Promising weeds forage potential in perennial Mediterranean agroecosystems

Léa Genty, Elena Kazakou, Aurélie Metay, Denis Bastianelli, Marie-Charlotte Bopp, Karim Barkaoui

HAL Id: hal-03988369
https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03988369

Better grazed than weeded: promising weeds digestibility in perennial Mediterranean agroecosystems

Léa Genty[1,2], Elena Kazakou[3], Aurélie Metay[2], Denis Bastianelli[4,5], Karim Barkaoui[1,2]

[1] CIRAD, UMR ABSys, F-34398 Montpellier, France

[2] ABSys, Univ Montpellier, CIHEAM-IAMM, CIRAD, INRAE, Institut Agro, Montpellier, France

[3] CEFE, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, Institut Agro, Montpellier, France

[4] CIRAD, UMR SELMET, F-34398 Montpellier, France

[5] SELMET, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, INRAE, Institut Agro, Montpellier, France

Abstract

Biodiversity presence in perennial agroecosystems increases the provision of ecosystem services (ES). Weeds are known to deliver supporting or regulating services but their potential to provide provisioning services is less studied. Our study aims to quantify the potential of weeds to provide forage resources for livestock in two Mediterranean perennial agroecosystems: olive groves and vineyards., We used a trait-based approach to investigate the abiotic determinants of weed quality and quantity variations at both the species and community levels. We surveyed spontaneous vegetation in 16 vineyards and 16 olive groves in the French Mediterranean region with contrasting pedoclimatic conditions and agricultural practices, during spring and fall 2021. Four leaf traits were measured: Leaf Dry Matter Content (LDMC), Specific Leaf Area (SLA), Leaf Nitrogen Content (LNC) and leaf C/N ratio (Leaf C/N) and four forage potential indicators: dry matter digestibility (DMD), crude proteins (CP), fiber content (NDF) and aboveground biomass (AB). We found that DMD of perennial agroecosystems weeds is high (689 ± 116 g kg^{-1}), and can be compared to those of forage species. Using linear mixed models and path analysis, we found that, at the community scale, LDMC is negatively linked to weed forage quality and that disturbing agricultural practices like

1

29 tillage, increase weed forage quality. However, at the scale of our study, we found no effect of

30 agricultural practices or pedoclimate on weeds leaf traits or on weeds quantity. Our results

31 revealed the potential of considering weeds as qualitative forage resources for livestock. The

32 long-term aim is to promote the integration of livestock in perennial cropping systems in order

33 to reduce the use of herbicides and/or tillage and to diversify agricultural production.

34 Keywords : forage resources ; leaf dry matter content ; soil management ; vineyards ; olive

35 groves

1. Introduction

37 Weeds were seen as a burden for a long time, but nowadays their potential to provide supporting

38 or regulating ecosystem services (ES) is increasingly recognized (Zhang et al., 2007; Milanovic

39 et al., 2021). This potential is particularly relevant in perennial woody agroecosystems where

40 the spontaneous vegetation provides resources and habitats for biodiversity (Simon et al., 2010).

41 In these perennial agroecosystems, temporal soil management on both rows and inter-rows

42 allows weeds presence at specific times without disturbing the agricultural production (Garcia

43 et al., 2019). Vineyards and olive groves can potentially host diverse weeds communities to

44 provide ES (Demestihas et al., 2017; Winter et al., 2018; Carpio et al., 2019 Paiola et al., 2020).

45 Both crops are traditional and patrimonial agroecosystems in the Mediterranean region,

46 representing almost 300 000 ha of vineyards and slightly more than 17 700 ha of olive groves

47 in the cultivated areas in Mediterranean France (Agreste, 2021). Under the Mediterranean

48 climate, it is crucial to manage weeds to limit competition for water during dry periods and

49 preserve crop yields. During recent decades, inter-row weeds have been increasingly managed

50 through tillage or mowing while herbicide application strongly decreases. However, these

51 agricultural practices have an important impact on biodiversity and affect its ability to provide

52 ES (Dale and Polasky, 2007; Syswerda and Robertson, 2014), partly because they modify the

53 composition and structure of weed communities (Fried et al., 2012). Weeds are often associated

54 with supporting or regulating ES, but in perennial agroecosystems, they can also be used for

55 provisioning services; livestock fodder, for example. Moreover, sheep grazing in the inter-rows

56 can be an alternative to herbicide, mowing (Niles et al., 2018), or tillage without affecting the

57 yield (Lazcano et al., 2022).

2

58   Weed biomass quality and quantity define forage potential. Their nutritive value and
59   palatability has rarely been evaluated in perennial woody agroecosystems and only at the
60   species level (Marten and Andersen, 1975; Marten et al., 1987). Dry matter digestibility (DMD)
61   is a key property to evaluate plant quality to feed ruminants because it estimates animal
62   digestion (Bruinenberg et al., 2002). It is positively linked to the crude proteins (CP), the total
63   amount of protein present and negatively to the fiber content (NDF) which is the total amount
64   of fiber present. Dry matter digestibility is known to be related to different leaf traits. Studies
65   about the relationships between traits, environment, and digestibility usually focused on
66   spontaneous vegetation of the pastures or the hays (Abaye et al., 2009; Bunton et al., 2019), but
67   never on weeds. The most documented relationship is the negative link between DMD, and/or
68   its components (fiber content, crude proteins), and leaf dry matter content (LDMC). The
69   dominance hypothesis (Grime, 1998), based on the idea that dominant species have a major
70   impact on processes compared to other species, appears to apply in explaining the digestibility
71   of the biomass of multi-species communities. This link between LDMC and forage quality was
72   found both at the species (Khaled., 2006; Pontes et al., 2007; Bumb et al., 2016; Tasset et al.,
73   2019) and community level (Andueza et al., 2010 ; Gardarin et al., 2014; Tasset et al., 2019).
74   DMD is positively linked to leaf nitrogen content (LNC) (Pontes et al., 2007; Bumb et al., 2016)
75   and specific leaf area (SLA) (Khaled., 2006; Pontes et al., 2007; Tasset et al., 2019). Leaf traits
76   like LDMC or SLA are also significant determinants of biomass productivity of the vegetation
77   (Pontes et al., 2007; Ansquer et al., 2009; Chollet et al., 2014).

78   Weeds represent a peculiar pool of species (Mahaut et al., 2020) that are favored in
79   disturbed and fertilized environments, which are important ecological filters characterizing
80   arable fields (Bourgeois et al., 2019). To cope with those filters, especially with high levels of
81   disturbance in intensively-managed agroecosystems, weeds develop ruderal strategies (Grime
82   et al., 1974) that are notably characterized by a fast life cycle (Wright et al., 2004). This strategy
83   can be summarized by traits from the Leaf-Height-Seed (LHS) scheme. For instance, high SLA
84   values suggest high biomass production, with fast growth, and early reproduction but smaller
85   dispersing seeds (Westoby, 1998). Weeds were recently found to exhibit a homogeneous trait
86   syndrome characterized by these ruderal strategies, especially with high SLA values (Bourgeois
87   et al., 2019). This weed-trait syndrome identified by acquisitive and productive strategies could
88   have an impact on forage quality because SLA is positively related to dry matter digestibility
89   (Khaled, 2006; Pontes et al., 2007; Tasset et al., 2019) and productivity: the main determinants
90   of forage potential of the vegetation. Similarly, SLA is strongly linked to LDMC and LNC,

3

91   which covariate with DMD (Khaled, 2006; Pontes et al., 2007; Andueza et al., 2010; Gardarin
92   et al., 2014; Bumb et al., 2016; Tasset et al., 2019). These results suggest that weeds represent
93   a promising potential to provide qualitative grazing resources according to the intensity of soil
94   management.

