Plants face the flow in V formation: A study of plant patch alignment in streams

Loreta Cornacchia [1,2*,a] Andrew Folkard [3] Grieg Davies,[4] Robert C. Grabowski,[5]
Johan van de Koppel,[1,2] Daphne van der Wal,[1,6] Geraldene Wharton,[7] Sara Puijalon,[8] Tjeerd J. Bouma[1,2,9]

[1]Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ), Department of Estuarine and Delta Systems, and Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands
[2]Groningen Institute for Evolutionary Life Sciences, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands
[3]Lancaster Environment Centre, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK
[4]Southern Water Services, Worthing, UK
[5]Cranfield Water Science Institute, Cranfield University, Cranfield, UK
[6]Faculty of Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation, University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands
[7]School of Geography, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK
[8]Univ Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, ENTPE, UMR 5023 LEHNA, Villeurbanne, France
[9]Department of Physical Geography, Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Abstract

Interactions between biological and physical processes, so-called bio-physical feedbacks, are important for landscape evolution. While these feedbacks have been quantified for isolated patches of vegetation in aquatic ecosystems, we still lack knowledge of how the location of one patch affects the occurrence of others. To test for patterns in the spatial distribution of vegetation patches in streams, we first measured the distance between *Callitriche platycarpa* patches using aerial images. Then, we measured the effects of varying patch separation distance on flow velocity, turbulence, and drag on plants in a field manipulation experiment. Lastly, we investigated whether these patterns of patch alignment developed over time following locations of reduced hydrodynamic forces, using 2-yr field observations of the temporal patch dynamics of *Ranunculus penicillatus* in a lowland chalk stream. Our results suggest that vegetation patches in streams organize themselves in V-like shapes to reduce drag forces, creating an optimal configuration that decreases hydrodynamic forces and may therefore encourage patch growth. Downstream patches are more frequently found at the rear and slightly overlapping the upstream patch, in locations that are partially sheltered by the established upstream vegetation while ensuring exposure to incoming flow (important for nutrient availability). Observations of macrophyte patch dynamics over time indicated that neighboring patches tend to grow in a slightly angled line, producing a spatial pattern resembling the V-formation in migratory birds. These findings point to the general role of bio-physical interactions in shaping how organisms align themselves spatially to aerodynamic and hydrodynamic flows at a range of scales.

Biogeomorphic landscapes, such as rivers, mangroves, and salt marshes, are characterized by strong interactions between biological and physical processes. These reciprocal interactions, also referred to as bio-physical feedbacks, are fundamental for landscape formation, adjustment, and evolution (Corenblit et al. 2007; Murray et al. 2008; Corenblit et al. 2015). By obstructing the flow, vegetation stimulates channel formation

*Correspondence: loreta.cornacchia@nioz.nl

[a]Present address: UMR 5023 LEHNA, Université Lyon 1, CNRS, ENTPE, Villeurbanne, France

in tidal marsh landscapes (Temmerman et al. 2007; Kearney and Fagherazzi 2016). In fluvial environments, riparian and floodplain plants affect the processes and morphology of alluvial rivers (Tal and Paola 2007; Gurnell 2014). Such environments are characterized by the presence of ecosystem engineers (Jones et al. 1994; Gurnell 2014), organisms that are able to modify their habitat through their action or their own physical structure. To understand these biogeomorphic systems, many studies have focused on interactions among vegetation, hydrodynamics, and sedimentation processes (Leonard and Luther 1995; Madsen et al. 2001; Bouma et al. 2007). These landscapes are often characterized by patchy vegetation, at least during the establishment phase. However, despite many plants being the keystone species in these environments,

understanding of how flow modification at the patch scale may affect the processes and mechanisms controlling vegetation establishment and the hydrodynamics of these systems remains limited.

The interactions between flowing water and plants have been studied across different ecosystems, over a variety of spatial scales and vegetation configurations. Such configurations include homogeneous fields of vegetation (Kouwen and Unny 1973; Nepf and Vivoni 2000; Chen et al. 2013) as well as isolated plant patches (Sand-Jensen and Vindbœk Madsen 1992; Bouma et al. 2009; Zong and Nepf 2012). The impact of a vegetation patch on hydrodynamics and sediment dynamics is location and scale dependent (Rietkerk and Van de Koppel 2008; van Wesenbeeck et al. 2008; Schoelynck et al. 2012), for instance, changing from reduced flow velocities within the vegetation to increased velocities around it. Many more studies have been carried out on individual patches of submerged aquatic macrophytes (for example, Sand-Jensen and Mebus 1996; Sand-Jensen 1998; Sukhodolov and Sukhodolova, 2009) compared to studies with multiple macrophyte stands (Cotton et al. 2006; Wharton et al. 2006; Marjoribanks et al. 2017). As patches in a landscape rarely grow in isolation but rather in mosaics (Temmerman et al. 2007; Van der Wal et al. 2008), including a pseudobraided pattern in rivers (Dawson 1989), one patch may affect other patches by altering its local environment. The size of the gap between vegetation patches can be influenced by current velocity (Fonseca and Bell 1998) and turbulence, and has implications for physical and ecological processes (e.g., sedimentation and nutrient availability) (Folkard 2005; Folkard 2011). Recent attention has been focused on the larger-scale impact of multiple patches, and how their size and/or alignment affects flow patterns (Folkard 2005; Vandenbruwaene et al. 2011; Adhitya et al. 2014) and sediment deposition (Meire et al. 2014), and the implications for landscape adjustments and evolution (Kondziolka and Nepf 2014; De Lima et al. 2015; Gurnell and Grabowski 2016). However, knowledge is still lacking on how the location of one patch may affect the occurrence of another patch, potentially leading to optimal spatial configurations due to hydrodynamic force reduction.

