)	-0.259	0.045	0.127	-0.447	-0.200
OM (g/kg)	0.059	0.106	-0.033	-0.361	-0.145
<b>pH</b>	<b>-0.520*</b>	-0.315	<b>-0.689**</b>	-0.423	<b>-0.735**</b>
TN (g/kg)	-0.031	-0.121	-0.076	-0.363	-0.215
TP (g/kg)	-0.439	-0.278	-0.317	-0.376	-0.489
TK (g/kg)	-0.283	-0.231	0.142	-0.252	-0.138
BD (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )	-0.152	0.313	-0.483	0.289	-0.062
PCS_Soil properties	-0.341	-0.173	-0.408	-0.513	-0.457

45  
 46 The PCS\_Topography was calculated as the measure of topography using only the two  
 47 components with eigenvalues above 1 (79.38% of the variance explained, PC1 primarily  
 48 explained elevation, slope and aspect, and PC2 explained convex;  $PC1 = 0.423 \times \text{elevation}' +$   
 49  $0.210 \times \text{convex}' + 0.355 \times \text{slope}' + 0.357 \times \text{aspect}'$ ; and  $PC2 = -0.144 \times \text{elevation}' + 0.761 \times \text{convex}'$   
 50  $-0.520 \times \text{slope}' + 0.241 \times \text{aspect}'$ , “” indicate that data were Z-score transformed with a mean  
 51 of 0 and a standard deviation of 1) in the PCA analysis. All primary variables were positively  
 52 correlated with PCS\_Topography at  $P < 0.01$  except slope ( $r = 0.408$ ;  $P = 0.131$ ). Note the  
 53 aspect was transformed and quantized by shade slope (0.3, approximately 0-45°,  
 54 approximately 315-360°), semi-shade slope (0.5, approx. 45-90°, approx. 270-315°),  
 55 semi-sunny slope (0.8, approx. 90-135°, approx. 225-270°) and sunny slope (1.0, approx.  
 56 135-225°) to show the light and temperature gradient<sup>1</sup>.

57 \* Correlation is significant at  $P < 0.05$  (2-tailed).

58 \*\* Correlation is significant at  $P < 0.01$  (2-tailed).

59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64

65 **Table S3** Pairwise coefficients of correlation showing the effects of topography on tree  
 66 diversity and genetic diversity of *B. roxburghiana* within each plot.

Diversity Topography	$R_a$	S_GD	SW_GD	PC1_GD	$R_{TR}$	S_TD	SW_TD	PC1_TD
Elevation (m)	-0.156	-0.045	0.012	-0.030	-0.296	-0.344	-0.252	-0.257
Slope	0.158	0.240	0.368	0.266	-0.314	-0.343	-0.220	-0.240
Convex	0.424	0.409	0.414	0.422	-0.427	-0.364	-0.354	-0.427
Aspect	-0.013	0.052	0.080	0.040	-0.443	-0.422	-0.207	-0.384
PCS_Topography	0.185	0.245	0.321	0.254	-0.486	-0.508	-0.373	-0.491

67

68 \*. Correlation is significant at  $P < 0.05$  (2-tailed).

69

70


71

72

73


74

75



76

77 **Figure S1** The study area (a), topographic map of the 20 ha FDP (b), and the plots within the  
 78 FDP in Xishuangbanna (c). Note that the geographic map of the study area was created with  
 79 Arcgis 10.0 (<http://www.esri.com/apps/products/arcgis/eval10/evalhelp/index.cfm>). The  
 80 three-dimensional map of the 20 ha FDP and the plot map within the FDP were created using  
 81 the R statistical software package (<http://www.r-project.org/>). The full figure was generated  
 82 with Adobe Photoshop CS 6  
 83 (<http://www.adobe.com/content/dotcom/cn/products/photoshop.html>).



84

85 **Figure S2** Connections between soil properties (soil pH and EP) and the effective population

86 size of *B. roxburghiana* ( $N_e$ , Log-transformed to improve normality); and the connections

87 between the rarefied tree richness and  $N_e$  and its genetic diversity (PCI\_GD) within each

88 plot.