95   Yet, disturbing agricultural practices like mowing, and fertilization are known to
96   increase the forage quality of plants (Duru et al., 1997; Gardarin et al., 2014; Bumb et al., 2016)
97   and traits directly linked to forage quality in grasslands (Garnier et al., 2016). These
98   relationships need to be investigated in perennial agroecosystems, where agricultural practices
99   often represent types of disturbance (like tillage or frequent mowing) that differ from those
100   usually found in grasslands. By cutting aboveground biomass, mowing keeps plants at the
101   vegetative stage, where they are the most digestible (Pontes et al., 2007; Gardarin et al., 2014).
102   Soil tillage is supposed to represent a higher disturbance for weeds than mowing (Gaba et al.,
103   2014; Kazakou et al., 2016) because it destroys both above and belowground biomass. Tillage
104   is known to select species with ruderal strategy (low LDMC and high LNC and SLA, according
105   to Kazakou et al., 2016) and may therefore also increase forage quality (Gaba et al., 2014).
106   However, the direct effect of tillage on digestibility has not been investigated yet. Interestingly,
107   olive groves and vineyards are not managed similarly: in France, vineyard inter-rows are
108   frequently tilled, especially in Mediterranean region (Fernandez-Mena et al., 2021), whereas
109   olive groves are usually mown. Consequently, plant species composition and diversity differ
110   between these agroecosystems, with usually lower taxonomic and functional diversity in
111   vineyards than in olive groves. In vineyards, there are usually more generalist species associated
112   with ruderal characteristics and disturbed environments (Cohen et al., 2015). These
113   disturbances can modify weed leaf traits and positively influence their digestibility.

114   Lastly, pedoclimatic conditions and season are also known to have an impact on both
115   leaf traits, quality and quantity of forage resources. Indeed, the digestibility of grassland species
116   is known to be higher in wetter conditions than in dryer ones (Gardarin et al., 2014) and higher
117   early in the season (Bumb et al., 2016). The biomass of grassland species decreases when water
118   soil content decreases (Chollet et al., 2014), but these relationships remain unknown for weed
119   species. Leaf traits related to digestibility are also affected by climate (Garnier et al., 2019), and
120   soil conditions (Jager et al., 2015). Based on these findings, we can hypothesize that
121   pedoclimatic conditions and the season will modify the forage potential of weeds in perennial
122   agroecosystems.

4

123   Our study aims at quantifying the potential of weeds to provide forage resources in

124 perennial agroecosystems across seasons under different soil management practices and

125 pedoclimatic conditions. Using a trait-based approach, we investigated the determinants of

126 weed quality and quantity variations in olive groves and vineyards at both the species and

127 community levels. We hypothesized that (1) forage quality would be high (high dry matter

128 digestibility and crude proteins and low fiber content) and related to leaf traits (high SLA and

129 LNC, low LDMC) ; (2) forage quality and associated traits would vary both between and within

130 agroecosystems. Due to different agricultural practices between agroecosystems, we expected

131 higher forage quality but lower biomass production in vineyards than in olive groves.

132 Specifically, we expected that disturbing practices like tillage would promote more digestible

133 species with higher LNC and SLA and lower LDMC compared to mowing; (3) forage quality,

134 associated traits, and biomass production would be all affected by pedoclimatic conditions. We

135 expected that low rainfall and low soil fertility would decrease forage quality by selecting less

136 digestible species with lower SLA and LNC and higher LDMC. To test these hypotheses, we

137 assessed weed composition and diversity and evaluated their forage quality and biomass

138 production in 16 vineyards and 16 olive groves with contrasting agricultural practices along a

139 pedoclimatic gradient in the French Mediterranean region during the spring and fall of 2021.

140 We measured leaf traits related to forage quality and digestibility and evaluated the forage

141 potential of the monitored communities both at the species and the community levels.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Study sites

144 We selected 32 fields corresponding to two agroecosystems (16 olive groves and 16 vineyards)

145 located in the French Mediterranean region, in an area of 60 km around Montpellier (Occitanie).

146 We chose the fields according to three criteria: (i) no herbicide use on the inter-row, (ii)

147 contrasting pedoclimatic conditions, and (iii) different soil management practices (tillage or

148 mowing).

149   To characterize agricultural practices in each field, we interviewed the farmers twice a

150 year in 2020 and 2021, focusing on inter-row management where most weed plants grow. The

151 questionnaire (composed of 61 questions for wine-growers and 45 questions for olive growers)

152 was divided into two principal sections: (1) general information about the farmland and the

153 studied fields, and (2) agricultural practices and soil management. We collected six variables

5

154 related to agricultural practices: the average number of tillages per year, the average depth of
155 tillage, the average number of mowing per year, the average return interval between two weed
156 destructions, the average applied nitrogen quantity, and the average quantity of irrigation per
157 year (mm) (Table S1).

158

2.2. Climatic conditions

160 Climatic conditions in each field were described using data from the nearest weather station to
161 each field. In total, for the 32 fields, we used 12 weather stations. The mean distance between
162 a field and a station was 8.65 ±4.2 km. The nearest station was located 0.5 km from the nearest
163 field, and the farthest station was located 19.7 km. We collected monthly rainfall, maximum
164 and minimum temperatures from 1980 to 2021. We used the function *biovars* from the *dismo*
165 (Hijmans 2017) package in the R software version 4.1.1 to calculate 6 climatic variables
166 representing the local seasonal trends: mean annual temperature, annual rainfall, rainfall of the
167 driest month, maximum temperature of the warmest month, annual temperature range and
168 precipitation seasonality (Table S2).

2.3. Soil analysis

170 To characterize the soil texture and properties, we sampled five soil cores in five randomly-
171 chosen inter-rows per field down to a depth of 20 cm. By pooling the five samples, we obtain
172 one composite soil sample per field. The pH (NF ISO 10390), soil texture (NF X 31-107
173 method), nitrogen content, cation-exchange capacity (CEC), and total organic matter content
174 (NF ISO 14235) were determined for each field sample (n = 32) following standard protocols
175 by a soil analysis laboratory (Table S3).

2.4. Botanical surveys

177 We conducted two seasonal botanical surveys in the inter-rows of each field, avoiding field
178 margins, during spring (March-April) and fall (November-December) 2021. We used five
179 randomly located 0.25 m^2 quadrats per field. We assessed the weeds by identifying each taxon
180 to the species, or genus level when species identification was not possible. We estimated species
181 abundance by visual assessment of cover percentage in each quadrat. We determined the
182 species' phenological stage using the method of Yvoz and al. (2021). We also recorded the
183 bare-soil cover for each quadrat.

6

2.5. Leaf functional traits at the species level

Based on the botanical surveys, we selected 74 species in vineyards and 64 in olive groves, representing 80 % of the plant abundance represented by the plant cover in each quadrat. Some species (n= 34) were found in both types of agroecosystem but were collected separately in vineyards and olive groves as they represent different populations. Five functional leaf traits were measured on 8 individuals per species in each type of agroecosystem according to the standard protocols described in Pérez-Harguindeguy et al. (2013): (1) leaf dry matter content (LDMC, mg g^{-1}) which is the oven-dry mass of a leaf, divided by its water-saturated fresh mass; (2) specific leaf area (SLA, m^2 kg^{-1}) which is the one-sided area of a fresh water-saturated leaf divided by its oven-dry mass, (3) leaf nitrogen content (LNC, mg g^{-1}), (4) leaf carbon content (LCC, mg g^{-1}) and (5) leaf C/N ratio (C/N ratio, mg g^{-1}) were measured pooling the 8 individuals leaves at the species level with elemental combustion analysis (NF ISO 10694) **(**Table S4**)** with three repeated measures.

2.6. Plant biomass production and quality indicators at the species and community level

We collected, oven-dried (60°C, 48 h), weighed, and ground (knife mill with 1mm sieve) the plant aboveground biomass (AB) present in each quadrat separately. Dry matter *in vitro* digestibility (DMD, g kg^{-1}) and two chemical components, neutral detergent fiber (NDF, g kg^{-1}) and crude protein (CP, g kg^{-1}, Table 1**)**, were determined at the community (n = 305) and at the species (n = 86) levels.

Analysis was performed using near-infrared reflectance spectroscopy (NIRS). NIRS is a non-destructive physical method to estimate chemical plant biomass composition.

Reflectance spectra were collected using a FOSS NIRSystem 6500 spectrometer (FOSS NIRSystems, Silver Spring, MD, USA) operating at 400–2500nm with a 2 nm step (i.e., 1050 data points). Spectra were taken on ground samples in ring cells equipped with quartz glass. Duplicate spectra measurements were performed (two different cup fillings) and averaged.

