

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The soil seed bank can buffer long-term compositional changes in annual plant communities

Niv DeMalach^{1,2*}, Jaime Kigel², Marcelo Sternberg¹

¹ School of Plant Sciences and Food Security, George S. Wise Faculty of Life Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

² Institute of Plant Sciences and Genetics in Agriculture, Robert H. Smith Faculty of Agriculture, Food and Environment, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Rehovot, Israel

* Corresponding author: Nivdemalach@mail.huji.ac.il

Keywords: community composition, temporal stability, temporal variability, climate change, community dynamics, dormancy, drylands, rainfall gradient, resilience, seed size, soil seed bank, succession,

ABSTRACT

1. Ecological theory predicts that the soil seed bank stabilises the composition of annual plant communities in the face of environmental variability. However, long-term data on the community dynamics in the seed bank and the standing vegetation are needed to test this prediction.
2. We tested the hypothesis that the composition of the seed bank undergoes lower temporal variability than the standing vegetation in a nine-year study in Mediterranean, semi-arid, and arid ecosystems. The composition of the seed bank was estimated by collecting soil cores from the studied sites on an annual basis. Seedling emergence under optimal watering conditions was measured in each soil core for three consecutive years, to account for seed dormancy.
3. In all sites, the composition of the seed bank differed from the vegetation throughout the years. Small-seeded and dormant-seeded species had a higher frequency in the seed bank than in the standing vegetation. In contrast, functional group membership (grasses vs. forbs) did not explain differences in species frequency between the seed bank and the vegetation after controlling for differences between grasses and forbs in seed mass and seed dormancy.
4. Contrary to predictions, the magnitude of year-to-year variability (the mean compositional dissimilarity between consecutive years) was not lower in the seed bank than in the vegetation in all sites. However, long-term compositional trends in the seed bank were weaker than in the vegetation in the Mediterranean and semi-arid sites. In the arid site where year-to-year variability was highest, no long-term trends were observed.

5. Synthesis: The effect of the seed bank on the temporal variability of the vegetation in annual communities depends on site conditions and time scale. While the year-to-year variability of the seed bank is similar to the vegetation, the soil seed bank can buffer long-term trends.

INTRODUCTION

Understanding the factors driving community stability is a key goal in ecology (Cleland et al., 2013; Collins, 2000; de Mazancourt et al., 2013; Komatsu et al., 2019). This goal is increasingly important in times of abrupt shifts in species composition driven by climate and land-use changes (Harrison, Gornish, & Copeland, 2015; Liu et al., 2018; Song et al., 2018; Swenson, Hulshof, Katabuchi, & Enquist, 2020). For plant communities, the natural storage of seeds in the soil (hereafter seed bank) is considered essential for compositional stability because seeds are highly resistant to environmental hazards (Angert, Huxman, Chesson, & Venable, 2009; Cohen, 1966; Ooi, 2012).

Soil seed banks are especially important in ecosystems with high rainfall variability, such as drylands (Huang, Yu, Guan, Wang, & Guo, 2016; Kigel, 1995). Currently, drylands cover 45% of the world's land surface (Právělie, 2016) and their cover is predicted to increase to 56% by the end of this century (Huang et al., 2016). Many drylands are dominated by annual plants that germinate each year from the seed bank (Angert et al., 2009; Tielborger et al., 2014). These communities are frequently characterized by high temporal variability in species composition driven by asynchronized fluctuations among populations of coexisting species (Bar-Massada & Hadar, 2017; Hobbs, Yates, & Mooney, 2007). Theoretically, the seed bank can buffer two types of compositional changes, namely year-to-year variability (Cohen, 1966) and long-term community changes (Koopmann, Müller, Tellier, & Živković, 2017). Year-to-year variability may result from

unpredictable differences among years in environmental conditions (e.g. precipitation, temperature). Long-term community changes are often caused by a trended variation in environmental conditions or management practices. Climate change models predict changes in both the mean and the variance of climatic conditions which will probably affect both year-to-year variability and long-term trends (Donat, Lowry, Alexander, O’Gorman, & Maher, 2016; Huang et al., 2016). Similarly, global land-use changes lead to directional changes in community composition (e.g. succession) but also affect year-to-year variability (Allan et al., 2014).

The role of the soil seed bank in buffering year-to-year environmental variability can vary across ecosystems. Classical theory predicts that a higher dormancy fraction will be favored in systems with high rainfall uncertainty such as deserts, while lower dormancy will be favored in more predictable environments (Cohen, 1966; Venable & Brown, 1988). However, the persistence of seeds in the soil is affected not only by dormancy but also by other factors such as seed predation, pathogen attack, and mechanical decay (Kigel, 1995; Thompson, 1987).

While ecological theory highlights the role of the seed bank in stabilising plant communities (Cohen, 1966; Venable & Brown, 1988), long-term monitoring of seed bank dynamics are scarce. Most empirical studies have focused on the short-term dynamics (<3 years) of seed banks (Bossuyt & Honnay, 2008; Osem, Perevolotsky, & Kigel, 2006) while several studies have used chronosequences as a substitute for the lack of long-term data from the same location (Dalling & Denslow, 1998; Török et al., 2018). We know of only one study that analyzed long-term seed bank dynamics, focusing on the ten most abundant species within a desert annual community (Venable & Kimball, 2012). Here, we compared temporal compositional trends in the seed bank and ensuing standing vegetation in annual plant communities spanning Mediterranean, semi-arid and arid ecosystems.

We hypothesized that year-to-year variability in the composition of the vegetation will increase with increasing aridity (because rainfall variability increases with aridity) while the seed bank will be more stable (Cohen, 1966; Venable & Brown, 1988), i.e. the role of the seed bank in buffering year-to-year variability will increase with aridity. Additionally, assuming that the seed bank is a major driver of the high stability of Middle-Eastern communities (Sternberg et al., 2015; Tielborger et al., 2014), we predicted that the seed bank will experience weaker long-term compositional trends than the vegetation.

A further aim of the study was to explain the differences in composition between the seed bank and the vegetation using a trait-based approach. Small-seeded species typically have higher fecundity ('the size-number tradeoff', Jakobsson & Eriksson, 2000), and higher persistence in the soil (Funes, Basconcelo, Díaz, & Cabido, 1999; Thompson, Band, & Hodgson, 1993; Thompson, Bakker, Bekker, & Hodgson, 1998). However, small-seeded species often have lower survival at the seedling stage (Ben-Hur, Fragman-Sapir, Hadas, Singer, & Kadmon, 2012; Metz et al., 2010). Therefore, we predicted that small-seeded species will be relatively more common in the seed bank than in the vegetation. We also hypothesized that species with higher seed dormancy will be more common in the seed bank (Thompson, 1987)

METHODS

Study sites

The study was conducted at three sites located along a rainfall gradient (ca. 100 km length) in Israel. All sites were located over the same calcareous bedrock on south-facing slopes at similar altitudes and experienced similar mean annual temperatures that range from 17.7 to 19.1 °C. The length of the growing season is determined by the rainfall, usually commencing in October–

November and ending in April–May, with shorter seasons in drier sites. A detailed description of the sites appears in previous publications (Harel, Holzapfel, & Sternberg, 2011; Tielborger et al., 2014).

Briefly, the three sites represent three different climatic regions: Mediterranean (Matta LTER; N 31° 42'; E 35° 03'), semi-arid (N 31°23'; E 34°54'), and arid (N 30° 52', E 34° 46'). Thus, the sites have relatively low species overlap in terms of Jaccard's similarity (Mediterranean–semi-arid: 0.64, Mediterranean–arid: 0.18, and semi-arid–arid: 0.22, see Tables S1–S3 for full species lists). The long-term mean annual rainfall in these three sites is 540, 300, and 90 mm with a coefficient of variation (CV) of 30%, 37%, and 51% respectively (Tielborger et al., 2014). The mean annual rainfall during the years of the study (2000/2001–2009/2010) was 502, 245, and 79 mm with a CV of 24%, 32%, and 48% respectively. All sites were fenced against grazing (by sheep and goats) in 2001. Before the establishment of the experimental plots, grazing intensity was high in the semi-arid site, intermediate in the Mediterranean site, and negligible in the arid site (M. Sternberg, personal observations). Each site included five plots of 250 m² (10 × 25 m) with a minimum distance of 10 m between plots. The Mediterranean and semi-arid sites included additional plots with rainfall manipulations that were not considered in the current manuscript.

Vegetation and seed bank sampling

The sampling of the vegetation was conducted annually at peak biomass – late March in the arid and semi-arid sites, and mid-April in the Mediterranean site, between the growing seasons of 2000/2001 and 2009/2010 (except in 2004/2005). Ten random samples (20 x 20 cm quadrats) of the herbaceous vegetation were taken in the open patches (i.e. patches without shrub cover) in each of the five plots (with a minimum distance of 1m from the plot's edges). Each sample was collected

by cutting the vegetation at the ground level and brought to the lab. There, plants were sorted by species, and individuals of each species were counted.

The composition of the seed bank (including both transient and persistent fractions) was estimated by collecting soil cores on an annual basis (2000–2009) in September before the onset of the rainy season. Ten random soil samples were taken from each plot independently of the vegetation samples because the collection of the soil samples is likely to affect the vegetation in that particular sampling area (and vice versa). Soil cores were sampled over an area of 5×5 cm with a soil depth of 5 cm and included surface standing plant litter (c.1-2 cm). Each sample was brought to the lab, thoroughly mixed, and stones and coarse roots were removed. The soil and plant litter was spread in drained plastic trays (12×14 cm, 6.5 cm depth) on a gauze sheet placed on top of a 3-cm-thick layer of perlite. The thickness of the soil layer varied between 0.75 and 1 cm. The trays were irrigated during winter (October-March) in a net-house at the Botanical Garden of Tel Aviv University. Emerging seedlings were identified, counted, and continuously removed until no further emergence was observed a few weeks after the end of irrigation. The overall germinable seed bank from each year was assessed by repeating the germination procedure for each soil sample for three consecutive growing seasons.

Seedling emergence under optimal watering conditions was followed in each soil core for three consecutive years to account for seed dormancy (i.e., seeds that do not germinate after one growing season; Harel, Holzapfel, & Sternberg, 2011). This approach enables a better estimate of the abundance of species with high dormancy fraction. During summer, seed bank trays were naturally dried in the net-house to mimic typical hot, dry field conditions. At the end of the third season, each soil sample was passed through 5- and 0.30-mm sieves, to retrieve non-germinated seeds that were counted under a microscope (80× magnification). Since the number of retrieved non-

germinated seeds was very low (<1% of the total number of emerged seedlings) and the procedure very time-consuming, this fraction of the seed bank was not considered in further analyses (see Harel, Holzapfel, & Sternberg, 2011).

The species lists for the three sites are found in the supporting information (Tables S1-S3).

Statistical Analyses

Our analysis focuses on the annual species that comprise most of the community in all sites in terms of biomass, abundance, and richness (Tielborger et al., 2014). The seed bank composition was estimated by pooling all seedlings that germinated from each soil core during the three consecutive years of germination. We also performed additional, separate analyses for each year of germination (see Appendix S1 for details). All analyses were based on the Bray-Curtis index (Bray & Curtis, 1957) as a measure of dissimilarity among years and/or between the vegetation and the seed bank. We chose this index which is based on relative abundance data because presence-absence indices are sensitive to variability in the total density (no. of individuals per area) and the spatial scale of the sampling unit (Chase & Knight, 2013). Both the sampling-unit area and total density differed between the seed bank and the vegetation.

