

### Drivers of wood-inhabiting fungal diversity in European and Oriental beech forests

Giorgi Mamadashvili, Antoine Brin, Maksym Chumak, Valeriia Diedus, Lars Drössler, Bernhard Förster, Kostadin B Georgiev, Tigran Ghrejyan, Ruslan Hleb, Mark Kalashian, et al.

### ▶ To cite this version:

Giorgi Mamadashvili, Antoine Brin, Maksym Chumak, Valeriia Diedus, Lars Drössler, et al.. Drivers of wood-inhabiting fungal diversity in European and Oriental beech forests. Ecology and Evolution, 2024, 14 (7), 10.1002/ece3.11660. hal-04646110

### HAL Id: hal-04646110 https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-04646110

Submitted on 12 Jul 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

Revised: 26 May 2024

#### RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access WILEY

# Drivers of wood-inhabiting fungal diversity in European and Oriental beech forests

Giorgi Mamadashvili<sup>1</sup> Antoine Brin<sup>2</sup> | Maksym Chumak<sup>3</sup> | Valeriia Diedus<sup>4</sup> | Lars Drössler<sup>5</sup> | Bernhard Förster<sup>6</sup> | Kostadin B. Georgiev<sup>7</sup> | Tigran Ghrejyan<sup>8</sup> | Ruslan Hleb<sup>9</sup> | Mark Kalashian<sup>8</sup> | Ivan Kamburov<sup>10</sup> | Gayane Karagyan<sup>8</sup> | Joni Kevlishvili<sup>11</sup> | Zviad Khutsishvili<sup>11</sup> | Laurent Larrieu<sup>12,13</sup> | Meri Mazmanyan<sup>8</sup> | Peter I. Petrov<sup>14</sup> | Levan Tabunidze<sup>15</sup> | Claus Bässler<sup>16,17</sup> | Jörg Müller<sup>1,17</sup>

#### Correspondence

Giorgi Mamadashvili, Field Station Fabrikschleichach, Department of Animal Ecology and Tropical Biology, Biocenter, University of Würzburg, Glashüttenstraße 5, Rauhenebrach 96181, Germany. Email: giorgi.mamadashvili@uniwuerzburg.de

Funding information BMBF-Federal Ministry of Education and Research

#### Abstract

The hyperdiverse wood-inhabiting fungi play a crucial role in the global carbon cycle, but often are threatened by deadwood removal, particularly in temperate forests dominated by European beech (Fagus sylvatica) and Oriental beech (Fagus orientalis). To study the impact of abiotic drivers, deadwood factors, forest management and biogeographical patterns in forests of both beech species on fungal composition and diversity, we collected 215 deadwood-drilling samples in 18 forests from France to Armenia and identified fungi by meta-barcoding. In our analyses, we distinguished the patterns driven by rare, common, and dominant species using Hill numbers. Despite a broad overlap in species, the fungal composition with focus on rare species was determined by Fagus species, deadwood type, deadwood diameter, precipitation, temperature, and management status in decreasing order. Shifting the focus on common and dominant species, only Fagus species, both climate variables and deadwood type remained. The richness of species within the deadwood objects increased significantly only with decay stage. Gamma diversity in European beech forests was higher than in Oriental beech forests. We revealed the highest gamma diversity for old-growth forests of European beech when focusing on dominant species. Our results implicate that deadwood retention efforts, focusing on dominant fungi species, critical for the decay process, should be distributed across precipitation and temperature gradients and both Fagus species. Strategies focusing on rare species should additionally focus on different diameters and on the conservation of old-growth forests.

Claus Bässler and Jörg Müller shared last author.

Co-author contributed to the conseptualising of the manuscript, which reshiped the initial submission to the current version.

For affiliations refer to page 10.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

#### KEYWORDS

deadwood fungi, Fagus orientalis, Fagus sylvatica, habitat heterogeneity, Hill numbers, species diversity

#### TAXONOMY CLASSIFICATION Biodiversity ecology

#### 1 | INTRODUCTION

In the western part of the Palearctic, temperate forests are dominated by two species of Fagus: European beech Fagus sylvatica in the West and Oriental beech Fagus orientalis in the East, ranging from eastern Bulgaria to the Hyrcanian forest in Iran. The latter are often Arcto-tertiary relicts, harboring many endemic plants and animals (Aliev, 2021; Fayvush & Aleksanyan, 2021; Goginashvili & Tvauri, 2013; Mathew et al., 2000). While for European beech the impact of forest management on several taxa has been well studied during the last decades (Brunet et al., 2010; Gossner et al., 2013; Hagge et al., 2019; Morales-Hidalgo et al., 2015; Ódor et al., 2006), drivers of biodiversity in Oriental beech are not well understood. Most of the studies in European beech forests have identified the loss of old growth trees and the reduction of deadwood amount by forest management as critical for biodiversity (Brunet et al., 2010; Gossner et al., 2013). As a consequence, the amount of deadwood has been selected as one of nine pan European indicators for maintenance, conservation, and appropriate enhancement of the biological diversity in forest ecosystems (Schuck et al., 2015).

Aware of the global responsibility for beech forest ecosystems, conservation strategies have increasingly focused on these ecosystems. Today, European beech forests are well represented in the Natura 2000 network of protected areas (Bohn & Neuhäusl, 2000), while Oriental beech forests of the Caucasus region belong to the Emerald Network of Areas of Special Conservation Interest (Artsivadze et al., 2018; Fayvush et al., 2016). Moreover, several remnants of natural beech forests have received the UNESCO World Heritage designation, including "The Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe," "Colchic Rainforests and Wetlands," and the "Hyrcanian Forest" (UNESCO, 2013, 2019, 2021). Despite the unique fauna and flora of these Tertiary relicts, many managers of Oriental beech forests are often not aware of the key role of deadwood for biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. This became particularly clear when Iran decided to protect the whole Hyrcanian forest and restricted tree removal on deadwood and old growth trees, which would cause a major threat to deadwood organisms (Müller et al., 2016, 2017). This underlines the need to combine findings and research from regions of both beech species. Moreover, in the context of climate change, European forest managers are considering Oriental beech as a potential tree in the future (Mellert & Šeho, 2022). This seems justified because a recent presence of this species in Italy is proved from 45,000-year-old DNA pollen samples (Paffetti et al., 2007) and because many saproxylic species specialization to trees is more at the genus than the species level as shown recently for saproxylic beetles (Vogel et al., 2020).

Fungi form a functionally important and hyper-diverse group in beech forests, acting as mycorrhiza symbionts supporting forest productivity and as key decomposers of litter and deadwood. During deadwood decomposition, many coexisting fungi create habitat heterogeneity and new resources for many other wood inhabiting organisms, and play a crucial role in nutrient cycling processes (Boddy, 2001; Friess et al., 2019; Gessner et al., 2010; Parisi et al., 2018; Valentín et al., 2014). The lignin barrier with the cellulose and hemicelluloses of deadwood, which hinders the polysaccharides from microbial decomposition is only disintegrated and opened for other deadwood dwelling organisms by the help of fungi species and their various secretion of enzymes (Dix & Webster, 1995; Fengel & Wegener, 1983; Floudas et al., 2012; Hoppe et al., 2016; Liers et al., 2006; Stokland et al., 2012).

The drivers of wood-inhabiting fungi diversity in beech forest depends on the spatial scale. At the local scale of a deadwood object, the tree species, decay stage, type of deadwood and microclimate are important drivers (Baber et al., 2016; Daniel & Nilsson, 1998; Englmeier et al., 2023; Krah et al., 2018; Müller et al., 2020; Purahong et al., 2018; Rajala et al., 2012; Ravner & Boddy, 1988), all affected by local forest management (Abrego, Christensen, et al., 2017; Bässler et al., 2014; Müller, Engel, et al., 2007). At the larger scale, connectivity and macroclimate became more important. For example, Abrego et al. (2015), Abrego, Christensen, et al. (2017) and Heilmann-Clausen et al. (2014) identified forest connectivity, condition and decay stage of substrates and the climate across European beech forests as the most important factor for fungal species communities in protected areas. Furthermore, Ódor et al. (2006) investigated semi-natural beech forests in Europe and showed that the diversity of saproxylic organisms is driven mostly by climate and forest management, deadwood volume and habitat fragmentation. Finally, Hagge et al. (2019) showed that the functional diversity of wood-inhabiting fungi European wide is determined by the latitude, elevation, forest cover, and urbanization.

Despite an increasing interest in beech forests of both *Fagus* species, systematic studies among the entire beech forest belt from France to Caucasus and Iran are widely missing. However, only in such a synopsis it is possible to test the influencing factors of the two beech species in comparison to local factors such as deadwood type, decomposition, diameter, climate, and management for biodiversity. To unify biodiversity research of wood-inhabiting fungi in European and Oriental beech forests, and to guide future conservation strategies, we conducted a sampling campaign from France in

WILEV

the West to Armenia and Georgia in the East. Using drilling samples and metabarcoding, we aimed at identifying the drivers of fungal communities in *Fagus* forests of both species. In specific, we were interested in the impact of (1) large-scale factors, such as the *Fagus* species and the two climate variables temperature and precipitation; (2) stand scale factors such a forest management; and (3) and smallscale factors such as the type of deadwood, decay stage, and diameter of the tree objects. For this, we used the concept of Hill numbers and focused on rare, common and dominant species (Hill, 1973). The Hill number concept was applied for the tree-object scale ( $\alpha$ diversity) and the scale of overall production and old-growth beech forests of both *Fagus* species ( $\gamma$ -diversity).