Several studies have revealed the importance of facilitation, i.e., positive interactions between species that promote establishment by mediation of physical stress (Bruno et al. 2003; Callaway 2007). Thus, positive feedbacks created by one patch may extend beyond the patch itself (Bruno and Kennedy 2000), leading to a facilitative effect on the establishment or growth of other species. Such interactions between vegetation patches are likely to be relevant for plant establishment in lotic environments, where primary colonization is challenging due to forces that act to dislodge seedlings and fragments (Riis 2008; Balke et al. 2014). However, studies of facilitation mostly focus on interactions between individuals of different species or interspecific interactions (Bruno et al. 2003; Callaway 2007). Consequently, we know relatively little about intraspecific facilitation mediated by existing vegetation patches of the same species and its effects on distribution patterns in the landscape. It is important to address this gap as intraspecific facilitation is likely to be a key process in flow-dominated systems, where currents and drag forces may impose a stress that limits growth and seedling establishment (Schutten et al. 2005; Puijalon et al. 2008; Balke et al. 2011). It is known that vegetation patches may increase flow velocity in some adjacent areas, while reducing it directly downstream of the patch (Bouma et al. 2007; Chen et al. 2012; Schoelynck et al. 2012). As a consequence, optimal spatial configurations of vegetation patches might be expected to emerge due to patterns of hydrodynamic force reduction, specifically in terms of drag force reduction.

Plant–flow interactions have been studied intensively in vegetated streams because of their ecological and geomorphological importance (Gurnell 2014; Bertoldi et al. 2015; Grabowski and Gurnell 2016), and the presence of unidirectional flow makes them an ideal model system. In this study, we investigated the spatial distribution of submerged aquatic vegetation patches and the implications of this for in-stream landscape adjustments over a 2-yr timescale. There were three components to the study. First, naturally occurring macrophyte patches were identified from aerial images to determine the average patch separation distances. Then, a field manipulation experiment was conducted to measure the effects of varying patch separation distance on flow velocity, turbulence, and drag on the submerged plants. We considered drag reduction as a proxy for the benefits derived by plants from their location in relation to other patches. Previous studies indicate that, on a short temporal scale, the survival and establishment of individual plants depend on successful root development (in the order of days; Barrat-Segretain et al. 1998; Barrat-Segretain et al. 1999) and protection from scouring or dislodgement due to currents and drag. Most of this primary colonization phase derives from drifting vegetative fragments, and rarely from seeds (Sand-Jensen et al. 1999; Riis 2008). To test whether the most frequent patch distributions corresponded to the locations with the lowest drag forces, we related patterns of drag reduction to the observed probability of patch occurrence identified from aerial images. After colonization, single shoots develop into patches on intra-annual time scales through clonal expansion (over the course of months; Cotton et al. 2006; Wharton et al. 2006). Therefore, finally, we tested whether such preferential patch distributions obtained from aerial images were supported by field observations of temporal patch dynamics in a lowland chalk stream over a period of 2 yr.

Materials and methods

Measuring interpatch distance from in-stream aerial images

To investigate the existence of preferential distributions of plant patches, we collected aerial images of an artificial drainage channel with natural colonization by aquatic vegetation. The channel is located along the Rhône River (France),

near Serrières-de-Briord (45.8153°N, 5.4274°E). The channel, selected for its uniform cross-sectional and planform geometry allowing a focus on plant configuration, had an average channel width of 8.0 m and an average depth of 0.8 m, rarely exceeding 1.3 m, with relatively straight banks. Aerial images of the streambed were taken with a digital camera mounted on a pole at a height of ~ 2 m. We identified 22 pairs of neighboring patches for the dominant aquatic macrophyte *Callitriche platycarpa*. This species has long, flexible shoots that are pushed in a downstream direction by the flow, generating an overhanging canopy that is rooted only at the upstream edge (Haslam 1978). The pairs could clearly be distinguished as separate patches through the presence of an unvegetated area between their rooting parts. In these streams, neighboring patches were defined as those within 1.5 m from each other, because the influence of an upstream patch can be observed for a distance equal to its length (Sand-Jensen and Mebus 1996; Schoelynck et al. 2012), and 1.5 m is representative of the average length of *C. platycarpa* patches (Sand-Jensen 1998). We measured the absolute longitudinal interpatch distance (distance between their upstream edges in the streamwise direction, L_d in m) and transversal interpatch distance (distance between their leftmost edges in the spanwise direction, T_d in m) between the pairs (Fig. 1). To account for differences in absolute distances due to the variability in patch sizes, we converted them into relative distances. To obtain relative longitudinal distances (L), we divided the absolute distance L_d by the length of the upstream patch L_u. To obtain relative transversal distances (T), we divided the absolute distance T_d by the width of the upstream patch T_u (Fig. 1). The frequency distributions of relative longitudinal and transversal distances were first converted into probability distributions. Then, the probability distributions in the two directions were multiplied by each other to obtain the probability of naturally observed occurrences of vegetation patches for each combination of L and T distances. This point grid was imported into GIS software and interpolated to obtain a two-dimensional probability map of naturally observed patch occurrence (%) at different distances from an existing patch, using kriging interpolation.

Quantifying the effects of interpatch distance on flow velocity and drag using a field manipulation experiment
Flow velocity measurements

To assess the effects of different patch configurations on flow reduction and acceleration, we measured the changes in flow velocity with varying patch separation distance through a field manipulation. Plants were detached from existing patches, transplanted on perforated metal plates, and fixed through cable ties at the roots, to recreate two *C. platycarpa* patches (1.2 m in length, 0.6 m in width) that could be moved and arranged at different distances in the river bed. The two patches were arranged into 10 different configurations, representing a combination of longitudinal and transversal distances (Fig. 2). The

patch located upstream ("patch U") was kept fixed, while the other one ("patch D") was moved downstream and/or laterally to create the configurations. The two patches were partially overlapping in one configuration ($T = 0.5$, $L = 0.46$), as the leading edge of patch D started at the end of the rooted area of patch U. In this case, the overhanging canopy of patch U was located in the upper water layer, while the leading edge of patch D was located close to the bed, which still allowed water to flow in between the two patches. The patch characteristics (width, length, and density) were kept constant between the fixed and mobile patches. Patch density was fixed by fitting the plants into the perforated metal plates, with an array of 9408 holes m^{-2}. The condition of the plant patches did not deteriorate during the course of the experiment, thus maintaining a similar morphological function within the river.