One major challenge in temporal analyses is that the dissimilarity in species composition across years can result from sampling errors instead of real temporal variability, especially in heterogenous landscapes (Kalyuzhny et al., 2014). We aimed to minimize the effects of sampling errors among replicates (due to spatial heterogeneity) by aggregating all vegetation and seed bank samples from each year in each site and taking the mean abundance of each species.

To visualize the temporal trends in species composition, we used non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS), the most robust ordination method (Minchin, 1987). We used PERMANOVA tests ('adonis' function of the 'vegan' R package, Oksanen et al., 2019) to test whether the

community composition varies among years and between the seed bank and the vegetation. Additionally, we tested for homogeneity of dispersion ('betadisp' function of the 'vegan' R package), one of the assumptions of PERMANOVA tests (Alekseyenko, 2016).

The year-to-year variability was estimated based on the mean distance among all possible pairs of consecutive sampling years. The differences between year-to-year variability in the seed bank and vegetation were compared with a permutation t-test using the 'coin' R package (Hothorn, Winell, Hornik, van de Wiel, & Zeileis, 2019).

To investigate long-term compositional variability we applied a time-lag analysis (Collins, Micheli, & Hartt, 2000) i.e. regressing time-lag (the temporal distance between each pair of years [log transformed]) and compositional dissimilarity (Bray-Curtis). The time-lag analysis is the temporal analog of the commonly used distance-decay approach for spatial analysis of compositional similarity (Nekola & White, 1999). The advantage of the time-lag approach is that it does not require using the first year as a reference point for all other years and allows more accurate estimation because of several replications for each distance class. In this analysis, the slope of the time-lag compositional distance relationship indicates the rate of long-term directional change in composition. We compared the slopes in the vegetation and the seed bank using the method proposed by Nekola & White (1999). This approach, which incorporates the dependence among replications of pairwise distance, was implemented using the 'Simba' R package (Jurasinski & Retzer, 2012)

We investigated whether species' traits can explain differences in composition between the seed bank and the vegetation, as well as differences in temporal trajectories, focusing on seed mass, seed dormancy, and functional group (grasses vs. forbs). These traits were chosen because of their importance for community assembly in the region (DeMalach, Ron, & Kadmon, 2019; Harel et

al., 2011). Seed mass data were taken from a previous study in the same sites (Harel, Holzapfel, & Sternberg, 2011) and were available for more than 90% of the individuals sampled. Additionally, a *seed dormancy* index was calculated for each species based on variability in the number of seedlings found in the soil cores during the three consecutive germination years: $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{(i-1) \cdot A_i}{2T}}$, where i is the year of germination (not the year of sampling), A_i is the abundance of the species in year i (all soil samples combined) and T is the total abundance of the species (summed over all years). The dormancy index is bounded between zero (when all seeds germinated during the first year) and one (when all seeds germinated during the third year). The square root reduces the skewness of the index resulting from the steep decrease in the number of germinating seeds over the three years. The dormancy index cannot capture dormancy for more than three years, but such long-term dormancy was negligible under net-house conditions (see ‘Vegetation and seed bank sampling’ section above).

We related species traits and species composition using affinity indices (DeMalach et al., 2019) as a solution for the problem of inflated type I error of the community-weighted mean approach (Miller, Damschen, & Ives, 2018; Peres-Neto, Dray, & ter Braak, 2017). We defined *seed bank affinity* as species’ relative abundance in the seed bank compared with the sum of relative abundances in the vegetation and seed bank:

$$\text{seed bank affinity} = \frac{A_{\text{seedbank}}}{A_{\text{seedbank}} + A_{\text{vegetation}}}$$

Here, A_{seedbank} and $A_{\text{vegetation}}$ represent the relative abundance of the species in the seed bank and the vegetation, respectively (all years pooled together). The seed bank affinity ranges from zero (when a species appears only in the vegetation) to one (appears only in the seed bank). The very rare species that appeared only in the seed bank or in the vegetation were not included in the

analyses of seed bank affinity to eliminate the possibility that differences result from low detection rate (see Tables S4–S6 for sample size in the different analyses).

We estimated the effect of the three major traits on seed bank affinity using linear models for species with relative abundance higher than 0.5% to avoid bias caused by rare species with more stochastic occurrences. In the regression, seed mass (mg) was \log_e transformed and the functional group was incorporated as a dummy variable coded one for grasses and zero for forbs. For each regression, we report both the coefficients without transformation (raw estimates) and standardized estimates (when both the explanatory variables and the dependent variable are standardized by subtracting their mean from each observation and then dividing by the standard deviation). Standardized coefficients enable comparison among variables with different units.

RESULTS

The composition of the seed bank (all three germination years pooled) significantly differed from the composition of the vegetation in the Mediterranean (pseudo- $F_{(1,15)} = 2.6$, $P = 0.016$), semi-arid (pseudo- $F_{(1,15)} = 3.9$, $P = 0.003$) and arid (pseudo- $F_{(1,15)} = 4.3$, $P < 0.001$) sites (Fig. 1, Fig. S1–S3). Heterogeneity of dispersion between the seed bank and the vegetation was found to be significant in the semiarid community (pseudo- $F_{(1,15)} = 5.1$, $P = 0.04$) and insignificant in the Mediterranean (pseudo- $F_{(1,15)} = 2.08$, $P = 0.17$) and the arid (pseudo- $F_{(1,15)} = 0.5$, $P = 0.48$) communities.




Figure 1: Community composition in the seed bank (red circles and polygon) and vegetation (green triangles and polygon) in the three sites represented using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) based on the Bray–Curtis index. Numbers represent years of sampling (1 – 2001, 2 – 2002, ..., 10 – 2010). The pink and cyan polygons represent the minimal compositional space occupied by the seed bank and the vegetation. The red and the green arrows represent the temporal trajectories of the community composition of the seed bank and the vegetation. (a) Mediterranean site, stress = 0.15. (b) Semi-arid site, stress = 0.08 (c) Arid site, stress = 0.13.




Figure 2. The effects of seed mass, seed dormancy index, and functional group membership (coded zero for forbs and one for grasses) on species' seed bank affinity. Effect size (points) represents standardized regression coefficients (see Table S4 for a detailed summary). Species' seed bank affinity (relative abundance in the seed bank compared with that in the vegetation) is negatively affected by seed mass and positively affected by seed dormancy. Error bars represent confidence intervals. The dashed line represents zero effect. $N_{(\text{Mediterranean})} = 80$, $N_{(\text{Semi-arid})} = 43$, $N_{(\text{Arid})} = 14$.

Species' seed bank affinity (relative abundance in the seed bank compared with the vegetation) was negatively affected by seed mass and positively affected by seed dormancy in the semiarid and arid sites (Fig. 2, Table S4), i.e. small-seeded species and species with higher seed dormancy were more common in the soil seed bank than in the vegetation (but significance levels were marginal in the arid site, Table S4). In the Mediterranean site, seed bank affinity was negatively affected by seed mass and unaffected by dormancy. Plant functional group membership (grasses vs. forbs) did not affect seed bank affinity in any of the sites (Fig. 2, Table S4). Species' seed mass and their dormancy index were not correlated in any of the sites (Fig. S7).

The results did not support our hypothesis that the seed bank undergoes lower year-to-year variability than the vegetation (Fig. 3, blue triangles). Differences in year-to-year variability (dissimilarity between pairs of consecutive years) between the seed bank and the vegetation were not significant in both the semiarid ($Z_{(1,10)} = 0.69$, $P = 0.49$) and arid ($Z_{(1,10)} = -0.99$, $P = 0.32$) sites. In the Mediterranean site, year-to-year variability was even slightly higher in the seed bank than in the vegetation ($Z_{(1,10)}$, $P = 0.013$).

Long term directional trends in community composition occurred in the Mediterranean and the semi-arid sites as indicated by the positive relationship between time-lag (temporal distance among years) and compositional distance (Fig. 3a–d, Fig. S8a–d). In contrast, there were no significant relationships between time-lag and compositional distance in the arid site (Fig. 3e–f, Fig. S8e–f).

The rates of long-term changes in the Mediterranean and semi-arid sites (the slopes in Fig. 3) were lower in the seed bank compared with the vegetation ($P = 0.013$ and $P < 0.001$, respectively) thereby supporting the hypothesis that the seed bank is more resistant to directional changes than the vegetation. The difference in the slopes was highest in the semi-arid site (about 3.5 times

steeper) leading to a larger divergence in composition between the seed bank and vegetation with time (Fig. S9).




Figure 3: Compositional distance (Bray–Curtis index) in the vegetation (left panels) and seed bank (right panels) as a function of time-lag (temporal distance between years of sampling including all possible pairs). The blue triangle represents the mean compositional distance between two consecutive years (year-to-year variability). The slope of the relationship indicates the rate of long-term trends. (a, b) Mediterranean site (c, d) Semi-arid site. (e, f) Arid site. The x-axis has a logarithmic scale. Trendlines were added when the relationship between time-lag and compositional distance was statistically significant ($P < 0.05$)

DISCUSSION

Our findings support the hypothesis that the seed bank is more resistant than the vegetation to long-term compositional shifts in both the Mediterranean and the semi-arid sites. However, the hypothesis of lower year-to-year variability in the seed bank was not supported in any of the sites. Additionally, we demonstrated that the composition of the seed bank differs from the standing vegetation because small-seeded and species with high dormancy fraction are overly represented in the seed bank.

Differential composition in the seed bank and the vegetation

The PERMANOVA demonstrates major differences in composition between the vegetation and the seed bank in all sites. In the case of the semi-arid site, the results should be treated with caution because the assumption of homogenous dispersion has been violated. Nonetheless, such violation is unlikely to inflate type I error in our study because we had a balanced sample size in the seed bank and the vegetation (see details in Alekseyenko, 2016).

We aimed to explain differences in composition using three major traits: seed mass, seed dormancy, and functional group membership. Seed bank affinity was partially explained by these traits ($R^2 = 0.07$, $R^2 = 0.18$, $R^2 = 0.54$, for the Mediterranean, semi-arid and arid sites, respectively), but additional traits could have increased the explanatory power.

Dormant-seeded species were more common in the seed bank than in the vegetation (Fig. 2), as expected for organisms that spend most of their life as seeds and only one growing season as developed plants. Our dormancy index was based on dormancy in net-house conditions with constant irrigation during the growing season which depleted the seed bank after three consecutive growing seasons (see Methods). In natural conditions, however, dormancy could be much longer

because of spatial heterogeneity in soil conditions, greater year-to-year variation in rainfall conditions, and other differences between natural and experimental conditions (Kigel, 1995; Thompson, 1987). Therefore, we believe that the association between dormancy and seed bank affinity is even stronger than implied by our analyses.