To perform prediction, calibrations already existing at CIRAD (French International Centre of Agricultural Research for Development, Montpellier, France) were used after being adapted to our samples. To do this, a subset of our samples was analysed with reference methods in the laboratory. NDF content was measured using the Van Soest method (Van Soest et al., , 1991) and CP content was measured with Kjeldahl method. DMD was measured by an in vitro

7

215 enzymatic method with pepsin and cellulase (Aufrère et al., 2007). Calibration was performed
216 using modified partial least square regression with the WINISI software (Version 4, Infrasoft
217 185 International, Port Matilda, PA, USA).

2.7. Community structure indices

219 Community Weighted Means (CWM) were calculated at the quadrat level for the five leaf traits
220 cited above **(Table 1)**. CWM is the average value of a given trait in a community and is
221 calculated as the average trait value $trait_i$ of each species i weighted by its abundance p_i (Garnier
222 et al., 2004) according to equation 1.

223 $$CWM_{trait} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i \times trait_i \qquad \text{Equation 1}$$

2.8. Data analysis

225 All statistical analyses were performed using the R software version 4.1.1 (R Core Team, 2021)
226 and the R packages *Tidyverse* (Wickham., 2009), *lme4* (Bates et al., 2015), *FactoMineR* (Josse
227 and Husson., 2008), *MuMIn* (Barton., 2020), *car* (Fox and Weisberg., 2019) and *piecewiseSEM*
228 (Lefcheck et al., 2020).

229   First, we conducted a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) with the six climatic
230 variables and the six soil variables to analyze the co-variations between pedoclimatic variables.
231 Similarly, we conducted a second PCA with the six variables related to agricultural practices.
232 The coordinates of the fields on the first two axes of both PCAs were used as composite
233 variables indicating the position of each field along two 'pedoclimatic gradients' ($PC1_{pedoclim}$,
234 $PC2_{pedoclim}$) and two 'agricultural gradients' ($PC1_{agri}$, $PC2_{agri}$) as explanatory environmental and
235 agronomic variables in the further analyses. We tested the effects of agroecosystem type
236 (vineyards *vs.* olive groves) on the explanatory variables from both PCAs using Student's T-
237 tests. We tested the relationship between pedoclimatic conditions and agricultural practices
238 using Pearson's correlation.

239   We tested the relationships between field-averaged AB, DMD, NDF and CP using
240 Pearson's correlations. We tested the effects of agroecosystem type (vineyards *vs.* olive groves)
241 and season (spring *vs.* autumn) on the variables using Student's T-tests at the field level.

242   We tested the effects of agroecosystem type (vineyards *vs.* olive groves) and season
243 (spring *vs.* autumn) on the CWM of the five leaf traits.

8

244   We ran a series of linear mixed-effects models to test the influence of the four abiotic

245 descriptors ($PC1_{pedoclim}$, $PC2_{pedoclim}$, $PC1_{agri}$, $PC2_{agri}$) on (1) the forage quality (DMD, NDF, CP,

246 AB), (2) the CWM of LDMC, SLA, LNC, LCC and C/N ratio, and (3) the influence of the

247 CWM of LDMC, SLA, LNC, LCC and C/N ratio on the forage quality. The field was added to

248 all models as a random effect. Before model selection and evaluation, we tested the collinearity

249 of the fixed effects in the model using the variance inflation factors with the *vif* function. VIF

250 values of 10 or higher are usually interpreted as revealing severe multicollinearity issues (Hair

251 et al., 2006) and were removed. For the pedoclimate and agricultural practices variables VIF of

252 $PC1_{pedoclim}$, $PC2_{pedoclim}$, $PC1_{agri}$, $PC2_{agri}$ were < 2, so we kept all the explanatory variables in the

253 tested models. For the CWM of the five leaf traits, the VIF of the CWM of LCN, LCC and C/N

254 ratio were >10 so we removed the CWM of LCC. When we removed LCC all VIFs were < 2.

255 We kept the CWM of LDMC, SLA, LCN, and C/N ratio in the tested models. We then used the

256 function 'dredge', which performs a stepwise comparison between full, reduced and 'null'

257 models built from the combination of all, several, or only one fixed effect. We selected the

258 model with the lowest second-order Akaike Information Criterion value (AICc values)

259 corrected for small sample sizes (Burnham et al., 2002). The cut-off to select a model was set

260 at Δ AICc < 2 (Burnham et al., 2002). When possible, we kept the most parsimonious model,

261 i.e. the simplest one. Finally, we evaluated the best-selected models using likelihood ratio tests

262 and calculated the marginal and conditional R^2 following Nakagawa & Schielzeth 2012.

263   Path analysis was used to understand the relationships between leaf traits, agricultural

264 practices, pedoclimate, and season on digestibility and its structural components. A

265 combination of linear models is used to quantify the relative effect of different variables on

266 digestibility and biomass with the field added as a random effect. The tested variables were

267 those selected by the linear mixed models performed before. Covariations were tested between

268 the pedoclimate and agricultural practice variables, between the CWM of leaf traits and between

269 digestibility and biomass. We tested the significance of estimated regression path coefficients

270 associated with each causal relationship between variables. Standardized regression path

271 coefficients are conventionally considered to strongly influence the variable when they are

272 above 0.8, moderately between 0.2 and 0.8, and little below 0.2 (Shipley et al., 2009).

273

3. Results

3.1. Pedoclimatic and agricultural practice gradients

The first two axes of the 'pedoclimatic gradient' PCA explained 59.9 % of the total variance among the 32 study fields. The first axis ($PC1_{pedoclim}$ 36.4 %) discriminated between the fields with high annual temperature ranges, high maximal temperatures and heavy rainfall from the fields with high annual mean temperatures and lower rainfalls. $PC1_{pedoclim}$ opposed the 'continental' fields with positive values to 'coastal' fields with negative values. The second axis ($PC2_{pedoclim}$, 23.9 %) discriminated the fields with high soil organic nitrogen content, soil organic matter, cation-exchange capacity, and presence of clay from the fields with high sand content (**Table 2**). $PC2_{pedoclim}$ opposed the 'fertile' fields with positive values to 'low-resource' fields with negative values (**Table 2**). The coordinates of the fields on the first two axes of the pedoclimatic PCA were extracted to create environmental explanatory variables found in **Table 2**. $PC1_{pedoclim}$ ($P < 0.0001$) and $PC2_{pedoclim}$ ($P < 0.0001$) significantly differed between agroecosystems, they were higher in olive groves than in vineyards.

The first two axes of the 'agricultural practices gradient' PCA explained 67.6 % of the total variance among the 32 study fields. The first axis ($PC1_{agri}$, 43.1 %) discriminated between the fields with high tillage and the mown ones. $PC1_{agri}$ opposed the 'tilled' fields with positive values, mostly vineyards, to the 'mown' fields with negative values, mostly olive groves. The second axis ($PC2_{agri}$, 24.5 %) was negatively correlated with the duration between two weed destruction dates (-0.67) and positively correlated with irrigation amount and mowing frequency. $PC2_{agri}$ mainly reflected the heterogeneity of agricultural practices within the olive groves: opposing 'irrigated and regularly mown' fields with positive values to 'rarely mown' fields with negative values. The coordinates of the fields on the first two axes of the agricultural practices PCA were extracted to create agricultural practice explanatory variables (Table 2). $PC1_{agri}$ ($P < 0.0001$) significantly differed between agroecosystems: it was higher in vineyards than in olive groves. $PC2_{agri}$ did not differ between agroecosystems.

$PC2_{pedoclim}$ and $PC1_{agri}$ were negatively correlated (R : -0.55, P = 0.0008): fields located on more fertile soils were managed by mowing more than by tillage. There were no other correlations between $PC1_{pedoclim}$, $PC2_{pedoclim}$, $PC1_{agri}$ and $PC2_{agri}$.

