AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Urbanization drivers differentially affect ground arthropod assemblages in the city of Turin (NW-Italy)

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1727361> since 2023-01-27T10:08:22Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1007/s11252-020-00937-z

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Urban Ecosystems

Urbanization drivers differentially affect ground arthropod assemblages in the city of Turin (NW-Italy) --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	UECO-D-19-00020R3	
Full Title:	Urbanization drivers differentially affect ground arthropod assemblages in the city of Turin (NW-Italy)	
Article Type:	Manuscript	
Keywords:	UHI-effect, fragmentation, activity density, multitaxonomic approach	
Corresponding Author:	Marco ISAIA, PhD Universita degli Studi di Torino Torino, ITALY	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Universita degli Studi di Torino	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Elena Piano, PhD	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Elena Piano, PhD	
	Francesca Bona	
	Marco ISAIA, PhD	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	Fondazione Giovanni Gorla (Bando dei Talenti della Società Civile 2016)	Dr Elena Piano
Abstract:	<p>Urbanization is a complex process associated with environmental changes affecting many biotic and abiotic ecosystem components, which cause the alteration of biological communities, habitat features, connectivity and stability. In particular, the urbanization process is usually associated with a decrease in species richness that parallels a general increase in the overall abundance of individuals, mostly due to generalist and tolerant species taking advantage of the altered environmental conditions and outcompeting and excluding native species. We here adopted a hierarchically nested sampling design to investigate the response of ground arthropods to the combined effects of multiple facets of urbanization, namely increased impervious surface cover, temperature and patch isolation, measured at small, intermediate and large spatial scale. We studied 15 plots of 150 m in diameter located in the city of Turin (NW-Italy), along an urbanization-cover gradient ranging from suburbia to the city center. For each plot we considered the level of urbanization at three different scales (circular buffers with a 100, 400 and 1600 m radius). Within each plot, we identified a control and an isolated subplot, and in each subplot, we measured ground temperature using dataloggers and we sampled ground arthropods with pitfall traps. Firstly, by relating ground temperature and urbanization cover, we showed that temperature values reflected an Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect, which indicates increasing values of temperature along the urbanization gradient. This trend was particularly evident at large scale regarding daily and diurnal temperature, and at small scale regarding nocturnal temperature. Secondly, we demonstrated that different groups of ground arthropods respond differently to urbanization cover, with major effects at the largest spatial scale. Finally, we extrapolated the differential contribution of urbanization cover, UHI-effect and patch isolation to the observed activity density of the investigated taxonomic groups: Coleoptera and Hemiptera were influenced by temperature, whereas Hymenoptera, Collembola, Acari and Araneae were mainly influenced by</p>	

	urbanization, especially in control subplots. Our results emphasize how a multitaxonomic approach can help unravel patterns of community assembly in urban areas.
--	---

Urbanization drivers differentially affect ground arthropod assemblages in the city of Turin (NW-Italy)

Elena Piano¹, Francesca Bona¹, Marco Isaia^{1*}

¹Department of Life Sciences and Systems Biology, University of Turin, Via Accademia Albertina 13, 10123 Turin, Italy

*Corresponding author: marco.isaia@unito.it

ABSTRACT

Urbanization is a complex process associated with environmental changes affecting many biotic and abiotic ecosystem components, which cause the alteration of biological communities, habitat features, connectivity and stability. In particular, the urbanization process is usually associated with a decrease in species richness that parallels a general increase in the overall abundance of individuals, mostly due to generalist and tolerant species taking advantage of the altered environmental conditions and outcompeting and excluding native species. We here adopted a hierarchically nested sampling design to investigate the response of ground arthropods to the combined effects of multiple facets of urbanization, namely increased impervious surface cover, temperature and patch isolation, measured at small, intermediate and large spatial scale. We studied 15 plots of 150 m in diameter located in the city of Turin (NW-Italy), along an urbanization-cover gradient ranging from suburbia to the city center. For each plot we considered the level of urbanization at three different scales (circular buffers with a 100, 400 and 1600 m radius). Within each plot, we identified a control and an isolated subplot, and in each subplot, we measured ground temperature using dataloggers and we sampled ground arthropods with pitfall traps. Firstly, by relating ground temperature and urbanization cover, we showed that temperature values reflected an Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect, which indicates increasing values of temperature along the urbanization gradient. This trend was particularly evident at large scale regarding daily and diurnal temperature, and at small scale regarding nocturnal temperature. Secondly, we demonstrated that different groups of ground arthropods respond differently to urbanization cover, with major effects at the largest spatial scale. Finally, we extrapolated the differential contribution of urbanization cover, UHI-effect and patch isolation to the observed activity density of the investigated taxonomic groups:

Coleoptera and Hemiptera were influenced by temperature, whereas Hymenoptera, Collembola, Acari and Araneae were mainly influenced by urbanization, especially in control subplots. Our results emphasize how a multitaxonomic approach can help unravel patterns of community assembly in urban areas.

Keywords: UHI-effect, fragmentation, activity density, multitaxonomic approach

INTRODUCTION

Land-use change has been recognized as one of the major drivers affecting biodiversity (Sala et al. 2000) and, over the recent decades, the conversion of natural lands into urban areas has been greatly increasing worldwide (Seto et al. 2011). From an ecological standpoint, urban ecosystems are associated with substantial changes in the physical environment, among which the increasing nutrient and pollution levels are the most evident (Parris 2016). However, other physical alterations may affect urban areas too. For instance, due to the amount of area characterized by a high built-up cover, ambient temperature in city cores is typically 1.5-2°C higher than in the rural surroundings, i.e. the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect (Oke 1982; Arnfield 2003). Higher urban temperatures mainly stem from an anthropogenic release of heat, combined with the heat stored and re-radiated by massive and complex urban structures (Rizwan et al. 2008). Urbanization effects are apparent also at a landscape scale, as the continuous growth of built-up areas interrupts the semi-natural habitats surrounding cities, creating partially or completely small isolated patches (Parris and Schneider 2009; Rotholz and Mandelik 2013). In addition, the residual natural habitat is often converted into highly impermanent and disturbed habitats, mainly derelict sites — such as brownfields, landfills, gravel and sand pits, industrial dumps and railway lands — characterized by altered soil physical and chemical properties (Small et al. 2003; Tóthmérész et al. 2011).

Such biophysical processes linked to urbanization can have wide-ranging effects on populations and species by altering the quantity, quality, temporal and spatial arrangement of resources (Parris 2016). For instance, the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect may alter the composition of biological communities due to differences in the thermal tolerance of species, causing a shift in community composition towards species with preferences for higher temperatures (Merckx and Van Dyck, 2019). In addition, as suitable habitat patches in urban environments are often isolated, they are more likely to be colonized by good rather than poor

dispersers (see Piano et al. 2017a for an example on ground beetles and Merckx and Van Dyck 2019 for lepidopterans). As a consequence, the number of species is expected to decrease in residual habitat patches (McKinney 2008).