89

90

91

92


93

94

95

96

97




98

99 **Figure S3** Topographical map of the 20 ha FDP and the soil pH and the distribution of  
 100 phosphorus availability across the FDP. These figures indicate the sites near the stream (in the  
 101 valley) in which the soils shared a high pH (b) and the sites with high soil pH that typically  
 102 shared high EP (d) across the 20 ha FDP. Note that figure S3a, b, c & d were created using  
 103 the R statistical software package (Version: Ri386 3.2.0, <http://www.r-project.org/>). The full  
 104 figure was generated with Adobe Photoshop CS 6  
 105 (<http://www.adobe.com/content/dotcom/cn/products/photoshop.html>).

106

107



108

109 **Figure S4** Conceptual models with hypothesized connection pathways from the structural  
 110 equation modeling analysis, with two alternative SEM models. We hypothesize that  
 111 topography primarily affects soil properties (e.g. soil nutrients or pH) (H1)<sup>2</sup> and that soil  
 112 properties (particularly the availability of limiting nutrients) affect tree diversity and genetic  
 113 diversity of *B. roxburghiana* in parallel (H2 and H3; Conceptual model a). Simultaneously,  
 114 the increase in tree diversity within the community could also negatively affect the genetic  
 115 diversity of *B. roxburghiana* by reducing the breadth of the average niche or through other  
 116 mechanisms (H4) and therefore leads to a negative correlation between tree diversity and  
 117 genetic diversity (Conceptual model b). Moreover, the increased genetic diversity of a  
 118 dominant tree species can also negatively affect the tree species diversity within the  
 119 community (H5, Conceptual model c); this conceptual model is the least supported within our



120 study system because the individuals of *B. roxburghiana* were only 1.24% of the total  
121 number of trees within our plots and therefore were likely to have little effect on the other  
122 trees within the community. Two possible models were constructed and are shown here  
123 (Models d and e), but these models did not fit well to the primary data (Model d: CFI= 0.901;  
124 GFI =0.792; RMSEA = 0.220 and Model e: CFI= 0.787; GFI =0.786; RMSEA = 0.353),  
125 indicating that the two models were not appropriate.

126 **Appendix S1** List of trees with a DBH>1 cm recorded across the plots. The ranking  
 127 of the trees within the appendix was obtained by the abundance of the trees within the  
 128 plots we studied.

Code	Trees
1	<i>Pittosporopsis kerrii</i>
2	<i>Parashorea chinensis</i>
3	<i>Knema furfuracea</i>
4	<i>Garcinia cowa</i>
5	<i>Saprosma ternata</i>
6	<i>Baccaurea ramiflora</i>
7	<i>Mezzettiopsis creaghii</i>
8	<i>Nephelium chryseum</i>
9	<i>Cinnamomum bejolghota</i>
10	<i>Dichapetalum gelonioides</i>
11	<i>Mallotus garrettii</i>
12	<i>Beilschmiedia roxburghiana</i>
13	<i>Semecarpus reticulata</i>
14	<i>Phoebe lanceolata</i>
15	<i>Pseuduvaria indochinensis</i>
16	<i>Ficus langkokensis</i>
17	<i>Trigonostemon thyrsoideum</i>
18	<i>Diospyros hasseltii</i>
19	<i>Syzygium latilimbum</i>
20	<i>Leea compactiflora</i>
21	<i>Barringtonia pendula</i>
22	<i>Dysoxylum binectariferum</i>
23	<i>Chisocheton siamensis</i>
24	<i>Sumbaviopsis albicans</i>
25	<i>Ficus fistulosa</i>
26	<i>Xanthophyllum siamense</i>
27	<i>Garcinia lancilimba</i>
28	<i>Harpullia cupanioides</i>
29	<i>Microcos chungii</i>
30	<i>Magnolia henryi</i>
31	<i>Aidia yunnanensis</i>
32	<i>Macropanax dispermus</i>
33	<i>Antidesma montanum</i>
34	<i>Pometia tomentosa</i>
35	<i>Knema globularia</i>
36	<i>Drypetes hoaensis</i>