Vertical profiles of flow velocity were measured with a three-dimensional acoustic Doppler velocimeter (ADV, Nortek) over 2 min at 10 Hz. Hydrodynamic profiles were measured at five vertical locations of 5%, 10%, 20%, 40%, and 90% of the depth above the river bed. Around the pair of vegetation patches, vertical profiles were located at distances of 0.2 and 0.1 m, respectively, from the upstream edges, and 0.2 m on both sides of each patch (at 0.35 m along their length), i.e., in the gap between the patches. For each point measurement in the profile, mean values of the velocity components u, v, and w were calculated (corresponding to velocities in the x, y, and z directions; m s^{-1}). Depth-averaged flow velocities u (in the streamwise direction) are expressed relative to incoming flow velocity, which was recorded at a fixed measurement point located 0.5 m upstream of patch U.

Turbulent kinetic energy

To determine the effects of different patch configurations on turbulence, we measured the changes in turbulent kinetic energy (TKE, m^2 s^{-2}) with different patch separation distances. TKE is a measure of hydrodynamic turbulence that can negatively affect plants through direct effects on their growth (Jaffe and Forbes 1993). Also, by governing processes of sediment trapping and resuspension (Hendriks et al. 2008), it can potentially affect plant establishment by reducing sediment stability. TKE was therefore calculated for the profile located at 0.1 m from the upstream edge of patch D, to investigate its potential implications for establishment. We first calculated the turbulent fluctuations $u'(t) = u(t) - \overline{u}$, where $u(t)$ is the time series of flow measurements and $\overline{u}$ is the time-averaged velocity (m s^{-1}) in the streamwise direction at each vertical position. The corresponding spanwise and vertical turbulent velocity components v' and w' were calculated in the same way. For each point measurement in the profile, TKE (per unit mass) was then calculated as $TKE = \frac{1}{2}\left(\overline{u'^2} + \overline{v'^2} + \overline{w'^2}\right)$.

Drag force measurements

To investigate the benefits of different patch configurations in terms of drag reduction, we measured the effects of varying

Fig. 1. Frequency distribution of **(A)** observed relative longitudinal interpatch distance (distance between upstream edges divided by upstream patch length) and **(B)** relative transversal interpatch distance (transversal gap between leftmost edges divided by upstream patch width) of neighboring patches of *C. platycarpa*. The aerial pictures show macrophyte patch pairs **(C, D)** growing in a staggered distribution, with overlapping canopies. The canopy of the upstream patch is outlined in black. Gray areas indicate the extent of the rooted area. Arrows indicate main river flow direction. **(E)** The force transducer employed in the field for drag measurements on macrophytes. **(F, G)** The experimental setup in the field with the transplanted vegetation patches and ADV for flow velocity measurements.

Fig. 2. Overview of the 10 patch configurations used in the field experiments, with indication of interpatch distance in the longitudinal and transversal directions. L and T are relative distances; T_d and L_d are absolute distances (in m). Patch "U" was kept fixed, while patch "D" was moved downstream and/or laterally. Arrows indicate flow direction, and arrow size and color indicate velocity magnitude relative to a measurement point located 0.5 m upstream of patch U. Gray areas indicate the extent of the rooted area. Orange dots are locations of drag measurements.

patch separation distance on drag forces. Drag forces were measured using a force transducer developed by the former WL Delft Hydraulics (now Deltares). The transducer consisted of a solid platform, carried by two steel cantilever beams, with four temperature-corrected strain gauges mounted in pairs on opposite sides of each of the two steel cantilevers (for details, *see* Bouma et al. 2005). The voltage output for the force transducer was linearly correlated with forces up to 10 N ($r^2 = 0.99$, $p < 0.001$). During the measurements, a *C. platycarpa* plant was mounted on top of the transducer and placed into the river bed at the upstream edge of patch D. For the measurements, we selected isolated plants of 55.1 ± 5.8 cm in height and with four to nine ramifications. Plants were attached to the transducer by their stem and positioned in a natural growth position to closely represent the natural conditions. Voltage readings were collected on a data logger at a frequency

of 100 Hz and expressed as the mean value for 1 min. As bending and leaning of the plant on the vegetation patch interferes with measuring the actual drag on the individual, drag measurements were also performed by removing patch D and repeating the measurement on the single plant. To allow comparisons between individuals, drag was expressed as a function of total plant surface area.

Effects of patch interactions on seasonal in-stream landscape adjustments: Evidence from temporal field surveys

To test whether new vegetation occurred preferentially at certain distances and directions from initial vegetation patches, we analyzed field surveys of vegetation development from a study on a chalk stream reach within the Frome-Piddle catchment (Dorset, U.K.) over 2 yr (monthly from July 2008 to July 2009, and bimonthly thereafter until July 2010; for further information on the field surveys, please see Davies 2012). The study reach was the Bere Stream (U.K. Grid Reference 385,563, 93,009), a relatively straight 30 m section with bankfull widths ranging between 7 and 9 m. The dominant in-channel aquatic macrophyte was water crowfoot (*Ranunculus penicillatus* subsp. *pseudofluitans*) which has highly similar patch establishment dynamics and structural traits to *C. platycarpa* (rooted at the upstream part of the patch and with very flexible stems that form an overhanging canopy; Haslam 1978). Furthermore, the main factors affecting initial establishment are determined by mechanical forces (e.g., drag and flow velocity). These forces increase the risk of plant uprooting or dislodgement and relate to plant morphological characteristics (Bal et al. 2011), rather than species characteristics such as growth rates. Thus, field observations of *Ranunculus* could be compared with the findings of the field manipulation experiments of *C. platycarpa*.

The data set from the Frome-Piddle catchment afforded a unique opportunity to assess the occurrence of new vegetation and changes in vegetation cover and spatial distribution over time. The field survey was a repeated measures design over time. During each survey, macrophyte distribution was mapped along 30 transects that were located at 1-m distance intervals along the 30-m long study reach. Along each transect, measurement points were located at 0.5 m intervals to record macrophyte presence and species. The sample size was 2150 measurement points, replicated over 19 surveys, of which six surveys were used in this study. Reach survey data were analyzed using GIS software. The total station coordinates of the transect markers were used to georeference a digitized version of the reach within a GIS. The output resulted in an array of points that were spatially arranged along transect lines. Vegetation cover observed at points in the reach data set was interpolated using an inverse distance weighted (IDW) interpolation method. If the predicted surface outputs from IDW differed from the substrate cover observed at any extra observation point not used in the IDW, the substrate cover observed at that point prevailed above the

IDW interpolation. Separate vegetation patches were derived using the minimum bounding geometry enclosing each of the polygon outputs from IDW. Although not measured in this study, seasonal changes in macrophyte cover are generally associated with changes in vegetation biomass density (g dry weight [DW] m^{-2}). A previous study in the Bere Stream found that *Ranunculus* density was lowest during winter (January, about 100 g DW m^{-2}) and peaked during the summer months (May–July), when it reached about 400 g DW m^{-2} (Dawson 1976).

