

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Priority effects between annual and perennial plants

Niv DeMalach*¹ (nivdemalach@gmail.com)

Tadashi Fukami¹

¹Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, USA

* Corresponding author: Tel. 1-650-721-1711, Fax: 1-560-723-6132

Keyword: alternative stable states, competition-colonization tradeoff, fecundity, functional traits, succession, life-history theory, transient dynamics, grassland, establishment-longevity tradeoff, positive feedback

ABSTRACT

1. In many grassland communities, the identity of dominant species may be determined by initial frequency owing to priority effects. Yet, the conditions for these priority effects remain unclear.
2. Focusing on interactions between annual and perennial plants, we used a simulation model to investigate how longevity, fecundity, and the competitive ability of seedlings might affect the probability of equilibrium priority effects (alternative stable states) and transient priority effects (alternative transient states).
3. The model suggests that establishment-longevity tradeoff, in which annuals have competitive advantage over perennial seedlings, is a necessary condition for equilibrium priority effects. Equilibrium priority effects also require low fecundity in both annuals and perennials and small fitness differences, as determined by their relative fecundity, survival probability, and competitive ability at the seedling stage.
4. Transient priority effects need only small fitness differences. Furthermore, the model indicate that transient priority effects could last several decades under a range of the parameter space, exceeding the duration of typical experiments and observations.
5. Synthesis: Our results suggest that equilibrium priority effects driven by a life-history trade-off are possible but may be uncommon because they require unrealistically low fecundity. In contrast, transient priority effects should be more likely. Previous empirical findings of priority effects in grasslands may mostly indicate alternative transient, rather than stable, states, or other mechanisms than a life-history tradeoff.

INTRODUCTION

Recently, there is renewed interest in priority effects, situations where species abundances within a community are determined by initial densities (Fukami, 2015). Priority effects are commonly studied within the framework of multiple equilibria (alternative stable states, hereafter equilibrium priority effects), where positive feedback increases the abundance of the more common species (Ke & Letten, 2018; Suding, Gross, & Houseman, 2004). Additionally, initial conditions could affect community dominance for many years due to long-lasting transient dynamics (Fukami & Nakajima, 2013; Hastings et al., 2018) despite eventual convergence into a single equilibrium (alternative transient states *sensu* Fukami & Nakajima 2011, hereafter transient priority effects).

Many factors can create the positive feedback required for priority effects in plant communities, including fire (Staver, Archibald, & Levin, 2011), soil microbes (positive plant-soil feedback, van der Putten et al., 2013), and modification of the physical environment (ecosystem engineering, Jones, Lawton, & Shachak, 1997). In addition, life-history tradeoffs among species (including establishment, fecundity, and mortality) can also contribute to priority effects (Fukami, 2015), but the conditions for priority effects caused by life-history tradeoffs are not well understood. The common Lotka-Volterra approach lumps together fecundity, establishment, and mortality, and therefore does not allow the role of life-history tradeoffs to be investigated. Furthermore, modelling that does consider life-history tradeoffs often focuses on conditions for species coexistence rather than priority effects (Calcagno, Mouquet, Jarne, & David, 2006; Crawley & May, 1987; Rees & Long, 1992; Tilman, 1994; Yu & Wilson, 2001).

In this paper, we use a simulation model to investigate when life-history tradeoffs cause priority effects. Our focus is on priority effects between annual and perennial grassland plants, which are thought to be common, especially in water limited systems (Corbin & D'Antonio, 2004; Jackson, 1985; Larios, Hallett, & Suding, 2017; Laycock, 1991; Stromberg & Griffin, 1996; T P Young, Zefferman, Vaughn, & Fick, 2015). We suspected that priority effects between annuals and perennials would be driven by a tradeoff between longevity and establishment, with annuals having competitive advantage over perennial seedlings. We focus on this tradeoff because evidence suggests that perennials' advantage of higher longevity often comes at the cost of lower competitive ability at the establishment stage (Bartolome & Gemmill, 1981; Dyer & Rice, 1997; Hamilton, Holzappel, & Mahall, 1999; Young et al., 2015). Annuals tend to germinate earlier than perennials, conferring an initial size advantage (Vaughn & Young, 2015; Wainwright & Cleland, 2013). Moreover, perennials often have lower specific leaf area, leaf mass fraction, and specific root length (Garnier, 1992; Vico, Manzoni, Nkurunziza, Murphy, & Weih, 2016). All these traits increase longevity, but reduce resource acquisition and therefore competitive ability during the establishment phase.