#### 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### 2.1 | Study areas

We collected drilling samples from 215 deadwood objects in different type of deadwood in production and old-growth beech dominated forest stands in six countries during the 2021–2022 summer and autumn seasons: France, Germany, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Georgia, and Armenia. Bulgaria is the only country with both species of *Fagus*, where European beech from west to east is replaced by Oriental beech. The 18 forests investigated ranged from 65 to 1770m above sea level (Table 1). For each plot, we extracted the extracted and used the local climatic variables mean annual temperature BIO1 and annual precipitation (BIO12) from WorldClim (Hijmans et al., 2005) grid data in 30s resolution and calculated the mean values for a 1-km radius around sampled localities, following the methodology of Gossner et al. (2013). Both variables were correlated with a Pearson's correlation coefficient of -.54, allowing simulatanouse use in one model.

#### 2.2 | Field sampling

During the field sampling, we selected 10 deadwood beech items per site. Each item was a natural snag, natural log, or simply a stump. We chose only beech deadwood to exclude tree species effects beyond the genus *Fagus*. For each deadwood item, we recorded the type of deadwood (snag/standing tree, log, and stump), the diameter at breast height (DBH), the decay class (1–4; early, late early, middle, and late) (Müller-Using & Bartsch, 2009), the coordinates (WGS84 world), the elevation and the *Fagus* species.

#### 2.3 | Fungal sampling

For collection of the molecular fungal community, we followed Rieker et al.'s (2022) sample protocol using disposable laboratory gloves (fresh pair for each item and disinfection before sampling), a knife for removing the outer bark surface of drilling position (to avoid contamination by random attached fragments and spores), spray bottle with 75% ethanol to disinfect the gloves and the drill after each object, Bunsen burner for flaming the drill and knife, the cordless drill with auger bits (10mm diameter, 300 or 400mm lengths), object with a diameter above 38 cm and then finally we drilled from both sides. We used Ziploc bags for collecting and storing the samples and labeling and a cool box with cold packs for transportation. The box was immediately placed inside the freezer at -20°C.

#### 2.4 | Laboratory work

#### 2.4.1 | DNA extraction and isolation

The total community DNA was extracted from 0.150g homogenized wood samples using NucleoSpin Soil, Mini kit for DNA (MACHEREY-NAGEL GmbH & Co. KG, Düren, Germany) following the manufacturer's protocol. Bead beating was run on a FastPrep-24 instrument (MPBiomedicals; 2 cycles of 30 s at speed 6.5). DNA concentrations were quantified using a NanoDrop UV–Vis spectrophotometer (Peqlab Biotechnologie GmbH, Erlangen, Germany). For sequencing the internal transcribed spacer (ITS2) regions of the fungal 18S rRNA gene, we applied for two-step, Nextera barcoded PCR libraries using the locus specific primer pair ITS3 (5'-GCA TCG ATG AAG AAC GCA GC-3') and ITS4 (5'-TCC TCC GCT TAT TGA TAT GC-3') with 20 PCR cycles for the first step and 15 PCR cycles for the second step were created. Subsequently the PCR libraries were sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq platform using a v2 500 cycles kit.

#### 2.4.2 | Amplicon-metagenomics data analysis

The produced paired end reads, which passed Illumina's chastity filter, were subject to de-multiplexing and trimming of Illumina adaptor residuals using Illumina's bcl2fastg software version v2.20.0.422. The quality of the reads was checked with the software FastQC version 0.11.8 and sequencing reads that fell below an average Q-score of 24 or had any uncalled bases (N) were removed from further analysis. The locus specific ITS2 primers were trimmed from the sequencing reads with the software cutadapt v3.2. Paired-end reads were discarded if the primer could not be trimmed. Trimmed forward and reverse reads of each pairedend read were merged to in-silico reform the sequenced molecule considering a minimum overlap of 15 bases using the software USEARCH version 11.0.667. Merged reads that contained ambiguous bases or were outliers regarding the expected amplicon size distribution were also discarded. Samples that resulted in less than 5000 merged reads were also discarded, to not distort the statistical analysis. From the remaining reads the fungal ITS2 subregions were extracted with help of the ITSx software suite v1.1.3 and its included database. The surviving reads were denoised using the UNOISE algorithm implemented in USEARCH to form zero-radius OTUs (zOTUs) also named amplicon sequence