3.2. Weed communities: species composition and their digestibility

During the two sessions (Spring 2021, Fall 2021) we identified 178 weed species overall (vineyards and olive groves), and the five most abundant were *Medicago minima* (Fabaceae), *Plantago lanceolata* (Plantaginaceae), *Bromus madritensis* (Poaceae), *Diplotaxis erucoides* (Brassicaceae) and *Geranium mole* (Geraniaceae)(Table S5). In vineyards, the five most abundant species were *Diplotaxis erucoides* (Brassicaceae), *Helminthotheca echioides* (Asteraceae), *Veronica persica* (Plantaginaceae), *Erodium cicutarium* (Geraniaceae) and *Malva sylvestris* (Malvaceae). In olive groves, the five most abundant species were *Medicago minima* (Fabaceae), *Plantago lanceolata* (Plantaginaceae), *Bromus spp* (including *B. madritensis, B. hordeaceus, B. sterilis*) (Poaceae), *Geranium molle* (Geraniaceae) and *Vulpia ciliata* (Poaceae). 30 species were only found in vineyards and 60 species only in olive groves so there were 88 species found both in olive groves and vineyards. 51 species were only found in spring and 35 only in fall so there were 92 species found both in spring and fall.

The five species with the lowest DMD were three Poaceaes *(Bothriochloa barbinodis:* 537 g kg^{-1}, *Vulpia ciliata:* 615 g kg^{-1}, *Cynodon dactylon*: 628 g kg^{-1}) and two Cyperaceaes (*Cyperus rotundus:* 538 g kg^{-1}, *Carex ornithopoda:* 609 g kg^{-1}) (Fig. 2)**.** The five species with the highest DMD were *Chenopodium album* (953 g kg^{-1}, Amaranthaceae) , *Calendula arvensis* (936 g kg^{-1} , Asteraceae), *Urtica urens* (919 g kg^{-1}, Urticaceae), *Diplotaxis erucoides* (886 g kg^{-1}, Brassicaceae) and *Galium aparine* (870 g kg^{-1}, Rubiaceae, Fig. 2).

We created four groups according to the DMD of each species by following the thresholds indicated by Bosworth et al. (1986). This study indicated that under 500 g kg^{-1} the DMD value was too low to fulfill all ruminant needs, but none of our species were below this threshold, so we did not retain that group. According to Bosworth et al., (1986), a digestibility above 600 g kg^{-1} was high, so we assumed that between 500 and 600 g kg^{-1} the digestibility is low, and we created our group 1 "low digestibility' with this threshold. Group 1 contained only two species whose total cover was 1.64 %. The group 2 "high digestibility" contained species between 600 and 800 g kg^{-1} and contained 49 species whose total cover was 51.9 %. Finally, we extrapolated and placed species whose DMD was above 800 g kg^{-1} in a third group: "very high digestibility" with 41 species whose total cover was 37.69 %. There were 8.77 % of the species cover for which the DMD was not measured at the species level.

11

3.3. Digestibility, fiber content, crude protein and aboveground biomass at the community level and their covariations across the agroecosystem and the season

At the community level, DMD (mean: 689 ± 116 g kg^{-1}), NDF (mean: 394 ± 101 g kg^{-1}) and CP (mean: 156 ± 50 g kg^{-1}) were significantly affected by both the agroecosystem and the season, except for AB (mean: 60.2 ± 46.7 g m^2) which did not differ between olive groves and vineyards **(Table 3)**. Communities found in olive groves had significantly higher NDF and lower DMD and CP compared to vineyards, which is consistent with the results of the green cover of each quality group. Communities collected during fall had significantly higher NDF and CP and lower DMD and AB than those collected in spring **(Table 3)**.

We found that DMD was negatively related to NDF (R = -0.85, P < 0.0001, Fig. 3A**)** and positively to CP (R = 0.59, P < 0.0001) **(**Fig. 3B**).** NDF was negatively related to CP (-0.42, P = 0.0006, Fig. 3C**)**. AB and CP were negatively related (-0.33, P = 0.008, Fig. 3D**)**. No significant relationship was found between AB and DMD (P = 0.94) nor with NDF (P = 0.79).

3.4. Variability of traits according to season and agroecosystem at the community level

The CWM of LDMC was the leaf trait with the highest range (84 to 463 mg g^{-1}), and the CWM of LCC was the leaf trait with the smallest range (224 to 444 mg g^{-1}, **Table 1)**. We found inconsistent effects of the season and the agroecosystem on CWM of leaf traits: the only leaf trait that was significantly affected by both the agroecosystem and the season was CWM LCC: it was significantly higher in olive groves (P = 0.03) than in vineyards and in spring (P = 0.002) than during fall. CWM LNC (P = 0.0002) was not affected by the agroecosystem but was significantly higher in fall than during spring. CWM SLA was not affected by the season but was significantly higher in olive groves (P < 0.0001) than in vineyards. No effect of the agroecosystem or season was found on the CWM LDMC and the CWM C/N ratio.

The CWM SLA was negatively correlated with the PC1$_{agri}$ (estimate = -1.52, P = 0.007) : tilled communities had higher CWM SLA than mown communities. The CWM C/N ratio was negatively correlated with the PC2$_{agri}$ (estimate = -5.59, P = 0.03): communities that were less regularly mown and irrigated had a higher CWM C/N ratio than those more regularly mown and irrigated. None of the other axes affected CWM SLA or CWM C/N ratio. None of the agricultural practices nor pedoclimatic axes were correlated with CWM of the three other leaf

12

traits (LDMC, LNC, LCC). The best models selected to explain the CWM of the three other leaf traits were always the null models, keeping only the random effect of the field.

3.5. Environmental variables and CWM of leaf traits modified digestibility and structural components

Concerning environmental variables, we found that DMD was positively linked to $PC1_{agri}$ opposing tilled vs. no-tilled/mown fields (estimate = 23.1, P = 0.01): plant communities in tilled fields had higher DMD than mown ones **(Table 4)**. DMD was also negatively linked to $PC2_{pedo}$ opposing fertile vs. low resource soils (estimate = -23.6, P = 0.003): communities from more fertile fields had significantly lower DMD than communities from low-resource soils **(Table 4)**. Similarly, NDF was negatively linked to $PC1_{agri}$ (estimate = -36.5, P < 0.0001): mown communities had higher NDF than tilled ones. NDF was also negatively linked to the $PC1_{pedoclim}$ opposing "continental" to "coastal" fields (estimate = -11.8, P = 0.01): coastal fields had higher NDF than continental ones **(Table 4)**. In contrast, CP was positively linked to $PC1_{agri}$ (estimate = 9.75, P = 0.009): tilled communities had higher CP than mown ones **(Table 4)**. $PC2_{agri}$ was never linked to DMD or any of its structural components. DMD and CP were not linked to $PC1_{pedoclim}$ and the digestibility structural components (NDF and CP) were not linked to $PC2_{pedoclim}$. Finally, none of the agricultural practices nor pedoclimatic PCs affected AB. The best model selected to explain AB was always the null model, keeping only the random effect of the field.

Concerning leaf traits, we found that DMD was negatively related with CWM LDMC (estimate = -0.51, , P = 0.002, Fig. 4A**)** and CWM C/N ratio (estimate = -0.67, P = 0.009, Fig. 4B**)** and positively with CWM LNC (estimate = 2.13, P = 0.04, Fig. 4C, Table 5**)**. NDF was positively related with CWM LDMC (estimate = 0.85, P < 0.0001, Table 5**)**. A positive relationship was also established between CP and CWM LNC (estimate = 3.15, P < 0.0001) and negatively with CWM C/N ratio (estimate = -0.45, P < 0.0001, Table 5**)**. CWM LNC was also negatively related to AB (estimate = -1.42, P = 0.006, Table 5**)**. Finally, CWM SLA was not related to digestibility, any of its structural components nor to AB.

Path analysis confirmed our previous results and showed that agricultural practices and pedoclimatic conditions did not modify the CWM of LCC, C/N ratio, and LDMC but directly had an impact on DMD **(Fig. 5)**: $PC1_{agri}$ increased DMD (P = 0.007), and $PC2_{pedoclim}$ decreased DMD (P = 0.007). It also showed that CWM LDMC (P = 0.002) and CWM C/N ratio (P = 0.02) decreased DMD whereas LNC increased DMD (P = 0.002, Fig. 5**)**. Only the season had an

13

396 impact on both DMD (P < 0.0001) and AB (P < 0.0001): they were both higher in spring than

397 in fall. We found no effect of CWM of leaf traits or agricultural practices and pedoclimate

398 variables on AB: only the season affected AB, which was higher in spring (P < 0.0001, Fig. 5).