METHODS

We built an individual-based, spatially implicit model describing population dynamics of plants where the local site is comprised of number of patches (cells), each of which can accommodate only one adult individual (e.g. Mouquet et al. 2002). In this modeling approach, plants compete for empty cells but the specific limiting resource is implicit for increasing generality. This approach is well suited for studying life-history trade-offs (Calcagno et al., 2006; Gonzalez &

Loreau, 2009; Hastings, 1980) as it explicitly considers fecundity and mortality. Our specific model describes the dynamics of two species, one annual (semelparous) and one perennial (iteroparous), interpreted as two dominant species or two functional groups with minor differences within each group. We highlight, that mortality in this model includes both natural mortality as well as any type of disturbance (e.g. fire, grazing, agriculture).

In the model, we simulate three processes each year: establishment (competition over recruitment sites), seed production, and mortality. First, at the beginning of the growing season, establishment of new recruits (annuals and perennial seedlings) occurs in patches with no adult perennials (i.e. adult perennials are not affected by annuals, Larios et al. 2017). The number of seeds of each species arriving to an empty patch is a random Poisson number with expected value (and SD) equal to the species' mean seed rain. Mean seed rain is the per-capita net fecundity times the proportion of cells occupied by a given plant species. The yearly probability of an empty cell to be occupied by an annual is determined by the following expression:

$\frac{C \cdot S_a(t)}{C \cdot S_p(t) + S_a(t)}$, where S_a and S_p represent the number of viable seeds of the perennials and annuals

and C is a weighting factor describing establishment differences. When $C = 1$, establishment is completely neutral (i.e. the probability of winning is determined only based on seed density).

Higher values of C imply that the annual seeds have higher competitive ability than perennials during the establishment phase.

The next process after establishment is seed production by annuals and adult perennials assuming perennial seedlings cannot produce seeds (Larios et al., 2017; Mordecai, Molinari, Stahlheber, Gross, & D'Antonio, 2015). The net per-capita fecundity for annuals and perennials (F_a , F_p) is the number of viable seeds per individual of annuals and adult perennials.

Biologically, this parameter represents the combined effect of a number of processes including seed production, seed viability, germination fraction, seed predation, and pathogens. For simplicity the model does not incorporate seed dormancy.

The last process each year is mortality occurring after seed set (i.e. after the end of the growing season). The yearly survival probability could be viewed as a result of an external factors (e.g. disturbance, drought) or as an endogenic demographic trait of the perennials. Survival probability differs between perennial seedlings (S_s) and perennial adults (S_p). Seedlings that do not die become adults the next year (Larios et al., 2017; Mordecai et al., 2015). All annuals die at the end of each growing season.

The fecundity of the annual species (F_a) is a free parameter of the model. The fecundity of the perennial species (F_p) is a function of annual fecundity and the fecundity coefficient (β): $F_p = \beta \cdot F_a$. This coefficient, ranging from zero to one, determines the strength of fecundity advantage. When $\beta = 1$, the two species have equal fecundity. As β decreases, the perennial species suffers from a greater fecundity disadvantage. This modeling choice allows us to disentangle the effect of fecundity advantage (determined by β) and the effect of varying the net fecundity of both species simultaneously (determined by F_a).

The parameter space we investigated (Table 1) was designed to represent a wide range of demographic traits from various systems around the world. We assumed that annual net fecundity (taking into account both seed production and germination fraction) was in the range of 3-300 (Dirks, Dumbur, Lienin, Kleyer, & Grünzweig, 2017; Jakobsson & Eriksson, 2000; Wainwright, HilleRisLambers, Lai, Loy, & Mayfield, 2018) and perennial adult survival was 0.8-0.99 (Fowler, 1995; Mordecai et al., 2015; Tuomi et al., 2013). Since preliminary

investigations showed that the effect of varying perennial seedling survival was qualitatively similar to varying adult survival, we report only the effects of the latter, i.e. we assumed that seedling survival was always 0.3 (following Mordecai et al., 2015). We did not find any relevant data for parameterizing C or β and therefore investigated a wide range (1-30 and 0.3-1, respectively).

Table 1. Parameters of the models

Symbol	Description (units)	Value(s)
C	Competitive difference among seedlings (unitless)	1,3,30
F_a	Net fecundity of annuals (viable seeds/year)	3,10,300
β	Ratio between annual and perennial fecundities (fraction)	0.3-1
S_s	Survival probability of perennial seedlings (fraction/year)	0.3
S_p	Survival probability of adult perennials (fraction/year)	0.8-0.99

For each combination of parameters, we investigated two initial conditions, annuals as residents (90% of the community) and as invaders (10% of the community). We chose this high abundance of invaders to reduce the possibility of extinction by demographic stochasticity (although preliminary simulation showed that the model results were robust to the exact portion of the invader).