We tested the hypothesis that directions of growth of new patches compared to existing patches during the survey period show preferential directions for plant growth, instead of being uniformly distributed in all directions. Therefore, six replicate surveys over three different periods were selected over the 2 yr (December 2008–July 2009, September 2009–January 2010, and January 2010–July 2010), because a net increase in *Ranunculus* cover was measured within each of them, allowing the phase of new macrophyte patch colonization to be captured. The shortest distance and direction (angle) between each new vegetation patch and the closest existing patch at the beginning of each survey period were calculated using the "Near" tool in ArcMap 10.4.

Statistical analyses

In the aerial photography, 22 replicate pairs of patches were considered. A chi-squared test was used to test for significant differences in the frequency of observed longitudinal and transversal distances between vegetation patches. In the field experiment, the statistical design was a fully factorial design with transversal and longitudinal distances as the main factors, comprising 10 different configurations (treatments) each measured once. Regression analysis was used to test the effects of varying longitudinal and transversal distances on depth-averaged and near-bed (5% and 10% of depth above the river bed) flow velocities in four different positions (between the patches, at the upstream edge of patch D, next to patch U, next to patch D), and on TKE at the upstream edge of patch D. We tested whether relative flow velocities would increase linearly with increasing interpatch distances, or follow a quadratic relationship which might be expected if relative flow velocities first increase until a maximum at intermediate distances and then decrease to 1 as they become equal to incoming flow velocity. In the latter case, patches become far enough apart so that they cease to interact. Hence, we fitted both linear and quadratic models using single (*L* or *T* distances) and multiple (*L* and *T* distances) predictor variables. We then used Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) to compare the adequacy of the candidate models, and selected the model with the lowest AIC score (Akaike 1998). Regression analysis was used to test for the relationship between flow velocities and drag forces on *C. platycarpa* in the field flume experiment. Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression was used for spatial regression between the experimental drag measured around a vegetation patch, and the probability

of naturally-observed patch occurrence. The latter was first log-transformed (natural log of original value +0.5) due to its skewed distribution. A chi-squared test was used to test for significant differences in angle of growth compared to a uniform distribution in all directions. A paired *t*-test was used to compare drag forces measured on single plants to drag on plants located at the upstream edge of a vegetation patch.

Results

Observed interpatch distances between pairs of macrophytes

The analysis of aerial photographs from the Rhône River study reach revealed that naturally occurring *C. platycarpa* stands display a nonrandom distribution relative to neighboring patches (Fig. 1). We observed that the leading edge of the downstream patch was most frequently located between one third and halfway along the length of the upstream patch (i.e., *L* = 0.3–0.5) (χ^2_8 = 20.54, *p* = 0.008). This longitudinal separation distance was relatively constant, regardless of the size and shape of the patches we analyzed (width/length ratios ranged from 0.25 to 0.83). In the transversal direction, the downstream patch was most frequently located at 80% of the width of the upstream patch from the latter's lateral edge (i.e., *T* = 0.8), hence partially overlapping with, and sheltered by, the overhanging canopy of the patch ahead (χ^2_6 = 14.90, *p* = 0.021).

Effects of interpatch distance on flow velocity and turbulence

Measurements of the hydrodynamic effects of different patch configurations in the Rhône River study reach showed that depth-averaged flow velocity and turbulence patterns were strongly affected by the distance between patches. In between the patches, flow velocity was strongly reduced when the patches were partly overlapping (i.e., for *T* = 0.5 and *L* = 0.46), but it increased when a clear separation developed between patches and flow was constricted. We found a significant linear relationship between flow velocities in between the patches and the relative transversal (*T*, spanwise) distance between the patches ($F_{1,8}$ = 31.45, r^2 = 0.79, *p* < 0.001; Fig. 3A–C; Table 1). When the patches were close together, with no more than a 5 cm gap (*T* ≤ 1.08), flow velocities between them were reduced and the pair tended to behave more like a single patch. However, flow velocity accelerated when the gap between the patches, and therefore *T*, increased. In particular, at *T* = 1.58, flow velocities between the two patches were higher than incoming velocities due to flow constriction (Fig. 3B).

We found that turbulence was minimized at intermediate distances along the length of an upstream patch, while it increased both when the patches were next to each other and when one was immediately downstream of the other. TKE upstream of the patch was significantly related to relative longitudinal distance *L* through a quadratic relationship

Fig. 3. Relative flow velocity measurements (flow velocity relative to incoming flow) in between the patches **(A–C)** and on the side of patch U **(G–I)** for the 10 configurations, showing the effects of increasing relative longitudinal and transversal distances. **(D–F)** Relationship between relative longitudinal and transversal distances and TKE (m² s⁻²) at the upstream edge of patch D. Green ovals are illustrations of the two neighboring patches and their relative separation distances on the axes. Arrow size and color indicate flow velocity magnitude, according to the color scale in Fig. 2.

$(F_{2,7} = 5.719$, $r^2 = 0.62$, $p = 0.03)$, the highest TKE occurred when patches were located next to each other (for $L = 0$; Fig. 3D–F). From $L = 0$, TKE decreased with increased relative longitudinal distance until a minimum at $L = 0.66$, after which it increased again for $L > 0.66$ as it entered the high TKE region in the wake of the upstream patch. This minimum TKE at $L = 0.66$ seems to be the point at which there was an optimal combination of sheltering from the oncoming flow by the

upstream patch (which increased with L) and minimization of the high TKE region in the wake of the upstream patch (which decreased with L). For the mean flow velocities upstream of patch D, results of single and multiple regression showed no significant relationship with T and L distances (Table 1).