399 Season also modified CWM LDMC (P = 0.01) and CWM LNC (P < 0.0001) which were both

400 higher in fall than in spring. Finally, we found strong covariations between CWM C/N ratio

401 and CWM LDMC (P < 0.0001) and between CWM C/N ratio and CWM LNC (P < 0.0001)

402 and between $PC1_{agri}$ and $PC2_{pedoclim}$ (P < 0.0001, Fig. 5). We found no covariation between

403 DMD and AB. To summarize, we found low but significant effects of CWM LNC and CWM

404 C/N ratio on DMD and only a seasonal effect on CWM LNC, CWM LDMC, and DMD. We

405 also found moderate but significant effects of $PC1_{agri}$, $PC2_{pedoclim,}$ and CWM LDMC on DMD.

406 Finally, the strongest effect observed, considered moderate according to Shipley et al., 2009, is

407 the effect of the season on the AB, which is higher in spring than in fall (Fig. 5).

4. Discussion

4.1. Olive grove and vineyard weeds had a potential to provide forage resources for livestock.

411 This study evaluates whether weeds have a potential to provide quality forage for livestock.

412 Our results indicate a promising potential for forage resources for sheep (Figure 2, Table 3).

413 Studied species and communities have a high *in vitro* digestibility (> 600 g kg^{-1}) with a mean

414 digestibility of around 769 g kg^{-1} at the leaf species level and 689 g kg^{-1} (± 116) at the

415 community level. These DMD values are suitable for ruminants (Bosworth et al., 1986, Fig. 2).

416 According to the indicator of Cruz et al. (2010), which proposes four categories of plant forage

417 quality based on their leaf traits values (LDMC), the majority of species (71.6%, Table 4) and

418 communities (87 %, Table 1) of our study fitted in the most digestible category (group A).

419 When compared to natural or sown grassland species, the studied weed species had

420 either equal (Bumb et al., 2016) or lower ranges of digestibility (Khaled et al., 2007). However,

421 the studied weed communities had a lower forage quality overall than sown grasslands

422 composed of selected forage species. Only four of the studied species had higher or similar

423 DMD than two of the most widespread sown forages species: *Lolium multiflorum* (mean DMD

424 : 892 g kg^{-1}) and *Medicago sativa* (mean DMD : 880 g kg^{-1}, Tables INRA, 2010) which cover

425 respectively 600 000 ha and 300 000 ha of grasslands in France (Agreste, 2006). Although some

426 of the most digestible species in our study: *Chenopodium album* (953 g kg^{-1}), *Diplotaxis*

14

427 *erucoides* (886 g kg^{-1}), and *Galium aparine* (870 g kg^{-1}) (Fig.2, Table S6), respectively the first,

428 the fourth and the fifth most digestible, are usually of important concern as they are considered

429 to be harmful weeds in annual cropping systems (herbicide-resistant, competitive, allelopathic)

430 and are therefore suppressed by weed management instead of being used as forage (Defelice,

431 2002; Qasem et al., 2007; Konstantinovic et al., 2015).

432   Contrary to quality, weed biomass production was low. Weeds in olive groves and

433 vineyards produced 0.6 t ha^{-1} on average (Table 1) which was considerably lower than the 3.5

434 to 5 t ha^{-1} of biomass produced in the permanent grasslands in the South of France (Agreste,

435 2016). However, these low values should be interpreted with caution since when the sampling

436 was realized, the peak of biomass was not reached for each weed community due to

437 management constraints of the agroecosystems. In particular, some plots (n = 60/305) had

438 already been mown or tilled before the vegetation sampling. Most of these plots were located

439 in vineyards (n = 40/60) where management was more disturbing and weeds more often

440 destroyed than in olive groves. Consequently, the potential biomass production may have been

441 under-estimated. This low biomass is also due to the fact that in early spring most of the annual

442 weeds are still young, which implies that their DMD is higher than when they reach their

443 biomass peak (Klein et al., 2013). This temporality is a major explanation of the high DMD of

444 the spring weed communities.

445   The forage potential was higher in spring than in fall, resulting from seasonal dynamics

446 of both weed biomass quantity (AB) and quality (dry matter digestibility, crude proteins and

447 fiber content) **(Table 3)**. The lower forage potential in fall can be explained by a seasonal

448 decrease in weed forage quality over the year (Abaye et al., 2009; Bumb et al., 2016) driven by

449 plant trait responses to the drier climatic conditions during summer and before the fall rainfalls.

450 Nevertheless, biomass production in fall can be an additional forage resource during a period

451 of usually low vegetative productivity.

4.2. Community scale weed forage potential was related to leaf traits

453 Our second hypothesis was that the relationships between biomass quality, quality and leaf

454 traits would be consistent in perennial agroecosystems as demonstrated in grasslands (Bumb et

455 al., 2016). Specifically, we found that forage quality increased with increasing LNC and more

456 significantly with decreasing LDMC and C/N at both the species and community levels. Our

457 results extend the genericity of trait-digestibility relationships previously demonstrated in

15

458 grasslands to weeds, despite their unique functional trait syndrome characterized by more
459 ruderal strategies (Bourgeois et al. 2019, Table 5, Fig 4, Fig 5). Additionally, the dominance
460 hypothesis was validated here as the CWM of different leaf traits calculated from the most
461 abundant species, were significantly related to forage quality (dry matter digestibility, crude
462 proteins and fiber content). Bumb et al. (2016) demonstrated that the increase of LDMC and
463 C/N ratio decreases digestibility, whereas an increase in LNC promotes nutritional quality and
464 increases digestibility. However, we did not find any relationship between SLA and forage
465 quality, even if this relationship is well documented in the literature (Pontes et al., 2007; Tasset
466 et al., 2019).

467 Unexpectedly, we found no relationship between weed leaf traits and biomass even if,
468 in previous studies, LDMC was found to be negatively related to biomass production in
469 grasslands (Pontes et al., 2007). Similarly, SLA has been repeatedly identified as a significant
470 determinant of biomass production in grasslands (Garnier et al., 2016). We assume that the
471 important presence of *Poaceae* with lower SLA than the other species could hide this
472 relationship. The low variation in biomass between the studied fields may explain this result.
473 Furthermore, the absence of significant relationships suggests that weed biomass may be driven
474 by agricultural practices more than plant traits in these regularly tilled or mowed
475 agroecosystems. However, to further understand trait-biomass relationships in such a particular
476 context, it might be relevant to measure traits of the stems, in addition to leaves (Bumb et al.,
477 2016), since they represent an important part of plant biomass and are usually part of the bite
478 category of most of the studied species (Agreil and Meuret, 2004).

4.3. Increased weed forage potential due to disturbance in specific agroecosystems

481 Reflecting differences in weed species composition, weed community forage quality differed
482 between agroecosystems. The three forage quality indicators (dry matter digestibility, crude
483 proteins and fiber content) revealed higher forage quality in vineyards than in olive groves
484 (**Table 3**). This difference can be explained by differing species composition between the
485 agroecosystems: contrary to olive groves, the frequent tillage of vineyards selected for more
486 digestible species. Our results demonstrated a difference between the five more abundant
487 species in each agroecosystem (Table S5). Two of the most abundant species of olive groves
488 were Poaceaes with low digestibility values: *Vulpia ciliata* (mean DMD: 615 g kg^{-1}) and
489 *Bromus spp* (mean DMD: 655 g kg^{-1}). More digestible species with higher DMD values were

16

490 more abundant in vineyards, : for example, the olive grove to vineyard comparison shows
491 *Chenopodium album* one to three occurrences, *Diplotaxis erucoides* two to sixty-one
492 occurrences and *Urtica urens* one to seventeen occurences. Only *Calendula arvensis* was
493 equally present in both systems with nine and seven occurrences in olive groves and vineyards
494 respectively. *Diplotaxis erucoides* (mean DMD: 886 g kg^{-1}), the most abundant (61
495 occurrences) and dominant (10% of species cover) species in vineyards, was also one of the
496 most digestible species found in the present study and compared to sown species.