Our operational definition of priority effects in this paper is situations in which dominance depends on initial conditions (i.e. when the annual species has abundance above 50% when

started with higher initial abundance but below 50% when starting in low abundance). We investigated model results at several time points, to study both equilibrium and transient priority effects. In all simulation runs, the community was comprised of 10,000 patches in order to reduce the effects of drift. We estimated the equilibrium conditions by fitting an asymptotic function describing the proportion of priority effects as a function of time ($y = b_0 + \frac{b_1 \cdot x}{b_2 + x}$). After 1000 timesteps, all simulations have (asymptotically) reached the equilibrium (Fig. S1).

RESULTS

In accordance with previous predictions (Charnov & Schaffer, 1973; Iwasa & Cohen, 1989), our model predicts that dominance by annuals decreases as the survival of adult perennial increases (Fig. 1), i.e. annuals are favored by increasing disturbance. Nonetheless, dominance is also affected by initial frequency under some conditions, leading to equilibrium (Fig. 1c-d) or transient (Fig. 1e-f) priority effects.




Figure 1. Representative examples of population dynamics of annuals (blue lines) and perennials (red lines) as affected by initial conditions and adult survival probability (S_p). In the left column, annuals are the majority of the initial community (90%). In the right column, annuals are the minority initially (10%). Low survival probability (0.85) leads to annual dominance (upper panels). Intermediate survival ($S_p=0.95$) leads to equilibrium priority effects. Under high levels of adult survival, there are transient priority effects (for decades), although the perennial species dominates in the long-term. Parameter values: $S_s = 0.3$, $F_a = 5$, $\beta = 0.5$, $C = 10$

Over the long term (Fig. 2), priority effects (marked in blue in Fig. 2) occur in the intermediate parameter space between annual dominance and perennial dominance, where fitness differences (*sensu* Chesson 2000) are small. In addition, equilibrium priority effects require the establishment-longevity tradeoff (i.e. $C > 1$) and a low fecundity level for both species (as

explained above F_a affects the fecundity of both species simultaneously). Within 1000 years, the less dominant species always reaches abundance below 1%, which we interpret as competitive exclusion (preliminary simulations showed that complete exclusion depends on the arbitrary choice of the number of patches).




Figure 2. Proportion of patches occupied by the annual species ('a' in the legend) after 1000 years as affected by competitive differences among seedlings (C), annual fecundity (F_a), fecundity ratio (β), and adult survival (S_p). The results (of each parameter combination) are the mean proportion of two simulations starting from different initial abundances (10% and 90% of annuals). Black regions represent perennial dominance while yellow regions represent annual dominance. The cases where the dominant species depends on initial conditions (i.e. when annuals comprised more than 50% in one simulation and less than 50% in the other simulation) are categorized as priority effects.

The parameter region of transient priority effects is larger. Transient priority effects require neither competitive advantage of annuals over perennial seedlings nor low fecundity (Fig. 3).

The proportion of the parameter space that shows transient priority effects slowly declined over

time from c. 37% after 30 years to c. 16% after 100 years and down to c. 8% at equilibrium (Fig. 4, S1-S5). We obtained qualitatively similar results when we introduced environmental variability to the model (Fig. S6-S8).




Figure 3. Proportion of patches occupied by the annual species ('a' in the legend) after 30 years. Symbols are as in Fig. 2.




Figure 4. Proportion of communities experiencing priority effects (where dominance is determined by initial conditions), annual dominance, and perennial dominance as a function of simulation time (based on the total parameter space). Circles are simulation results and solid lines indicate asymptotic predictions ($y = b_0 + \frac{b_1 \cdot x}{b_2 + x}$). The horizontal blue dashed line represents the asymptotic proportion of priority effects ($b_0 + b_1$). Note the logarithmic scale of the x-axis. Estimated parameters for priority effects are: $b_0 = 296, b_1 = -288, b_2 = 3$. Estimated parameters for annuals are: $b_0 = -72, b_1 = ,116, 0, b_2 = 6$. Estimated parameters for perennials are: $b_0 = -2938, b_1 = 2987, 0, b_2 = 0$.

DISCUSSION

Taken together, our analysis suggested two previously unrecognized conditions for priority effects in grassland plants. First, equilibrium priority effects require low fecundity and establishment-longevity tradeoff. Second, this trade-off is not necessary for transient yet long-lasting priority effects, which require only small fitness difference. Below, we elaborate on these conditions for priority effects, place our results in the context of existing knowledge from previous studies, and discuss limitations and implications of our findings.