Areas of weakest flow deflection (i.e., reduced hydrodynamic forces) were found around the upstream patch at intermediate longitudinal distances and, in particular, when

Table 1. Regression results of linear and quadratic models including single (*T, L*) or multiple (*T* and *L*) predictor variables. Final selected models (in bold) are based on AIC values.

		Linear model			Quadratic model		
		Predictor variables					
		T×L	*T*	*L*	*T×L*	*T*	*L*
Relative $\overline{U}$ between patches	R^2	0.82	0.79	0.00	0.87	0.81	0.06
	p value	0.01	0.0005	0.84	0.058	0.002	0.79
	AIC	−17.64	**−19.96**	−4.06	−16.99	−19.08	−2.67
Relative $\overline{U}$ upstream of patch "D"	R^2	0.40	0.24	0.05	0.71	0.33	0.28
	p value	0.33	0.15	0.49	0.26	0.24	0.31
	AIC	−6.22	−7.71	−5.59	−9.37	−7.05	−6.28
Relative $\overline{U}$ next to patch "U"	R^2	0.41	0.22	0.00	0.90	0.25	0.69
	p value	0.329	0.16	0.99	0.033	0.36	0.016
	AIC	−25.53	−26.77	−24.19	**−40.09**	−25.10	−33.95
Relative $\overline{U}$ next to patch "D"	R^2	0.33	0.31	0.00	0.38	0.31	0.085
	p value	0.45	0.09	0.95	0.76	0.26	0.73
	AIC	−22.32	−26.05	−22.29	−19.15	−24.05	−21.18
TKE upstream of patch "D"	R^2	0.31	0.00	0.27	0.76	0.07	0.62
	p value	0.48	0.99	0.11	0.18	0.77	0.03
	AIC	−80.09	−80.31	−83.53	−86.83	−79.04	**−87.99**

the two patches were partly overlapping. However, flow deflection increased both when the patches were next to each other and when one was immediately downstream of the other. A significant nonlinear (quadratic) relationship was found between flow velocities next to patch U and both relative transversal (*T*) and relative longitudinal (*L*) distances ($F_{4,5}$ = 7.931, r^2 = 0.90, *p* = 0.03; Fig. 3G–I; Table 1). As *L* increased, flow velocity first decreased for intermediate distances (between 0.16 and 0.58), due to weaker flow redirection around the patch. Then, it increased again to become equal to the incoming flow velocity, following a quadratic relationship. As *T* increased, and therefore the gap between the patches increased, the flow velocity increased until it was equal to the incoming flow velocity for *T* ≥ 1.5. However, flow velocities next to patch D showed no significant relationship with relative transversal (*T*) and longitudinal (*L*) distances (Table 1).

Testing the relationship between patch distance and near-bed flow velocities revealed no significant relationship between patch distances and velocities at 5% of the depth above the river bed (Supporting Information Table S1). A significant quadratic relationship between flow velocities in between the patches and both relative transversal (*T*) and relative longitudinal (*L*) distances was confirmed for flow measurements at 10% of the depth (Supporting Information Table S2).

Effects of interpatch distances on drag forces

Existing vegetation patches appeared to create sheltered areas where drag was minimized, and new patches were more likely to occur in these locations. Measurements of the drag

force derived from a plant's particular location around an existing vegetation patch revealed a significant relationship between flow velocity and drag force per unit surface area on *C. platycarpa* individuals (r^2 = 0.92, *p* = 0.0001; Fig. 4A). As our field drag force measurements were in the same order of magnitude as measurements performed on the same species in a laboratory flume (Puijalon et al. 2011), we assert that the field setup provided comparable and accurate measurements. Drag forces ranged from 0.19 to 4.63 N m^{-2}, due to the flow modification by the vegetation patch, with lowest drag forces right along the lateral edge of the patch, at ≥ 0.55 m from the upstream edge. This distance along the length of the patch corresponded to the end of the rooted area and the start of the floating canopy, with the downstream patch forming an angle of 28° relative to the upstream patch. Plotting the drag in an interpolated spatial grid around a patch shows that the most frequent locations of neighboring patches based on our field observations correspond to positions with intermediate to low drag forces (Fig. 4A,D). Furthermore, the probability of observed patch occurrence in a certain position is inversely related to the observed drag force in that position (ordinary least squares spatial regression, r^2 = 0.28, *p* < 0.0001; Fig. 4C).

Comparison of average drag force measurements on single plants, representing the conditions of initial establishment, compared to plants located at the upstream edge of a well-established patch (*n* = 10 configurations) showed that *C. platycarpa* individuals experience significantly higher drag when alone (Fig. 5; paired *t*-test, t_{19} = −2.28, *p* = 0.03). This observation shows that drag forces on the upstream plants are mitigated by leaning onto other plants in a patch.

Fig. 4. (A, B) Drag forces per unit surface area on single *C. platycarpa* individuals in different positions around a vegetation patch in the field flume. **(A)** Relationship between flow velocity and drag force in the field (this study) and in a laboratory flume (Puijalon et al. 2011). **(B)** The drag measurements (black dots, same points as in **A**) are plotted in an interpolated spatial grid around an existing vegetation patch (in green). **(C, D)** Probability of observed patch occurrence around an existing vegetation patch. **(C)** Spatial regression between the experimental drag in a certain position around a vegetation patch, and the probability of patch occurrence in the same position. **(D)** Map of probability of patch occurrence (%), based on the combination of the observed frequency distributions of relative longitudinal and transversal distances in Fig. 1. Black dots indicate the grid of distance observations. Note that the vegetation patch (green oval with dashed line border) provides an indication of the average size of an existing patch; the actual size observed in natural neighboring patches may vary.