497   Agricultural practices were the primary cause of weed forage quality differences between
498 agroecosystems. As expected, in the more disturbed agroecosystems like vineyards, the forage
499 quality was higher, but there was no effect of the agricultural practices nor of the agrosystem
500 on biomass production. We found consistent positive effects of tillage on the forage quality
501 (DMD, NDF, CP). These findings confirm those observed in grassland environments where
502 higher levels of disturbance caused higher digestibility (Duru et al., 1997; Gardarin et al., 2014;
503 Bumb et al., 2016). However, vineyards presented a significantly higher potential regarding the
504 quality of the forage potential (mean DMD: 737 g kg^{-1}) than olive groves (mean DMD: 644 g
505 kg^{-1}, **Table 3),** which was explained by differences in agricultural practices. The PC1$_{agri}$ showed
506 that digestibility was higher when the soil was tilled rather than mown and increased with the
507 frequency and depth of tillage **(Table 4, Fig 6)**. In previous studies, the increase in digestibility
508 with the number of mowings/grazing was explained by the effect of the defoliation that keeps
509 the vegetation at the vegetative stage and stimulates fast regrowth with less investment in the
510 structural tissue (Pontes et al., 2007; Gardarin et al., 2014) but also selects fast life-cycle
511 species. We assumed that, even if mowing stimulated regrowth and thus higher digestibility
512 (Pontes et al., 2007), tillage was selected for more ruderal and thus more digestible species at
513 the community level. Because tillage uproots plants, it is associated to a higher level of
514 disturbance than mowing, which likely selected for species with more ruderal strategies.
515 However, in grassland studies, the type of disturbance was different (gradient of mowing and/or
516 sheep grazing intensity and frequency) than in vineyards and none of the previous studies had
517 studied the effect of tillage on digestibility. These disturbance-resistant species generally have
518 acquisitive and fast-growing strategies (Grime., 1974; Wright et al., 2004) associated with traits
519 that also promote high digestibility. Surprisingly our results did not show any direct effect of
520 agricultural practices on the CWM of any leaf trait unlike previous studies where agricultural
521 practices modified leaf traits like SLA or LDMC (Gaba et al., 2013; Kazakou et al., 2016; Bopp

17

et al., 2022). This could be due to the narrow range of variations of the CWMs of the leaf traits preventing detection of any covariation with the environmental variables.

Contrary to our expectations, weed biomass was not explained by agricultural practices. We expected that agricultural practices would reduce weed biomass , especially tillage, because they specifically aim at reducing plant cover. This lack of effect of tillage on weed biomass production could be due to the frequent biomass destruction in all fields (mean number of mowings: 1.8, mean number of tillage: 3.6), which maintained a low level of weed biomass everywhere, not representative of species biomass production potential. Finally, maybe other variables could influence weed biomass production like temporal variations in the management at an annual scale or annual weather variables like the quantity of rainfall.

4.4. Weed forage potential was not affected by climatic conditions but varied with soil fertility

Despite a significant rainfall gradient among the surveyed fields, weed forage quality did not vary with climate. As suggested by Gardarin et al., 2014, we expected that forage quality would be lower under more arid conditions in response to more abundant stress-tolerant species with a high LDMC in weed communities. Soil fertility had a negative effect on DMD of weed communities (Table 4, Fig 6). This relationship was not verified for crude proteins and fiber content or aboveground biomass. This result contradicts previous studies, in grasslands, where fertile soils positively affected leaf traits like SLA or LNC or decreased LDMC, and increased digestibility (Duru et al., 2007; Ordoñez et al., 2009; Jager et al 2015). The negative relationship between fertility and digestibility found in our study can be due to the covariation between $PC1_{agri}$ (tillage VS mowing axis: Table 2) and $PC2_{pedoclim}$ (fertile vs not fertile soils: Table 2): tillage increases DMD but also decreases the organic matter in the soil. Consequently, the effect of tillage overrides the effect of soil fertility.

Finally, the absence of a relationship between pedoclimatic or agricultural practices and leaf traits made the role of leaf traits difficult to interpret in mediating the response of digestibility to environmental conditions (Garnier et al., 2019). However, the limited range of both gradients (pedoclimate, agricultural practices) can explain the weak response of digestibility traits across the field network (Fig 1, Table S2). A more detailed assessment of intraspecific trait variability could probably improve the detection of local effects of the environment.

18

4.5. Perspectives for perennial cropping systems management

We demonstrated that weeds could represent a qualitative source of forage in vineyards and olive groves. Management practices with high disturbing effects like tillage increased forage quality but limited the biomass production below its peak by constantly removing the weeds. Moreover, previous studies demonstrated that tillage reduces biodiversity in perennial agroecosystems, especially of wild bees and arthropods (Kratschmer et al., 2018; Carpio et al., 2019), soil biodiversity (Sanchez-Moreno et al., 2015) or plant richness and abundance (Fried et al., 2019; Carpio et al., 2020). In contrast, cover crops or spontaneous vegetation often increase the biodiversity in the fields (Gomez et al., 2018; Cohen et al., 2015) and, consequently the provision of ES (Kavvadias et al., 2019; Daane et al., 2017). Even if tillage significantly increased weed digestibility, forage quality in non-tilled fields can already be considered high according to both *Bosworth et al.* (1986) and *Cruz et al.* (2010) : it is possible to achieve high forage quality and biodiversity-friendly farming practices simultaneously in highly disturbed ecosystems such as vineyards and olive groves.

In vineyards and olive groves weed quantity is low because of the disturbing agricultural practices. Unlike grasslands, biomass production is not the principal objective of the studied agroecosystems, and it would not be possible to produce a high quantity of weed biomass while preserving crop yields. However agricultural practices can be modified to avoid tillage or mowing before the sheep graze. It is also possible to manage the number of sheep or time spent grazingto adapt to the available biomass and to other targeted ES (Zhang et al., 2021). Additionally, weed biomass represents a complementary resource to grasslands and is not the principal sheep food source. Finally, even if the biomass is low at the field level, a lot of olive groves (17 700 ha) and overall vineyards (300 000 ha) are present in the French Mediterranean region (Agreste, 2021), representing a very important potential. Removing weeds by sheep grazing is also a biodiversity-friendly agricultural practice that does not affect the yield and helps to reduce time spent on mechanical or chemical weeding (Niles et al., 2018 ; Lazcano et al., 2022).

Our study suggest to change the temporality of management practices in olive groves and vineyards. Nowadays, most farmers destroy plant cover in spring to avoid competition for water with weeds (Fernandez-Mena et al., 2021; Kazakou et al., 2016; France Olive website, April 2022): this was the case of all of the wine-growers and 75% of olive growers in the study. Consequently, we suggest that the higher forage potential in spring is also interesting for sheep

585 farmers because it is early in the year, at a period where forage resources can still be rare in
586 semi-natural or natural environments and where weed digestibility is high. It would be a win-
587 win association to remove the weeds by sheep grazing in spring. Fall grazing can also be
588 considered as an interesting option because it precedes (olive) or follows (grapevine) the
589 harvest, and a lot of producers will also destroy the soil cover at this time of the year: 63% of
590 the wine-growers and 33% of the olive growers destroy the weed biomass during fall. However,
591 it might not be as interesting as in spring for sheep farmers because of the low weed quantity.

592   Finally, integrating sheep in vineyards and olive groves may represent economic
593 benefits for producers by reducing herbicide costs or tillage and mowing time and fertilize the
594 field (Niles et al., 2018 ; Schoof et al., 2021). It also increases ecological benefits by reducing
595 agricultural practices that could negatively impact the biodiversity of agroecosystems. More
596 broadly, this farming practice contributes to better integration of crop and livestock systems in
597 Mediterranean agriculture. In this perspective, our study provides a sound basis for evaluating
598 the forage potential of weeds found in vineyards and olive groves, two emblematic
599 Mediterranean agroecosystems.