Conditions for priority effects

Coexistence and equilibrium priority effects occur when fitness difference is small (Ke & Letten, 2018), which is found, in our case, between the parameter space of annual dominance and that of perennial dominance (e.g. when mortality levels are intermediate). In this intermediate parameter space, negative feedback (negative frequency dependence) would lead to coexistence by allowing both species to increase when rare, whereas positive feedback (positive frequency dependence) would disadvantage species with low abundance, leading to priority effects (Fukami, Mordecai, & Ostling, 2016; Ke & Letten, 2018). Our model produces only priority effects, so here we seek to identify the model assumption that caused positive feedback.

One assumption of our model is higher fecundity of the annual species (Charnov & Schaffer, 1973; Iwasa & Cohen, 1989). The resultant fecundity-longevity tradeoff could not produce positive or negative feedbacks, and therefore the species with the highest life-time fecundity should always win in the absence of any additional tradeoff (Agren, & Fagerstrom, 1984). In accordance, priority effects occur even when this tradeoff is relaxed (i.e. when fecundity ratio, β , is 1 in Fig. 2).

Another assumption of our model is competitive advantage of annuals over perennial seedlings (Bartolome & Gemmill, 1981; Dyer & Rice, 1997; Vaughn & Young, 2015). This assumption leads to an establishment-longevity tradeoff, which we find here to be a necessary condition for equilibrium priority effects. The establishment advantage of annuals reduces the population growth rate of perennials when they are rare since their seedlings are outcompeted by the annual species (the probability of a patch being empty from annual seeds by chance is low due to the high density of annuals). Conversely, high cover of perennials reduces the population growth rate of the annuals by reducing the availability of open patches which are necessary for their recruitment each year. Since annuals are short-lived, they are particularly prone to extinction when none of their seedlings can find a vacant patch.

In addition, the model suggests that simultaneously decreasing net fecundity of both species (as affected by F_a) increases the likelihood of priority effects. In our model, priority effects are driven by low recruitment of the rare species. Increasing fecundity reduces this recruitment limitation, thereby decreasing priority effects. In Lotka-Volterra models, however, there is no effect of intrinsic growth rate on priority effects (Ke & Letten, 2018). This difference is probably attributable to the coupling of mortality and fecundity into the intrinsic growth rate in the models.

The low net fecundity required for equilibrium priority effects raises the question how likely they occur in real plants, given that many herbaceous plants produce more than 1000 seeds per individual (Jakobsson & Eriksson, 2000). In some cases, however, low levels of net fecundity may arise through the high probability of seed loss caused by pathogens, mechanic decay, and seed predation. The proportion of seeds becoming seedlings can indeed be low, especially in

species with high seed output (Ben-Hur, Fragman-Sapir, Singer, & Kadmon, 2012; Muller-Landau, 2010).

Our results indicate a large parameter space of transient priority effects lasting several decades (i.e. longer than most long-term experiments). These priority effects do not require an establishment-longevity tradeoff, although they are more likely (i.e. occur in a larger parameter space) when the tradeoff exists (Fig. 3, Fig. S1-4). The parameters that were used included some arbitrary choices due to data limitation, but our results suggest that slow convergence to equilibrium (see also Fukami & Nakajima 2013) may be a common phenomenon than generally recognized (see Fig. S1).

Comparison with previous studies

Unlike this study, most previous studies considered the tradeoff between longevity and competitive advantage as a mechanism of coexistence, not priority effects (Chave, Muller-Landau, & Levin, 2002; Tilman, 1994). This difference is likely to reflect different assumptions about competition. In our model, the better competitor (annual) cannot invade a community dominated by the inferior competitor (perennial), since seeds cannot replace established adults (replacement competition, *sensu* Yu & Wilson 2001). In contrast, in previous models (Chave et al., 2002; Tilman, 1994), seeds of the best competitor immediately replace established individuals of the inferior competitor (displacement competition, *sensu* Yu & Wilson 2001) and therefore the less competitive species cannot prevent invasion. In the context of annual-perennial competition, evidence suggests that our replacement assumption (where seedlings cannot replace established adults) may be more realistic (Calcagno et al., 2006; Yu & Wilson, 2001).

Two previous models have also assumed that seedlings cannot replace adults (Baudena, D'Andrea, & Provenzale, 2010; Kisdi & Geritz, 2003). Although the focus of these models was conditions for coexistence under competition-colonization tradeoff, they found equilibrium priority effects in part of their parameter space. These studies did not investigate priority effects in detail, but we suspect that the conditions are qualitatively similar to ours as priority effects were found in a parameter space where fecundity was low and the better competitor had lower longevity. Hence, the establishment-longevity trade-off could be a main mechanism of priority effects beyond the scope of annual-perennial interactions (e.g. in Savanna, Baudena et al. 2010).