The finding that small-seeded species were relatively more common in the seed bank (Fig. 2) could be related to several factors. First, small-seeded species often have higher fecundity and are less sensitive to seed predation (Jakobsson & Eriksson, 2000; Lebrija-Trejos, Lobato, & Sternberg, 2011; Petry, Kandlikar, Kraft, Godoy, & Levine, 2018) resulting in higher abundance in the seed bank. At the same time, small-seeded seedlings are more sensitive to abiotic stress (Moles & Westoby, 2004; Muller-Landau, 2010) and size-asymmetric competition (DeMalach et al., 2019) which may reduce their abundance in the vegetation compared with the seed bank. Furthermore, seed size is often correlated with persistence in the soil (Funes, Basconcelo, Díaz, & Cabido, 1999; Thompson, Band, & Hodgson, 1993; Thompson, Bakker, Bekker, & Hodgson, 1998) and with environmental factors controlling germination, particularly light conditions (Kigel, 1995; Thompson, 1987).

In our main analyses, we focused on the total seed bank which included all seeds that germinated during three consecutive watering years after the collection. Comparison of the separate analyses of seeds germinating in the first year only and total seed banks (all years pooled, Fig. 1; see Appendix S1 for details) showed similar patterns of germination (Fig. S4) because the proportion of seeds germinating during the first year was much higher than in the following two years. Moreover, differences between the seed bank and the vegetation were found also when we compared the vegetation to the second and the third years of germination (Fig. S5–S6). In sum, our conclusion that the seed bank undergoes similar year-to-year variability in composition as the

vegetation but slower rates of long-term shifts is valid for the total seed bank, as well as the seed bank estimated for each germination year separately (Fig. S10–S12).

All our analyses were based on the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity index which is mostly affected by changes in the relative abundance of common species. The common species in the three sites were found in both the seed bank and the vegetation (Tables S1-S3). However, in each site, some rare species were exclusively found in either the seed bank or the vegetation. Such patterns could be related to the four times larger area of the vegetation samples or the higher density of the seed bank.

The role of the seed bank in buffering year-to-year variability

We used the mean compositional distance among each pair of consecutive years as an indicator of year-to-year variability. This type of short-term variability is often caused by stochastic differences among years in climatic conditions but can also be affected by directional trends (e.g. succession). In our case, we believe that year-to-year variability is mostly related to stochastic variability among years since in the overwhelming majority of cases we did not find a significant overall temporal trend in year-to-year variability (Fig. S13).

Year-to-year variability in the composition of both the seed bank and the vegetation was highest in the arid site which is probably related to the high rainfall variability in this site. However, we caution that despite our aim to minimize alternative sources of variability among sites (see methods), it is difficult to reach generalizations based on three ecosystems.

In contrast with our prediction, year-to-year variability in the seed bank was not lower than in the vegetation. We attribute this finding to species-specific variability in fecundity among years (Venable, 2007) which may lead to high compositional variability in the seed bank. Furthermore, seed bank composition could be affected by variability in dormancy among years due to

fluctuations in temperature, soil moisture, granivores, and pathogens (Venable, 2007). Nonetheless, our findings do not imply that the seed bank does not play a role in buffering temporal fluctuations in the vegetation. Even though the relationships between seed bank and vegetation dynamics are highly complex, seed banks can still serve as ‘insurance’ against population extinctions even when species abundance varies among years (Fischer & Stocklin, 1997).

The role of the seed bank in buffering long-term shifts

We supported the hypothesis that seed bank composition is more resistant to long-term changes than the vegetation by showing lower rates of directional changes in both the Mediterranean and the semi-arid sites (Fig. 3). Directional changes in composition in both sites (Fig. 1, 3) are probably related to the removal of livestock grazing during the establishment of the research sites (Golodets, Kigel, & Sternberg, 2010; Osem, Perevolotsky, & Kigel, 2004; Tielborger et al., 2014). The trend was stronger in the semi-arid site than in the Mediterranean site where past grazing was more intense, while grazing intensity was negligible in the arid site.

Conclusions

Investigating the drivers of compositional stability is of major importance in times of major climate and land-use changes (Damschen, Harrison, & Grace, 2010; Duprè et al., 2010; Harrison et al., 2015; Komatsu et al., 2019). Several studies have speculated that patterns of vegetation stability are related to seed bank stability. For example, the high drought sensitivity of the vegetation in Californian grasslands was attributed to a depleted seed bank (Harrison, LaForgia, & Latimer, 2018). Furthermore, it has been shown that drought and nitrogen deposition deplete seed banks in several grasslands (Basto et al., 2018, 2015). Conversely, the high stability of Middle-Eastern

annual communities to grazing and rainfall changes was attributed to the high resistance of their seed bank to these environmental factors (Sternberg, Gutman, Perevolotsky, & Kigel, 2003; Sternberg et al. 2017; Tielborger et al., 2014). Our results provide empirical support for the above assertion. We have demonstrated that in the Mediterranean and the semi-arid communities, the seed bank undergoes weaker long-term shifts. Therefore, we argue that a better understanding of the buffering role of soil seed banks under climate change will significantly improve our predictions for the future distribution and persistence of annual plant communities.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are most grateful to Claus Holzapfel, Hadas Parag, Danny Harel, and Danny Wallach for soil seed bank sampling, and to Irit Konsens for vegetation sampling. We thank two anonymous reviewers and the handling editor for constructive comments on this manuscript. Michael Kalyuzhny provided comments on the temporal analyses. The study was supported by the GLOWA Jordan River project and funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), in collaboration with the Israeli Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST). ND was supported by the Tel Aviv University Postdoctoral Fellowship. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Alekseyenko, A. V. (2016). Multivariate Welch t-test on distances. *Bioinformatics*, 32(23), 3552–3558. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btw524
- Allan, E., Bossdorf, O., Dormann, C. F., Prati, D., Gossner, M. M., Tschardtke, T., ... Fischer, M. (2014). Interannual variation in land-use intensity enhances grassland multidiversity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(1), 308–313. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1312213111

- Angert, A. L., Huxman, T. E., Chesson, P., & Venable, D. L. (2009). Functional tradeoffs determine species coexistence via the storage effect. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *106*(28), 11641–11645. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0904512106
- Bar-Massada, A., & Hadar, L. (2017). Grazing and temporal turnover in herbaceous communities in a Mediterranean landscape. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, *28*(2), 270–280. doi: 10.1111/jvs.12489
- Basto, S., Thompson, K., Grime, J. P., Fridley, J. D., Calhim, S., Askew, A. P., & Rees, M. (2018). Severe effects of long-term drought on calcareous grassland seed banks. *Npj Climate and Atmospheric Science*, *1*(1), 1. doi: 10.1038/s41612-017-0007-3
- Basto, S., Thompson, K., Phoenix, G., Sloan, V., Leake, J., & Rees, M. (2015). Long-term nitrogen deposition depletes grassland seed banks. *Nature Communications*, *6*(1), 1–6. doi: 10.1038/ncomms7185
- 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
- Bossuyt, B., & Honnay, O. (2008). Can the seed bank be used for ecological restoration? An overview of seed bank characteristics in European communities. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, *19*(6), 875–884. doi: 10.3170/2008-8-18462
- Bray, J. R., & Curtis, J. T. (1957). An ordination of the upland forest communities of southern wisconsin. *Ecological Monographs*, *27*(4), 325–349. doi: 10.2307/1942268
- Chase, J. M., & Knight, T. M. (2013). Scale-dependent effect sizes of ecological drivers on biodiversity: why standardised sampling is not enough. *Ecology Letters*, *16*, 17–26. doi: 10.1111/ele.12112
- Cleland, E. E., Collins, S. L., Dickson, T. L., Farrer, E. C., Gross, K. L., Gherardi, L. A., ... Suding, K. N. (2013). Sensitivity of grassland plant community composition to spatial vs. temporal variation in precipitation. *Ecology*, *94*(8), 1687–1696. doi: 10.1890/12-1006.1
- Cohen, D. (1966). Optimizing reproduction in a randomly varying environment. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *12*(1), 119–129. doi: 10.1016/0022-5193(66)90188-3
- Collins, S L. (2000). Disturbance frequency and community stability in native tallgrass prairie. *American Naturalist*, *155*(3), 311–325. doi: 10.1086/303326
- Collins, Scott L., Micheli, F., & Hartt, L. (2000). A method to determine rates and patterns of variability in ecological communities. *Oikos*, *91*(2), 285–293. doi: 10.1034/j.1600-0706.2000.910209.x
- Dalling, J. W., & Denslow, J. S. (1998). Soil seed bank composition along a forest chronosequence in seasonally moist tropical forest, Panama. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, *9*(5), 669–678. doi: 10.2307/3237285
- Damschen, E. I., Harrison, S., & Grace, J. B. (2010). Climate change effects on an endemic-rich edaphic flora: resurveying Robert H. Whittaker's Siskiyou sites (Oregon, USA). *Ecology*, *91*(12), 3609–3619. doi: 10.1890/09-1057.1
- de Mazancourt, C., Isbell, F., Larocque, A., Berendse, F., De Luca, E., Grace, J. B., ... Loreau, M. (2013). Predicting ecosystem stability from community composition and biodiversity. *Ecology Letters*, *16*(5), 617–625. doi: 10.1111/ele.12088
- DeMalach, N., & Kadmon, R. (2018). Seed mass diversity along resource gradients: the role of allometric growth rate and size-asymmetric competition. *Ecology*, *99*(10), 2196–2206. doi: 10.1002/ecy.2450

- DeMalach, N., Ron, R., & Kadmon, R. (2019). Mechanisms of seed mass variation along resource gradients. *Ecology Letters*, 22(1), 181–189. doi: 10.1111/ele.13179
- Donat, M. G., Lowry, A. L., Alexander, L. V., O’Gorman, P. A., & Maher, N. (2016). More extreme precipitation in the world’s dry and wet regions. *Nature Climate Change*, 6(5), 508–513. doi: 10.1038/nclimate2941
- Duprè, C., Stevens, C. J., Ranke, T., Bleeker, A., Pepler-Lisbach, C., Gowing, D. J. G., ... Diekmann, M. (2010). Changes in species richness and composition in European acidic grasslands over the past 70 years: The contribution of cumulative atmospheric nitrogen deposition. *Global Change Biology*, 16(1), 344–357. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2486.2009.01982.x
- Fischer, M., & Stocklin, J. (1997). Local Extinctions of Plants in Remnants of Extensively Used Calcareous Grasslands 1950 -1985. *Conservation Biology*, 11(3), 727–737. doi: 10.1046/j.1523-1739.1997.96082.x
- Funes, G., Basconcelo, S., Díaz, S., & Cabido, M. (1999). Seed size and shape are good predictors of seed persistence in soil in temperate mountain grasslands of Argentina. *Seed Science Research*, 9(4), 341–345. doi: 10.1017/s0960258599000355
- Golodets, C., Kigel, J., & Sternberg, M. (2010). Recovery of plant species composition and ecosystem function after cessation of grazing in a Mediterranean grassland. *Plant And Soil*, 329(1–2), 365–378.
- Harel, D., Holzapfel, C., & Sternberg, M. (2011). Seed mass and dormancy of annual plant populations and communities decreases with aridity and rainfall predictability. *Basic and Applied Ecology*, 12(8), 674–684. doi: 10.1016/j.baae.2011.09.003
- Harrison, S. P., Gornish, E. S., & Copeland, S. (2015). Climate-driven diversity loss in a grassland community. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 112(28), 8672–8677. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1502074112
- Harrison, S. P., LaForgia, M. L., & Latimer, A. M. (2018). Climate-driven diversity change in annual grasslands: Drought plus deluge does not equal normal. *Global Change Biology*, 24(4), 1782–1792. doi: 10.1111/gcb.14018
- Hobbs, R. J., Yates, S., & Mooney, H. A. (2007). Long-term data reveal complex dynamics in grassland in relation to climate and disturbance. *Ecological Monographs*, 77(4), 545–568. doi: 10.1890/06-1530.1
- Hothorn, T., Winell, H., Hornik, K., van de Wiel, M. A., & Zeileis, A. (2019). *coin: conditional inference procedures in a permutation test framework*. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/package=coin>
- Huang, J., Yu, H., Guan, X., Wang, G., & Guo, R. (2016). Accelerated dryland expansion under climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, 6(2), 166–171. doi: 10.1038/nclimate2837
- 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.
- Jurasinski, G., & Retzer, V. (2012). *Simba: A collection of functions for similarity analysis of vegetation data*. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/package=simba>
- Kalyuzhny, M., Seri, E., Chocron, R., Flather, C. H., Kadmon, R., & Shnerb, N. M. (2014). Niche versus neutrality: a dynamical analysis. *The American Naturalist*, 184(4), 439–446. doi: 10.1086/677930
- Kigel, J. (1995). Seed germination in arid and semiarid regions. In *Seed development and germination* (pp. 645–699). Routledge.