37	<i>Epiprinus siletianus</i>
38	<i>Sloanea tomentosa</i>
39	<i>Dendrocide sinuata</i>
40	<i>Cleidion brevipetiolatum</i>
41	<i>Lasianthus verticillatus</i>
42	<i>Ardisia thyrsoiflora</i>
43	<i>Mallotus tetracoccus</i>
44	<i>Polyalthia simiarum</i>
45	<i>Castanopsis indica</i>
46	<i>Eurya austroyunnanensis</i>
47	<i>Sarcosperma kachinense</i> var. <i>simondii</i>
48	<i>Symplocos cochinchinensis</i>
49	<i>Pterospermum menglunense</i>
50	<i>Castanopsis megaphylla</i>
51	<i>Macaranga indica</i>
52	<i>Walsura robusta</i>
53	<i>Urophyllum chinense</i>
54	<i>Lasiococca comberi</i>
55	<i>Aquilaria yunnanensis</i>
56	<i>Antidesma japonicum</i>
57	<i>Cryptocarya acutifolia</i>
58	<i>Litsea dilleniifolia</i>
59	<i>Drimycarpus racemosus</i>
60	<i>Diospyros nigrocortex</i>
61	<i>Walsura yunnanensis</i>
62	<i>Sterculia lanceolata</i>
63	<i>Pygeum macrocarpum</i>
64	<i>Canarium tonkinense</i>
65	<i>Beilschmiedia robusta</i>
66	<i>Symplocos sp1</i>
67	<i>Turpinia pomifera</i>
68	<i>Dysoxylum sp1</i>
69	<i>Amoora duodecimantha</i>
70	<i>Gomphandra tetrandra</i>
71	<i>Aglaiia perviridis</i>
72	<i>Mitrephora thorelii</i>
73	<i>Amoora yunnanensis</i>
74	<i>Orophea hainanensis</i>
75	<i>Gironniera subaequalis</i>
76	<i>Ardisia solanacea</i>
77	<i>Miliusa sinensis</i>
78	<i>Artocarpus tonkinensis</i>
79	<i>Mayodendron igneum</i>

80	<i>Oreocnide frutescens</i>
81	<i>Memecylon cyanocarpum</i>
82	<i>Syzygium rockii</i>
83	<i>Alphonsea monogyna</i>
84	<i>Alphonsea hainanensis</i>
85	<i>Oreocnide sp2</i>
86	<i>Garcinia xanthochymus</i>
87	<i>Phlogacanthus curviflorus</i>
88	<i>Neonauclea sp1</i>
89	<i>Metadina trichotoma</i>
90	<i>Sarcosperma kachinense</i>
91	<i>Platea latifolia</i>
92	<i>Litsea baviensis</i>
93	<i>Elaeocarpus austroyunnanensis</i>
94	<i>Horsfieldia kingii</i>
95	<i>Glycosmis lucida</i>
96	<i>Garuga floribunda var. gamblei</i>
97	<i>Engelhardtia spicata</i>
98	<i>Elaeocarpus rugosus</i>
99	<i>Diospyros xishuangbannaensis</i>
100	<i>Tarennoidea wallichii</i>
101	<i>Myristica yunnanensis</i>
102	<i>Garcinia xishuangbannaensis</i>
103	<i>Ficus sp1</i>
104	<i>Canarium subulatum</i>
105	<i>Beilschmiedia sp1</i>
106	<i>Persea tenuipilis</i>
107	<i>Ostodes katharinae</i>
108	<i>Litchi chinensis</i>
109	<i>Ficus chrysocarpa</i>
110	<i>Drypetes sp1</i>
111	<i>Beilschmiedia purpurascens</i>
112	<i>Actinodaphne henryi</i>
113	<i>Memecylon polyanthum</i>
114	<i>Mallotus sp1</i>
115	<i>Lindera metcalfiana</i>
116	<i>Horsfieldia glabra</i>
117	<i>Castanopsis echidnocarpa</i>
118	<i>Artocarpus lakoocha</i>
119	<i>Ardisia quinquegona</i>
120	<i>Saurauia tristyla</i>
121	<i>Phoebe puwenensis</i>
122	<i>Litsea verticillata</i>