Empirical tests of priority effects among annual and perennial plants remain scarce. Seabloom et al.'s (2003) study is probably the most direct test to date. Using seed addition (1,000 seeds/m²), they showed that perennials were able to invade annual-dominated communities and vice versa, a result interpreted as evidence against equilibrium priority effects. However, their experimental manipulation removed recruitment limitation, which is a necessary condition for equilibrium priority effects in our model. An alternative approach is to estimate demographic parameters of co-occurring annual and perennial species to build a system-specific model. This approach yielded variable results. A model of grassland in northern California (Uricchio, Daws, Spear, & Mordecai, 2019) suggested that annuals would be better competitors and therefore capable of invading perennial monocultures, whereas a model for southern California grasslands suggested that competitive outcomes would depend on nitrogen availability (Larios et al., 2017). Under low nitrogen availability, perennials dominate; under high availability, annuals dominate; and under intermediate levels, priority effects are expected. This result is consistent with our model's prediction that priority effects occur under intermediate conditions between annual and perennial dominance.

Limitations

One limitation of our approach is the implicit assumption that annuals and perennials have the same adult size (since only one individual can occupy each patch). We used this common modeling approach (Calcagno et al., 2006; Chave et al., 2002; Crawley & May, 1987; Rees & Long, 1992; Tilman, 1994) in order to facilitate comparison with other models. Nonetheless, since plants vary in size, our model should be viewed as having the extent of cover, rather than the number of individuals, as the focal unit of abundance. Therefore, system-specific parametrization of simple models like ours should focus on quantifying fecundity per unit area rather than per capita and incorporate vegetative growth (i.e. the capability of perennials to fill space without the need for establishment).

Another simplifying assumption of our model is the absence of seed dormancy. A similar model of annual-perennial interactions has shown that simply incorporating dormancy into the model (i.e. a constant portion of seeds germinate every year) has modest effects on the model predictions (Rees & Long, 1992). However, this model has also suggested that if dormancy is induced by the presence of established perennials (i.e. annual seeds are able to wait for the right time and replace dead perennials) many predictions could change (Rees & Long, 1992). We speculate that such selective germination may further reduce the probability for equilibrium priority effects but may also increase the length of transient dynamics. Furthermore, interactions between seed bank and environmental variability may lead to complex outcomes depending on the specific characteristics of seed dormancy (Brown & Venable, 1986; Rees & Long, 1992), interactions between seed dormancy and other traits (Venable & Brown, 1988), and temporal autocorrelation in environmental conditions (Danino, Shnerb, Azaele, Kunin, & Kessler, 2016). We found that a simple addition of environmental variability does not affect the model

predictions (SI Appendix, Fig. S6-S8), but the complex interactions between seed bank and environmental variability in time and space remain to be fully investigated.

Lastly, our model focuses on interactions between two species that represent two functional groups with minor interspecific variability (or two dominant species from each group). However, high variation within the two groups may lead to deviation from the predicted patterns e.g. in cases where there is one highly competitive species that is able to outcompete all the rest regardless of initial conditions.

Conclusion

We have shown that equilibrium priority effects driven by life-history tradeoff are theoretically possible but may be uncommon in annual-perennial interactions, given that they require unrealistically low fecundity. This finding does not necessarily mean that priority effects between annual and perennials cannot occur, as there are many other mechanisms that can lead to priority effects besides life-history tradeoffs (e.g. soil feedback, fire feedback). A challenge for future empirical studies is to disentangle the different mechanisms. System-specific parameterizations of our simple model should be useful for this purpose. We have also shown here that initial dominance of annuals may often last several decades even when perennials eventually dominate, frequently resulting in transient, yet long-lasting priority effects. This second finding may be more relevant to understanding real grassland communities, provided that most communities rarely reach equilibrium.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Eyal Ben-Hur, Inga Dirks, and Ove Eriksson for providing us with raw data from their studies for estimation of the fecundity range of annual and perennial species. Marc Cadotte, Callie Chappell, Po-Ju Ke, Jesse Miller, Erin Mordecai, Suzanne Ou, and three anonymous reviewers provided comments. This work was supported by the Rothschild fellowship (N.D.) and the Terman Fellowship of Stanford University (N.D. and T.F.). We have no conflict of interests.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

N.D. and T.F. conceived and designed the study; N.D. performed the simulations. N.D. and T.F. wrote the manuscript.