- Komatsu, K. J., Avolio, M. L., Lemoine, N. P., Isbell, F., Grman, E., Houseman, G. R., ... Zhang, Y. (2019). Global change effects on plant communities are magnified by time and the number of global change factors imposed. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *116*(36), 17867–17873. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1819027116
- Koopmann, B., Müller, J., Tellier, A., & Živković, D. (2017). Fisher–Wright model with deterministic seed bank and selection. *Theoretical Population Biology*, *114*, 29–39. doi: 10.1016/J.TPB.2016.11.005
- Lebrija-Trejos, E., Lobato, M.-C. C., & Sternberg, M. (2011). Reproductive traits and seed dynamics at two environmentally contrasting annual plant communities: from fieldwork to theoretical expectations. *Israel Journal of Ecology and Evolution*, *57*(1–2), 73–90.
- Liu, H., Mi, Z., Lin, L., Wang, Y., Zhang, Z., Zhang, F., ... He, J.-S. (2018). Shifting plant species composition in response to climate change stabilises grassland primary production. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *115*(16), 4051–4056. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1700299114
- Metz, J., Liancourt, P., Kigel, J., Harel, D., Sternberg, M., & Tielbörger, K. (2010). Plant survival in relation to seed size along environmental gradients: a long-term study from semi-arid and Mediterranean annual plant communities. *Journal of Ecology*, *98*, 697–704.
- Miller, J. E. D., Damschen, E. I., & Ives, A. R. (2018). Functional traits and community composition: A comparison among community-weighted means, weighted correlations, and multilevel models. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *10*(3), 415–425. doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.13119
- Minchin, P. R. (1987). An evaluation of the relative robustness of techniques for ecological ordination. *Vegetatio*, *69*(1–3), 89–107. doi: 10.1007/BF00038690
- Moles, A. T., & Westoby, M. (2004). Seedling survival and seed size: a synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Ecology*, *92*(3), 372–383.
- 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
- Nekola, J. C., & White, P. S. (1999). The distance decay of similarity in biogeography and ecology. *Journal of Biogeography*, *26*(4), 867–878. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2699.1999.00305.x
- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., ... Wagner, H. (2019). *vegan: community ecology package*. Retrieved from <https://cran.r-project.org/package=vegan>
- Ooi, M. K. J. (2012). Seed bank persistence and climate change. *Seed Science Research*, *22*(S1), S53–S60. doi: 10.1017/S0960258511000407
- Osem, Y., Perevolotsky, A., & Kigel, J. (2004). Site productivity and plant size explain the response of annual species to grazing exclusion in a Mediterranean semi-arid rangeland. *Journal of Ecology*, *92*(2), 297–309.
- Osem, Yagil, Perevolotsky, A., & Kigel, J. (2006). Similarity between seed bank and vegetation in a semi-arid annual plant community: The role of productivity and grazing. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, *17*(1), 29–36. doi: 10.1111/j.1654-1103.2006.tb02420.x
- Peres-Neto, P. R., Dray, S., & ter Braak, C. J. F. (2017). Linking trait variation to the environment: critical issues with community-weighted mean correlation resolved by the fourth-corner approach. *Ecography*, *40*(7), 806–816. doi: 10.1111/ecog.02302

- Petry, W. K., Kandlikar, G. S., Kraft, N. J. B., Godoy, O., & Levine, J. M. (2018). A competition-defence trade-off both promotes and weakens coexistence in an annual plant community. *Journal of Ecology*, *106*(5), 1806–1818. doi: 10.1111/1365-2745.13028
- Pianka, E. R. (1970). On r-and K-selection. *The American Naturalist*, *104*(940), 592–597.
- Právělie, R. (2016). Drylands extent and environmental issues. A global approach. *Earth-Science Reviews*, *161*, 259–278. doi: 10.1016/J.EARSCIREV.2016.08.003
- Song, X.-P., Hansen, M. C., Stehman, S. V., Potapov, P. V., Tyukavina, A., Vermote, E. F., & Townshend, J. R. (2018). Global land change from 1982 to 2016. *Nature*, *560*(7720), 639–643. doi: 10.1038/s41586-018-0411-9
- Sternberg, M., Golodets, C., Gutman, M., Perevolotsky, A., Ungar, E. D., Kigel, J., & Henkin, Z. (2015). Testing the limits of resistance: a 19-year study of Mediterranean grassland response to grazing regimes. *Global Change Biology*, *21*(5), 1939–1950. doi: 10.1111/gcb.12866
- Sternberg, M., Gutman, M., Perevolotsky, A., & Kigel, J. (2003). Effects of grazing on soil seed bank dynamics: An approach with functional groups. *Journal of Vegetation Science*, *14*(3), 375–386. doi: 10.1111/j.1654-1103.2003.tb02163.x
- Swenson, N. G., Hulshof, C. M., Katabuchi, M., & Enquist, B. J. (2020). Long-term shifts in the functional composition and diversity of a tropical dry forest: a 30-yr study. *Ecological Monographs*, ecm.1408. doi: 10.1002/ecm.1408
- Thompson, K., Band, S. R., & Hodgson, J. G. (1993). Seed Size and Shape Predict Persistence in Soil. *Functional Ecology*, *7*(2), 236. doi: 10.2307/2389893
- Thompson, K. (1987). seeds and seed banks. *New Phytologist*, *106*(1), 23–34.
- Thompson, Ken, Bakker, J. P., Bekker, R. M., & Hodgson, J. G. (1998). Ecological correlates of seed persistence in soil in the north-west European flora. *Journal of Ecology*, *86*(1), 163–169. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2745.1998.00240.x
- Tielborger, K., Bilton, M. C., Metz, J., Kigel, J., Holzapfel, C., Lebrija-Trejos, E., ... Sternberg, M. (2014). Middle-Eastern plant communities tolerate 9 years of drought in a multi-site climate manipulation experiment. *Nature Communications*, *5*. doi: 10.1038/ncomms6102
- Török, P., Kelemen, A., Valkó, O., Miglécz, T., Tóth, K., Tóth, E., ... Tóthmérész, B. (2018). Succession in soil seed banks and its implications for restoration of calcareous sand grasslands. *Restoration Ecology*, *26*, S134–S140. doi: 10.1111/rec.12611
- Venable, D. L., & Kimball, S. (2012). Population and community dynamics in variable environments: the desert annual system. In *Temporal Dynamics and Ecological Process* (pp. 140–164). Cambridge University Press.
- Venable, D. Lawrence. (2007). Bet hedging in a guild of desert annuals. *Ecology*, *88*(5), 1086–1090. doi: 10.1890/06-1495
- 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.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

MS and JK conceived the research idea within the GLOWA Jordan River project and collected the data. ND developed the seed bank and vegetation comparison, performed the statistical analysis, and wrote the first draft of the paper. All authors substantially contributed to the writing of the manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All data will be available on FigShare

COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Appendix S1

In the main analyses, seed bank was defined as the total number of seedlings emerging from soil cores, i.e. pooling together the three consecutive years of germination. Additionally, we applied a complementary approach where separate analyses were conducted for each of the three years of germination.

In the arid site, the seed bank composition during the second and third year of germination included a single species – *Filago desertorum*, which emerged in the second germination year of 2001, 2002, 2004, and 2009 sampling years, and the third germination year of 2003 sampling. No seedlings emerged during the third germination year of 2004 and 2006 sampling years. We chose not to exclude years with a single species (these years have identical locations in an NMDS plot and zero distance in time-lag analysis), but years without emerged species were excluded (compositional distance could not be computed).

Overall, the results of these separate analyses were qualitatively similar to the main analysis (Fig S4–S6, S12–S14). Regardless of the type of seed bank analyzed, year-to-year variability of the vegetation was higher compared to the seed bank, and the slope of the time-lag analyses was steeper in the vegetation compared with the seed bank.

Table S1: Species list for the Mediterranean site sorted by relative abundance. Rank – the rank of relative abundance. RA – mean relative abundance (in the seed bank and the vegetation together). Seed mass – mean seed mass [mg]. Dormancy – dormancy index. Seed bank – occurrence in the seed bank (Y\N). Veg - occurrence in the vegetation (Y\N).