Effects of patch interactions on seasonal in-stream landscape adjustments: Evidence from temporal field surveys

Field surveys over a 2 yr period in the Frome-Piddle catchment (U.K.) showed that new vegetation patches occurred at specific orientations from existing vegetation patches ($\chi_5^2 = 9.20$, $p = 0.1$ for December 2008–July 2009; $\chi_5^2 = 12.80$, $p = 0.025$ for September 2009–January 2010; $\chi_5^2 = 10.88$, $p = 0.053$ for January 2010–July 2010, and $\chi_5^2 = 24.34$, $p < 0.001$ for all survey periods together; Table 2). Within each of the three time periods we analyzed, the most common direction of growth was at angles between 0° and 60° from existing patches (with a peak around 30°), in a downstream direction toward the right bank with a second most common

direction at angles between 120° and 180°, downstream toward the left bank (Fig. 6; Table 2). The most common angles of growth found through field surveys are consistent with the angle of 28° found through field measurements and corresponding to a region where drag forces are the lowest (Fig. 4). Overall, these observations support the hypothesis that new patches occur in a slightly angled line with respect to existing well-established patches, in locations with reduced hydrodynamic and drag forces (Fig. 4).

The observed seasonal trends of in-stream vegetation growth and die-back were similar over the two survey years in the Frome-Piddle catchment (Table 2; the corresponding changes in fine sediment deposition within *Ranunculus* patches are reported in Davies 2012). During both years,

Fig. 5. Drag forces on a single plant vs. a plant located in a vegetation patch, averaged over the 10 vegetation configurations (paired *t*-test, $t_{19} = -2.2813$, $p = 0.03$). Error bars indicate standard error.

Ranunculus reached its peak cover in the period May–July and began to decline shortly after (until December), due to the seasonal dieback linked to increasing channel discharge and decreasing daylengths and water temperatures. In September 2009, a particularly low *Ranunculus* cover was observed (7%), likely related to the increase in autumn discharges. However, in-stream vegetation started to recover from January onward, when daylengths increased, with new *Ranunculus* patches recolonizing the stream bed.

Discussion

While most studies of bio-geomorphic feedbacks have focused on isolated or already established patches, our study examined the spatial configuration of patches and quantified

where plant patches occur in relation to one another. A key finding was that new vegetation patches in streams organize themselves in V-like shapes during the establishment phase to reduce hydrodynamic and drag forces. Field observations showed that patches are more likely to grow at the end of the rooted area of the upstream patch, where its floating canopy starts (i.e., between one third and halfway down the length of an upstream patch) and slightly off to its side (overlapping with part of their width). Measurements in the field revealed that these locations correspond to areas where drag is reduced, due to partial sheltering from high flow velocities and TKE by well-established vegetation patches. Field manipulations supported this hypothesis, showing that mean flow velocity is reduced by partially overlapping with upstream patches in the across-stream direction, and turbulence is minimized when growing halfway down the length of an upstream patch in the main flow direction. Flow deflection around the upstream patch is weakest when a partial V shape is formed, suggesting that additional secondary patch growth can occur on the other side of the V. These patterns of patch alignment in formation resemble the formation adopted by migratory birds (Portugal et al. 2014) or the drag-reducing queue formations in spiny lobsters (Bill and Herrnkind 1976). This provides evidence of the role that bio-physical interactions have in shaping the way organisms position themselves spatially in landscapes, in both air and water flow, across a range of scales.

Facilitative interactions within the landscape of a self-organized species

The positive and negative feedbacks underlying the formation of self-organized patterns have been identified for a wide range of ecosystems (Rietkerk et al. 2002; van de Koppel et al. 2005; Larsen et al. 2007). At the scale of a single patch, it

Table 2. Changes in *Ranunculus* in-stream vegetation cover (%) and direction of growth of newly occurring vegetation patches with respect to the nearest existing vegetation patch (°), based on field observations in the Frome-Piddle catchment (UK), performed over three different time periods covering the annual growth cycle. Observations were of the dominant species *Ranunculus penicillatus* subsp. *pseudofluitans*.

		Dec 2008	Jul 2009	Sep 2009	Jan 2010	Jul 2010	
Ranunculus cover (%)		13	22	7	22	30	
Angle to nearest vegetation patch (°)		Dec 2008–Jul 2009	Sep 2009–Jan 2010		Jan 2010–Jul 2010		Total
Downstream	0–60	5	5		6		16
	60–120	0	3		1		4
	120–180	3	2		4		9
Upstream	180–240	1	0		5		6
	240–300	1	0		0		1
	300–360	1	0		1		2
Total		11	10		17		38
χ^2		9.20	12.80		10.88		24.34
df		5	5		5		5
p value		0.1	0.025		0.053		<0.001

Fig. 6. (Top) Planform representation of the distribution of in-stream macrophyte patches of *Ranunculus penicillatus* subsp. *pseudofluitans.* In gray: existing vegetation patches at the start of the survey period; dotted lines: lateral expansion of initial vegetation patches through clonal growth; in green: new patches occurring at the end of the survey period. Black lines indicate the shortest distance and direction of growth between the newly occurring vegetation and the nearest existing patch. **(Bottom)** Distance and direction of growth (°) of new vegetation patches in each time period over the stream bed.

is well known that a positive feedback of reduced flow velocities within patches is linked to a negative feedback limiting lateral growth (Bouma et al. 2009; Schoelynck et al. 2012). However, while positive feedbacks are generally observed at a small scale within a patch (Rietkerk and Van de Koppel 2008), knowledge of the larger-scale facilitation of seedling or fragment establishment by a self-organized species is limited. Our study provides a first indication of establishment mechanisms operating at this larger, between-patch scale. We show how an existing vegetation patch modifies flow velocities and resulting drag forces in its surroundings thereby leading to positive or negative effects on the occurrence of other patches, operating at a distance. Facilitative interactions within the same self-organized species, and over larger scales, might therefore be an important but overlooked process determining the evolution of spatial patterns over time.