DATA ACCESSIBILITY

All simulation codes are available on FigShare: <https://figshare.com/s/fb208ec97ca7dd0f250f>

REFERENCES

- Ågren, G. I., Fagerström, T., Agren, G. I., & Fagerstrom, T. (1984). Limiting Dissimilarity in Plants: Randomness Prevents Exclusion of Species with Similar Competitive Abilities. *Oikos*, 43(3), 369. doi: 10.2307/3544155
- Bartolome, J. W., & Gemmill, B. (1981). The ecological status of *Stipa pulchra* (poaceae) in california. *Madroño*, Vol. 28, pp. 172–184. doi: 10.2307/41424320
- Baudena, M., D'Andrea, F., & Provenzale, A. (2010). An idealized model for tree-grass coexistence in savannas: the role of life stage structure and fire disturbances. *Journal of*

Ecology, 98(1), 74–80. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2745.2009.01588.x

Ben-Hur, E., Fragman-Sapir, O., Hadas, R., Singer, A., & Kadmon, R. (2012). Functional trade-offs increase species diversity in experimental plant communities. *Ecology Letters*, 15(11), 1276–1282. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2012.01850.x

Brown, J. S., & Venable, D. L. (1986). Evolutionary Ecology of Seed-Bank Annuals in Temporally Varying Environments. *The American Naturalist*, 127(1), 31–47. doi: 10.1086/284465

Calcagno, V., Mouquet, N., Jarne, P., & David, P. (2006). Coexistence in a metacommunity: the competition-colonization trade-off is not dead. *Ecology Letters*, 9(8), 897–907. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2006.00930.x

Charnov, E. L., & Schaffer, W. M. (1973). Life-history consequences of natural selection: Cole's result revisited. *The American Naturalist*, 107(958), 791–793.

Chave, J., Muller-Landau, H. C., & Levin, S. A. (2002). Comparing classical community models: theoretical consequences for patterns of diversity. *The American Naturalist*, 159(1), 1–23. doi: 10.1086/324112

Chesson, P. (2000). Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 31, 343–366. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.31.1.343

Corbin, J. D., & D'Antonio, C. M. (2004). Competition between native perennial and exotic annual grasses: Implications for an historical invasion. *Ecology*, 85(5), 1273–1283. doi: 10.1890/02-0744

Crawley, M. J., & May, R. M. (1987). Population dynamics and plant community structure:

competition between annuals and perennials. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 125(4), 475–489.

Danino, M., Shnerb, N. M., Azaele, S., Kunin, W. E., & Kessler, D. A. (2016). The effect of environmental stochasticity on species richness in neutral communities. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 409, 155–164. doi: 10.1016/J.JTBI.2016.08.029

De Meester, L., Vanoverbeke, J., Kilsdonk, L. J., & Urban, M. C. (2016). Evolving Perspectives on Monopolization and Priority Effects. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 31(2), 136–146. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2015.12.009

Dirks, I., Dumbur, R., Lienin, P., Kleyer, M., & Grünzweig, J. M. (2017). Size and Reproductive Traits Rather than Leaf Economic Traits Explain Plant-Community Composition in Species-Rich Annual Vegetation along a Gradient of Land Use Intensity. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 8, 891. Retrieved from <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpls.2017.00891>

Dyer, A. R., & Rice, K. J. (1997). Intraspecific and diffuse competition: the response of *Nassella pulchra* in a California grassland. *Ecological Applications*, 7(2), 484–492. doi: 10.1890/1051-0761(1997)007[0484:IADCTR]2.0.CO;2

Fowler, N. L. (1995). Density-dependent demography in two grasses: a five-year study. *Ecology*, 76(7), 2145–2164. doi: 10.2307/1941689

Fukami, T. (2015). Historical Contingency in Community Assembly: Integrating Niches, Species Pools, and Priority Effects. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, Vol 46, 46, 1–23. doi: 10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-110411-160340

- Fukami, Tadashi, Mordecai, E. A., & Ostling, A. (2016). A framework for priority effects. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 27(4), 655–657. doi: 10.1111/jvs.12434
- Fukami, Tadashi, & Nakajima, M. (2013). Complex plant-soil interactions enhance plant species diversity by delaying community convergence. *Journal of Ecology*, 101(2), 316–324. doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.12048
- Garnier, E. (1992). Growth analysis of congeneric annual and perennial grass species. *Journal of Ecology*, 665–675.
- Gonzalez, A., & Loreau, M. (2009). The Causes and Consequences of Compensatory Dynamics in Ecological Communities. In *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics: Vol. 40. Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics* (pp. 393–414). doi: 10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.39.110707.173349
- Hamilton, J. G., Holzapfel, C., & Mahall, B. E. (1999). Coexistence and interference between a native perennial grass and non-native annual grasses in California. *Oecologia*, 121(4), 518–526. doi: 10.1007/s004420050958
- Hastings, A. (1980). Disturbance, coexistence, history, and competition for space. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 18(3), 363–373. doi: 10.1016/0040-5809(80)90059-3
- Hastings, A., Abbott, K. C., Cuddington, K., Francis, T., Gellner, G., Lai, Y.-C., ... Zeeman, M. Lou. (2018). Transient phenomena in ecology. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 361(6406), eaat6412. doi: 10.1126/science.aat6412
- Iwasa, Y., & Cohen, D. (1989). Optimal growth schedule of a perennial plant. *The American Naturalist*, 133(4), 480–505.