Nonetheless, urban fragments can be characterized by abundant populations of some taxa, since synanthropic urban species may outcompete and exclude native species (Shochat et al. 2010; Mammola et al. 2018), leading to contradictory results (e.g. Christie et al. 2010; Faeth et al. 2011; Fortel et al. 2014; Saari et al. 2016; Banaszak-Cibicka et al. 2018; Alvarez Guevara and Ball 2018). In fact, not only do organisms react differently to environmental changes in urban areas, but they also differ in their response to the scales at which urbanization takes place, as a result of their combination of traits, e.g. dispersal capacity or foraging range (see Egerer et al. 2017, Merckx and Van Dyck 2019, Merckx et al., 2018b). These changes in biodiversity may, in turn, affect key ecosystem processes, like nutrient cycling, decomposition and pest control (McIntyre et al., 2001). Thus, the understanding of the ecological implications of the urbanization process is gaining more and more importance in the scientific debate.

Since ground arthropods cover all of the consumers' trophic roles — i.e. herbivores, predators and decomposers — they are abundant, diverse and responsible for numerous ecosystem functions. They exhibit a variety of dispersal capacities and foraging ranges, likely being affected by urbanization at different spatial scales (Egerer et al. 2017, Eggenberger et al. 2019). Many studies have shown how local factors and habitat types in urban patches may negatively affect the abundance of different arthropod groups (Christie et al. 2010; Norton et al. 2014; Philpott et al. 2014; Otoshi et al. 2015; Laguki et al. 2017; Kyrö et al. 2018), but little is known about their scale of response (see Egerer et al. 2017, Merckx et al. 2018a and Merckx and Van Dyck 2019 for some evidences). In addition, the Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect and patch isolation have been shown to seriously affect single species dynamics (Meineke et al. 2013; Youngsteadt et al. 2015; Kaiser et al. 2016) and community composition in urban environments (Clavero et al. 2011; Menke et al. 2011; Piano et al. 2017a; Meineke et al. 2017; Merckx et al. 2018a; Merckx et al. 2018b). However, to date, the extent to which the combined effect of these phenomena affects ground arthropod abundance has never been addressed by simultaneously examining multiple taxonomic groups. Given their pivotal role in ecosystem functionality — e.g. litter decomposition and pest control —, understanding how urbanization impacts

multiple groups of ground arthropods is necessary to predict alterations in the provision of ecosystem services, which has proved to be strictly dependent on biodiversity in urban areas (Zitter 2016).

Here we performed a field study to investigate the combined effect of increasing urbanization cover (i.e. increasing impervious surfaces, Elvidge et al. 2007), urban heat-island effect and isolation within an urban area on six orders of ground arthropods, differing in their dispersal capacity and foraging behaviour. We selected 15 sampling sites along an urbanization gradient in the city of Turin (Italy), and in each site we sampled arthropods in an isolated green patch (traffic roundabouts) and in the closer wider green area. In addition, within each sampling patch, we measured temperature values during the entire sampling period. We aimed at: i) checking the presence of the UHI-effect in the study area and the scale of temperature response to urbanization, and whether it is influenced by patch isolation; ii) examining at which scale urbanization mostly affects ground arthropod assemblages, by considering the percentage of impervious surfaces at different scales; and iii) evaluating the differential effect of urbanization, UHI-effect and isolation on the activity density of different groups of ground arthropods and whether these groups show different responses to these parameters. We hypothesized that: i) temperature would increase along the urbanization gradient as a consequence of the UHI-effect; ii) the scale of response would differ depending on the examined arthropod group; and iii) arthropod groups would be differentially affected by urbanization, temperature and isolation, showing distinctive responses.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sampling design

This study was conducted in the metropolitan area of Turin (NW-Italy, approximately 900,000 inhabitants), within 15 km of the city center. The city of Turin was founded by the Romans around the year 50 B.C. and it is located between the Western Alps and the beginning of the Po plain in the region of Piedmont. The altitude ranges between 220 and 280 m a.s.l. and the climate is continental.

In order to test the effect of patch isolation independently from urbanization level, we adopted a specific sampling design consisting of a random selection of a total of 15 sites (plots) with open vegetation along an

urbanization gradient: from less urbanized areas in the suburbia to the city center (Fig. 1). In order to examine how patch isolation affects the community of ground arthropods, in each plot we identified two sampling subplots: i) an isolated subplot, located in a roundabout with open vegetation, maintained by regular mowing, and ii) a control subplot, located in the nearest green area with the same type of vegetation, being represented by small green urban patches (1,000 m²), urban parks or semi-natural areas at the city borders (up to a few hundreds of hectares). The whole sampling plot –including the two subplots – was a circular area with a diameter of 150 m (approximately 18,000 m²). We chose roundabouts as appropriate proxies for isolated patches because they are completely surrounded by roads, which constitute a partial - or even a complete - barrier for many organisms (Jaeger and Fahrig 2004). Both control and isolated subplots were, and still are, managed by the public green authority of Turin, which mowed the grass once during the study period in all subplots, thus guaranteeing the same degree of disturbance in both subplot categories. Roundabouts ranged from 6 to 30 m radius (i.e. approximately from 150 to 2,500 m² in surface area), and were equally distributed among three age classes (1 = less than 10 years of age ; 2 = 10 years of age; 3 = more than 10 years of age), which were estimated from historical aerial maps using Google Earth (<https://www.google.com/earth/download/ge>) (Tab. 1). The average distance between sampling plots was of 8,878 m ($\pm 1,705.6$), ranging from 1,408 to 18,512 m.

In order to investigate the scale of response of ground arthropod groups to urbanization cover, we calculated the degree of urbanization for each plot in three progressive larger buffers, defined as circles with a 100 m (small scale), 400 m (medium scale) and 1,600 m (large scale) radius - with the roundabout as the center. By using digital maps updated to 2017 (http://geomap.reteunitaria.piemonte.it/WEBCAT/CAPABILITIES/wms_regp_basecarto10bn_2017.xml) in QGis (Quantum Gis Development 2018) with a resolution of 5 m, we delimited impervious surfaces, namely buildings, roads and parking areas, within each buffer. We then calculated the urbanization cover as the ratio between the area covered by impervious surfaces within the buffer and the total area of the buffer. To explore the UHI effect, we monitored temperature at a ground level in both the isolated and the control subplot of each sampling plot, using 30 HOBO® Pendant® Temperature Data Loggers (Onset Computer Corporation), which were set to record temperature every hour. Data loggers were installed and shielded with an ad-hoc, custom fabricated shield consisting of a shade cloth at the beginning of the experiment, and were

downloaded **after** each sampling occasion. For each subplot we calculated the average daily (0 a.m. – 12 p.m.), diurnal (7 a.m. – 6 p.m.) and nocturnal (7 p.m. – 6 a.m.) temperatures **for** every sampling session.