Name	Family	Rank	RA	Seed mass	Dormancy	Seed bank	Veg
<i>Brachypodium distachyon</i>	Gramineae	1	0.1438	3.69	0.11	Yes	Yes
<i>Lolium rigidum</i>	Gramineae	2	0.0676	4.59	0.31	Yes	Yes
<i>Plantago afra</i>	Plantaginaceae	3	0.0663	0.68	0.38	Yes	Yes
<i>Catapodium rigidum</i>	Gramineae	4	0.0522	0.194	0.37	Yes	Yes
<i>Convolvulus siculus</i>	Convolvulaceae	5	0.0496	NA	0.33	Yes	Yes
<i>Avena sterilis</i>	Gramineae	6	0.0458	9.16	0.42	Yes	Yes
<i>Valantia hispida</i>	Rubiaceae	7	0.0444	0.22	0.22	Yes	Yes
<i>Plantago cretica</i>	Plantaginaceae	8	0.0351	1.07	0.40	Yes	Yes
<i>Picris galileae</i>	Compositae	9	0.0346	0.3	0.41	Yes	Yes
<i>Sedum rubens</i>	Crassulaceae	10	0.0284	0.04	0.44	Yes	Yes
<i>Anagallis arvensis</i>	Primulaceae	11	0.0228	0.43	0.66	Yes	Yes
<i>Bromus fasciculatus</i>	Gramineae	12	0.0217	1	0.12	Yes	Yes
<i>Torilis tenella</i>	Umbelliferae	13	0.0163	0.42	0.39	Yes	Yes
<i>Convolvulus pentapetaloides</i>	Convolvulaceae	14	0.0158	NA	0.56	Yes	Yes
<i>Galium judaicum</i>	Rubiaceae	15	0.0142	0.33	0.42	Yes	Yes
<i>Crepis sancta</i>	Compositae	16	0.0139	0.9	0.50	Yes	Yes
<i>Rhagadiolus stellatus</i>	Compositae	17	0.0133	3.27	0.46	Yes	Yes
<i>Aegilops peregrina</i>	Gramineae	18	0.0125	10.55	0.42	Yes	Yes
<i>Stipa capensis</i>	Gramineae	19	0.0121	2.21	0.32	Yes	Yes
<i>Mercurialis annua</i>	Euphorbiaceae	20	0.0109	0.05	0.51	Yes	Yes
<i>Hedypnois rhagadioloides</i>	Compositae	21	0.0109	2.083	0.60	Yes	Yes
<i>Bromus madritensis</i>	Gramineae	22	0.0100	0	0.16	Yes	Yes
<i>Hordeum spontaneum</i>	Gramineae	23	0.0099	27.3	0.23	Yes	Yes
<i>Galium murale</i>	Rubiaceae	24	0.0096	0.94	0.36	Yes	Yes
<i>Hymenocarpus circinnatus</i>	Papilionaceae	25	0.0091	7.03	0.56	Yes	Yes
<i>Stachys neurocalycina</i>	Labiatae	26	0.0079	0.94	0.66	Yes	Yes
<i>Urospermum picroides</i>	Compositae	27	0.0075	2.71	0.51	Yes	Yes
<i>Trifolium stellatum</i>	Papilionaceae	28	0.0072	2.7	0.49	Yes	Yes
<i>Trifolium pilulare</i>	Papilionaceae	29	0.0058	2.82	0.56	Yes	Yes
<i>Campanula hierosolymitana</i>	Campanulaceae	30	0.0057	0.05	0.58	Yes	Yes
<i>Linum corymbulosum</i>	Linaceae	31	0.0055	4.73	0.62	Yes	Yes
<i>Bromus alopecuroides</i>	Gramineae	32	0.0055	1.28	0.18	Yes	Yes
<i>Silene nocturna</i>	Caryophyllaceae	33	0.0054	0.27	0.64	Yes	Yes
<i>Trifolium purpureum</i>	Papilionaceae	34	0.0052	0.73	0.59	Yes	Yes
<i>Parapholis incurva</i>	Gramineae	35	0.0048	1.05	0.49	Yes	Yes
<i>Coronilla scorpioides</i>	Papilionaceae	36	0.0047	20.8	0.68	Yes	Yes
<i>Avena barbata</i>	Gramineae	37	0.0047	5.9	0.22	Yes	No
<i>Filago pyramidata</i>	Compositae	38	0.0047	0.06	0.66	Yes	Yes
<i>Biscutella didyma</i>	Cruciferae	39	0.0046	0.65	0.41	Yes	Yes
<i>Velezia rigida</i>	Caryophyllaceae	40	0.0046	0.26	0.58	Yes	Yes
<i>Alopecurus utriculatus</i>	Gramineae	41	0.0045	1.37	0.22	Yes	Yes
<i>Onobrychis caput galli</i>	Papilionaceae	42	0.0045	14.23	0.55	Yes	Yes

<i>Filago contracta</i>	Compositae	43	0.0045	0.1	0.45	Yes	Yes
<i>Trifolium dasyurum</i>	Papilionaceae	44	0.0043	NA	0.16	Yes	Yes
<i>Lotus peregrinus</i>	Papilionaceae	45	0.0043	1.91	0.53	Yes	Yes
<i>Torilis leptophylla</i>	Umbelliferae	46	0.0043	2.43	0.41	Yes	Yes
<i>Anthemis pseudocotula</i>	Compositae	47	0.0042	0.41	0.47	Yes	Yes
<i>Pterocephalus plumosus</i>	Dipsacaceae	48	0.0042	2.6	0.38	Yes	Yes
<i>Pimpinella cretica</i>	Umbelliferae	49	0.0041	0.37	0.43	Yes	Yes
<i>Scorpiurus muricatus</i>	Papilionaceae	50	0.0039	1.49	0.66	Yes	Yes
<i>Trifolium campestre</i>	Papilionaceae	51	0.0038	0.53	0.47	Yes	Yes
<i>Medicago monspeliaca</i>	Papilionaceae	52	0.0037	0.72	0.54	Yes	Yes
<i>Filago palaestina</i>	Compositae	53	0.0036	0.08	0.68	Yes	Yes
<i>Trifolium scabrum</i>	Papilionaceae	54	0.0036	1.07	0.55	Yes	Yes
<i>Isatis lusitanica</i>	Cruciferae	55	0.0033	1.7	0.38	Yes	Yes
<i>Helianthemum salicifolium</i>	Cistaceae	56	0.0033	5.43	0.20	Yes	Yes
<i>Crucianella aegyptiaca</i>	Rubiaceae	57	0.0032	0.79	0.39	Yes	Yes
<i>Clypeola jonthlaspi</i>	Cruciferae	58	0.0031	0.21	0.37	Yes	Yes
<i>Erodium malacoides</i>	Geraniaceae	59	0.0030	0.71	0.47	Yes	Yes
<i>Theligonum cynocrambe</i>	Theligonaceae	60	0.0030	NA	0.43	Yes	Yes
<i>Medicago coronata</i>	Papilionaceae	61	0.0028	0.81	0.52	Yes	Yes
<i>Tordylium trachycarpum</i>	Umbelliferae	62	0.0027	NA	0.36	Yes	Yes
<i>Scabiosa palaestina</i>	Dipsacaceae	63	0.0027	2.62	NA	No	Yes
<i>Ziziphora capitata</i>	Labiatae	64	0.0027	0.31	0.00	Yes	Yes
<i>Alyssum strigosum</i>	Cruciferae	65	0.0025	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Onobrychis squarrosa</i>	Papilionaceae	66	0.0025	16.29	0.39	Yes	Yes
<i>Centaureum tenuiflorum</i>	Compositae	67	0.0021	0.02	0.53	Yes	No
<i>Pterocephalus brevis</i>	Dipsacaceae	68	0.0020	0.6	0.42	Yes	Yes
<i>Medicago rotata</i>	Papilionaceae	69	0.0019	4.61	0.57	Yes	Yes
<i>Lagoecia cuminoides</i>	Umbelliferae	70	0.0019	0.53	0.27	Yes	Yes
<i>Linum strictum</i>	Linaceae	71	0.0018	0.25	0.48	Yes	Yes
<i>Diploaxis viminea</i>	Cruciferae	72	0.0018	0.2	0.50	Yes	Yes
<i>Thlaspi perfoliatum</i>	Cruciferae	73	0.0017	0.42	0.24	Yes	Yes
<i>Lomelosia palaestina</i>	Dipsacaceae	74	0.0016	0	0.34	Yes	No
<i>Hippocrepis unisiliquosa</i>	Papilionaceae	75	0.0016	3.67	0.67	Yes	Yes
<i>Cephalaria syriaca</i>	Dipsacaceae	76	0.0013	0	-1.00	No	Yes
<i>Linum pubescens</i>	Linaceae	77	0.0013	0.75	0.59	Yes	Yes
<i>Chaetosciadium trichospermum</i>	Umbelliferae	78	0.0013	0.8	0.63	Yes	Yes
<i>Psilurus incurvus</i>	Gramineae	79	0.0013	0.05	0.44	Yes	Yes
<i>Misopates orontium</i>	Scrophulariaceae	80	0.0012	NA	0.63	Yes	Yes
<i>Arenaria leptoclados</i>	Caryophyllaceae	81	0.0012	0.04	0.61	Yes	Yes
<i>Briza maxima</i>	Gramineae	82	0.0011	1.67	0.24	Yes	Yes
<i>Atractylis cancellata</i>	Compositae	83	0.0011	1.44	0.46	Yes	Yes
<i>Medicago orbicularis</i>	Papilionaceae	84	0.0010	5.66	0.61	Yes	Yes
<i>Cephalaria joppensis</i>	Dipsacaceae	85	0.0010	0	0.19	Yes	No
<i>Crupina crupinastrum</i>	Compositae	86	0.0010	22.5	0.13	Yes	Yes
<i>Geropogon hybridus</i>	Compositae	87	0.0008	9.75	0.53	Yes	Yes
<i>Medicago polymorpha</i>	Papilionaceae	88	0.0008	6.09	0.77	Yes	Yes
<i>Alyssum simplex</i>	Cruciferae	89	0.0008	0.65	0.22	Yes	No
<i>Crucianella macrostachya</i>	Rubiaceae	90	0.0008	0.79	0.34	Yes	No
<i>Avena wiestii</i>	Gramineae	91	0.0007	9.14	0.86	Yes	No
<i>Trisetaria macrochaeta</i>	Gramineae	92	0.0007	1.87	0.28	Yes	No