cription of study sites and samples.	
Deso	
Ш	
A B	
Ť	

hFRA_FsProductionFMPFsFs $4.93643$ $0.97221$ $811-984$ $11$ $30-45$ $2-4$ $0.5$ hFRA_FsOlderowthFMOFsFs $4.29055$ $0.95659$ $951-958$ $11$ $30-75$ $2-4$ $0.5$ pluetteGER_FsPoductionGFMPsFs $4.90576$ $13.24844$ $718-774$ $11$ $30-75$ $2-4$ $0.5$ gluetteGER_FsPoductionGFMPsFs $4.90567$ $13.24844$ $718-774$ $17$ $30-75$ $2-4$ $0.5$ didGER_FsPoductionGFMPsFs $4.90562$ $13.30664$ $758-331$ $14$ $20-720$ $1-4$ $0.5$ didGER_FsPoductionGFMPsFs $4.93050$ $13.24844$ $758-331$ $14$ $20-76$ $1-4$ $0.5$ aBUL-FsPoductionGFMPsFs $4.93050$ $13.30644$ $355-404$ $20$ $60-120$ $1-4$ $0.5$ aBUL-FsOlderowthBuBOFsFs $4.315903$ $2312848$ $355-404$ $20$ $20-26$ $2-4$ $0.5$ aBUL-FsOlderowthBuBOFsFs $4.315903$ $2312848$ $355-404$ $20$ $20-46$ $1-4$ $0.5$ aBUL-FsOlderowthBuBOFsFs $4.323050$ $235-2192$ $212$ $12-70$ $21-4$ $0.5$ aBUL-FsOlderowthBuBOFsFs $4.32304$ $255-404$ $20$ $20-62$	Region	Region2	Forest type	Label	Tree species	Latitude	Longitude	Elevation	Samples	Diameter [cm]	Decay	Types
IR $1^{5}$ Old-growth         FMOF         F         42.99055         0.96659         51-958         11         30-75         2-4         D           hutte         GR $1^{5}$ Old-growth         GMOF         F         49.09767         13.24844         718-774         17         60-120         1-4         D           k         GR $1^{5}$ Poduction         GFF         F         49.0569         13.30664         755-813         14         22-78         1-4         D           d         GR $1^{5}$ F         49.0507         13.30664         755-813         16         22-78         1-4         D         D           d         BUL $1^{5}$ Old-growth         Gr $1^{5}$ 49.93068         10.55793         438-475         19         1-4         D		FRA_Fs	Production	FrMPFs	Fs	42.98643	0.97321	811-984	11	30-45	2-4	D, S
InductionGRL FsOld-growthGrMOsFs $4909767$ $13.24844$ $718.774$ $17$ $60-120$ $1-4$ D.SKGRL FsProductionGrPFsFs $4906692$ $13.30664$ $765331$ $14$ $22.78$ $1-4$ D.SKGRL FsProductionGrPFsFs $4909632$ $13.30664$ $765533$ $438.475$ $19$ $22.78$ $1-4$ D.SKGRL FsOld-growthGrPFsFs $4993080$ $10.55733$ $438.475$ $19$ $22.78$ $1-4$ D.SBUL FsOld-growthBuBOFsFs $491503$ $2312849$ $60-1467$ $11$ $30-62$ $2-4$ D.SBUL FsOld-growthBuSOFsFs $431503$ $2312849$ $60-1457$ $11$ $30-62$ $2-4$ D.SBUL FsOld-growthBuSOFsFs $431503$ $2312849$ $60-1457$ $11$ $30-62$ $2-4$ D.SBUL FsOld-growthBuSOFsFs $431503$ $2312849$ $60-147$ $18$ $1-6$ D.SBUL FsOld-growthBuSOFsFs $432146$ $23.212849$ $56-411$ $18$ $1-50$ $2-4$ D.SBUL FsOld-growthBuSOFsFs $432146$ $23.212849$ $50-411$ $18$ $1-50$ $2-6$ D.SBUL FsOld-growthBuSOFsFs $43.24907$ $23.2439$ $21$ $1-75$ D.S $1-8$ GCD FsPoductionGeDFs		FRA_Fs	Old-growth	FrMOFs	Fs	42.99055	0.96659	951-958	11	30-75	2-4	D, S
k         GER_Fs         Production         GrPs         Fs $49.06692$ 13.30664         765-831         14 $22.78$ 1-4         D           Id         GER_Fs         Production         GrPs         Fs $49.93008$ 10.57733         438-475         19         18-84         1-4         D/5           Id         GER_Fs         Oldgrowth         GrPs         Fs $49.93008$ 10.57733         438-475         19         18-84         1-4         D/5           Id         GER_Fs         Oldgrowth         BrD/Fs         Fs $4315803$ 23.12848         60-1465         1         36-62         3-4         D/5         D/5           Id         UKR_Fs         Oldgrowth         BuD/Fs         Fs $43.15803$ 23.61263         55-730         13         36-62         2-4         D/5         D/5         D/5           UKR_F         Oldgrowth         BuD/Fs         Fs $43.15803$ 23.61263         55-730         21         D/5	ghuette	GER_Fs	Old-growth	GrMOFs	Fs	49.09767	13.24844	718-774	17	60-120	$1^{-4}$	D, S
	×	GER_Fs	Production	GrSPFs	Fs	49.06692	13.30664	765-831	14	22-78	$1^{-4}$	D, S
	ld	GER_Fs	Production	GrTPFs	Fs	49.93008	10.55793	438-475	19	18-84	$1^{-4}$	D, S, St
a         BULFs         Old-growth         BuBOFs         Fs         43.15803         23.12848         600-1465         11         30-62         3-4         D           a         BULFo         Old-growth         BuSOFs         Fo         42.1076         23.12848         65-471         18         16-50         2-4         D;           ika         UKRFs         Old-growth         BuSOFs         Fo         42.1076         23.6205         742-799         22         18-72         1-4         D;           ika         UKRFs         Production         UKNPs         Fs         48.26866         23.65095         325-530         21         1-4         D;         D;           oka         CEO_Fo         UKRFs         Production         GEBFo         Fs         43.45001         94-1160         1-4         D;         D;           GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GEOFo         Fs         43.45001         94-1160         9         2-4         D;         D;           GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GEOFo         Fs         41.97701         43.45001         94-1160         9         1-4         D;         D;           GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GEOFo	ald	GER_Fs	Old-growth	GrTOFs	Fs	49.86061	10.49864	355-404	20	60-120	2-4	D, S
Image: Mode Condition         Dide Condition         BusoFs         Fo         42.10796         27.78437         65-471         18         16-50         2-4         D/s           Ika         UKR_Fs         Old-growth         UkNOFs         Fs         48.26886         23.62126         742-799         22         18-72         1-4         D/s           Ika         UKR_Fs         Production         UkNPfs         Fs         48.26866         23.65095         325-530         21         1-4         D/s           Inka         TeOuction         UkNPfs         Fs         48.22146         23.65095         325-530         21         1-4         D/s           Inka         GEO_Fo         Production         UKNPfs         Fs         48.22146         23.65095         325-530         21         1-4         D/s           Instruction         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GeBPFo         Fo         41.97047         43.45001         94-1160         9         2-4         D/s         D/s           Instruction         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GeO/Fo         Fo         41.97149         46.32148         480-1005         11         2-6         1-4         D/s           Instould	a	BUL_Fs	Old-growth	BuBOFs	Fs	43.15803	23.12848	600-1465	11	30-62	3-4	۵
Had         UKR_Fs         Old-growth         UKMOFs         Fs         48.26866         23.62126         742-799         22         18-72         1-4         D/S           old         UKR_Fs         Production         UKVPFs         Fs         48.22146         23.65095         325-530         21         10-58         1-4         D/S           old         UKR_Fs         Production         UKVPFs         Fs         48.22146         23.65095         325-530         21         10-58         1-4         D/S           0         UCV_Fs         Production         GEDFo         Fs         41.97267         43.44907         880-1113         10         50-92         1-4         D/S           0         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GEOFo         Fs         41.97267         43.44907         880-1113         10         50-92         1-4         D/S           0         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GEOFo         Fs         41.97267         45.44607         10         10-5         1-4         D/S         10           0         GEO_FO         Old-growth         GEO/FO         Fs         41.91701         10         10         1-4         D/S         1-5         D/S<		BUL_Fo	Old-growth	BuSOFs	Fo	42.10796	27.78437	65-471	18	16-50	2-4	D, S
olka         UKL <sub>F</sub> s         Production         UKVFs         Fs         48.22146         23.55095         325-530         21         10-58         1-4         D,S           GEO_Fo         Production         GEBFo         Fo         41.96267         43.45001         880-1113         10         50-92         1-4         D,S           if         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GEBFo         Fo         41.9749         43.45001         94-1160         9         26-46         1-4         D,S           if         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GEBOFo         Fo         41.97794         43.45001         94-1160         9         26-46         1-4         D,S           if         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GELOFo         Fo         41.8779         46.32148         480-1005         11         28-52         1-3         26-46         1-4         D,S           if         GEO_Fo         Production         GeMPFo         Fo         41.81756         17         28-52         1-3         26-46         1-4         5           if         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         AFOFo         Fo         40.6504         1-4         10         5           if	olka	UKR_Fs	Old-growth	UkMOFs	Fs	48.26886	23.62126	742-799	22	18-72	$1^{-4}$	D, S
	holka	UKR_Fs	Production	UkvpFs	Fs	48.22146	23.65095	325-530	21	10-58	$1^{-4}$	D, S
GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GeBOFo         Fo         41.97949         43.45001         994-1160         9         26-46         1-4         D,S           i         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GeLOFo         Fo         41.84729         46.32148         480-1005         11         28-52         1-3         St           i         GEO_Fo         Production         GeMPFo         Fo         41.91701         46.09561         770-1128         13         40-82         1-4         St           i         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArOFo         Fo         41.91701         46.09561         770-1128         13         40-82         1-4         St           i         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArOFo         Fo         41.09047         44.81056         1120-1042         2         1-4         St           i         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArOFo         Fo         41.09047         44.81056         1120-1042         2         51-75         1-3         3-4         St           i         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArOFo         Fo         40.90897         45.05504         1388         1         2         3-7         3-3         3-7		GEO_F0	Production	GeBPFo	Fo	41.96267	43.44907	880-1113	10	50-92	$1^{-4}$	D, S
i         GEO_Fo         Old-growth         GeLOFo         Fo         41.84729         46.32148         480-1005         11         28-52         1-3         St           i         GEO_Fo         Production         GeMPFo         Fo         41.91701         46.09561         770-1128         13         40-82         1-4         S           i         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArAOFo         Fo         41.09047         44.81056         1126-1170         2         30-44         3-4         S, st           in         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArTOFo         Fo         41.09047         44.81056         1120-1042         2         51-75         1-3         7         D           in         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArTOFo         Fo         40.08097         45.00504         1388         1         22-22         3-3         3-4         S         St           in         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArZOFo         Fo         41.2143         44.92292         1280         3         3-4         S         S         S         S         S         S         S         S         S         S         S         S         S         S		GEO_Fo	Old-growth	GeBOFo	Fo	41.97949	43.45001	994-1160	6	26-46	$1^{-4}$	D, S
GEO_Fo         Production         GeMPFo         Fo         41.91701         46.09561         770-1128         13         40-82         1-4         S           i         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArOFo         Fo         40.66068         45.07848         1768-1770         2         30-44         3-4         5.5t           ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArOFo         Fo         41.09047         44.81056         1120-1042         2         51-75         1-3         D           in         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArOFo         Fo         40.90897         45.06504         1388         1         22-22         3-3         D           ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArZOFo         Fo         41.12143         44.922292         1280         3         3-42         5.5t		GEO_Fo	Old-growth	GeLOFo	Fo	41.84729	46.32148	480-1005	11	28-52	$1^{-3}$	St
j         RRM_Fo         Old-growth         AraOFo         Fo         40.66068         45.07848         1768-1770         2         30-44         3-4         S, St           RRM_Fo         Old-growth         ArTOFo         Fo         41.09047         44.81056         1120-1042         2         51-75         1-3         D           n         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArYOFo         Fo         40.90897         45.06504         1388         1         22-22         3-3         St           ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArZOFo         Fo         41.12143         44.92292         1280         3         32-42         2-3         D		GEO_Fo	Production	GeMPFo	Fo	41.91701	46.09561	770-1128	13	40-82	$1^{-4}$	S
ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArTOFo         Fo         41.09047         44.81056         1120-1042         2         51-75         1-3         D           in         ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArYOFo         Fo         40.90897         45.06504         1388         1         22-22         3-3         5t           ARM_Fo         Old-growth         ArZOFo         Fo         41.12143         44.92292         1280         3         32-42         2-3         D,S	ej.	ARM_Fo	Old-growth	ArAOFo	Fo	40.66068	45.07848	1768-1770	2	30-44	3-4	s, st
in ARM_Fo Old-growth ArYOFo Fo 40.90897 45.06504 1388 1 22-22 3-3 St ARM_Fo Old-growth ArZOFo Fo 41.12143 44.92292 1280 3 32-42 2-3 D,S		ARM_Fo	Old-growth	ArTOFo	Fo	41.09047	44.81056	1120-1042	2	51-75	$1^{-3}$	۵
ARM_Fo Old-growth ArZOFo Fo 41.12143 44.92292 1280 3 32-42 2-3 D, S	an	ARM_Fo	Old-growth	ArYOFo	Fo	40.90897	45.06504	1388	1	22-22	3–3	St
		ARM_Fo	Old-growth	ArZOFo	Fo	41.12143	44.92292	1280	с	32-42	2–3	D, S

\_\_\_\_\_

WILEY

variants (ASVs) discarding singletons and chimeras in the process. The resulting OTU abundance table was then filtered for possible barcode bleed-in contaminations using the UNCROSS algorithm. OTU sequences were compared to the reference sequences of the UNITE database provided by https://www.drive5.com/usear ch/manual/sintax\_downloads.html, taxonomies were predicted and confidences were calculated using the SINTAX algorithm implemented in USEARCH. The identification revealed very similar proportions of unidentified OTUs with 43% in *Fagus orientalis* and 40% in *Fagus sylvatica* (Table S1). DNA extraction, library construction, sequencing and data analysis described in this section were performed by Microsynth AG (Balgach, Switzerland). For a list of OUT identifications, see Table S1.