Data collection

Within each subplot, ground-active arthropods were captured using a triplet of pitfall traps (5-10 m apart), placed at least 20 cm from the subplot border (i.e. the road) and at least 5 m apart to increase catching efficiency (Ward et al. 2001). Pitfall traps consisted of plastic jars (diameter 90 mm, length 110 mm) dug into the ground, ensuring the upper edge of the glass **was flush** with the soil surface. Pitfall traps were filled with 20 ml of 50% propylene glycol, which is a neutral field sampling preservative, with no attractive or repulsive characteristics for most arthropod groups. The pitfall traps were placed on the same day (May 16th, 2017) and were emptied every three weeks for a total of three sampling sessions (June 6th, June 27th **and** July 18th 2017).

Collected material was placed into vials containing **70%** ethanol to preserve specimens. The specimens were sorted, identified following Angelini et al. (2002) and counted. All arthropods were sorted by order or class and by superorder in the case of the Acari. Non-arthropod organisms (e.g. Gasteropoda, Oligochaeta) and larvae were discarded. Arthropod taxa that **had** been found in less than 50% of the total sampling sites (i.e. Orthoptera, Diptera, Dermaptera, Thysanoptera, Lepidoptera, Opiliones, Pseudoscorpionida, Chilopoda, Diplopoda and Isopoda) were also excluded from further analysis to avoid zero inflation. Finally, we retained only 6 out of 16 arthropod orders (Coleoptera, Hymenoptera, Hemiptera, Collembola, Acari and Araneae), which represented the dominant groups. Data from the triplets collected in the same subplot were pooled together and, prior to data analysis, abundance data **was** transformed into **a daily activity density** (D.A.; Brandmayr et al. 2005) following the formula:

$$D.A. = N / ndays * ntraps$$

where N is the abundance of each taxonomic group divided by the sampling effort, expressed as the product **of** the number of days in which traps were active and the number of retrieved traps. This data transformation **has** allowed us to standardize abundance values based on the number of effectively retrieved traps, given that some pitfall traps were lost during the sampling season.

Data analysis

All statistical analyses were performed with the R 3.5.3 (R Development Core Team, 2019) **software**.

UHI-effect

In order to investigate, the presence of the UHI-effect, we modelled the response of average daily, diurnal and nocturnal temperatures against urbanization cover, measured as the coverage of impervious surfaces at a small, medium and large scale. Since the levels of urbanization cover (i.e. percentage of **the** urbanization surface) recorded at the three scales **correlated** with each other, we performed three different models for each temperature variable via linear mixed models (LMMs, in accordance with Zuur et al. 2009), assuming a normal distribution for dependent variables. We compared the performance of models fitted with **an** urbanization level in different buffers (%Urb) and selected the model with the lowest AICc value. We preferred the AICc over the AIC because of small dimensions of the datasets (Hurvich and Tsai 1989). In addition, the model with the lowest AICc was kept as a reference point to calculate the AICc differences ($\Delta AICc$) between **the** models, given that models with values of $\Delta AICc < 2$ are judged to have substantial support and should be considered viable alternatives to the model with the lowest AICc (Burnham and Anderson 2002). In order to further scrutinize whether isolated subplots were characterized with a different microclimate compared to control ones, we also included a categorical variable, distinguishing control and isolated subplots. The models had the following structure:

$$y \sim \%Urb + Isolation + (1|PlotID) + (1|Session)$$

where y indicates average daily, diurnal or nocturnal temperature, %Urb represents the percentage of impervious surface in the buffer (i.e. the level of urbanization) and Isolation represents a categorical variable which distinguishes **the** control and isolated subplots. Given the spatial (two subplots within each plot) and temporal dependence of the data (three sampling sessions), we applied the mixed procedure to include the plot (PlotID) and the sampling session (Session) as **a** random factor to account for the variations they introduced in our samples, rather than **testing** for their direct effects on the dependent variables.

Response to urbanization

In order to disentangle the relative contribution of urbanization cover, UHI-effect and isolation on the activity density of ground arthropods and to check whether the examined groups responded to the environmental parameters differently, we tested the predictor variables and potential interactions against the activity density of ground arthropods via linear mixed models (LMMs, in accordance with Zuur et al. 2009). We assumed a normal distribution for dependent variables and we used the plot (PlotID) and the sampling session (Session) as random variables. Firstly, we explored the dataset following the standard protocol for data exploration proposed by Zuur et al. (2010). According to Zuur et al. (2009, 2010), the inclusion of outliers and highly correlated predictors in the regression analysis leads to misleading results – type I and II statistical errors. Successively, we used Cleveland's dotplots to assess the presence of outliers in dependent and independent variables, and we investigated multi-collinearity among covariates. The percentages of urbanization measured in different buffers were highly correlated, as well as average, diurnal and nocturnal temperatures (Pearson's $r > 0.7$). On the other hand, temperature and urbanization were not collinear (Pearson's $r < 0.5$) according to the indications provided by Zuur et al. (2009, 2010) and therefore could be retained within the same models. Given that predictor variables were expressed in different measurement units, we standardized them to achieve variance homogenization prior to model fitting, as suggested in Zuur et al. (2009).

The response of arthropod groups to environmental parameters was tested with a two-step approach. First, for each taxonomic group, we proceeded with fitting three separated full models, one for each scale of urbanization cover, and we selected the one with the lowest AICc. This procedure was implemented to check at which scale the response of each group was more evident. We also calculated the $\Delta AICc$ for all the other models as the difference between the AICc of the considered model and the AICc of the best model, i.e. with the lowest AICc. Models with $\Delta AICc < 2$ are considered equivalent to the best model (Burnham and Anderson 2002). The full models had the following structure:

$$y \sim \%Urb + \%Urb^2 + Temp + Temp^2 + Isolation + \%Urb*Temp + \%Urb*Isolation + Temp*Isolation + (1|Session) + (1|PlotID)$$

where y refers to the activity density of each arthropod group, %Urb represents the percentage of urbanized surface in the buffer, Temp represents the average daily temperature, and Isolation represents a categorical

variable between the control and isolated subplots. The quadratic terms of predictor variables were included to investigate the occurrence of parabolic responses. Given the spatial and temporal dependence of the data, we applied a mixed procedure to include two grouping variables (PlotID and Session) as random factors, to account for the variation they introduced in our samples, rather than to test for their direct effects on the dependent variables. We adopted a gamma error distribution to keep into account the strictly positive values of activity density data.

Secondly, for each taxonomic group, we performed a backward elimination on the selected model to obtain the minimum adequate model, i.e. the model including only variables that influence the activity density of the examined group.