- Jackson, L. E. (1985). Ecological Origins of California's Mediterranean Grasses. *Journal of Biogeography*, 12(4), 349. doi: 10.2307/2844866
- Jakobsson, A., & Eriksson, O. (2000). A comparative study of seed number, seed size, seedling size and recruitment in grassland plants. *Oikos*, 88(3), 494–502.
- Jones, C. G., Lawton, J. H., & Shachak, M. (1997). Positive and negative effects of organisms as physical ecosystem engineers. *Ecology*, 78(7), 1946–1957. doi: 10.1890/0012-9658(1997)078[1946:paneoo]2.0.co;2
- Ke, P.-J., & Letten, A. D. (2018). Coexistence theory and the frequency-dependence of priority effects. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2(11), 1691–1695. doi: 10.1038/s41559-018-0679-z
- Kisdi, E., & Geritz, S. A. H. (2003). On the coexistence of perennial plants by the competition-colonization trade-off. *The American Naturalist*, 161(2), 350–354. doi: 10.1086/345855
- Larios, L., Hallett, L. M., & Suding, K. N. (2017). Where and how to restore in a changing world: a demographic-based assessment of resilience. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 54(4), 1040–1050. doi: 10.1111/1365-2664.12946
- Laycock, W. A. (1991). Society for Range Management Stable States and Thresholds of Range Condition on North American Rangelands: A. In *Source: Journal of Range Management* (Vol. 44). Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/4002738?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
- Mordecai, E. A., Molinari, N. A., Stahlheber, K. A., Gross, K., & D'Antonio, C. (2015). Controls over native perennial grass exclusion and persistence in California grasslands invaded by annuals. *Ecology*, 96(10), 2643–2652. doi: 10.1890/14-2023.1.sm

- Mouquet, N., Moore, J. L., & Loreau, M. (2002). Plant species richness and community productivity: why the mechanism that promotes coexistence matters. *Ecology Letters*, 5(1), 56–65. doi: 10.1046/j.1461-0248.2002.00281.x
- Muller-Landau, H. C. (2010). The tolerance-fecundity trade-off and the maintenance of diversity in seed size. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(9), 4242–4247. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0911637107
- Rees, M., & Long, M. J. (1992). Germination biology and ecology of annual plants. *American Naturalist*, 139(3), 484–508. doi: 10.1086/285340
- Seabloom, E. W., Harpole, W. S., Reichman, O. J., & Tilman, D. (2003). Invasion, competitive dominance, and resource use by exotic and native California grassland species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100(23), 13384–13389. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1835728100
- Staver, A. C., Archibald, S., & Levin, S. A. (2011). The global extent and determinants of savanna and forest as alternative biome states. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 334(6053), 230–232. doi: 10.1126/science.1210465
- Stromberg, M. R., & Griffin, J. R. (1996). Long-Term Patterns in Coastal California Grasslands in Relation to Cultivation, Gophers, and Grazing. *Ecological Applications*, 6(4), 1189–1211. doi: 10.2307/2269601
- Suding, K. N., Gross, K. L., & Houseman, G. R. (2004). Alternative states and positive feedbacks in restoration ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 19(1), 46–53. doi: 10.1016/J.TREE.2003.10.005

- Tilman, D. (1994). Competition and biodiversity in spatially structured habitats. *Ecology*, 75(1), 2–16. doi: 10.2307/1939377
- Tuomi, J., Crone, E. E., Gremer, J. R., Jäkäläniemi, A., Lesica, P., Pedersen, B., & Ramula, S. (2013). Prolonged dormancy interacts with senescence for two perennial herbs. *Journal of Ecology*, 101(3), 566–576. doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.12086
- Uricchio, L. H., Daws, S. C., Spear, E. R., & Mordecai, E. A. (2019). Priority Effects and Nonhierarchical Competition Shape Species Composition in a Complex Grassland Community. *The American Naturalist*, 000–000. doi: 10.1086/701434
- van der Putten, W. H., Bardgett, R. D., Bever, J. D., Bezemer, T. M., Casper, B. B., Fukami, T., ... Wardle, D. A. (2013). Plant-soil feedbacks: the past, the present and future challenges. *Journal of Ecology*, 101(2), 265–276. doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.12054
- Vaughn, K. J., & Young, T. P. (2015). Short-term priority over exotic annuals increases the initial density and longer-term cover of native perennial grasses. *Ecological Applications*, 25(3), 791–799. doi: 10.1890/14-0922.1
- Venable, D. L., & Brown, J. S. (1988). The selective interactions of dispersal, dormancy, and seed size as adaptations for reducing risk in variable environments. *American Naturalist*, 131(3), 360–384.
- Vico, G., Manzoni, S., Nkurunziza, L., Murphy, K., & Weih, M. (2016). Trade-offs between seed output and life span - a quantitative comparison of traits between annual and perennial congeneric species. *New Phytologist*, 209(1), 104–114. doi: 10.1111/nph.13574
- Wainwright, C. E., & Cleland, E. E. (2013). Exotic species display greater germination plasticity