#### 2.4.3 | Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were performed using R 4.3.1 (R Core Team, 2021). To determine fungal species richness and community composition, we followed two approaches. First, we used the observed species after excluding the records with only one read (Adamo et al., 2020). Removal of these records increase data guality for further analysis (Tedersoo et al., 2022). Second, we rarefied each community matrix (function *rrarefy*, package vegan by Oksanen et al., 2020). To determine a suitable rarefaction depth, we first calculated the read sums for each sample. Based on this exercise, we decided to use a minimum of 990 reads per samle as rarefaction depth. As diversity analyses of communities from both approaches revealed very similar results, we present the results only for the observed reads (first approach). We then calculated species richness for each object. Here, we are aware that OTUs are not equivalent to species but for reasons of readability, we chose the term species throughout the manuscript. Community matrices based on each log was calculated along the Hill numbers in "ecodist" package (Goslee & Urban, 2007) for dissimilarity indices representing a focus on rare (q=0, Jaccard Index), common (q=1, Horn Index) and dominant (q=2, Morisita Horn) species (Chao et al., 2014). This allowed giving increasing weights to species with high abundances.

Different predictor sets for fungi community compositions at the object level were tested using multiple regression on distance matrices (MRMs) (Lichstein, 2007) as follows: First distance matrices for the fungi composition for q=0, 1, and 2 were created. In a second step, distance matrices were created for the management type (production/old-growth forests, Gower's distance), diameter of the deadwood object (Euclidian distance), temperature (Euclidian distance), precipitation (Euclidian distance), decay stage (Euclidian distance) and *Fagus* species (Gower distance). Since the two species are distributed along a longitudinal gradient, the predictor distance beech species was replaced in a second approach by a spatial distance (Euclidian distance) that considers the nested structure of the plots in the stands (Mamadashvili et al., 2023).

To model the species richness per deadwood object, we used a multiple negative binomial model as species numbers are count data. We included sampling site as a random factor to account for replicated measurements of different objects in a forest. As predictors, we used *Fagus* species, temperature, precipitation, forest type, deadwood type, wood decay and diameter (see Table S1). We finally repeated all analyses based on the rarefied communities (see above). As this did not change the results, we present these results only in the supplement.

To compare the gamma diversity of wood-inhabiting fungi in production and old-growth forests of both *Fagus* species, we fitted rarefaction-extrapolation curves across all objects of each category based on the incidences of fungi species per object using the function iNext in package iNext (Hsieh et al., 2016). To account for unequal sample coverage in the four categories due to variation in sampling size or even natural variation in sample completeness, we standardized by sample coverage as recommended by Chao and Jost (2012). Non-overlapping confidence intervals indicate significant differences.

#### 3 | RESULTS

In total, we found 548 OTUs in 215 deadwood objects of beech. European beech revealed more unique OTUs than Oriental beech, but the majority (62%) could be found in both (Figure 1). Moreover, it is important to note that twice as many deadwood items were sampled in European beech (n = 146) than in Oriental beech (n = 69) sampling sites (Figure 1).

Overall, the explained variance in fungal composition on the single object was low (0.22%–0.35%), however, the multiple regression on distance matrices, identified significant environmental variables determining the community composition (Figure 2). For q=0, the *Fagus* species, the type of deadwood, the diameter, the precipitation, and management were identified as significant variables in descending order. With increasing Hill-numbers, only *Fagus* species, temperature, precipitation, and type of deadwood remained significant determinants for community composition (Figure 2). However, as illustrated in Figure 3, the communities of both species showed a large overlap in wood-inhabiting fungi.





FIGURE 1 Venn diagram of fungal OTUs in the two Fagus species collected in 18 beech dominated forests, *n*, deadwood items sampled.



**FIGURE 3** Community composition of fungi species identified by meta-barcoding from 215 beech deadwood objects collected from *Fagus sylvatica* (Fs) and *Fagus orientalis* (Fo). Distance matrix for q=0 is based on Jaccard Index, for q=1 on Horn, and for q=2 on Morisita-Horn as in Figure 2.

Substituting the distance matrix *Fagus* species by a spatial distance matrix revealed similar results (Figure S1), indicating that the effect of *Fagus* species and space cannot be distinguished due to the biogeographical distribution of the two *Fagus* species. These results were robust even when using the rarified species community (see R code in SM and Figure S2).

The richness of the single deadwood object ( $\alpha$ -diversity) was more or less independent from our predictors with one exception. With increasing decay stage, the richness per object increased significantly, which was again robust to the use of raw or rarified communities (Table S2).

Grouping all objects in four categories made by the combination of two *Fagus* species and the two management status (oldgrowth vs. production), the rarefaction-extrapolation curves showed higher  $\gamma$ -diversity for both groups from European beech than in Oriental beech with focus on rare species at the same sample coverage (Figure 4, q=0). Focusing on dominant species, the highest diversity was found in old-growth European beech forests (Figure 4, q=2).

#### 4 | DISCUSSION

Our systematic investigation of wood-inhabiting fungi in beech forests from France to Armenia revealed overall high similarity in species composition and a difference in  $\alpha$ -diversity only by differences in decay stages. However, the species composition in European and Oriental beech revealed to be significantly different for all Hill numbers. Second, preciptation determined the species composition in all three Hill numbers. This underlines that large-scale drivers including the both *Fagus* species and climate drive the overall very similar community of wood-inhabiting fungi. Local factors as deadwood type, decay stage and diameter were only relevant for distinguishing composition of rare species.

#### 4.1 | Fagus species is important

Current research of fungal communities related to different host species compared mostly different host tree genera showing



FIGURE 4 Gamma diversity of Beech forests of both Fagus species and in production as well as old-growth sites using rarefactionextrapolation curves based on sample coverage. Solid lines indicate rarefaction, dashed lines extrapolation curves. Nonoverlapping confidence bands indicate significant difference.

distinct fungal communities (Abrego, Norberg, et al., 2017; Englmeier et al., 2023; Krah et al., 2018; Purahong et al., 2018). Therefore, our knowledge on differences in fungi within a host genus is rather scarce. Here our findings are a first confirmation that fungal species might differ even between very similar tree species within a genus. However, if looking at the distribution of OTUs between the two Fagus species and taking into account the OTUs that could be detected in at least 10 samples, there were hardly any OTUs that only occur in one of the two Fagus species (Table S1). If this was the case, it was mostly unidentified species and exclusively on Fagus sylvatica but not on Fagus orientalis. This emphasizes that there are hardly any more frequently occurring unique fungal species/OTUs in Fagus orientalis to be expected.

The limitation for identifying the role of host tree identity versus biogeography remains in our study, because both beech species are spatially separated from West to East. Hence, finally we cannot distinguish between the impact of bioregion, history (Tertiary relicts in Oriental beech), and the host species and its traits itself. However, we can state that there are differences in fungi communities in deadwood of both species. Even earlier studies in European beech forests by Heilmann-Clausen et al. (2014) demonstrated a longitudinal effect on the composition of fungi in European beech forests and was discussed as an effect of differences in climate and land use history. Finally it is important to consider that some studies have shown that climate influence wood properties in F. orientalis (Topaloğlu et al., 2016) or in both Fagus species (Elzami, 2018), which might affect the fungal composition.

We focused in this study on fungi species identified only via metabarcoding of wood samples. Studies on host effects with sporocarp surveys and metabarcoding revealed always a strong effect of the host identity on community composition in sporocarp datasets (Müller et al., 2020). Here sporocarp records represent probably more the dominant species in deadwood objects. This is further supported by the fact that the impact of host species for fungi by metabarcoding increased toward common and dominant species along

the Hill numbers in Müller et al. (2020). Similarly, in our data the role of the Fagus species increased toward dominant species (Figure 2). In summary, we found either relatively similar communities or more diverse communities on the  $\alpha$ - or on the  $\gamma$ -level in much younger European beech forests than in the Tertiary relicts of Oriental beech forests.