123	<i>Horsfieldia pandurifolia</i>
124	<i>Carallia brachiata</i>
125	<i>Alseodaphne petiolaris</i>
126	<i>Neonauclea griffithii</i>
127	<i>Mangifera sylvatica</i>
128	<i>Eriobotrya prinoidea</i>
129	<i>Croton sp2</i>
130	<i>Aporosa yunnanensis</i>
131	<i>Ambroma augusta</i>
132	<i>Syzygium oblatum</i>
133	<i>Glochidion lanceolarium</i>
134	<i>Elaeocarpus varunua</i>
135	<i>Dysoxylum hongkongense</i>
136	<i>Lithocarpus vestitus</i>
137	<i>Lasianthus chrysonneurus</i>
138	<i>Dolichandrone stipulata</i>
139	<i>Colona thorelii</i>
140	<i>Ailanthus triphysa</i>
141	<i>Vitex quinata</i>
142	<i>Tabernaemontana corymbosa</i>
143	<i>Schefflera bodinieri</i>
144	<i>Pavetta hongkongensis</i>
145	<i>Ormosia sp1</i>
146	<i>Oreocnide rubescens</i>
147	<i>Myrsine seguinii</i>
148	<i>Mitrephora maingayi</i>
149	<i>Microtropis discolor</i>
150	<i>Dysoxylum densiflorum</i>
151	<i>Castanopsis hystrix</i>
152	<i>Mallotus barbatus</i>
153	<i>Litsea pierrei</i>
154	<i>Ficus hispida</i>
155	<i>Duperrea pavettifolia</i>
156	<i>Beilschmiedia fasciata</i>
157	<i>Trevesia palmata</i>
158	<i>Syzygium cathayense</i>
159	<i>Phoebe minutiflora</i>
160	<i>Garuga pinnata</i>
161	<i>Ficus auriculata</i>
162	<i>Celtis biondii</i>
163	<i>Actinodaphne obovata</i>
164	<i>Trema orientalis</i>
165	<i>Saurauia cerea</i>

166	<i>Ficus variolosa</i>
167	<i>Ficus subincisa</i>
168	<i>Ficus esquiroliana</i>
169	<i>Elaeocarpus glabripetalus</i>
170	<i>Croton sp3</i>
171	<i>Cinnamomum tenuipilis</i>
172	<i>Alphonsea sp1</i>
173	<i>Aglaia abbreviata</i>
174	<i>Pterospermum lanceifolium</i>
175	<i>Mallotus paniculatus</i>
176	<i>Dysoxylum lukii</i>
177	<i>Drypetes perreticulata</i>
178	<i>Chisocheton paniculatus</i>
179	<i>Bridelia tomentosa</i>
180	<i>Apodytes sp1</i>
181	<i>Xanthophyllum yunnanense</i>
182	<i>Sapium baccatum</i>
183	<i>Meliosma kirkii</i>
184	<i>Litsea panamanja</i>
185	<i>Litsea garrettii</i>
186	<i>Lithocarpus grandifolius</i>
187	<i>Linociera insignis</i>
188	<i>Lagerstroemia tomentosa</i>
189	<i>Horsfieldia tetratepala</i>
190	<i>Heteropanax fragrans</i>
191	<i>Flacourtia ramontchii</i>
192	<i>Ficus hirta</i>
193	<i>Elaeocarpus sphaerocarpus</i>
194	<i>Elaeocarpus apiculatus</i>
195	<i>Diospyros kaki</i>
196	<i>Chukrasia tabularis</i>
197	<i>Bridelia insulana</i>
198	<i>Bischofia javanica</i>
199	<i>Alchornea tiliifolia</i>
200	<i>Trichilia connaroides</i>
201	<i>Terminalia bellirica</i>
202	<i>Schima wallichii</i>
203	<i>Radermachera microcalyx</i>
204	<i>Olea rosea</i>
205	<i>Manglietia forrestii</i>
206	<i>Macropanax undulatus</i>
207	<i>Homalium ceylanicum var. laoticum</i>
208	<i>Ficus oligodon</i>