The spacing of the vegetation patches resembles the organized spatial configurations observed in other organisms. For

instance, migratory birds maximize the upward motion of air from the bird ahead and reduce drag due to air resistance (Lissaman and Shollenberger 1970; Weimerskirch et al. 2001; Portugal et al. 2014), and fish schools adopt different spatial configurations that can lead to reduced energy expenditure (Ashraf et al. 2017). Our temporal observations showed preferential patch occurrence at 0° to 60° angles from existing patches, with a peak around 30°. This angle is consistent with the 28° angle at which drag on the downstream patch was minimized in the field manipulation. However, the regions of minimum drag force did not strictly correspond to the most frequent location of patch occurrence. This discrepancy could be due to the low number of drag measurement points in that location or to processes occurring during patch development (e.g., erosion of the upstream patch front and downstream displacement of patches [Sand-Jensen and Vindbœk Madsen 1992] and nutrient availability). The observed vegetation patch configurations might involve a balance between stress reduction and nutrient availability. For submerged aquatic plants, the position immediately in the wake of another patch could seem equally or even more beneficial in terms of drag reduction. However, the V position might be a hydrodynamic optimum to maximize drag reduction while still ensuring exposure to light and delivery of nutrients by water flow. Flume experiments on nitrogen uptake showed that ammonium uptake rates for *Callitriche* increased when the patch was located at a leading edge, where it was exposed to higher mean velocity (Cornacchia et al. 2018*a*). Instead, *Callitriche* had very low ammonium uptake rates when it was immediately downstream of another patch and exposed to low mean velocities. This finding suggests that partial, rather than complete, sheltering by established vegetation can allow more nutrients to be delivered to the downstream patch. Similarly, in mussel beds, aggregation at high densities provides the advantage of protection from physical forces but also increases competition for food (van de Koppel et al. 2005; De Paoli 2017). Therefore, the balance between reducing stress and maintaining resource availability might be an important factor influencing patch distributions in different self-organized systems. Further measurements of hydrodynamics and nutrient uptake and/or numerical modeling studies are required to investigate the physical explanation for these patterns such as the V formation.

The consistency between the neighboring patch distances observed for *C. platycarpa* and *Ranunculus penicillatus* suggest that such V-shaped settlement might be typical for lotic aquatic environments. Thus, it might be a general process for submerged aquatic vegetation in running waters, at least for species with similar morphologies and experiencing comparable drag forces (Bal et al. 2011). However, vegetation distributions can be more complex than the streamlined, V-shaped patterns described here. Moderate flow velocities and unidirectional flows tend to create a streamlined patch distribution, whereas a near-homogeneous plant cover would emerge in

streams with sustained periods of low flow velocities (Cornacchia et al. 2018*b*). Moreover, a model accounting for interactions between neighboring patches of emergent vegetation found that wake interactions and resulting deposition patterns influence secondary patch growth (De Lima et al. 2015), yielding complex distributions and not necessarily recognizable V shapes. More complex patterns in vegetation growth have also been observed in a stream with a rich abundance of aquatic plant species (Cameron et al. 2013). Plant traits could also influence the occurrence of recognizable V-shaped patterns. For instance, a V pattern might not be expected for species showing high resistance to hydrodynamic forces (Puijalon et al. 2011), high root anchorage strength (Schutten et al. 2005; Gurnell et al. 2013; Liffen et al. 2013) or relying less on areas of low velocity and fine sediment deposition for their establishment and growth. Our observations were not able to provide evidence of this distribution pattern in other species, which were not as abundant in our field sites. Further studies are necessary to test if a clear dominant species is needed to achieve this configuration and how the presence of other species might affect the patterns and spacing between patches.

The patches in our experiment were constructed on an array of 9408 holes m^{-2}. As a nondimensional measure of canopy density (Nepf 2012), *Callitriche* patches have a frontal area per bed area $ah = 0.200 \pm 0.035$ at the incoming flow velocity of 0.24 m s^{-1} (Cornacchia et al. 2018*a*). This density value is similar to other studies. Bouma et al. (2007) created patches with $ah = 0.64$. In Zong and Nepf (2011), ah ranged from 0.48 to 2.52. These values fall in the dense canopy regime described in Nepf (2012), corresponding to $ah > 0.1$. Therefore, the hydrodynamic patterns presented in this study can generally be expected in other ecosystems with flexible submerged species under dense canopy conditions and presenting similar patch structure (i.e., overhanging canopies).

Initial patterns control future pattern formation: Implications for ecosystem resilience

Our results on the role of patchiness on vegetation distribution suggest that initial vegetation patterns determine where future patches occur. This creates patterns at multiple spatial scales: a patch–patch scale during initial establishment, which over time leads to a pseudobraided pattern in the organization of mature patches at the reach scale, with vegetated bands separated by unvegetated channels. These patterns likely develop on two different time scales. On the scale of generally 1 to 10 d, primary colonization by individual shoots relies on successful root development (Barrat-Segretain et al. (1998); Barrat-Segretain et al. (1999)), which allows them to withstand scouring or dislodgement due to currents and drag (as in our field manipulation). After primary colonization, single shoots develop into patches through clonal growth over the course of months, based on our monitoring data and literature studies (Cotton et al. 2006; Wharton et al. 2006). Therefore, the

complex self-organized patterning of stream macrophytes likely results from processes interacting at different spatial and temporal scales.

Pattern formation at multiple scales, both spatial and temporal, has also been found to increase resilience in mussel beds, which are another self-organized ecosystem (Liu et al. 2014). Similar to macrophytes, mussel aggregation into clumps improves their growth and offers protection against hydrodynamic forces (Van de Koppel et al. 2008). Thus, the presence of a few initial patches can facilitate the establishment of new patches. It might promote faster recovery following disturbance events such as floods by creating a self-reinforcing state that increases the resilience of lotic ecosystems. The sheltering effect presumably strengthens as the number of patches increases, eventually developing into near-full vegetation cover (cf. Van der Wal et al. [2008] for *Spartina* tussocks growing into a fully vegetated salt marsh). In regularly disturbed ecosystems, where the hydrologic regime and flow variability are among the primary factors controlling macrophyte establishment and development (Riis and Biggs 2003), this process may be crucially important for vegetation recovery (Barrat-Segretain et al. 1998; Barrat-Segretain et al. 1999; Riis 2008). Our study suggests the general role of bio-physical interactions in shaping how organisms align themselves to hydrodynamic flows in different landscapes and across multiple spatial scales.