RESULTS

UHI-effect

The level of urbanization (%Urb) ranged from 12.9% to 95.0%, with an average value of 54.8% at a small scale (100 m), from 11.1% to 99.6% with an average value of 56.2% at a medium scale (400 m) and from 18.7% to 94.8% with an average value of 58.8% at a large scale (1,600 m), therefore covering a wide gradient of urbanization. Mean daily temperature values recorded during the sampling period ranged between 19.98°C and 31.85°C, with an average value of 26.14°C. Mean diurnal temperatures ranged from 21.27 °C to 40.58°C, with an average value of 30.12°C, whereas mean nocturnal temperatures ranged between 18.29°C and 26.45°C, with an average value of 22.16°C.

Results of the statistical models showed how both daily and nocturnal temperature values significantly increased with increasing urbanization level in every buffer, whereas diurnal temperature values showed a significant positive relationship only with the urbanization measured in 400 m and 1,600 m buffers (Tab. 1).

In addition, according to the AICc values, the best models for daily and diurnal temperature included urbanization cover at a large scale (1,600 m buffer), whereas the best model for nocturnal temperature included urbanization cover at a small scale (100 m) (Tab. 1 and Fig. 2). These trends were particularly evident in the control subplots, whereas temperature growth was much less pronounced in isolated subplots, even if values were generally higher.

Scale of response to urbanization

A total of 215 out of 270 pitfall traps were retrieved during the whole sampling season. We collected a total of 99,897 individuals with a mean of 464.3 individuals per pitfall trap (see Fig. 3 for abundances of each group). The best models (i.e. lowest AICc) included urbanization measured in the larger buffer (1,600 m radius) for most groups, except Coleoptera and Acari, whose best models included urbanization at a small (buffer of 100 m of radius) and intermediate (buffer at 400 m of radius) scale, respectively (Tab. 2). However, given that the $\Delta AICc$ values are < 2 , the response of Coleoptera could be considered equivalent at a large scale, while for Hemiptera the response is equivalent at an intermediate scale.

Response to environmental parameters

The results of the models show a differential response to urbanization for the different taxonomic groups (Tab. 3 and Fig. 4). The level of urbanization (%Urb) was included in the final models of all groups, except for Coleoptera and Hemiptera, but it proved to have significant positive effect only on Acari. Temperature was included in 4 out of 6 final models, with significant responses for three groups (Tab. 3 and Fig. 5). While Coleoptera and Acari proved to be negatively affected by temperature, Araneae showed a significant positive trend. The quadratic term was included in the final model of Acari with a significant negative effect. Isolation was included in 5 out of 6 groups and we observed significantly higher values of activity density in control subplots than in isolated subplots in 3 out of 5 groups, namely Hymenoptera, Acari and Araneae (Tab. 3 and Fig. 6). The interaction between urbanization level (%Urb) and isolation was included in 4 out of 6 final models, with significant lower values of activity density in isolated subplots compared to the control subplots, with increasing urbanization for Hymenoptera, Acari and Collembola, whereas Araneae showed the opposite trend (Tab. 3 and Fig. 4). The interaction between isolation and temperature was included in the final model of Hemiptera and Acari, but only the former showed a significant effect (Tab. 3 and Fig. 5), with temperature negatively affecting this group in isolated subplots more than in control subplots. The interaction between urbanization levels and temperature was included in the final model of Acari with a significant positive effect, thus underling how temperature positively affects this group in highly urbanized areas (Tab. 3 and Fig. 7).

DISCUSSION

Urbanization is expected to impact biodiversity and, consequently, ecosystem functioning due to the combined effect of multiple interacting pressures – increasing impervious surfaces, increasing temperature and habitat fragmentation. Thanks to a hierarchical, nested sampling design we were able to evaluate the differential role of impervious surfaces and isolation on the UHI-effect, and tested the combined effect of these pressures on the activity density of six ground arthropod groups.

Our first aim was to check whether the UHI-effect was actually ongoing by relating recorded temperature values with urbanization at a small, medium and large scale, and whether isolation could affect this parameter. We hypothesized that temperature would increase along the urbanization gradient as a consequence of the UHI-effect and our results confirmed our hypothesis. We revealed that temperature values observed during the sampling period significantly increased along the urbanization gradient, confirming the presence of a UHI-effect in the city of Turin, especially at night. Similar trends were observed by Diamond et al. (2014) and Merckx et al. (2018a) in Ohio (USA) and Belgium (Europe) respectively. However, only nocturnal temperature was mainly influenced by urbanization at a local scale — possibly because of the buildings releasing heat stored during the day — while daily and diurnal temperatures better reflect urbanization on a larger scale. As the scale increases, the influence of the adjoining land-uses decreases (Ziter et al. 2019). Thus, we can suppose that night temperatures can be mitigated by the surrounding land cover and the UHI-effect is mainly reflected on a local scale. In addition, nocturnal temperature measured at ground level, like as in this study, seems to be more influenced by microscale site characteristics than air temperature as reviewed by Arnfield et al. (2003). Conversely, during the day, the heat absorbed by impervious surfaces probably creates extremely isolated temperature islands, limiting the possible mitigating effects of surrounding land use. These results point out how urbanization may have climatic repercussions even at a very local scale, exacerbating the UHI-effect and transforming cities into climatic mosaics. This phenomenon has been observed in the city of Baltimore (USA), where the center is 5-10°C warmer than the surrounding area (Brazel et al. 2000; George et al. 2007). In addition, our results demonstrated that isolated patches, such as roundabouts, have significantly higher temperature values compared to control ones and their temperature values appear to be less influenced by urbanization compared

1 to the control sites. This is in accordance with the literature, since altered physical and chemical conditions,
2 such as microclimate alteration, have been documented in ruderal habitats, like road edges, as a result of road
3 operation and traffic (Parris and Schneider 2008), further contributing to the creation of a climatic mosaic in
4 cities. Moreover, control patches can be influenced by surrounding land use, e.g. tree canopy cover of
5 adjacent forested areas may mitigate the UHI-effect (Ziter et al. 2019), while this is not possible in isolated
6 patches.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 Our second aim was to examine to what scale urbanization could affect ground arthropods, by considering
15 the percentage of impervious surfaces at a small, medium and large scale. We showed that responses of
16 ground arthropods were better explained by large scale urbanization, contradicting our hypothesis. These
17 outcomes apparently contradict literature, since several works highlight how local factors usually have a
18 stronger effect than landscape factors (Angold et al. 2006; Small et al. 2006; Schwartz et al. 2013; Bennett
19 and Lovell 2014; Do et al. 2014; Philpott et al. 2014; Otoshi et al. 2015; Kyrö et al. 2018), even if Delgado
20 de la Flor et al. (2017) and McCary et al. (2018) observed how covariation between local and landscape
21 factors affect ground-active arthropods. In particular, McCary et al. (2018) highlighted how the shared
22 variance between local, i.e. habitat type, landscape and landscape fragmentation variables explained half of
23 the variation in several ground-active arthropods, whereas Delgado de la Flor (2017) evidenced a combined
24 effect of local habitat type and buildings in the landscape on ground beetle community composition.
25 However, as habitat types differed profoundly in these studies, it remained less clear to what extent the
26 measured response was a consequence of habitat type or urbanization *per se*. Since we consistently sampled
27 the same habitat type along the urbanization gradient, we were able to disentangle the scale of response
28 without confounding factors, underpinning how urbanization affects ground arthropods at a large scale. The
29 only exception is represented by Acari, which demonstrated a medium scale response, whereas, according to
30 the minimum adequate model, Coleoptera were not affected by urbanization.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Our third aim was to evaluate the differential effect of urbanization, the UHI-effect and isolation on the
54 activity density of different taxonomic groups and whether the examined groups showed different responses
55 to these environmental parameters. We hypothesized arthropod groups would be differentially affected by
56 urbanization, temperature and isolation, showing idiosyncratic responses, and our results confirmed our
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