209	<i>Ficus glaberrima</i>
210	<i>Euodia austrosinensis</i>
211	<i>Dendrocide urentissima</i>
212	<i>Dalbergia sp1</i>
213	<i>Croton argyratus</i>
214	<i>Castanopsis mekongensis</i>
215	<i>Canthium simile</i>
216	<i>Alstonia rostrata</i>
217	<i>Ailanthus fordii</i>
218	<i>Tapiscia yunnanensis</i>
219	<i>Syzygium yunnanense</i>
220	<i>Pavetta polyantha</i>
221	<i>Oxyceros sinensis</i>
222	<i>Mussaenda macrophylla</i>
223	<i>Mitrephora wangii</i>
224	<i>Litsea monopetala</i>
225	<i>Glycosmis pentaphylla</i>
226	<i>Ficus cyrtophylla</i>
227	<i>Cryptocarya sp1</i>
228	<i>Croton kongensis</i>
229	<i>Calophyllum polyanthum</i>
230	<i>Aquilaria sp1</i>
231	<i>Aphananthe cuspidata</i>
232	<i>Alstonia scholaris</i>
233	<i>Acer garrettii</i>
234	<i>Xanthophyllum sp1</i>
235	<i>Ulmus lanceifolia</i>
236	<i>Tetrameles nudiflora</i>
237	<i>Syzygium cumini</i>
238	<i>Sapindus rarak</i>
239	<i>Pseuderanthemum malaccense</i>
240	<i>Pouteria grandifolia</i>
241	<i>Phoebe sp1</i>
242	<i>Paramichelia baillonii</i>
243	<i>Meliaceae sp1</i>
244	<i>Mallotus philippinensis</i>
245	<i>Litsea sp2</i>
246	<i>Laurocerasus phaeosticta</i>
247	<i>Homalium sp1</i>
248	<i>Ficus sp3</i>
249	<i>Ficus benjamina</i>
250	<i>Euodia glabrifolia</i>
251	<i>Elaeocarpus sp1</i>

252	<i>Elaeocarpus prunifolioides</i>
253	<i>Debregeasia longifolia</i>
254	<i>Dalbergia sp2</i>
255	<i>Cylindrokelupha yunnanensis</i>
256	<i>Croton sp1</i>
257	<i>Cinnamomum chartophyllum</i>
258	<i>Aphananthe aspera</i>
259	<i>Anthocephalus chinensis</i>
260	<i>Adenanthera pavonina</i>
261	<i>Turpinia montana</i>
262	<i>Toona ciliata</i>
263	<i>Syzygium fruticosum</i>
264	<i>Stereospermum colais</i>
265	<i>Scleropyrum wallichianum</i>
266	<i>Schefflera fengii</i>
267	<i>Pygeum topengii</i>
268	<i>Pandanus furcatus</i>
269	<i>Oreocnide sp1</i>
270	<i>Mussaenda multinervis</i>
271	<i>Morus macroura</i>
272	<i>Morinda angustifolia</i>
273	<i>Melia toosendan</i>
274	<i>Medinilla septentrionalis</i>
275	<i>Manglietia sp1</i>
276	<i>Mangifera sp1</i>
277	<i>Macaranga henryi</i>
278	<i>Litsea sp1</i>
279	<i>Litsea euosma</i>
280	<i>Lithocarpus truncatus</i>
281	Lauraceae sp1
282	<i>Lasianthus rigidus</i>
283	<i>Gmelina arborea</i>
284	<i>Ficus sp2</i>
285	<i>Ficus semicordata</i>
286	<i>Ficus sagittata</i>
287	<i>Ficus altissima</i>
288	<i>Euodia sp1</i>
289	<i>Engelhardtia roxburghiana</i>
290	<i>Elaeocarpus sp3</i>
291	<i>Elaeocarpus sp2</i>
292	<i>Dysoxylum sp2</i>
293	<i>Diplospora mollissima</i>
294	<i>Dalbergia fusca</i>



295	<i>Cinnamomum tamala</i>
296	<i>Cinnamomum mollifolium</i>
297	<i>Cinnamomum glanduliferum</i>
298	<i>Celtis timorensis</i>
299	<i>Celtis philippensis</i>
300	<i>Capparis sabiaefolia</i>
301	<i>Callicarpa bodinieri</i>
302	<i>Broussonetia papyrifera</i>
303	<i>Brassaiopsis glomerulata</i>
304	<i>Aporosa villosa</i>
305	<i>Apodytes dimidiata</i>
306	<i>Amoora sp1</i>
307	<i>Albizia procera</i>
308	<i>Albizia chinensis</i>
309	<i>Aidia sp1</i>
310	<i>Aglaiia sp1</i>
311	<i>Acrocarpus fraxinifolius</i>

129

130

131 **Reference**

132 1. Liu, S. L. *et al.* The relationship between landform, soil characteristics and plant  
 133 community structure in the Danglingshan mountain region, Beijing. *Acta*  
 134 *Phytoecol. Sin.* **27**, 496-502 (2003).

135 2. Sollins, P. Factors influencing species composition in tropical lowland rain forest:  
 136 does soil matter? *Ecology* **79**, 23-30 (1998).

137

138