#### Precipitation is always important. 4.2 temperature toward dominant species

A second important variable for determining fungi community composition, for all Hill numbers, was precipitation (Figure 2). In contrast, the temperature proved to be important only for communities focusing on typical and dominant species (Figure 2). Beech forests form very different temperate forest ecosystems from lowland to montane levels in both European and Oriental beech. With increasing elevation, the precipitation regularly increases and temperature decreases which is one of the fundamental drivers for fungal composition (Bässler, Müller, Dziock, et al., 2010; Xu et al., 2023). Similarly, Heilmann-Clausen et al. (2014) identified elevation as an important driver for turnover in fungal species communities within European beech reserves in Europe as well. In contrast, along a local elevation gradient Bässler, Müller, Dziock, et al. (2010) found structural parameters more important than the elevation gradient, which could not be confirmed in our large-scale study. However, in most of these local studies (Bässler, Müller, Hothorn, et al., 2010) temperature and precipitation are to highly correlated to be distinguished. Here, our wide range of plots and only limited correlation of both, allowed to identify precipitation as more important in general and particularly for rare species communities, while the dominant communities were affected by both. This contrasts with studies from central Europe using wood-inhabiting fungi in specific (Heilmann-Clausen et al., 2014) and overall fungal diversity considering a broad range of guilds (Andrew et al., 2018). However, our spatial scale clearly

II **FY**\_Ecology and Evolution

exceeds the scale used in these studies which might explain the observed difference. Indeed, within increasing scale, both precipitation and temperature become important and have been suggested to drive global fungal diversity (Mikryukov et al., 2023; Tedersoo et al., 2014; Větrovský et al., 2019). As climate changes, temperature and precipitation are changing and many species shift their geographic range in these long-lasting ecosystems (Antão et al., 2022). From our findings, this is to be expected also for wood-inhabiting fungi (Bässler et al., 2016; Bässler, Müller, Hothorn, et al., 2010).

# 4.3 | Gamma diversity of managed and unmanaged beech forests of both species

Splitting the samples in both beech species and management types, we found the highest diversity of dominant species in old-growth European beech forests, but not in production forests. No difference could be found between both management types in Oriental beech (Figure 4). This might indicate more impactful silviculture treatment in European beech than in Oriental beech forests, leading to reduction of functional diversity in the former in terms of deadwood (Gossner et al., 2013). However, the highest diversity in old-growth European beech might be surprising as Oriental beech forests are in generally much older and some of them untouched at least since many centuries (Aliev, 2021; Kurz et al., 2023; UNESCO, 2013, 2019).

Moreover, Oriental beech seems to be the older beech species harboring high levels of genetic diversity and should promote the diversity of its inhabitants (Azaryan et al., 2022; Cardoni et al., 2022; Kurz et al., 2023; Müller et al., 2016). On the other hand, the geographical range of European beech is much larger (see Figure 5) and in general larger host ranges lead to higher diversity (Brändle & Brandl, 2001). Additionally, the larger the range in European beech the broader the climate niche can be assumed, which then should promote diversity of fungi (Elzami, 2018). Although, climate niche studies did not confirm a broader niche width in Oriental versus European beech (Mellert & Šeho, 2022). Another reason might be larger phylogenetic tree diversity in European beech forests with oak in the lowlands and conifers as silver fir or spruce in higher altitudes, supporting more fungal species which might then jump over to beech deadwood (Krah et al., 2018). In contrast, most Fagus orientalis forests (with exception of Borjomi) lack conifers exhibiting in total a lower phylogenetic gamma diversity. On the other hand, wood-inhabiting fungi are highly mobile. Therefore, historically younger old-growth forests might be colonized successful by more dominant fungi species, which still coexist. In contrast, it might be that over the time since the Tertiary diversity of dominant fungi has shrunk as result of the high and long-lasting competition. However, this suggestion remains to be confirmed in future studies, e.g. by experiments as in Englmeier et al. (2023).

Management affected the species composition of rare species, but not of common or dominant species. Here we have to keep in



FIGURE 5 Geographical distribution of European (*Fagus sylvatica*) and Oriental (*F. orientalis*) beech (Caudullo et al., 2017) and the location of the 18 sampling stands (old-growth and production forest stands) extending from the French Pyrenees to Armenia-Caucasus, investigated for saproxylic fungi communities in deadwood.

WILEY

mind that this effect was controlled for structural elements as deadwood type, diameter, or decay stage, which are respectively influenced by forest management as well. This means that silvicultural management has comprehensive impacts on fungal composition at least for rare species. Such subtle effects of management on fungal communities have been shown along regional logging intensity gradients in European beech forests in Germany (Bässler et al., 2014; Müller, Engel, et al., 2007) or in Spain (Abrego & Salcedo, 2011), where fungal communities in old reserves differed than communities in production forests. These studies identified species promoted or negatively affected by increasing forest management (Abrego, Norberg, et al., 2017; Bässler et al., 2014).

# 4.4 | Type of deadwood is important for the rare species

Different types of deadwood offer very different substrates, e.g., from wet to dry (microclimate) conditions. This opens different environmental conditions for different species. Therefore, forests with high variation of deadwood types provide more different niches for more species (Uhl et al., 2022). In contrast, even large amount of deadwood dominated by similar types as after large scale disturbance, can lead to reduced fungal diversity (Beudert et al., 2015), because wood-inhabiting fungi are highly competitive (Boddy, 2021; Fukami et al., 2010). Regularly some dominant species occupy the major deadwood resources successfully and outcompete other species (Vogel et al., 2017). This has been shown on the scale of petri dishes in the lab (Fukami et al., 2010), to field experiments (Hagge et al., 2019) and indicated by global experiments (Seibold et al., 2021). As a consequence, fungi often show overdispersion in assembly patterns and have more species on more different objects as small twigs, when total resource volume is standardized (Bässler et al., 2014; Heilmann-clausen & Christensen, 2004) and the decay is faster with a few dominant but efficient species than with a high diversity of species including many rare ones (Fukami et al., 2010). To escape the competition pressure, it seems therefore of advantage that deadwood is offered in many different types, which might have affected the composition in our data with focus on rare ones.

#### 4.5 | Diameter is important for the rare species

Bader et al. (1995) studied the deadwood size as an indicator for fungal diversity and showed that some species prefer well decayed and large logs, which is the reason why such species were well abundant in old growth forest sites but they became rare with increasing human activities-cuttings. In addition, according to Küffer and Senn-Irlet (2005) more species of fungi tend to be on deadwood with various diameters. However, Heilmannclausen and Christensen (2004) confirmed that the dead small trees and branches host higher diversity then large trees and larger logs do. Also, in production forest stands the main driver of deadwood fungi (and other saproxylic organisms) diversity is fine woody debris, which creates a general deadwood volume (Brabcová et al., 2022).

## 4.6 | Wood decay stage as driver for species richness

Deadwood decomposition is a succession with distinct species turnovers over time in all organisms, including fungi (Fukasawa, 2018). Lindblad (1998), Fukasawa et al. (2009) and Pouska et al. (2016) found a significant effect of deadwood decay stage on fungi species richness and community composition. In systematic surveys by fruiting bodies and metabarcoding the decay stage was critical for fungal species composition along the Hill numbers (Müller et al., 2020). This is in contrast with our study, as we could not confirmed these findings with our results. Here the main reason might be that our sampling did not cover a broader range of decay or the pattern on the large scale was overridden by other factors. However, we found decay stage as the only predictor to increase  $\alpha$ -diversity per log (Table S1), which is in line with the findings from Bader et al. (1995) and Kubartová et al. (2012).

#### 5 | CONCLUSION FOR BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND FOREST MANAGEMENT UNDER CLIMATE CHANGE

Our study provides some important implications for conservation and forest management. First, the high diversity and similarity of wood-inhabiting fungi in beech forests across the 4k kilometer of temperate forest belt supports the view of a highly mobile organism group with a lot of functional insurance in rare and dominant species. From a mycological perspective the skepticism againts the usage of Oriental beech in silviculture managment in Western Europe seems not to be justified. Reason for that is the fact that fungi communities of both *Fagus* species are very similar. For conservation, our results show that effort should be put on establishment of protected areas in different climate conditions for both *Fagus* species, as currently mirrored in the Natural Heritages. For local managers interested in enhancing diversity of wood-inhabiting fungi the retention of different types of beech deadwood seems promising.

#### AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Giorgi Mamadashvili: Conceptualization (equal); data curation (lead); formal analysis (equal); writing – original draft (equal). Antoine Brin: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing – review and editing (equal). Maksym Chumak: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing – review and editing (equal). Valeriia Diedus: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing – review and editing (equal). Lars Drössler: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing – review and editing (equal). I FV\_Ecology and Evolution

Förster: Conceptualization (equal). Kostadin B. Georgiev: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Tigran Ghrejyan: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Ruslan Hleb: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Mark Kalashian: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Ivan Kamburov: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Gayane Karagyan: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Joni Kevlishvili: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Zviad Khutsishvili: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Laurent Larrieu: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Meri Mazmanyan: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Peter I. Petrov: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Levan Tabunidze: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Claus Bässler: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal). Jörg Müller: Data curation (equal); resources (equal); writing - review and editing (equal).