<i>Cicer judaicum</i>	Papilionaceae	93	0.0007	22.34	0.64	Yes	Yes
<i>Rostraria cristata</i>	Gramineae	94	0.0007	NA	0.34	Yes	Yes
<i>Parapholis filiformis</i>	Gramineae	95	0.0007	NA	-1.00	No	Yes
<i>Cephalaria tenella</i>	Dipsacaceae	96	0.0007	NA	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Senecio leucanthemifolius</i>	Compositae	97	0.0006	0.25	0.71	Yes	Yes
<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>	Compositae	98	0.0006	0.18	0.00	Yes	Yes
<i>Helianthemum aegyptiacum</i>	Cistaceae	99	0.0006	NA	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Galium setaceum</i>	Rubiaceae	100	0.0005	0.09	0.52	Yes	Yes
<i>Vicia palaestina</i>	Papilionaceae	101	0.0005	26.04	0.63	No	Yes
<i>Bromus japonicus</i>	Gramineae	102	0.0005	NA	0.20	Yes	Yes
<i>Erophila praecox</i>	Cruciferae	103	0.0005	0.03	0.61	No	Yes
<i>Crithopsis delileana</i>	Gramineae	104	0.0005	4.1	0.25	Yes	Yes
<i>Geranium rotundifolium</i>	Geraniaceae	105	0.0005	2.6	0.53	Yes	Yes
<i>Euphorbia chamaepeplus</i>	Euphorbiaceae	106	0.0004	1.17	0.51	Yes	Yes
<i>Callipeltis cucullaria</i>	Rubiaceae	107	0.0004	0.1	0.36	Yes	Yes
<i>Bromus lanceolatus</i>	Gramineae	108	0.0004	NA	0.18	Yes	Yes
<i>Silene colorata</i>	Caryophyllaceae	109	0.0004	NA	0.52	Yes	No
<i>Daucus durieua</i>	Umbelliferae	110	0.0004	1.67	0.69	Yes	No
<i>Erodium gruinum</i>	Geraniaceae	111	0.0004	57.33	0.45	Yes	Yes
<i>Catananche lutea</i>	Compositae	112	0.0004	2.55	0.41	No	Yes
<i>Ononis mollis</i>	Papilionaceae	113	0.0004	NA	0.29	Yes	Yes
<i>Ononis ornithopodioides</i>	Papilionaceae	114	0.0004	1.67	0.61	Yes	Yes
<i>Euphorbia oxyodonta</i>	Euphorbiaceae	115	0.0004	NA	0.63	Yes	Yes
<i>Galium cassium</i>	Rubiaceae	116	0.0004	NA	0.26	Yes	No
<i>Euphorbia exigua</i>	Euphorbiaceae	117	0.0003	0.15	0.64	Yes	Yes
<i>Erodium moschatum</i>	Geraniaceae	118	0.0003	5.47	0.22	Yes	No
<i>Anchusa aegyptiaca</i>	Boraginaceae	119	0.0003	5.97	0.48	Yes	Yes
<i>Lomelosia porphyroneura</i>	Dipsacaceae	120	0.0003	NA	0.82	Yes	No
<i>Telmissa microcarpa</i>	Crassulaceae	121	0.0003	NA	0.38	Yes	No
<i>Astragalus asterias</i>	Papilionaceae	122	0.0003	NA	0.34	Yes	Yes
<i>Parietaria lusitanica</i>	Urticaceae	123	0.0003	NA	0.76	Yes	Yes
<i>Crassula alata</i>	Crassulaceae	124	0.0003	NA	0.49	Yes	No
<i>Lathyrus blepharicarpos</i>	Papilionaceae	125	0.0003	NA	0.58	Yes	Yes
<i>Althaea hirsuta</i>	Malvaceae	126	0.0003	NA	0.29	Yes	Yes
<i>Reichardia tingitana</i>	Compositae	127	0.0002	1.13	0.52	Yes	Yes
<i>Veronica cymbalaria</i>	Scrophulariaceae	128	0.0002	NA	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Sherardia arvensis</i>	Rubiaceae	129	0.0002	NA	0.56	Yes	No
<i>Trifolium tomentosum</i>	Papilionaceae	130	0.0002	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Trigonella hierosolymitana</i>	Papilionaceae	131	0.0002	NA	0.58	Yes	Yes
<i>Crepis aspera</i>	Compositae	132	0.0002	0.19	0.85	Yes	Yes
<i>Medicago tuberculata</i>	Papilionaceae	133	0.0002	NA	0.87	Yes	Yes
<i>Linum nodiflorum</i>	Linaceae	134	0.0002	8.61	0.43	Yes	Yes
<i>Minuartia decipiens</i>	Caryophyllaceae	135	0.0002	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Minuartia hybrida</i>	Caryophyllaceae	136	0.0001	0.11	0.45	Yes	Yes
<i>Cuscuta spp</i>	Convolvulaceae	137	0.0001	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Astragalus epiglottis</i>	Papilionaceae	138	0.0001	1.61	0.71	No	Yes
<i>Medicago truncatula</i>	Papilionaceae	139	0.0001	4.93	0.75	Yes	No
<i>Trigonella spinosa</i>	Papilionaceae	140	0.0001	NA	0.58	Yes	Yes
<i>Cichorium endivia</i>	Compositae	141	0.0001	1.07	0.62	Yes	Yes
<i>Notobasis syriaca</i>	Compositae	142	0.0001	NA	0.00	No	Yes

<i>Trifolium resupinatum</i>	Papilionaceae	143	0.0001	NA	0.50	Yes	No
<i>Euphorbia helioscopia</i>	Euphorbiaceae	144	0.0001	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Trifolium cherleri</i>	Papilionaceae	145	0.0001	NA	0.00	Yes	Yes
<i>Factorovskya aschersoniana</i>	Papilionaceae	146	0.0001	NA	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Aegilops kotschy</i>	Gramineae	147	0.0001	NA	0.35	Yes	No
<i>Geranium molle</i>	Geraniaceae	148	0.0001	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Trifolium argutum</i>	Papilionaceae	149	0.0001	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Ononis sicula</i>	Papilionaceae	150	0.0001	1.3	NA	No	Yes
<i>Erodium subintegrifolium</i>	Geraniaceae	151	0.0001	NA	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Minuartia mediterranea</i>	Caryophyllaceae	153	0.0001	NA	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Silene decipiens</i>	Caryophyllaceae	153	0.0001	NA	0.31	Yes	No
<i>Valerianella vesicaria</i>	Valerianaceae	154	0.0001	3.48	0.49	No	Yes
<i>Diplotaxis harra</i>	Cruciferae	156	0.0001	NA	0.29	Yes	No
<i>Ononis viscosa</i>	Papilionaceae	156	0.0001	NA	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Minuartia picta</i>	Caryophyllaceae	157	0.0001	NA	0.39	Yes	No
<i>Pisum sativum</i>	Papilionaceae	158	0.0001	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Alopecurus myosuroides</i>	Gramineae	160	4E-05	NA	0.29	Yes	No
<i>Carthamus glaucus</i>	Compositae	160	4E-05	NA	0.58	Yes	No
<i>Astragalus tribuloides</i>	Papilionaceae	161	4E-05	4.63	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Trifolium clusii</i>	Papilionaceae	162	4E-05	1.02	NA	No	Yes
<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>	Geraniaceae	164	3E-05	1.25	0.43	Yes	No
<i>Hypochaeris achyrophorus</i>	Compositae	164	3E-05	NA	0.41	Yes	No
<i>Silene alexandrina</i>	Caryophyllaceae	165	3E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Euphorbia peplus</i>	Euphorbiaceae	166	3E-05	1.7	0.60	Yes	No
<i>Onobrychis crista galli</i>	Papilionaceae	167	3E-05	NA	0.60	No	Yes
<i>Scandix verna</i>	Umbelliferae	168	3E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Calendula arvensis</i>	Compositae	169	3E-05	1.15	0.50	No	Yes
<i>Vicia sativa</i>	Papilionaceae	170	2E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Silene aegyptica</i>	Caryophyllaceae	172	2E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Trifolium clypeatum</i>	Papilionaceae	172	2E-05	5	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Helianthemum lasiocarpum</i>	Cistaceae	173	1E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Filago desertorum</i>	Compositae	174	1E-05	0.03	0.46	No	Yes
<i>Centaurea cyanoides</i>	Compositae	177	8E-06	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Crepis senecioides</i>	Compositae	177	8E-06	0.09	0.29	No	Yes
<i>Medicago minima</i>	Papilionaceae	177	8E-06	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Vulpia myuros</i>	Gramineae	177	8E-06	NA	NA	No	Yes

Table S2: Species list for the semi-arid site sorted by relative abundance. Rank – the rank of relative abundance. RA – mean relative abundance (in the seed bank and the vegetation together). Seed mass – mean seed mass [mg]. Dormancy – dormancy index. Seed bank – occurrence in the seed bank (Y\N). Veg - occurrence in the vegetation (Y\N).

Name	Family	Rank	RA	Seed mass	Dormancy	Seed bank	Veg
<i>Trisetaria macrochaeta</i>	Gramineae	1	0.3638	1.87	0.28	Yes	Yes
<i>Crithopsis delileana</i>	Gramineae	2	0.1367	4.1	0.25	Yes	Yes
<i>Filago contracta</i>	Compositae	3	0.0984	0.1	0.45	Yes	Yes
<i>Aegilops peregrina</i>	Gramineae	4	0.0417	10.55	0.42	Yes	Yes
<i>Atractylis cancellata</i>	Compositae	5	0.0335	1.44	0.46	Yes	Yes
<i>Carrichtera annua</i>	Cruciferae	6	0.0319	1.35	0.54	Yes	Yes
<i>Cichorium endivia</i>	Compositae	7	0.0289	1.07	0.62	Yes	Yes
<i>Stipa capensis</i>	Gramineae	8	0.0256	2.21	0.32	Yes	Yes
<i>Brachypodium distachyon</i>	Gramineae	9	0.0252	3.69	0.11	Yes	Yes
<i>Sedum rubens</i>	Crassulaceae	10	0.0224	0.04	0.44	Yes	Yes
<i>Catapodium rigidum</i>	Gramineae	11	0.0221	0.194	0.37	Yes	Yes
<i>Anagallis arvensis</i>	Primulaceae	12	0.0215	0.43	0.66	Yes	Yes
<i>Erophila minima</i>	Cruciferae	13	0.021	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Onobrychis crista galli</i>	Papilionaceae	14	0.0121	NA	0.60	Yes	Yes
<i>Rostraria cristata</i>	Gramineae	15	0.009	NA	0.34	Yes	Yes
<i>Hedynois rhagadioloides</i>	Compositae	16	0.0076	2.083	0.60	Yes	Yes
<i>Psilurus incurvus</i>	Gramineae	17	0.0063	0.05	0.44	Yes	Yes
<i>Plantago cretica</i>	Plantaginaceae	18	0.0063	1.07	0.40	Yes	Yes
<i>Parapholis incurva</i>	Gramineae	19	0.0056	1.05	0.49	Yes	Yes
<i>Plantago coronopus</i>	Plantaginaceae	20	0.0052	0.38	0.38	Yes	Yes
<i>Aegilops kotschy</i>	Gramineae	21	0.0049	NA	0.35	Yes	No
<i>Lolium rigidum</i>	Gramineae	22	0.0047	4.59	0.31	Yes	Yes
<i>Hippocrepis unisiliquosa</i>	Papilionaceae	23	0.0045	3.67	0.67	Yes	Yes
<i>Filago desertorum</i>	Compositae	24	0.004	0.03	0.46	Yes	Yes
<i>Hymenocarpus circinnatus</i>	Papilionaceae	25	0.0038	7.03	0.56	Yes	Yes
<i>Minuartia picta</i>	Caryophyllaceae	26	0.0036	NA	0.39	Yes	Yes
<i>Filago palaestina</i>	Compositae	27	0.0035	0.08	0.68	Yes	Yes
<i>Medicago monspeliaca</i>	Papilionaceae	28	0.0033	0.72	0.54	Yes	Yes
<i>Crassula alata</i>	Crassulaceae	29	0.003	NA	0.49	Yes	No
<i>Linum pubescens</i>	Linaceae	30	0.0028	0.75	0.59	No	Yes
<i>Daucus durieua</i>	Umbelliferae	31	0.0023	1.67	0.69	Yes	Yes
<i>Bromus fasciculatus</i>	Gramineae	32	0.0021	1	0.12	Yes	Yes
<i>Parapholis filiformis</i>	Gramineae	33	0.002	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Euphorbia chamaepeplus</i>	Euphorbiaceae	34	0.0018	1.17	0.51	Yes	Yes
<i>Onobrychis squarrosa</i>	Papilionaceae	35	0.0016	16.29	0.39	Yes	Yes
<i>Urospermum picroides</i>	Compositae	36	0.0016	2.71	0.51	Yes	No
<i>Linum strictum</i>	Linaceae	37	0.0014	0.25	0.48	Yes	Yes
<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>	Compositae	38	0.0012	0.18	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Crepis sancta</i>	Compositae	39	0.0012	0.9	0.50	Yes	Yes
<i>Diploaxis viminea</i>	Cruciferae	40	0.0011	0.2	0.50	Yes	No
<i>Valantia hispida</i>	Rubiaceae	41	0.0009	0.22	0.22	Yes	Yes
<i>Herniaria hirsuta</i>	Caryophyllaceae	42	0.0009	0.1	0.27	Yes	Yes
<i>Bromus madritensis</i>	Gramineae	43	0.0008	NA	0.16	Yes	No