and higher germination rates than native species across multiple cues. *Biological Invasions*, 15(10), 2253–2264. doi: 10.1007/s10530-013-0449-4

Wainwright, C. E., HilleRisLambers, J., Lai, H. R., Loy, X., & Mayfield, M. M. (2018). Distinct responses of niche and fitness differences to water availability underlie variable coexistence outcomes in semi-arid annual plant communities. *Journal of Ecology*. doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.13056

Young, T P, Zefferman, E. P., Vaughn, K. J., & Fick, S. (2015). Initial success of native grasses is contingent on multiple interactions among exotic grass competition, temporal priority, rainfall and site effects. *Aob Plants*, 7. doi: 10.1093/aobpla/plu081

Young, Truman P., Stuble, K. L., Balachowski, J. A., & Werner, C. M. (2017). Using priority effects to manipulate competitive relationships in restoration. *Restoration Ecology*, 25, S114–S123. doi: 10.1111/rec.12384

Yu, D. W., & Wilson, H. B. (2001). The competition-colonization trade-off is dead; long live the competition-colonization trade-off. *The American Naturalist*, 158(1), 49–63. doi: 10.1086/320865

SUPPORTING INFORMATION




Fig. S1. Proportion of communities experiencing priority effects (where dominance is determined by initial conditions), annual dominance and perennials dominance as a function of simulation time (note the logarithmic scale) as affected by competitive differences (C) and annual fecundity (F_a). Results are based on combining all levels of fecundity ratio [β] and adult survival [S_p]). Circles are the simulation results and solid lines represent curve fitting of an asymptotic function ($y = b_0 + \frac{b_1 \cdot x}{b_2 + x}$). The dashed blue line represents the equilibrium proportion of priority effects (estimated as $b_0 + b_1$).




Fig. S2. Proportion of patches occupied by the annual species (a) after 50 timesteps (years). Symbols are as in Fig. 2.




Fig. S3. Proportion of patches occupied by the annual species (a) after 100 timesteps (years). Symbols are as in Fig. 2.




Fig. S4. Proportion of patches occupied by the annual species (a) after 200 timesteps (years). Symbols are as in Fig. 2.




Fig. S5. Proportion of patches occupied by the annual species (a) after 500 timesteps (years). Symbols are as in Fig. 2.

Appendix S1

We investigated whether environmental variability reduces the strength of priority effects. Hence, we assumed that competitive difference (C) among new recruits varies among years. We chose to vary competitive difference because variation in fecundity always lead to extinction of the annual species (since there is no seed bank in the model). Competitive differences were a random log-normal variable with a mean of 1, 3, or 30, and SD of 3 for the associated normal distributions (Fig. S6). This approach allowed incorporating variation in time while keeping the mean conditions as in the main simulations (as presented in Fig. 2). We found that the effects of environmental variations were minor (Fig. S7-S8).




Fig. S6. Histograms of competitive differences (C) in the simulation (note the logarithmic scale) where environmental variability was incorporated. (a) mean = 1 (b) mean = 3 (c) mean = 30. These values refer to the upper, middle and lower panels in Fig. S5.




Fig. S7. Proportion of patches occupied by the annual species (a) after 1000 timesteps (years) in a temporally variable environment. Competitive differences in each timestep were drawn from log normal distributions with (geometric) means of 1, 10, and 30. Symbols are as in Fig. 2.




Fig. S8. Proportion of communities experiencing priority effects (where dominance is determined by initial conditions), annual dominance and perennial dominance as a function of simulation time (based on the total parameter space) in a temporally variable environment. Competitive differences in each timestep were drawn from log normal distributions with (geometric) means of 1, 10, and 30. Symbols are as in Fig. 4. Estimated parameters for priority effects are: $b_0 = 581, b_1 = -275, b_2 = 2$. Estimated parameters for annuals are: $b_0 = -182, b_1 = ,233, 0, b_2 = 3$. Estimated parameters for perennials are: $b_0 = -10674, b_1 = 10716, b_2 = 0$.