#### AFFILIATIONS

<sup>1</sup>Field Station Fabrikschleichach, Department of Animal Ecology and Tropical Biology, Biocenter, University of Würzburg, Rauhenebrach, Germany <sup>2</sup>Sciences and digital department, University of Toulouse, Ecole d'Ingénieurs de PURPAN, UMR INRAE-INPT DYNAFOR, Toulouse, France

<sup>3</sup>Department of Entomology and Biodiversity Preservation, Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine

<sup>4</sup>State Museum of Natural History, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Lviv, Ukraine

<sup>5</sup>Forestry Research and Competence Center ThüringenForst AöR, Gotha, Germany

<sup>6</sup>Chair for Strategic Landscape Planning and Management, Technical University of Munich, Freising, Germany

<sup>7</sup>Hessian State Agency for Nature Conservation, Environment and Geology, Hesse, Germany

<sup>8</sup>Laboratory of Entomology and Soil Zoology, Scientific Center of Zoology and Hydroecology NAS RA, Yerevan, Armenia

<sup>9</sup>Forestry laboratory, Carpathian Biosphere Reserve, Rakhiv, Ukraine

<sup>10</sup>Strandzha Nature Park Directorate, Malko Tarnovo, Bulgaria

<sup>11</sup>Biodiversity Conservation Center "Nacres", Tbilisi, Georgia

<sup>12</sup>Université de Toulouse, INRAE, UMR DYNAFOR, Castanet-Tolosan, France
<sup>13</sup>CNPF-CRPF Occitanie, France

<sup>14</sup>University of Forestry Sofia, Field Base Petrohan, Barzia, Bulgaria <sup>15</sup>Caucasus Nature Fund – CNF, Tbilisi, Georgia

<sup>16</sup>Ecology of Fungi, Bayreuth Center of Ecology and Environmental Research (BayCEER), University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth, Germany

<sup>17</sup>Conservation and Research Department, Bavarian Forest National Park, Grafenau, Germany

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Our study was financed by Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung–BMBF as BeechDIV project. We are grateful to everyone for their input during fieldworks and sampling the materials. We thank Lena Fleckenstein for help processing the samples in the lab for metabarcoding. Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors have no conflicts of interest.

#### DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Annotated R code, including the data needed to reproduce the statistical analyses and figures, is publicly available from figshare (DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.24720003). During review, code and data are available at: https://figshare.com/s/5e64d74d00e18a27f402.

#### ORCID

Giorgi Mamadashvili https://orcid.org/0009-0008-2168-716X Jörg Müller https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1409-1586

#### REFERENCES

- Abrego, N., Bässler, C., Christensen, M., & Heilmann-Clausen, J. (2015). Implications of reserve size and forest connectivity for the conservation of wood-inhabiting fungi in Europe. *Biological Conservation*, 191, 469–477.
- Abrego, N., Christensen, M., Bässler, C., Ainsworth, A. M., & Heilmann-Clausen, J. (2017). Understanding the distribution of woodinhabiting fungi in European beech reserves from species-specific habitat models. *Fungal Ecology*, 27, 168–174.
- Abrego, N., Norberg, A., & Ovaskainen, O. (2017). Measuring and predicting the influence of traits on the assembly processes of woodinhabiting fungi. *Journal of Ecology*, 105, 1070–1081.
- Abrego, N., & Salcedo, I. (2011). How does fungal diversity change based on woody debris type? A case study in Northern Spain. *Ekologija*, 57, 112–116.
- Adamo, M., Voyron, S., Chialva, M., Marmeisse, R., & Girlanda, M. (2020). Metabarcoding on both environmental DNA and RNA highlights differences between fungal communities sampled in different habitats. *PLoS ONE*, 15, e0244682.
- Aliev, K. (2021). The importance of beech forests in the preservation of valuable species of the flora of Dagestan. BIO Web of Conferences, 35, 00003.
- Andrew, C., Halvorsen, R., Heegaard, E., Kuyper, T. W., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Krisai-Greilhuber, I., Bässler, C., Egli, S., Gange, A. C., Høiland, K., Kirk, P. M., Senn-Irlet, B., Boddy, L., Büntgen, U., & Kauserud, H. (2018). Continental-scale macrofungal assemblage patterns correlate with climate, soil carbon and nitrogen deposition. Journal of Biogeography, 45, 1942–1953.
- Antão, L. H., Weigel, B., Strona, G., Hällfors, M., Kaarlejärvi, E., Dallas, T., Opedal, Ø. H., Heliölä, J., Henttonen, H., Huitu, O., Korpimäki, E., Kuussaari, M., Lehikoinen, A., Leinonen, R., Lindén, A., Merilä, P., Pietiäinen, H., Pöyry, J., Salemaa, M., ... Laine, A. L. (2022). Climate change reshuffles northern species within their niches. *Nature Climate Change*, 12, 587–592.

Artsivadze, K., Nozadze, S. & Shavgulidze, I. (2018). Emerald networkquestions and answers. Reseachgate.

Azaryan, M., Vajari, K. A., & Amanzadeh, B. (2022). Herb-layer diversity and morphological traits of beech trees (*Fagus orientalis* L.) in development stages of natural temperate forests. *Biologia*, 78, 101–108.

- Baber, K., Otto, P., Kahl, T., Gossner, M. M., Wirth, C., Gminder, A., & Bässler, C. (2016). Disentangling the effects of forest-stand type and dead-wood origin of the early successional stage on the diversity of wood-inhabiting fungi. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 377, 161–169.
- Bader, P., Jansson, S., & Jonsson, B. G. (1995). Wood-inhabiting fungi and substratum decline in selectively logged boreal spruce forests. *Biological Conservation*, 72, 355–362.
- Bässler, C., Cadotte, M. W., Beudert, B., Heibl, C., Blaschke, M., Bradtka, J. H., Langbehn, T., Werth, S., & Müller, J. (2016). Contrasting

patterns of lichen functional diversity and species richness across an elevation gradient. *Ecography*, *39*, 689–698.

- Bässler, C., Ernst, R., Cadotte, M., Heibl, C., & Müller, J. (2014). Near-tonature logging influences fungal community assembly processes in a temperate forest. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 51, 939–948.
- Bässler, C., Müller, J., Dziock, F., & Brandl, R. (2010). Effects of resource availability and climate on the diversity of wood-decaying fungi. *Journal of Ecology*, 98, 822–832.
- Bässler, C., Müller, J., Hothorn, T., Kneib, T., Badeck, F., & Dziock, F. (2010). Estimation of the extinction risk for high-montane species as a consequence of global warming and assessment of their suitability as cross-taxon indicators. *Ecological Indicators*, 10, 341–352.
- Beudert, B., Bässler, C., Thorn, S., Noss, R., Schröder, B., Dieffenbach-Fries, H., Foullois, N., & Müller, J. (2015). Bark beetles increase biodiversity while maintaining drinking water quality: Bark beetles, biodiversity and drinking water. Conservation Letters, 8, 272–281.
- Boddy, L. (2001). Fungal community ecology and wood decomposition processes in angiosperms: From standing tree to complete decay of coarse Woody debris. *Ecological Bulletins*, 49, 43–56.
- Boddy, L. (2021). Fungi and trees: Their complex relationships. Arboricultural Association.
- Bohn, U., & Neuhäusl, R. (2000). Karte der natürlichen vegetation Europas/ map of the natural vegetation of Europe. Maßstab/Scale 1: 2 500 000. Landwirtschaftsverlag.
- Brabcová, V., Tláskal, V., Lepinay, C., Zrůstová, P., Eichlerová, I., Štursová, M., Müller, J., Brandl, R., Bässler, C., & Baldrian, P. (2022). Fungal community development in decomposing fine deadwood is largely affected by microclimate. Frontiers in Microbiology, 13, 835274.
- Brändle, M., & Brandl, R. (2001). Species richness of insects and mites on trees: Expanding Southwood: Insects and mites on trees. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 70, 491–504.
- Brunet, J., Fritz, Ö., & Richnau, G. (2010). Biodiversity in European beech forests—A review with recommendations for sustainable forest management. *Ecological Bulletins*, 53, 77–94.
- Cardoni, S., Piredda, R., Denk, T., Grimm, G. W., Papageorgiou, A. C., Schulze, E., Scoppola, A., Salehi Shanjani, P., Suyama, Y., Tomaru, N., & Worth, J. R. (2022). 5S-IGS rDNA in wind-pollinated trees (*Fagus* L.) encapsulates 55 million years of reticulate evolution and hybrid origins of modern species. *The Plant Journal*, 109, 909–926.
- Caudullo, G., Welk, E., & San-Miguel-Ayanz, J. (2017). Chorological maps for the main European woody species. *Data in Brief*, 12, 662–666.
- Chao, A., Gotelli, N. J., Hsieh, T. C., Sander, E. L., Ma, K. H., Colwell, R. K., & Ellison, A. M. (2014). Rarefaction and extrapolation with Hill numbers: A framework for sampling and estimation in species diversity studies. *Ecological Monographs*, 84, 45–67.
- Chao, A., & Jost, L. (2012). Coverage-based rarefaction and extrapolation: Standardizing samples by completeness rather than size. *Ecology*, 93, 2533–2547.
- Daniel, G. & Nilsson, T. (1998). Developments in the study of soft rot and bacterial decay. Researchgate.
- Dix, N. J., & Webster, J. (1995). Fungal ecology. Springer.
- Elzami, E. (2018). Der Naturwissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades Dr. rer. nat. Friedrich-Alexander-Universität.
- Englmeier, J., Rieker, D., Mitesser, O., Benjamin, C., Fricke, U., Ganuza, C., Haensel, M., Kellner, H., Lorz, J., Redlich, S., Riebl, R., Rojas-Botero, S., Rummler, T., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Stengel, E., Tobisch, C., Uhler, J., Uphus, L., Zhang, J., ... Bässler, C. (2023). Diversity and specialization responses to climate and land use differ between deadwood fungi and bacteria. *Ecography*, 5-10, e06807.
- Fayvush, G., & Aleksanyan, A. (2021). Plant diversity in riverine wetlands of Armenia. *Bocconea*, *29*, 81–87.
- Fayvush, G., Arakelyan, M., & Aleksanyan, A. (2016). The "Emerald" network in the Republic of Armenia. Վան Արյան.
- Fengel, D. & Wegener, G. (1983). Wood: Chemistry, ultrastructure, reactions. Springer.