<i>Filago pyramidata</i>	Compositae	44	0.0008	0.06	0.66	Yes	Yes
<i>Torilis tenella</i>	Umbelliferae	45	0.0007	0.42	0.39	Yes	Yes
<i>Picris galileae</i>	Compositae	46	0.0007	0.3	0.41	Yes	Yes
<i>Linum corymbulosum</i>	Linaceae	47	0.0006	4.73	0.62	No	Yes
<i>Campanula hierosolymitana</i>	Campanulaceae	48	0.0006	0.05	0.58	Yes	Yes
<i>Bromus alopecuroides</i>	Gramineae	49	0.0006	1.28	0.18	Yes	Yes
<i>Bromus lanceolatus</i>	Gramineae	50	0.0006	NA	0.18	Yes	Yes
<i>Callipeltis cucullaria</i>	Rubiaceae	51	0.0006	0.1	0.36	Yes	Yes
<i>Hordeum spontaneum</i>	Gramineae	52	0.0006	27.3	0.23	Yes	No
<i>Rhagadiolus stellatus</i>	Compositae	53	0.0005	3.27	0.46	Yes	Yes
<i>Silene nocturna</i>	Caryophyllaceae	54	0.0005	0.27	0.64	Yes	Yes
<i>Biscutella didyma</i>	Cruciferae	55	0.0005	0.65	0.41	Yes	Yes
<i>Minuartia hybrida</i>	Caryophyllaceae	56	0.0005	0.11	0.45	Yes	Yes
<i>Erodium malacoides</i>	Geraniaceae	57	0.0005	0.71	0.47	Yes	Yes
<i>Mercurialis annua</i>	Euphorbiaceae	58	0.0005	0.05	0.51	Yes	No
<i>Anthemis pseudocotula</i>	Compositae	59	0.0005	0.41	0.47	Yes	Yes
<i>Pterocephalus brevis</i>	Dipsacaceae	60	0.0004	0.6	0.42	Yes	Yes
<i>Crepis aspera</i>	Compositae	61	0.0004	0.19	0.85	Yes	No
<i>Avena barbata</i>	Gramineae	62	0.0004	5.9	0.22	Yes	No
<i>Velesia rigida</i>	Caryophyllaceae	63	0.0004	0.26	0.58	Yes	Yes
<i>Chaetosciadium trichospermum</i>	Umbelliferae	64	0.0004	0.8	0.63	Yes	No
<i>Scabiosa palaestina</i>	Dipsacaceae	65	0.0004	2.62	NA	No	Yes
<i>Isatis lusitanica</i>	Cruciferae	66.5	0.0003	1.7	0.38	Yes	No
<i>Trifolium purpureum</i>	Papilionaceae	66.5	0.0003	0.73	0.59	Yes	No
<i>Avena sterilis</i>	Gramineae	68	0.0003	9.16	0.42	Yes	Yes
<i>Adonis dentata</i>	Ranunculaceae	69	0.0003	0	NA	No	Yes
<i>Galium judaicum</i>	Rubiaceae	70	0.0003	0.33	0.42	Yes	Yes
<i>Reichardia tingitana</i>	Compositae	71	0.0003	1.13	0.52	Yes	Yes
<i>Helianthemum salicifolium</i>	Cistaceae	72	0.0003	5.43	0.20	No	Yes
<i>Clypeola jonthlaspi</i>	Cruciferae	73	0.0003	0.21	0.37	Yes	Yes
<i>Crepis senecioides</i>	Compositae	74	0.0003	0.09	0.29	Yes	Yes
<i>Crucianella aegyptiaca</i>	Rubiaceae	75	0.0002	0.79	0.39	Yes	Yes
<i>Anchusa aegyptiaca</i>	Boraginaceae	76	0.0002	5.97	0.48	Yes	Yes
<i>Pterocephalus plumosus</i>	Dipsacaceae	77	0.0002	2.6	0.38	Yes	No
<i>Theligonium cynocrambe</i>	Theligonaceae	78	0.0002	NA	0.43	Yes	No
<i>Senecio leucanthemifolius</i>	Compositae	79	0.0002	0.25	0.71	Yes	No
<i>Trifolium scabrum</i>	Papilionaceae	80	0.0002	1.07	0.55	Yes	Yes
<i>Galium murale</i>	Rubiaceae	81.5	0.0001	0.94	0.36	Yes	No
<i>Tordylium trachycarpum</i>	Umbelliferae	81.5	0.0001	NA	0.36	Yes	No
<i>Pteranthus dichotomus</i>	Caryophyllaceae	83	0.0001	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Catananche lutea</i>	Compositae	84	0.0001	2.55	0.41	Yes	Yes
<i>Schismus arabicus</i>	Gramineae	85	0.0001	0.05	0.19	No	Yes
<i>Geranium rotundifolium</i>	Geraniaceae	86.5	0.0001	2.6	0.53	Yes	No
<i>Micropus supinus</i>	Compositae	86.5	0.0001	37.31	0.69	Yes	No
<i>Factorovskya aschersoniana</i>	Papilionaceae	88	1E-04	NA	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Lotus peregrinus</i>	Papilionaceae	89	1E-04	1.91	0.53	Yes	No
<i>Erodium gruinum</i>	Geraniaceae	90	9E-05	57.33	0.45	No	Yes
<i>Lagoecia cuminoides</i>	Umbelliferae	91.5	9E-05	0.53	0.27	Yes	No
<i>Onobrychis caput galli</i>	Papilionaceae	91.5	9E-05	14.23	0.55	Yes	No
<i>Bupleurum lancifolium</i>	Umbelliferae	93	9E-05	4.57	0.71	No	Yes

<i>Astragalus asterias</i>	Papilionaceae	94	8E-05	NA	0.34	No	Yes
<i>Salvia viridis</i>	Labiatae	95	8E-05	2.4	0.20	No	Yes
<i>Mericanpaea ciliata</i>	Rubiaceae	96	6E-05	NA	0.00	Yes	Yes
<i>Centaurea hyalolepis</i>	Compositae	99	6E-05	NA	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Convolvulus siculus</i>	Convolvulaceae	99	6E-05	NA	0.33	Yes	No
<i>Crucianella macrostachya</i>	Rubiaceae	99	6E-05	0.79	0.34	Yes	No
<i>Erodium laciniatum</i>	Geraniaceae	99	6E-05	1.25	0.35	Yes	No
<i>Erodium moschatum</i>	Geraniaceae	99	6E-05	5.47	0.22	Yes	No
<i>Plantago bellardii</i>	Plantaginaceae	102	5E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Scabiosa prolifera</i>	Dipsacaceae	103	5E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Plantago afra</i>	Plantaginaceae	104	4E-05	0.68	0.38	Yes	No
<i>Valerianella vesicaria</i>	Valerianaceae	105	4E-05	3.48	0.49	No	Yes
<i>Scorpiurus muricatus</i>	Papilionaceae	106	4E-05	1.49	0.66	No	Yes
<i>Carthamus glaucus</i>	Compositae	107	4E-05	NA	0.58	No	Yes
<i>Calendula arvensis</i>	Compositae	108	4E-05	1.15	0.50	No	Yes
<i>Ononis mollis</i>	Papilionaceae	109	3E-05	NA	0.29	No	Yes
<i>Silene aegyptica</i>	Caryophyllaceae	110	3E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Minuartia decipiens</i>	Caryophyllaceae	111	2E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Plantago ovata</i>	Plantaginaceae	113	2E-05	NA	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Tripodion tetraphyllum</i>	Papilionaceae	113	2E-05	NA	0.71	No	Yes
<i>Silene alexandrina</i>	Caryophyllaceae	114	1E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Astragalus epiglottis</i>	Papilionaceae	117	1E-05	1.61	0.71	No	Yes
<i>Astragalus tribuloides</i>	Papilionaceae	117	1E-05	4.63	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Convolvulus pentapetaloides</i>	Convolvulaceae	117	1E-05	NA	0.56	No	Yes
<i>Geropogon hybridus</i>	Compositae	117	1E-05	9.75	0.53	No	Yes
<i>Thlaspi perfoliatum</i>	Cruciferae	117	1E-05	0.42	0.24	No	Yes
<i>Alyssum strigosum</i>	Cruciferae	121	1E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Galium setaceum</i>	Rubiaceae	121	1E-05	0.09	0.52	No	Yes
<i>Vulpia muralis</i>	Gramineae	121	1E-05	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Bromus tectorum</i>	Gramineae	124	7E-06	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Carthamus tenuis</i>	Compositae	124	7E-06	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Bromus japonicus</i>	Gramineae	127	5E-06	NA	0.20	No	Yes
<i>Ononis ornithopodioides</i>	Papilionaceae	127	5E-06	1.67	0.61	No	Yes
<i>Papaver hybridum</i>	Papaveraceae	127	5E-06	NA	NA	No	Yes
<i>Trifolium tomentosum</i>	Papilionaceae	127	5E-06	NA	NA	No	Yes

Table S3: Species list for the arid site sorted by relative abundance. Rank – the rank of relative abundance. RA – mean relative abundance (in the seed bank and the vegetation together). Seed mass – mean seed mass [mg]. Dormancy – dormancy index. Seed bank – occurrence in the seed bank (Y\N). Veg - occurrence in the vegetation (Y\N).