hypothesis. In respect to this, our sampling design was particularly suitable in disentangling the effect of patch isolation and urbanization on the different taxonomic groups here investigated.

Our results showed that Acari and Araneae were mostly affected by urbanization, as their final models included all the three examined environmental parameters, namely urbanization cover, temperature and patch isolation. These results are in accordance with the review provided by El-Sabawii (2018), who highlighted how predator groups, such as Acari and Araneae, are more affected **by urbanization than others**. A weaker response was observed for Hymenoptera, here mainly represented by ants, Collembola and Hemiptera, mainly represented by aphids, whose final models included two parameters. In particular, patch isolation showed a **significantly** negative effect for all groups, suggesting how their fitness in urban environments may be negatively affected by their low dispersal. Coleoptera showed the weakest response, as they were **only affected** by one parameter, namely temperature. This result may be due to the heterogeneous composition of Coleoptera in terms of feeding guilds, with the response of each guild being masked **by** the others.

By using the percentage of impervious surfaces as a proxy of urbanization, we **have** highlighted how this parameter alone does not affect examined taxonomic groups, except for Acari that showed a significant positive trend with increasing urbanization. However, if we consider the interaction between urbanization cover and patch isolation, we could highlight extremely variable responses among taxonomic groups: in particular, Collembola and Hymenoptera showed a positive and negative trend in control and isolated patches respectively with increasing urbanization, whereas Araneae showed the opposite trend. Although species richness positively responds to increasing availability of natural habitats even in anthropogenic environments (e.g. Piano et al. 2017b), contradictory results are common when analysing individual densities. For instance, Kotze et al. (2011) highlighted how in certain cities the abundance of beetles decreased with increasing urbanization, while in others this pattern was less consistent, or even opposite, in the case of communities dominated by introduced species (Niemelä and Kotze 2009). Such inconsistent responses reflect the complex nature of urban habitats and urban arthropod communities. On **the** one hand, pollution - as well as the high level of impermanence in urban habitats - may lead to an increased stochasticity in environmental conditions (Parris 2016), which may negatively affect particular groups. For instance, predators, like spiders, are expected to be sensitive to pollution because they feed at higher trophic

levels, where toxins and pollutants tend to accumulate (see El-Sabawii 2018 for a review on this topic). On the other hand, urban patches provide a high availability of trophic resources (Parris 2016), which might favour generalist and alien species. For instance, pest arthropods, like some mites, are expected to increase in urban areas, due to human activity that eradicate native predators (Shocat et al. 2010). Similarly, omnivores, such as ants, which here represent 95% of Hymenoperans, are probably favoured in urban areas by the increase of anthropogenic food resources (El-Sabawii 2018). These changes at different trophic levels may have repercussions on the entire trophic food web, compromising the ecosystem services provided by the ground arthropod fauna, such as litter decomposition or pest control. Model outcomes displayed opposite trends of arthropod groups against temperature, which show a negative effect on Coleoptera and Acari and a positive effect on Araneae; whereas Hemiptera are favoured by temperature in control patches and disfavoured in isolated ones. Overall, the response to temperature increase has been shown to be extremely variable across arthropod groups as a consequence of variable physiological heat tolerance in ectotherms (Youngsteadt et al. 2017). Increasing temperature may, in fact, favour the fitness of those organisms with a wide thermal tolerance breadth, whereas species with a narrow thermal tolerance breath will be negatively affected (Sunday et al. 2012). This is especially true at mid-latitudes, as demonstrated by physiological tests, which showed that the lowest thermal tolerance to the UHI effect is observed between 30° and 35°N or S (Chown and Duffy 2015), whereas response patterns within the temperate zone showed contradictory results (Pelini et al. 2014). On the basis of measured physiological tolerances, two recent studies have predicted that mid-latitudes (between 20° and 40°) will encompass strong variability among taxa regarding the effects of urban warming and climate change on their fitness (Kingsolver et al. 2013; Chown and Duffy 2015). Moreover, the response of arthropod groups to environmental temperature may also be mediated by other environmental parameters, as demonstrated by the final model of Acari, which included the interaction between the urbanization cover and temperature. In respect to this group, higher temperatures have a negative effect on activity density, but this effect decreases and disappears with increasing urbanization cover, suggesting how the effect of urbanization *sensu stricto* may override the UHI-effect. In addition, the response to the UHI-effect may be even more complex since it seems to be mediated by life-history traits, such as dispersal capacity (Merckx et al. 2018a). Our results confirm such a response to temperature

1 increase, pointing out how the repercussions of the UHI effect are extremely hard to predict and therefore
2 mitigate.

3
4
5 It should be noted that temperature data recorded in the field with dataloggers is highly influenced by shield
6 methods and ad-hoc, custom-fabricated shields, such as those used in this work, and may produce bias in
7 temperature measures, especially in urban areas (Terando et al. 2017). Therefore, these results should be
8 interpreted with caution.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Finally, we observed a consistent negative effect of isolation on 5 out of 6 taxonomic groups with significant
16 results for Hymenoptera, Acari and Araneae. Moreover, we proved that this effect is even stronger at
17 increasing levels of urbanization. Despite always showing higher values in control vs isolated patches,
18 spiders represent an exception to this pattern since their abundance in isolated patches increases with the
19 rising level of urbanization. This result contradicts literature, since Braaker et al. (2014) demonstrated how
20 isolated surrogates of natural habitats in urban areas, such as green roofs, might sustain populations of highly
21 dispersive arthropods, e.g. bees and weevils, but limit poor dispersers, e.g. carabids and spiders. However, in
22 some cases (e.g. small Linyphiids or young instars of Lycosids) spiders may show high dispersal capacity via
23 ballooning, therefore overcoming the limits imposed by isolation. Therefore, according to our results,
24 isolated patches in urban areas might be considered as islands surrounded by an inhospitable matrix that
25 limits the dispersion of organisms. While habitat connectivity between isolated patches does not represent a
26 limit for highly dispersive groups, it might severely limit poor dispersers, with serious repercussions on
27 biodiversity.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 Our results emphasize how a multitaxonomic approach may help in unravelling apparently contradictory
46 patterns in urban areas. Indeed, we isolated the response of taxonomic groups on an urbanization level, UHI-
47 effect and patch isolation, which may act in opposite directions depending on the sensitivity of each group.
48
49 In addition, we highlighted how ground arthropod responses mainly occur on a large scale. In conclusion,
50 urbanization has negative ecological repercussions by diversely affecting the abundance of several
51 taxonomic groups of ground arthropods, which play a central role in a variety of processes, or represent a
52 food source for higher trophic levels, thus suggesting potential negative effects on ecosystem functionality
53 and services.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Acknowledgements