- Floudas, D., Binder, M., Riley, R., Barry, K., Blanchette, R. A., Henrissat, B., Martínez, A. T., Otillar, R., Spatafora, J. W., Yadav, J. S., Aerts, A., Benoit, I., Boyd, A., Carlson, A., Copeland, A., Coutinho, P. M., de Vries, R. P., Ferreira, P., Findley, K., ... Hibbett, D. S. (2012). The Paleozoic origin of enzymatic lignin decomposition reconstructed from 31 fungal genomes. *Science*, 336, 1715–1719.
- Friess, N., Müller, J. C., Aramendi, P., Bässler, C., Brändle, M., Bouget, C., Brin, A., Bussler, H., Georgiev, K. B., Gil, R., Gossner, M. M., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Isacsson, G., Krištín, A., Lachat, T., Larrieu, L., Magnanou, E., Maringer, A., Mergner, U., ... Seibold, S. (2019). Arthropod communities in fungal fruitbodies are weakly structured by climate and biogeography across European beech forests. Diversity and Distributions, 25, 783–796.
- Fukami, T., Dickie, I. A., Paula Wilkie, J., Paulus, B. C., Park, D., Roberts, A., Buchanan, P. K., & Allen, R. B. (2010). Assembly history dictates ecosystem functioning: Evidence from wood decomposer communities: Carbon dynamics and fungal community assembly. *Ecology Letters*, 13, 675–684.
- Fukasawa, Y. (2018). Fungal succession and decomposition of Pinus densiflora snags. Ecological Research, 33, 435–444.
- Fukasawa, Y., Osono, T., & Takeda, H. (2009). Dynamics of physicochemical properties and occurrence of fungal fruit bodies during decomposition of coarse woody debris of *Fagus crenata*. *Journal of Forest Research*, 14, 20–29.
- Gessner, M. O., Swan, C. M., Dang, C. K., McKie, B. G., Bardgett, R. D., Wall, D. H., & Hättenschwiler, S. (2010). Diversity meets decomposition. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 25, 372–380.
- Goginashvili, N. & Tvauri, I. (2013). Beech forests with yew (Fageta-taxceto) in Georgia. Researchgate.
- Goslee, S. C., & Urban, D. L. (2007). The ecodist package for dissimilaritybased analysis of ecological data. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 22, 1–19.
- Gossner, M. M., Lachat, T., Brunet, J., Isacsson, G., Bouget, C., Brustel, H., Weisser, W. W., & Mueller, J. (2013). Current near-to-nature forest management effects on functional trait composition of Saproxylic beetles in beech forests. *Conservation Biology*, 27, 605–614.
- Hagge, J., Bässler, C., Gruppe, A., Hoppe, B., Kellner, H., Krah, F.-S., Müller, J., Seibold, S., Stengel, E., & Thorn, S. (2019). Bark coverage shifts assembly processes of microbial decomposer communities in dead wood. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 286, 20191744.
- Heilmann-Clausen, J., Aude, E., Van Dort, K., Christensen, M., Piltaver, A., Veerkamp, M., Walleyn, R., Siller, I., Standovár, T., & Òdor, P. (2014). Communities of wood-inhabiting bryophytes and fungi on dead beech logs in Europe—Reflecting substrate quality or shaped by climate and forest conditions? *Journal of Biogeography*, 41, 2269–2282.
- Heilmann-clausen, J., & Christensen, M. (2004). Does size matter?On the importance of various dead wood fractions for fungal diversity in Danish beech forests. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 201, 105–117.
- Hijmans, R. J., Cameron, S. E., Parra, J. L., Jones, P. G., & Jarvis, A. (2005). Very high resolution interpolated climate surfaces for global land areas. *International Journal of Climatology*, 25, 1965–1978.
- Hill, M. O. (1973). Diversity and evenness: A unifying notation and its consequences. *Ecology*, *54*, 427-432.
- Hoppe, B., Purahong, W., Wubet, T., Kahl, T., Bauhus, J., Arnstadt, T., Hofrichter, M., Buscot, F., & Krüger, D. (2016). Linking molecular deadwood-inhabiting fungal diversity and community dynamics to ecosystem functions and processes in central European forests. *Fungal Diversity*, 77, 367–379.
- Hsieh, T. C., Ma, K. H., & Chao, A. (2016). iNEXT: An R package for rarefaction and extrapolation of species diversity (Hill numbers). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7, 1451–1456.
- Krah, F., Seibold, S., Brandl, R., Baldrian, P., Müller, J., & Bässler, C. (2018). Independent effects of host and environment on the diversity of wood-inhabiting fungi. *Journal of Ecology*, 106, 1428–1442.

 $\mathcal{N}$ ILEY

12 of 13 WII FY\_Ecology and Evolution

- Kubartová, A., Ottosson, E., Dahlberg, A., & Stenlid, J. (2012). Patterns of fungal communities among and within decaying logs, revealed by 454 sequencing. *Molecular Ecology*, 21, 4514–4532.
- Küffer, N., & Senn-Irlet, B. (2005). Influence of forest management on the species richness and composition of wood-inhabiting basidiomycetes in Swiss forests. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 14, 2419–2435.
- Kurz, M., Kölz, A., Gorges, J., Pablo Carmona, B., Brang, P., Vitasse, Y., Kohler, M., Rezzonico, F., Smits, T. H. M., Bauhus, J., Rudow, A., Kim Hansen, O., Vatanparast, M., Sevik, H., Zhelev, P., Gömöry, D., Paule, L., Sperisen, C., & Csilléry, K. (2023). Tracing the origin of oriental beech stands across Western Europe and reporting hybridization with European beech–Implications for assisted gene flow. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 531, 120801.
- Lichstein, J. W. (2007). Multiple regression on distance matrices: A multivariate spatial analysis tool. *Plant Ecology*, 188, 117–131.
- Liers, C., Ullrich, R., Steffen, K. T., Hatakka, A., & Hofrichter, M. (2006). Mineralization of 14C-labelled synthetic lignin and extracellular enzyme activities of the wood-colonizing ascomycetes Xylaria hypoxylon and Xylaria polymorpha. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology, 69, 573–579.
- Lindblad, I. (1998). Wood-inhabiting fungi on fallen logs of Norway spruce: Relations to forest management and substrate quality. *Nordic Journal of Botany*, 18, 243–255.
- Mamadashvili, G., Brin, A., Bässler, C., Chumak, V., Chumak, M., Deidus, V., Drössler, L., Emberger, C., Georgiev, K. B., Ghrejyan, T., Gossner, M. M., Hleb, R., Rafiei-Jahed, R., Kalashian, M., Kambarov, I., Karagyan, G., Kevlishvili, J., Khutsishvili, Z., Kraus, D., ... Müller, J. (2023). Drivers of tree-related microhabitat profiles in European and oriental beech forests. *Biological Conservation*, 285, 110245.
- Mathew, B., Jalili, A., & Jamzad, Z. (2000). Red data book of Iran. A preliminary survey of endemic, rare and endangered plant species in Iran. Kew Bulletin, 55, 759.
- Mellert, K., & Šeho, M. (2022). Suitability of Fagus orientalis Lipsky at marginal Fagus sylvatica L. forest sites in Southern Germany. IForest–Biogeosciences and Forestry, 15, 417–423.
- Mikryukov, V., Dulya, O., Zizka, A., Bahram, M., Hagh-Doust, N., Anslan,
  S., Prylutskyi, O., Delgado-Baquerizo, M., Maestre, F. T., Nilsson,
  H., Pärn, J., Öpik, M., Moora, M., Zobel, M., Espenberg, M., Mander,
  Ü., Khalid, A. N., Corrales, A., Agan, A., ... Tedersoo, L. (2023).
  Connecting the multiple dimensions of global soil fungal diversity.
  Science Advances, 9, eadj8016.
- Morales-Hidalgo, D., Oswalt, S. N., & Somanathan, E. (2015). Status and trends in global primary forest, protected areas, and areas designated for conservation of biodiversity from the Global Forest Resources Assessment 2015. Forest Ecology and Management, 352, 68–77.
- Müller, J., Engel, H., & Blaschke, M. (2007). Assemblages of woodinhabiting fungi related to silvicultural management intensity in beech forests in southern Germany. *European Journal of Forest Research*, 126, 513–527.
- Müller, J., Sagheb Talebi, K., & Thorn, S. (2017). Protect Iran's ancient forest from logging. *Science*, *355*, 918.
- Müller, J., Simon, T., Roland, B., Khosro, S.-T., Barimani, H. V., Sebastian, S., Ulyshen, M. D., & Gossner, M. M. (2016). Protecting the forests while allowing removal of damaged trees may imperil Saproxylic insect biodiversity in the Hyrcanian beech forests of Iran: Protecting the forests. *Conservation Letters*, 9, 106–113.
- Müller, J., Ulyshen, M., Seibold, S., Cadotte, M., Chao, A., Bässler, C., Vogel, S., Hagge, J., Weiß, I., Baldrian, P., Tláskal, V., & Thorn, S. (2020). Primary determinants of communities in deadwood vary among taxa but are regionally consistent. *Oikos*, 129, 1579–1588.
- Müller-Using, S., & Bartsch, N. (2009). Decay dynamic of coarse and fine woody debris of a beech (Fagus sylvatica L.) forest in Central Germany. European Journal of Forest Research, 128, 287–296.
- Ódor, P., Heilmann-Clausen, J., Christensen, M., Aude, E., van Dort, K. W., Piltaver, A., Siller, I., Veerkamp, M. T., Walleyn, R., Standovár, T.,