Name	Family	Rank	RA	Seed mass	Dormancy	Seed bank	Veg
<i>Crepis sancta</i>	Compositae	1	0.254	0.9	0.50	Yes	Yes
<i>Malva aegyptia</i>	Malvaceae	2	0.1867	1.4	0.00	Yes	Yes
<i>Herniaria hirsuta</i>	Caryophyllaceae	3	0.1211	0.1	0.27	Yes	Yes
<i>Plantago bellardii</i>	Plantaginaceae	4	0.1188	NA	NA	Yes	Yes
<i>Trisetaria macrochaeta</i>	Gramineae	5	0.0888	1.87	0.28	Yes	Yes
<i>Lappula spinocarpus</i>	Boraginaceae	6	0.0387	7.62	NA	Yes	Yes
<i>Astragalus tribuloides</i>	Papilionaceae	7	0.0251	4.63	0.00	Yes	Yes
<i>Schismus arabicus</i>	Gramineae	8	0.0213	0.05	0.19	Yes	Yes
<i>Urospermum picroides</i>	Compositae	9	0.02	2.71	0.51	Yes	Yes
<i>Lolium rigidum</i>	Gramineae	10	0.0152	4.59	0.31	Yes	Yes
<i>Plantago coronopus</i>	Plantaginaceae	11	0.011	0.38	0.38	Yes	Yes
<i>Catapodium rigidum</i>	Gramineae	12	0.0079	0.194	0.37	Yes	No
<i>Gymnarrhena micrantha</i>	Compositae	13	0.0074	NA	0.50	Yes	Yes
<i>Carrichtera annua</i>	Cruciferae	14	0.0065	1.35	0.54	Yes	No
<i>Crepis aspera</i>	Compositae	15	0.0061	0.19	0.85	Yes	No
<i>Avena wiestii</i>	Gramineae	16	0.0058	9.14	0.86	Yes	No
<i>Picris longirostris</i>	Compositae	17	0.0055	0.3	0.41	Yes	No
<i>Biscutella didyma</i>	Cruciferae	18	0.0048	0.65	0.41	Yes	No
<i>Cichorium endivia</i>	Compositae	19	0.0042	1.07	0.62	Yes	No
<i>Galium judaicum</i>	Rubiaceae	20	0.0039	0.33	0.42	Yes	No
<i>Plantago afra</i>	Plantaginaceae	21	0.0037	0.68	0.38	No	Yes
<i>Reichardia tingitana</i>	Compositae	22	0.0034	1.13	0.52	No	Yes
<i>Bromus fasciculatus</i>	Gramineae	23	0.0034	1	0.12	Yes	Yes
<i>Cuscuta spp</i>	Convolvulaceae	24	0.0023	NA	NA	Yes	Yes
<i>Hippocrepis unisiliquosa</i>	Papilionaceae	25.5	0.0022	3.67	0.67	Yes	No
<i>Filago contracta</i>	Compositae	25.5	0.0022	0.1	0.45	Yes	No
<i>Erodium cicutarium</i>	Geraniaceae	27	0.0022	1.25	0.43	Yes	No
<i>Erucaria microcarpa</i>	Cruciferae	28	0.002	0.45	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Gastrocotyle hispida</i>	Boraginaceae	29	0.0019	NA	NA	Yes	Yes
<i>Euphorbia chamaepeplus</i>	Euphorbiaceae	30	0.0018	1.17	0.51	No	Yes
<i>Erodium touchyanum</i>	Geraniaceae	31.5	0.0016	NA	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Filago palaestina</i>	Compositae	31.5	0.0016	0.08	0.68	Yes	No
<i>Helianthemum salicifolium</i>	Cistaceae	33	0.0016	5.43	0.20	Yes	Yes
<i>Anthemis melampodina</i>	Compositae	34	0.0015	0.41	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Erodium laciniatum</i>	Geraniaceae	35	0.0014	1.25	0.35	No	Yes
<i>Silene decipiens</i>	Caryophyllaceae	36	0.0014	NA	0.31	No	Yes
<i>Anagallis arvensis</i>	Primulaceae	37	0.0013	0.43	0.66	Yes	Yes
<i>Helianthemum lasiocarpum</i>	Cistaceae	38.5	0.0013	NA	NA	Yes	No
<i>Spergula fallax</i>	Caryophyllaceae	38.5	0.0013	NA	NA	Yes	No
<i>Avena sterilis</i>	Gramineae	41.5	0.0011	9.16	0.42	Yes	No
<i>Filago desertorum</i>	Compositae	41.5	0.0011	0.03	0.46	Yes	No
<i>Stipa capensis</i>	Gramineae	41.5	0.0011	2.21	0.32	Yes	No

<i>Isatis lusitanica</i>	Cruciferae	41.5	0.0011	1.7	0.38	Yes	No
<i>Leontodon laciniatus</i>	Compositae	44	0.0009	0.24	NA	No	Yes
<i>Valantia hispida</i>	Rubiaceae	45	0.0009	0.22	0.22	No	Yes
<i>Filago pyramidata</i>	Compositae	46	0.0008	0.06	0.66	No	Yes
<i>Sonchus oleraceus</i>	Compositae	47	0.0007	0.18	0.00	Yes	No
<i>Arenaria leptoclados</i>	Caryophyllaceae	48	0.0003	0.04	0.61	No	Yes
<i>Plantago ovata</i>	Plantaginaceae	49	0.0003	NA	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Bupleurum lancifolium</i>	Umbelliferae	50.5	0.0002	4.57	0.71	No	Yes
<i>Minuartia hybrida</i>	Caryophyllaceae	50.5	0.0002	0.11	0.45	No	Yes
<i>Spergularia diandra</i>	Caryophyllaceae	52	0.0002	0.09	0.00	No	Yes
<i>Diplotaxis harra</i>	Cruciferae	53	0.0001	NA	0.29	No	Yes

Table S4: Results of linear models of species' seed bank affinity as a function of their seed mass (\log_e transformed [mg]), seed dormancy index, and functional group membership (0 – forbs, 1 – grasses). Standardized estimates for the regression coefficients are calculated by standardizing both the explanatory and the dependent variables to enable comparison among variables varying in units (see methods).

	Mediterranean				Semi-arid				Arid			
	(raw) estimate	Std. estimate	Std. error	p	(raw) estimate	Std. estimate	Std. error	p	(raw) estimate	Std. estimate	Std. error	p
(intercept)	0.37	0.00	0.13	0.212	0.13	0.00	0.20	0.463	0.20	0.00	0.14	0.184
Seed mass	-0.03	-0.23	0.02	0.05	-0.06	-0.32	0.03	0.046	-0.08	-0.45	0.04	0.063
Dormancy	0.21	0.16	0.17	0.21	0.75	0.38	0.36	0.043	0.74	0.55	0.31	0.040
Grass	0.14	0.04	0.07	0.76	0.22	0.33	0.13	0.09	0.10	0.16	0.15	0.512
N	80				43				14			
R ²	0.07				0.18				0.54			




Fig. S1: Community composition in the seed bank (brown circles) and vegetation (green triangles) in the Mediterranean site represented using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of the 30 most abundant species (instead of all species as in the main text) based on Bray–Curtis dissimilarity. The pink and cyan polygons represent the minimal compositional space occupied by the seed bank and the vegetation. Stress = 0.11.




Fig. S2: Community composition in the seed bank (brown circles) and vegetation (green triangles) in the Semi-arid site represented using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of the 30 most abundant species (instead of all species as in the main text) based on Bray–Curtis dissimilarity. The pink and cyan polygons represent the minimal compositional space occupied by the seed bank and the vegetation. Stress = 0.06

(c) Arid




Fig. S3: Community composition in the seed bank (brown circles) and vegetation (green triangles) in the Arid site represented using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of the 30 most abundant species (instead of all species as in the main text) based on Bray–Curtis dissimilarity. Names of all species used in the analysis are shown. The pink and cyan polygons represent the minimal compositional space occupied by the seed bank and the vegetation. Stress = 0.13




Fig. S4: Community composition in the seed bank from *the first germination season* (brown circles) and vegetation (green triangles) in the three sites represented using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) based on Bray–Curtis dissimilarity. (a) Mediterranean site, stress=0.15, Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 2.27$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} = 0.03$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 2.7$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.12$. (b) Semi-arid site, stress=0.09, Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 4.75$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} = 0.004$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 7.4$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.01$. (c) Arid site, stress=0.12, Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 3.8$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} = 0.009$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 0.67$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.44$.




Fig. S5: Community composition in the seed bank from *the second germination season* (brown circles) and vegetation (green triangles) in the three sites represented using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) based on Bray–Curtis dissimilarity. (a) Mediterranean site, stress=0.14, Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 4.68$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} < 0.001$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 11.825$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.003$. (b) Semi-arid site, stress=0.15, Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 1.97$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} = 0.04$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 4.6$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.04$. (c) Arid site, stress=0.09, Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 6.8$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} < 0.001$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 0.46$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.54$.




Fig. S6: Community composition in the seed bank from *the third germination season* (brown circles) and vegetation (green triangles) in the three sites represented using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) based on Bray–Curtis dissimilarity. (a) Mediterranean site, stress=0.14, Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 5.5$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} < 0.001$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 18.9$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.001$. (b) Semi-arid site, stress=0.12, Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 4.02$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} = 0.001$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 0.75$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.4$ (c) Arid site, stress= 10^{-5} , Pseudo- $F_{\text{PERMANOVA}(1,15)} = 5.6$, $P_{\text{PERMANOVA}} < 0.001$, Pseudo- $F_{\text{DISPERSION}(1,15)} = 4.44$, $P_{\text{DISPERSION}} = 0.05$.




Fig. S7. Relationships between seed mass and seed dormancy. Orange points represent grass species while blue circles represent forb species. (a) Mediterranean site (N=80) (b) Semi-arid site (N=43) (c) Arid site (N=14). The relationships were not significant for any of the sites. The x-axes in the left panels are in logarithmic scale.




Fig S8: The relationship between the temporal distance from the first growing season (2001/2002) and the compositional distance (Bray–Curtis index) for the years 2002/2003–2009/2010. Note the log scale of the x-axis. A trend line appears when there is a significant linear trend ($P < 0.05$).




Fig. S9. Temporal dynamics of Bray–Curtis distance between the seed bank and the vegetation in the three sites. Each point represents the distance between the vegetation collected during March\April and the seed bank that was collected before the vegetation during September of the previous calendar year. A trend line appears when there is a significant linear trend ($P < 0.05$).




Fig. S10: Compositional distance (Bray–Curtis index) in the vegetation (left panels) and seed bank from *the first germination season* (right panels) as a function of time lag (temporal distance between years of sampling including all possible pairs). The blue triangle represents the mean compositional distance between two consecutive years (year-to-year variability). The slope of the relationship indicates the rate of long-term trends. (a,b) Mediterranean site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) < 0.001$, $P(\text{slope}) < 0.05$. (c,d) Semi-arid site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) > 0.05$, $P(\text{slope}) < 0.001$. (e,f) Arid site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) > 0.05$, $P(\text{slope}) > 0.05$. The x-axis is on a logarithmic scale.




Fig. S11: Compositional distance (Bray–Curtis index) in the vegetation (left panels) and seed bank from *the second germination season* (right panels) as a function of time lag (temporal distance between years of sampling including all possible pairs). The blue triangle represents the mean compositional distance between two consecutive years (year-to-year variability). The slope of the relationship indicates the rate of long-term trends. (a,b) Mediterranean site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) < 0.05$, $P(\text{slope}) = 0.01$. (c,d) Semi-arid site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) > 0.05$, $P(\text{slope}) < 0.001$. (e,f) Arid site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) > 0.05$, $P(\text{slope}) > 0.05$. The x-axis is on a logarithmic scale.




Fig. S12: Compositional distance (Bray–Curtis index) in the vegetation (left panels) and seed bank from *the third germination season* (right panels) as a function of time lag (temporal distance between years of sampling including all possible pairs). The blue triangle represents the mean compositional distance between two consecutive years (year-to-year variability). The slope of the relationship indicates the rate of long-term trends. (a,b) Mediterranean site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) < 0.005$, $P(\text{slope}) < 0.001$. (c,d) Semi-arid site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) < 0.05$, $P(\text{slope}) < 0.005$ (e,f) Arid site, $P(\text{year-to-year variability}) < 0.05$, $P(\text{slope}) > 0.05$. The x-axis is on a logarithmic scale.




Fig. S13. Relationships between the year of sampling and year-to-year variability. Year-to-year variability is the Bray–Curtis distance between each year compared with the previous year (e.g. ‘2002’ represents the distance between 2002\2003 and 2001\2002 growing seasons). A trend line appears when there is a significant linear trend ($P < 0.05$).