This work is part of the research fellowship grant “Bando dei Talenti della Società Civile 2016” won by EP and funded by the Fondazione Gorla, the University of Turin and the Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences. The authors wish to thank the three anonymous referees, who contributed to the significant improvement of the manuscript with their constructive comments and suggestions. We thank Giulia Chiampo and Simone Savio for their help in the field work and sample sorting. Many thanks also to Alexandra Jones for linguistic revision of the text. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alvarez Guevara JN, Ball BA (2018) Urbanization alters small rodent community composition but not abundance. *PeerJ* 6: e4885.

Angold PG et al. (2006) Biodiversity in urban habitat patches. *Sci Tot Env* 360: 196–204.

Arnfield AJ (2003) Two decades of urban climate research: a review of turbulence, exchanges of energy and water, and the urban heat island. *Int J Climatol* 23: 1-26.

Banaszak-Cibicka W, Twerd L, Fliszkiewicz M, Giejdasz K, Langowska A (2018) City parks vs. natural areas - is it possible to preserve a natural level of bee richness and abundance in a city park? *Urban Ecosyst* 21: 599–613.

Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S (2015) Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *J Stat Softw* 67(1): 1-48.

Bennett AB, Lovell ST (2014) A comparison of arthropod abundance and arthropod mediated predation services in urban green spaces. *Insect Conserv Divers* 7: 405–412.

Bishop L (1990) Meteorological aspects of spider ballooning. *Environ Entomol* 19(5): 1381-1387.

Brandmayr P (2005) I coleotteri carabidi per la valutazione ambientale e la conservazione della biodiversità: manuale operativo. APAT. Manuali e linee guida. 34/2005.

Braaker S, Ghazoul J, Obrist MK, Moretti M (2014) Habitat connectivity shapes urban arthropod communities: the key role of green roofs. *Ecology*, 95(4): 1010-1021.

Brazel A, Selover N, Vose R, Heisler G. (2000) The tale of two climates Baltimore and Phoenix urban LTER sites. *Clim Res* 15(2): 123-135.

Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) Model selection and multimodel inference New York. NY: Springer.

1 Chown SL, Duffy GA (2015) Thermal physiology and urbanization: perspectives on exit, entry and
2 transformation rules. *Funct Ecol* 29(7): 902-912.
3

4
5 Christie FJ, Cassis G, Hochuli DF (2010) Urbanization affects the trophic structure of arboreal
6 arthropod communities. *Urban Ecosyst* 13: 169–180.
7
8

9
10 Clavero M, Villero D, Brotons L (2011) Climate change or land use dynamics: do we know what
11 climate change indicators indicate? *Plosone* 6(4): 1-8.
12
13

14
15 Delgado de la Flor YA, Burkman CE, Eldredge TK, Gardiner MM (2017) Patch and landscape-
16 scale variables influence the taxonomic and functional composition of beetles in urban greenspaces.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190

Fortel L, Henry M Guilbaud, L, Guirao AL, Kuhlmann M, Mouret H, Rollin O, Vaissière BE (2014) Decreasing Abundance, Increasing Diversity and Changing Structure of the Wild Bee Community (Hymenoptera: Anthophila) along an Urbanization Gradient. *Plosone* 9: e104679.

George K, Ziska LH, Bunce JA, Quebedeaux B (2007) Elevated atmospheric CO₂ concentration and temperature across an urban–rural transect. *Atmos Environ* 41(35): 7654-7665.

Hurvich CM, Tsai CL (1989) Regression and time series model selection in small samples. *Biometrika* 76: 297–307.

Kaiser A, Merckx T & Van Dyck H (2016) The Urban Heat Island and its spatial scale dependent impact on survival and development in butterflies of different thermal sensitivity. *Ecol Evol* 6(12): 4129-4140.

Kingsolver JG, Diamond SE, Buckley LB (2013) Heat stress and the fitness consequences of climate change for terrestrial ectotherms. *Funct Ecol* 27: 1415–1423.

Kotze DJ, Brandmayr P, Casale A et al. (2011) Forty years of carabid beetle research in Europe - from taxonomy, biology, ecology and population studies to bioindication, habitat assessment and conservation. *Zookeys* 100: 55-148.

Kyrö K, Brenneisen S, Kotze DJ, Szallies A, Gerner M, Lehvävirta S (2018) Local habitat characteristics have a stronger effect than the surrounding urban landscape on beetle communities on green roofs. *Urban For Urban Green* 29: 122–130.

Lagucki E, Burdine JD, McCluney KE (2017) Urbanization alters communities of flying arthropods in parks and gardens of a medium-sized city. *PeerJ* 5: e3620.

Mammola S, Isaia M, Demonte D, Triolo P, Nervo M (2018) Artificial lighting triggers the presence of urban spiders and their webs on historical buildings. *Landscape Urban Plan* 180: 187-194.

Mazerolle MJ (2017) AICcmodavg: Model selection and multimodel inference based on (Q)AIC(c). R package version 2.1-1. <https://cran.r-project.org/package=AICcmodavg>.

McCary MA, Minor E, Wise DH (2018) Covariation between local and landscape factors influences the structure of ground-active arthropod communities in fragmented metropolitan woodlands. *Landscape Ecol* 33(2): 225-239.

McDonald RI, Kareiva P, Forman RT (2008) The implications of current and future urbanization for global protected areas and biodiversity conservation. *Biol Cons* 141(6): 1695-1703.

McIntyre NE, Rango J, Fagan WF, Faeth SH (2001) Ground arthropod community structure in a heterogeneous urban environment. *Landscape Urban Plan* 52: 257–274.

McKinney ML (2008) Effects of urbanization of species richness: a review of plants and animals. *Urban Ecosyst* 11: 161-176.

Oke TR (1982) The energetic basis of the urban heat island. *Q J Roy Meteor* 108: 1-24.