van Hees, A. F. M., Kosec, J., Matočec, N., Kraigher, H., & Grebenc, T. (2006). Diversity of dead wood inhabiting fungi and bryophytes in semi-natural beech forests in Europe. *Biological Conservation*, 131, 58–71.

- Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P., O'Hara, R.B., Simpson, G., Solymos, P., & Stevens, M. (2020). Vegan community ecology package version 2.5-7 November 2020. Researchgate.
- Paffetti, D., Vettori, C., Caramelli, D., Vernesi, C., Lari, M., Paganelli, A., Paule, L., & Giannini, R. (2007). Unexpected presence of *Fagus orientalis* complex in Italy as inferred from 45,000-year-old DNA pollen samples from Venice lagoon. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 7, S6.
- Parisi, F., Pioli, S., Lombardi, F., Fravolini, G., Marchetti, M., & Tognetti, R. (2018). Linking deadwood traits with saproxylic invertebrates and fungi in European forests—A review. *IForest - Biogeosciences and Forestry*, 11, 423–436.
- Pouska, V., Macek, P., & Zíbarová, L. (2016). The relation of fungal communities to wood microclimate in a mountain spruce forest. *Fungal Ecology*, 21, 1–9.
- Purahong, W., Wubet, T., Krüger, D., & Buscot, F. (2018). Molecular evidence strongly supports deadwood-inhabiting fungi exhibiting unexpected tree species preferences in temperate forests. *The ISME Journal*, 12, 289–295.
- R Core Team. (2021). Download R-4.3.1 for Windows. The R-project for statistical computing. https://cran.r-project.org/bin/windows/ base/
- Rajala, T., Peltoniemi, M., Pennanen, T., & Mäkipää, R. (2012). Fungal community dynamics in relation to substrate quality of decaying Norway spruce (Picea abies [L.] Karst.) logs in boreal forests. FEMS Microbiology Ecology, 81, 494–505.
- Rayner, A. D. M., & Boddy, L. (1988). Fungal decomposition of wood: Its biology and ecology. Wiley.
- Rieker, D., Krah, F.-S., Gossner, M. M., Uhl, B., Ambarli, D., Baber, K., Buscot, F., Hofrichter, M., Hoppe, B., Kahl, T., Kellner, H., Moll, J., Purahong, W., Seibold, S., Weisser, W. W., & Bässler, C. (2022). Disentangling the importance of space and host tree for the betadiversity of beetles, fungi, and bacteria: Lessons from a large deadwood experiment. *Biological Conservation*, 268, 109521.
- Schuck, A., Parviainen, J., Bozzano, M., Estreguil, C., Koskela, J., Krumm, F., Lier, M., Quadt, V., Sotirov, M., Van Brusselen, J., Vítková, L., & Winkel, G. (2015). State of Europe's forests 2015. Part II: European forests: Status, trends and policy responses. In *Ministerial conference on the protection of forests in Europe–FOREST*. EUROPE Liaison Unit Madrid.
- Seibold, S., Rammer, W., Hothorn, T., Seidl, R., Ulyshen, M. D., Lorz, J., Cadotte, M. W., Lindenmayer, D. B., Adhikari, Y. P., Aragón, R., Bae, S., Baldrian, P., Barimani Varandi, H., Barlow, J., Bässler, C., Beauchêne, J., Berenguer, E., Bergamin, R. S., Birkemoe, T., ... Müller, J. (2021). The contribution of insects to global forest deadwood decomposition. *Nature*, *597*, 77–81.
- Stokland, J. N., Siitonen, J., & Jonsson, B. G. (2012). Biodiversity in dead wood. Ecology, biodiversity, and conservation. Cambridge University Press.
- Tedersoo, L., Bahram, M., Põlme, S., Kõljalg, U., Yorou, N. S., Wijesundera, R., Ruiz, L. V., Vasco-Palacios, A. M., Thu, P. Q., Suija, A., Smith, M. E., Sharp, C., Saluveer, E., Saitta, A., Rosas, M., Riit, T., Ratkowsky, D., Pritsch, K., Põldmaa, K., ... Abarenkov, K. (2014). Global diversity and geography of soil fungi. *Science*, *346*, 1256688.
- Tedersoo, L., Mikryukov, V., Zizka, A., Bahram, M., Hagh-Doust, N., Anslan, S., Prylutskyi, O., Delgado-Baquerizo, M., Maestre, F. T., Pärn, J., Öpik, M., Moora, M., Zobel, M., Espenberg, M., Mander, Ü., Khalid, A. N., Corrales, A., Agan, A., Vasco-Palacios, A. M., ... Abarenkov, K. (2022). Global patterns in endemicity and vulnerability of soil fungi. *Global Change Biology*, *28*, 6696–6710.
- Topaloğlu, E., Ay, N., Altun, L., & Serdar, B. (2016). Effect of altitude and aspect on various wood properties of oriental beech (*Fagus*

orientalis Lipsky) wood. Turkish Journal of Agriculture and Forestry, 40, 397–406.

- Uhl, B., Krah, F.-S., Baldrian, P., Brandl, R., Hagge, J., Müller, J., Thorn, S., Vojtech, T., & Bässler, C. (2022). Snags, logs, stumps, and microclimate as tools optimizing deadwood enrichment for forest biodiversity. *Biological Conservation*, 270, 109569.
- UNESCO. (2013). Ancient and primeval beech forests of the Carpathians and other regions of Europe. UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

UNESCO. (2019). Hyrcanian forests. UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

- UNESCO. (2021). Colchic rainforests and wetlands. UNESCO World Heritage Centre.
- Valentín, L., Rajala, T., Peltoniemi, M., Heinonsalo, J., Pennanen, T., & Mäkipää, R. (2014). Loss of diversity in wood-inhabiting fungal communities affects decomposition activity in Norway spruce wood. Frontiers in Microbiology, 5, 1–11.
- Větrovský, T., Kohout, P., Kopecký, M., Machac, A., Man, M., Bahnmann, B. D., Brabcová, V., Choi, J., Meszárošová, L., Human, Z. R., Lepinay, C., Lladó, S., López-Mondéjar, R., Martinović, T., Mašínová, T., Morais, D., Navrátilová, D., Odriozola, I., Štursová, M., ... Baldrian, P. (2019). A meta-analysis of global fungal distribution reveals climate-driven patterns. *Nature Communications*, 10, 5142.
- Vogel, S., Alvarez, B., Bässler, C., Müller, J., & Thorn, S. (2017). The Redbelted Bracket (*Fomitopsis pinicola*) colonizes spruce trees early after bark beetle attack and persists. *Fungal Ecology*, 27, 182–188.
- Vogel, S., Gossner, M. M., Mergner, U., Müller, J., & Thorn, S. (2020). Optimizing enrichment of deadwood for biodiversity by varying

sun exposure and tree species: An experimental approach. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *57*, 2075–2085.

Xu, Y., Chen, Y., Dang, P., Jiang, X., Zheng, W., Lei, J., & Yan, W. (2023). Decay of fallen wood and elevation affects soil fungal community assembly and indirectly controls community diversity. *Applied Soil Ecology*, 182, 104683.

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Mamadashvili, G., Brin, A., Chumak, M., Diedus, V., Drössler, L., Förster, B., Georgiev, K. B., Ghrejyan, T., Hleb, R., Kalashian, M., Kamburov, I., Karagyan, G., Kevlishvili, J., Khutsishvili, Z., Larrieu, L., Mazmanyan, M., Petrov, P. I., Tabunidze, L., Bässler, C., & Müller, J. (2024). Drivers of wood-inhabiting fungal diversity in European and Oriental beech forests. *Ecology and Evolution*, *14*, e11660. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.11660