Acknowledgments

References

608 Abaye, A. O., Scaglia, G., & Teutsch, C. (2009). *The nutritive value of common pasture weeds*
609   *and their relation to livestock nutrient requirements. Publication 418-150*. 1–9.

610 Agreil, C., & Meuret, M. (2004). An improved method for quantifying intake rate and ingestive
611   behaviour of ruminants in diverse and variable habitats using direct observation. *Small*
612   *Ruminant Research*, *54*(1–2), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2003.10.013

20

613   Andueza, D., Cruz, P., Farruggia, A., Baumont, R., Picard, F., & Michalet-Doreau, B. (2010).
614   Nutritive value of two meadows and relationships with some vegetation traits. *Grass and*
615   *Forage Science*, *65*(3), 325–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2494.2010.00750.x

616   Ansquer, P., Duru, M., Theau, J. P., & Cruz, P. (2009). Functional traits as indicators of fodder
617   provision over a short time scale in species-rich grasslands. *Annals of Botany*, *103*(1), 117–
618   126. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcn215

619   Bopp, M.-C., Kazakou, E., Metay, A., & Fried, G. (2022). Relative importance of region,
620   seasonality and weed management practice effects on the functional structure of weed
621   communities in French vineyards. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *330*(June),
622   107892. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2022.107892

623   Bosworth, H. C. . ; B. G. . ;, & Bailey. (1986). *Forage nutritive quality of weeds in Alabama*.

624   Bosworth, S. C., Hoveland, C. S., Buchanan, G. A., & Anthony, W. B. (1980). Forage Quality
625   of selected Warm−Season Weed Species 1 . *Agronomy Journal*, *72*(6), 1050–1054.
626   https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1980.00021962007200060044x

627   Bourgeois, B., Munoz, F., Fried, G., Mahaut, L., Armengot, L., Denelle, P., Storkey, J., Gaba,
628   S., & Violle, C. (2019). What makes a weed a weed? A large-scale evaluation of arable
629   weeds through a functional lens. *American Journal of Botany*, *106*(1), 90–100.
630   https://doi.org/10.1002/ajb2.1213

631   Bruinenberg, M. H., Valk, H., Korevaar, H., & Struik, P. C. (2002). *Factors affecting*
632   *digestibility of temperate forages from seminatural grasslands : a review*. 292–301.

633   Bumb, I., Garnier, E., Coq, S., Nahmani, J., Del Rey Granado, M., Gimenez, O., & Kazakou,
634   E. (2018). Traits determining the digestibility-decomposability relationships in species
635   from   Mediterranean   rangelands.   *Annals   of   Botany*,   *121*(3),   459–469.
636   https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcx175

637   Bunton, G., Trower, Z., Roberts, C., & Bradley, K. W. (2019). *Seasonal changes in forage*
638   *nutritive value of common weeds encountered in Missouri pastures*. *1986*.
639   https://doi.org/10.1017/wet.2019.89

21

640 Carpio, A. J., Castro, J., & Tortosa, F. S. (2019). Arthropod biodiversity in olive groves under
641   two soil management systems: presence versus absence of herbaceous cover crop.
642   *Agricultural and Forest Entomology*, *21*(1), 58–68. https://doi.org/10.1111/afe.12303

643 Carpio, A. J., Lora, Á., Martín-Consuegra, E., Sánchez-Cuesta, R., Tortosa, F. S., & Castro, J.
644   (2020). The influence of the soil management systems on aboveground and seed bank
645   weed communities in olive orchards. *Weed Biology and Management*, *20*(1), 12–23.
646   https://doi.org/10.1111/wbm.12195

647 Chollet, S., Rambal, S., Fayolle, A., Hubert, D., Foulquié, D., & Garnier, E. (2014). Combined
648   effects of climate, resource availability, and plant traits on biomass produced in a
649   Mediterranean rangeland. *Ecology*, *95*(3), 737–748. https://doi.org/10.1890/13-0751.1

650 Cohen, M., Bilodeau, C., Alexandre, F., Godron, M., Andrieu, J., Grésillon, E., Garlatti, F., &
651   Morganti, A. (2015). What is the plant biodiversity in a cultural landscape? A comparative,
652   multi-scale and interdisciplinary study in olive groves and vineyards (Mediterranean
653   France). *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *212*, 175–186.
654   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.06.023

655 Daane, K. M., Hogg, B. N., Wilson, H., & Yokota, G. Y. (2018). Native grass ground covers
656   provide multiple ecosystem services in Californian vineyards. *Journal of Applied Ecology*,
657   *55*(5), 2473–2483. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13145

658 Dale, V. H., & Polasky, S. (2007). Measures of the effects of agricultural practices on ecosystem
659   services. *Ecological Economics*, *64*(2), 286–296.
660   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.05.009

661 Defelice, M. S. (2002). Catchweed Bedstraw or Cleavers, Galium aparine L.—A Very "Sticky"
662   Subject 1 . *Weed Technology*, *16*(2), 467–472. https://doi.org/10.1614/0890-
663   037x(2002)016[0467:cbocga]2.0.co;2

664 Demestihas, C., Plénet, D., Génard, M., Raynal, C., & Lescourret, F. (2017). Ecosystem
665   services in orchards. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, *37*(2).
666   https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-017-0422-1

667 Duru, M., Cruz, P., Theau, J. P., Jouany, C., Ansquer, P., Al, R., Khaled, H., Therond, O., Duru,

668   M., Cruz, P., Theau, J. P., Jouany, C., Ansquer, P., Duru, M., Cruz, P., Theau, J., & Jouany,

669   C. (2020). *Typologies de prairies riches en espèces en vue d ' évaluer leur valeur d '*

670   *usage : bases agro-écologiques et exemples d ' application To cite this version : HAL Id :*

671   *hal-02663029 Typologies de prairies riches en espèces en vue d ' évaluer leur valeur d '.*

672 Fried, G., Kazakou, E., & Gaba, S. (2012). Trajectories of weed communities explained by

673   traits associated with species' response to management practices. *Agriculture, Ecosystems*

674   *and Environment*, *158*, 147–155. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2012.06.005

675 Fried, G., Cordeau, S., Metay, A., & Kazakou, E. (2019). Relative importance of environmental

676   factors and farming practices in shaping weed communities structure and composition in

677   French vineyards. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *275*(January), 1–13.

678   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2019.01.006

679 Gaba, S., Fried, G., Kazakou, E., Chauvel, B., & Navas, M. L. (2014). Agroecological weed

680   control using a functional approach: A review of cropping systems diversity. *Agronomy*

681   *for Sustainable Development*, *34*(1), 103–119. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-013-0166-

682   5

683 Garcia, L., Celette, F., Gary, C., Ripoche, A., Valdés-Gómez, H., & Metay, A. (2018).

684   Management of service crops for the provision of ecosystem services in vineyards: A

685   review. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *251*(March 2017), 158–170.

686   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.09.030

687 Gardarin, A., Garnier, É., Carrère, P., Cruz, P., Andueza, D., Bonis, A., Colace, M. P., Dumont,

688   B., Duru, M., Farruggia, A., Gaucherand, S., Grigulis, K., Kernéïs, É., Lavorel, S., Louault,

689   F., Loucougaray, G., Mesléard, F., Yavercovski, N., & Kazakou, E. (2014). Plant trait-

690   digestibility relationships across management and climate gradients in permanent

691   grasslands. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *51*(5), 1207–1217. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-

692   2664.12293

693 Garnier, E., Navas, M.-L., & Grigulis, K. (2016). Plant Functional Diversity. In *Plant*

694   *Functional Diversity*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198757368.001.0001

695   Garnier, E., Vile, D., Roumet, C., Lavorel, S., Grigulis, K., Navas, M. L., & Lloret, F. (2019).
696   Inter- and intra-specific trait shifts among sites differing in drought conditions at the north
697   western edge of the Mediterranean Region. *Flora: Morphology, Distribution, Functional*
698   *Ecology of Plants*, *254*(July 2018), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.flora.2018.07.009

699   Gómez, J. A., Campos, M., Guzmán, G., Castillo-Llanque, F., Vanwalleghem, T., Lora, Á., &
700   Giráldez, J. V. (2018). Soil erosion control, plant diversity, and arthropod communities
701   under heterogeneous cover crops in an olive orchard. *Environmental Science and Pollution*
702   *Research*, *25*(2), 977–989. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-8339-9

703   González-Rosado, M., Lozano-García, B., Aguilera-Huertas, J., & Parras-Alcántara, L. (2020).
704   Short-term effects of land management change linked to cover crop on soil organic carbon
705   in Mediterranean olive grove hillsides. *Science of the Total Environment*, *744*, 140683.
706   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140683

707   Hanisch, M., Schweiger, O., Cord, A. F., Volk, M., & Knapp, S. (2020). Plant functional traits
708   shape multiple ecosystem services, their trade-offs and synergies in grasslands. *Journal of*
709   *Applied Ecology*, *57*(8), 1535–1550. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13644

710   Inra, T. (2010). *Alimentation des bovins, ovins et caprins Besoins des animaux-Valeurs des*
711   *aliments E À J O U R 2 0 1 0*.