Meineke EK, Dunn RR, Sexton JO Frank SD (2013) Urban Warming Drives Insect Pest Abundance on Street Trees. *Plosone* 8: e59687.

Meineke EK, Holmquist AJ, Wimp GM, Frank SD (2017) Changes in spider community composition are associated with urban temperature, not herbivore abundance. *J Urban Ecol* 3: juw010.

Menke SB, Guénard B, Sexton JO, Weiser MD, Dunn RR, Silverman J (2011) Urban areas may serve as habitat and corridors for dry-adapted, heat tolerant species: an example from ants. *Urban Ecosyst* 14(2): 135-163.

Merckx T et al. (2018a). Body-size shifts in aquatic and terrestrial urban communities. *Nature* 558: 113–116.

Merckx T, Kaiser A, Van Dyck H (2018b) Increased body size along urbanization gradients at both community and intraspecific level in macro- moths. *Global Change Biol* 24(8): 3837-3848.

Merckx T., Van Dyck H. (2019) Urbanization-driven homogenization is more pronounced and happens at wider spatial scales in nocturnal and mobile flying insects. *Glob Ecol Biogeog* 28(10) doi: 10.1111/geb.12969

Niemelä J, Kotze DJ (2009) Carabid beetle assemblages along urban to rural gradients: A review. *Landscape Urban Plan* 92: 65-71.

Norton BA, Thomson LJ, Williams NSG, McDonnell MJ (2014) The effect of urban ground covers on arthropods: An experiment. *Urban Ecosyst* 17: 77–99.

Otoshi MD, Bichier P, Philpott SM (2015) Local and Landscape Correlates of Spider Activity Density and Species Richness in Urban Gardens. *Environ Entomol* 44: 1043–1051.

Parris KM (2016) *Ecology of Urban Environments*. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, West Sussex, UK.

Parris KM, Schneider A (2009) Impacts of traffic noise and traffic volume on birds of roadside habitats. *Ecol Soc* 14(1): 29.

Pelini SL et al. (2014) Geographic differences in effects of experimental warming on ant species diversity and community composition. *Ecosphere* 5: 1–12.

Philpott SM, Cotton J, Bichier P, Friedrich RL, Moorhead LC, Uno S, Valdez M (2014) Local and landscape drivers of arthropod abundance, richness, and trophic composition in urban habitats. *Urban Ecosyst* 17: 513–532.

Piano E et al. (2017a) Urbanization drives community shifts towards thermophilic and dispersive species at local and landscape scales. *Global Change Biol* 23(7): 2554-2564.

Piano E, Isaia M, Falasco E, La Morgia V, Soldato G, Bona F (2017b) Local versus landscape spatial influence on biodiversity: a case study across five European industrialized areas. *Environ Mon Ass* 189(3): 126.

QGIS Development Team (2018) QGIS Geographic Information System. Open Source Geospatial Foundation Project. <http://qgis.osgeo.org>

R Development Core Team (2019) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <http://www.R-project.org>

1 Rizwan AM, Dennis LY, Chunho LIU (2008) A review on the generation, determination and
2 mitigation of Urban Heat Island. J Environ Sci 20(1): 120-128.
3

4
5 Rotholz E, Mandelik Y (2013) Roadside habitats: effects on diversity and composition of plant,
6 arthropod, and small mammal communities. Biod Cons 22(4): 1017-1031.
7

8
9
10 Saari S, Richter S, Higgins M, Oberhofer M, Jennings A, Faeth SH (2016) Urbanization is not
11 associated with increased abundance or decreased richness of terrestrial animals - dissecting the literature
12 through meta-analysis. Urban Ecosyst 19: 1251–1264.
13
14
15

16
17
18 Sala OE et al. (2000) Global biodiversity scenarios for the year 2100. Science 287(5459): 1770-
19 1774.
20
21

22
23 Seto KC, Gueneralp B, Hutyrá LR (2012) Global forecasts of urban expansion to 2030 and direct
24 impacts on biodiversity and carbon pools. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 109: 16083-16088.
25
26

27
28 Shochat E, Warren PS, Faeth SH, McIntyre NE, Hope D (2006) From patterns to emerging processes
29 in mechanistic urban ecology. TREE 21(4): 186-191.
30
31

32
33
34 Shochat E, Lerman SB, Anderies JM, Warren PS, Faeth SH, Nilon CH (2010) Invasion, competition,
35 and biodiversity loss in urban ecosystems. BioScience 60(3): 199-208.
36
37

38
39 Shwartz A, Muratet A, Simon L, Julliard R (2013) Local and management variables outweigh
40 landscape effects in enhancing the diversity of different taxa in a big metropolis. Biol Cons 157: 285–292.
41
42

43
44 Simonneau M, Courtial C, Pétilion J (2016) Phenological and meteorological determinants of spider
45 ballooning in an agricultural landscape. C R Biol 339(9-10): 408-416.
46
47

48
49 Small EC, Sadler JP, Telfer MG (2003) Carabid beetle assemblages on urban derelict sites in
50 Birmingham, UK. J Insect Cons 6(4): 233-246.
51
52

53
54 Small E, Sadler JP, Telfer M (2006) Do landscape factors affect brownfield carabid assemblages?
55 Sci Tot Environ 360: 205–222.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Sunday JM, Bates AE, Dulvy NK (2012) Thermal tolerance and the global redistribution of animals. *Nature Climate Change* 2(9): 686.

Terando AJ, Youngsteadt E, Meineke EK, Prado SG (2017) Ad hoc instrumentation methods in ecological studies produce highly biased temperature measurements. *Ecol Evol* 7(23): 9890-9904.

Tóthmérész B, Máthé I, Balázs E, Magura T (2011) Responses of carabid beetles to urbanization in Transylvania (Romania). *Landscape and Urban Plan* 101(4): 330-337.

Ward DF, New TR, Yen AL (2001) Effects of pitfall trap spacing on the abundance, richness and composition of invertebrate catches. *J Insect Cons* 5(1): 47-53.

Weyman GS (1993) A review of the possible causative factors and significance of ballooning in spiders. *Ethol Ecol Evol* 5(3): 279-291.

Youngsteadt E, Dale AG, Terando AJ, Dunn RR, Frank SD (2015) Do cities simulate climate change? A comparison of herbivore response to urban and global warming. *Global Change Biol* 21: 97–105.

Youngsteadt E, Ernst AF, Dunn RR, Frank SD (2017) Responses of arthropod populations to warming depend on latitude: evidence from urban heat islands. *Global Change Biol* 23: 1436–1447.

Ziter C (2016) The biodiversity–ecosystem service relationship in urban areas: a quantitative review. *Oikos* 125(6): 761-768.

Ziter CD, Pedersen EJ, Kucharik CJ, Turner MG (2019) Scale-dependent interactions between tree canopy cover and impervious surfaces reduce daytime urban heat during summer. *PONAS* 116(15): 7575-7580.

Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker NJ, Savaliev AA, Smith GM (2009) Mixed effect models and extensions in ecology with R. Berlin: Springer; 574 pp.

Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Elphick SC (2010) A protocol for data exploration to avoid common statistical problem. *Methods Ecol Evol* 1(1): 3-14.

Tables

Table 1 AICc and Δ AICc values for models performed with urbanization at small, medium and large scale and estimated parameters and p-values (in brackets) for models performed on temperature variables against urbanization (%Urb) and patch isolation (Isolation) in each buffer. The best models and significant results are reported in bold.

	DAILY TEMPERATURE (°C)			DIURNAL TEMPERATURE (°C)			NOCTURNAL TEMPERATURE (°C)		
	100 m	400 m	1600 m	100 m	400 m	1600 m	100 m	400 m	1600 m
AICc	343.3	341.6	338.0	424.9	423.1	419.9	241.9	246.0	245.7
ΔAICc	5.3	3.6	0	5	3.2	0	0	4.1	3.8
%Urb	0.024 ± 0.009	0.025 ± 0.008	0.036 ± 0.010	0.027 ± 0.016	0.033 ± 0.015	0.051 ± 0.018	0.02 ± 0.004	0.017 ± 0.004	0.021 ± 0.005
	(0.009)	(0.003)	(<0.001)	(0.085)	(0.027)	(0.006)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)	(<0.001)
Isolation	1.29 ± 0.478	1.35 ± 0.471	1.4 ± 0.460	2.41 ± 0.854	2.5 ± 0.842	2.58 ± 0.826	0.133 ± 0.231	0.198 ± 0.238	0.227 ± 0.238
	(0.010)	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.565)	(0.407)	(0.344)

Table 2 AICc and Δ AICc values for models performed with urbanization at small, medium and large scale. The best models, namely those with the lowest value of AICc, are reported in bold. Δ AICcs are calculated as the difference between the AICc of the examined model and the AICc of the best model. Models with Δ AICc < 2 could be considered as equivalent of the best model.

		100 m	400 m	1600 m
Coleoptera	AICc	558.5	561.2	560.0
	Δ AICc	0	2.7	1.5
Hymenoptera	AICc	579.9	578.0	575.4
	Δ AICc	4.5	2.6	0
Hemiptera	AICc	448.0	446.8	445.5
	Δ AICc	2.5	1.3	0
Collembola	AICc	602.6	601.9	596.8
	Δ AICc	5.8	5.1	0
Acari	AICc	570.1	563.8	567.6
	Δ AICc	6.3	0	3.8
Araneae	AICc	424.7	424.2	419.3
	Δ AICc	5.4	4.9	0

Table 3 Estimated parameters $\pm$ standard errors and p-values (in brackets) of final models selected for each taxonomic group. Significant results are reported in bold.

Taxon	Scale of response	%Urb	%Urb ²	Temp	Temp ²	Isolation	%Urb: Isolation	Temp: Isolation	%Urb: Temp
Coleoptera	Small	-	-	-0.434 $\pm$ 0.121 (<0.001)	-	-	-	-	-
Hymenoptera	Large	0.206 $\pm$ 0.180 (0.252)	-	-	-	-0.472 $\pm$ 0.098 (<0.001)	-0.208 $\pm$ 0.104 (0.045)	-	-
Hemiptera	Large	-	-	0.089 $\pm$ 0.184 (0.629)	-	-0.352 $\pm$ 0.184 (0.056)	-	-0.408 $\pm$ 0.187 (0.029)	-
Collembola	Large	0.251 (0.252)	-	-	-	-0.137 (0.436)	-0.563 (0.002)	-	-
Acari	Medium	0.920 $\pm$ 0.275 (<0.001)	-	-0.581 $\pm$ 0.168 (<0.001)	-0.148 $\pm$ 0.093 (0.003)	-0.466 $\pm$ 0.207 (0.025)	-0.546 $\pm$ 0.210 (0.009)	0.417 $\pm$ 0.239 (0.082)	0.401 $\pm$ 0.137 (0.003)
Araneae	Large	-0.014 $\pm$ 0.008 (0.102)	-	0.103 $\pm$ 0.046 (0.026)	-	-1.06 $\pm$ 0.422 (0.012)	0.015 $\pm$ 0.006 (0.020)	-	-

Figure captions

Fig. 1 Map of the sampling plots with buffers (black circles) and impervious areas evidenced (dark grey).

Fig. 2 Predicted values and confidence intervals for daily, diurnal and nocturnal temperatures modelled against urbanization cover (%Urbanization) in both control (solid line) and isolated (dashed line) sites. Predicted values modelled against %Urbanization were calculated using the buffer included in the selected model for each temperature measure.

Fig. 3 Total abundance of ground arthropods sampled during the study.

Fig. 4 Predicted values and confidence intervals for activity density of the different groups modelled against urbanization cover (%Urbanization) in both control (solid line) and isolated (dashed line) subplots, with observed values (green dots = control subplots; grey dots = control subplots). Predicted values modelled against %Urbanization were calculated using the buffer included in the selected model for each taxonomic group.

Fig. 5 Predicted values and confidence intervals for activity density of Coleoptera, Acari and Araneae modelled against daily temperature in both control (solid line) and isolated (dashed line) subplots, with observed values (green dots = control subplots; grey dots = control subplots).

Fig. 6 Boxplots representing observed activity density values for each taxonomic group in control and isolated sites. Asterisks indicate significant differences according to statistical models (significance level: *0.05, **0.01, ***0.001).

Fig. 7 Predicted values and confidence intervals for activity density of Acari and the interaction between urbanization and temperature. Lines represent the temperature effect at low (0%, continuous line), intermediate (50%, dashed line) or high (100%, dotted line) urbanization cover.

Figure 1

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Fig. 1.tiff](#)

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Fig. 4_new.tif](#)

Figure 5

[Click here to access/download;Figure;Fig 5_new.tif](#)

Figure 6

Figure 7

COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR:

Co-Editor-In-Chief: I agree with the recommendation of the Associate Editor and suggest you find a native English speaker who can help improve the readability of your manuscript. Upon receipt of a corrected manuscript, we will be able to accept your manuscript.

Dear Dr. Isaia,

Thank you for your resubmission and attention to addressing the comments of the reviewers. I think the manuscript is acceptable pending an additional read from a native English speaker.

All the best,
Susannah Lerman, PhD
Associate Editor
USDA Forest Service

>>> Dear Editors,

Many thanks for the positive comments on our manuscript. We adjusted the text following the suggestions provided by a native speaker as you required. We hope that this could substantially improve the readability of our manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

Marco Isaia

Francesca Bona

Elena Piano

[Click here to access/download](#)

Supplementary Material

Piano et al._Supplementary material.docx