712   Jager, M. M., Richardson, S. J., Bellingham, P. J., Clearwater, M. J., & Laughlin, D. C. (2015).
713   Soil fertility induces coordinated responses of multiple independent functional traits.
714   *Journal of Ecology*, *103*(2), 374–385. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12366

715   Kavvadias, V., Koubouris, G. (2019). Sustainable Soil Management Practices in Olive Groves.
716   In: Panpatte, D., Jhala, Y. (eds) Soil Fertility Management for Sustainable Development.
717   Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-5904-0_8

718   Kazakou, E., Fried, G., Richarte, J., Gimenez, O., Violle, C., & Metay, A. (2016). A plant trait-
719   based response-and-effect framework to assess vineyard inter-row soil management.
720   *Botany Letters*, *163*(4), 373–388. https://doi.org/10.1080/23818107.2016.1232205

24

721 Khaled, R. A. H., Duru, M., Decruyenaere, V., Jouany, C., & Cruz, P. (2006). Using leaf traits
722   to rank native grasses according to their nutritive value. *Rangeland Ecology and*
723   *Management*, *59*(6), 648–654. https://doi.org/10.2111/05-031R2.1

724 Konstantinović, B., Blagojević, M., Konstantinović, B., & Samardžić, N. (2015). Resistance of
725   weed species Chenopodium album l. To ALS-inhibitors. *Romanian Agricultural*
726   *Research*, *32*, 1–9.

727 Kratschmer, S., Pachinger, B., Schwantzer, M., Paredes, D., Guernion, M., Burel, F., Nicolai,
728   A., Strauss, P., Bauer, T., Kriechbaum, M., Zaller, J. G., & Winter, S. (2018). Tillage
729   intensity or landscape features: What matters most for wild bee diversity in vineyards?
730   *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *266*(November 2017), 142–152.
731   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2018.07.018

732 Liss, P. S., & Slater, P. G. (1974). © *1974 Nature Publishing Group*.

733 Mahaut, L., Cheptou, P., Fried, G., Munoz, F., Storkey, J., Vasseur, F., Violle, C., &
734   Bretagnolle, F. (2020). *Plant Science*. *25*(11).

735 Marten, G. C., & Andersen, R. N. (1975). Forage Nutritive Value and Palatability of 12
736   Common Annual Weeds 1 . *Crop Science*, *15*(6), 821–827.
737   https://doi.org/10.2135/cropsci1975.0011183x001500060024x

738 Marten, G. C., Sheaffer, C. C., & Wyse, D. L. (1987). Forage Nutritive Value and Palatability
739   of Perennial Weeds. *Agronomy Journal*, *79*(6), 980–986.
740   https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj1987.00021962007900060006x

741 Mhazo, N., Chivenge, P., & Chaplot, V. (2016). Tillage impact on soil erosion by water:
742   Discrepancies due to climate and soil characteristics. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and*
743   *Environment*, *230*, 231–241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.04.033

744 Niles, M. T., Garrett, R. D., Walsh, D., & Niles, M. T. (2018). *Ecological and economic benefits*
745   *of integrating sheep into viticulture production*.

746 Ordoñez, J. C., Van Bodegom, P. M., Witte, J. P. M., Wright, I. J., Reich, P. B., & Aerts, R.
747   (2009). A global study of relationships between leaf traits, climate and soil measures of

748   nutrient fertility. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, *18*(2), 137–149.
749   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-8238.2008.00441.x

750 Paiola, A., Assandri, G., Brambilla, M., Zottini, M., Pedrini, P., & Nascimbene, J. (2020).
751   Exploring the potential of vineyards for biodiversity conservation and delivery of
752   biodiversity-mediated ecosystem services: A global-scale systematic review. *Science of*
753   *the Total Environment*, *706*, 135839. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135839

754 Panpatte, D. G., & Jhala, Y. K. (2019). Soil fertility management for sustainable development.
755   *Soil Fertility Management for Sustainable Development*, 1–291.
756   https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-5904-0

757 Pontes, L. D. S., Soussana, J. F., Louault, F., Andueza, D., & Carrère, P. (2007). Leaf traits
758   affect the above-ground productivity and quality of pasture grasses. *Functional Ecology*,
759   *21*(5), 844–853. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2007.01316.x

760 Qasem, J. R. (2007). Allelopathic activity of white rocket [Diplotaxis erucoides (L.) DC.].
761   Allelopathy: new concepts & methodology. Science Publishers, Enfiled, NH, USA, 139-
762   164.

763 Sánchez-Moreno, S., Castro, J., Alonso-Prados, E., Alonso-Prados, J. L., García-Baudín, J. M.,
764   Talavera, M., & Durán-Zuazo, V. H. (2015). Tillage and herbicide decrease soil
765   biodiversity in olive orchards. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, *35*(2), 691–700.
766   https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-014-0266-x

767 Schoof, N., Kirmer, A., Hörl, J., Luick, R., Tischew, S., Breuer, M., Fischer, F., Müller, S., &
768   von Königslöw, V. (2021). Sheep in the vineyard: First insights into a new integrated crop–
769   livestock system in central europe. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *13*(22), 1–16.
770   https://doi.org/10.3390/su132212340

771 Simon, S., Bouvier, J. C., Debras, J. F., & Sauphanor, B. (2010). Biodiversity and pest
772   management in orchard systems. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*,
773   *30*(1), 139–152. https://doi.org/10.1051/agro/2009013

774 Syswerda, S. P., & Robertson, G. P. (2014). Ecosystem services along a management gradient
775   in Michigan (USA) cropping systems. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, *189*, 28–
776   35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2014.03.006

777 Tasset, E., Boulanger, T., Diquélou, S., Laîné, P., & Lemauviel-Lavenant, S. (2019). Plant trait
778   to fodder quality relationships at both species and community levels in wet grasslands.
779   *Ecological   Indicators*,   *97*(October   2018),   389–397.
780   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.10.035

781 Winter, S., Bauer, T., Strauss, P., Kratschmer, S., Paredes, D., Popescu, D., Landa, B., Guzmán,
782   G., Gómez, J. A., Guernion, M., Zaller, J. G., & Batáry, P. (2018). Effects of vegetation
783   management intensity on biodiversity and ecosystem services in vineyards: A meta-
784   analysis. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *55*(5), 2484–2495. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-
785   2664.13124

786 Wright, I. J., Reich, P. B., Westoby, M., Ackerly, D. D., Baruch, Z., Bongers, F., Cavender-
787   Bares, J., Chapin, T., Cornellssen, J. H. C., Diemer, M., Flexas, J., Garnier, E., Groom, P.
788   K., Gulias, J., Hikosaka, K., Lamont, B. B., Lee, T., Lee, W., Lusk, C., … Villar, R. (2004).
789   The   worldwide   leaf   economics   spectrum. *Nature*,   *428*(6985),   821–827.
790   https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02403

791 Zhang, W., Ricketts, T. H., Kremen, C., Carney, K., & Swinton, S. M. (2007). Ecosystem
792   services and dis-services to agriculture. *Ecological Economics*, *64*(2), 253–260.
793   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.02.024

794

795

796