References

Adhitya, A., T. Bouma, A. Folkard, M. van Katwijk, D. Callaghan, H. de Iongh, and P. Herman. 2014. Comparison of the influence of patch-scale and meadow-scale characteristics on flow within seagrass meadows: A flume study. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **516**: 49–59. doi:10.3354/meps10873

Akaike, H. 1998. Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle (Selected Papers of Hirotugu Akaike), p. 199–213. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-1694-0_15

Ashraf, I., H. Bradshaw, T.-T. Ha, J. Halloy, R. Godoy-Diana, and B. Thiria. 2017. Simple phalanx pattern leads to energy saving in cohesive fish schooling. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **114**: 9599–9604. doi:10.1073/pnas.1706503114

Bal, K. D., T. J. Bouma, K. Buis, E. Struyf, S. Jonas, H. Backx, and P. Meire. 2011. Trade-off between drag reduction and light interception of macrophytes: Comparing five aquatic plants with contrasting morphology. Funct. Ecol. **25**: 1197–1205. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2011.01909.x

Balke, T., T. J. Bouma, E. M. Horstman, E. L. Webb, P. L. Erftemeijer, and P. M. Herman. 2011. Windows of opportunity: Thresholds to mangrove seedling establishment on tidal flats. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **440**: 1–9. doi:10.3354/meps09364

Balke, T., P. M. Herman, and T. J. Bouma. 2014. Critical transitions in disturbance-driven ecosystems: Identifying

windows of opportunity for recovery. J. Ecol. **102**: 700–708. doi:10.1111/1365-2745.12241

Barrat-Segretain, M.-H., G. Bornette, and A. Hering-Vilas-Bôas. 1998. Comparative abilities of vegetative regeneration among aquatic plants growing in disturbed habitats. Aquat. Bot. **60**: 201–211. doi:10.1016/S0304-3770(97)00091-0

Barrat-Segretain, M.-H., C. P. Henry, and G. Bornette. 1999. Regeneration and colonization of aquatic plant fragments in relation to the disturbance frequency of their habitats. Arch. Hydrobiol. **145**: 111–127. doi:10.1127/archiv-hydrobiol/145/1999/111

Bertoldi, W., M. Welber, A. Gurnell, L. Mao, F. Comiti, and M. Tal. 2015. Physical modelling of the combined effect of vegetation and wood on river morphology. Geomorphology **246**: 178–187. doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2015.05.038

Bill, R. G., and W. F. Herrnkind. 1976. Drag reduction by formation movement in spiny lobsters. Science **193**: 1146–1148. doi:10.1126/science.193.4258.1146

Bouma, T., M. De Vries, E. Low, G. Peralta, I. Tánczos, J. van de Koppel, and P. J. Herman. 2005. Trade-offs related to ecosystem engineering: A case study on stiffness of emerging macrophytes. Ecology **86**: 2187–2199. doi:10.1890/04-1588

Bouma, T., L. Van Duren, S. Temmerman, T. Claverie, A. Blanco-Garcia, T. Ysebaert, and P. Herman. 2007. Spatial flow and sedimentation patterns within patches of epibenthic structures: Combining field, flume and modelling experiments. Cont. Shelf Res. **27**: 1020–1045. doi:10.1016/j.csr.2005.12.019

Bouma, T., M. Friedrichs, B. Van Wesenbeeck, S. Temmerman, G. Graf, and P. Herman. 2009. Density-dependent linkage of scale-dependent feedbacks: A flume study on the intertidal macrophyte *Spartina anglica*. Oikos **118**: 260–268. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2008.16892.x

Bruno, J. F., and C. W. Kennedy. 2000. Patch-size dependent habitat modification and facilitation on New England cobble beaches by *Spartina alterniflora*. Oecologia **122**: 98–108. doi:10.1007/PL00008841

Bruno, J. F., J. J. Stachowicz, and M. D. Bertness. 2003. Inclusion of facilitation into ecological theory. Trends Ecol. Evol. **18**: 119–125. doi:10.1016/S0169-5347(02)00045-9

Callaway, R. M. 2007. Direct mechanisms for facilitation, p. 15–116. *In* Positive interactions and interdependence in plant communities. Springer, Dordrecht. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-6224-7_2

Cameron, S. M., V. I. Nikora, I. Albayrak, O. Miler, M. Stewart, and F. Siniscalchi. 2013. Interactions between aquatic plants and turbulent flow: A field study using stereoscopic PIV. J. Fluid Mech. **732**: 345–372. doi:10.1017/jfm.2013.406

Chen, Z., A. Ortiz, L. Zong, and H. Nepf. 2012. The wake structure behind a porous obstruction and its implications for deposition near a finite patch of emergent vegetation. Water Resour. Res. **48**: W09517. doi:10.1029/2012WR012224

Chen, Z., C. Jiang, and H. Nepf. 2013. Flow adjustment at the leading edge of a submerged aquatic canopy. Water Resour. Res. **49**: 5537–5551. doi:10.1002/wrcr.20403

Corenblit, D., E. Tabacchi, J. Steiger, and A. M. Gurnell. 2007. Reciprocal interactions and adjustments between fluvial landforms and vegetation dynamics in river corridors: A review of complementary approaches. Earth Sci. Rev. **84**: 56–86. doi:10.1016/j.earscirev.2007.05.004

Corenblit, D., and others. 2015. Engineer pioneer plants respond to and affect geomorphic constraints similarly along water–terrestrial interfaces world-wide. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. **24**: 1363–1376. doi:10.1111/geb.12373

Cornacchia, L., S. Licci, H. Nepf, A. Folkard, D. van der Wal, J. van de Koppel, S. Puijalon, and T. Bouma. 2018*a*. Turbulence-mediated facilitation of resource uptake in patchy stream macrophytes. Limnol. Oceanogr. doi:10.1002/lno.11070

Cornacchia, L., J. Van De Koppel, D. Van Der Wal, G. Wharton, S. Puijalon, and T. J. Bouma. 2018*b*. Landscapes of facilitation: How self-organized patchiness of aquatic macrophytes promotes diversity in streams. Ecology **99**: 832–847. doi:10.1002/ecy.2177

Cotton, J., G. Wharton, J. Bass, C. Heppell, and R. Wotton. 2006. The effects of seasonal changes to in-stream vegetation cover on patterns of flow and accumulation of sediment. Geomorphology **77**: 320–334. doi:10.1016/j.geomorph.2006.01.010

Davies, G. R. 2012. The transport and retention of fine sediments in seasonally vegetated lowland streams. Queen Mary Univ.. doi:10.1177/2150135112443971

Dawson, F. 1976. The annual production of the aquatic macrophyte *Ranunculus penicillatus* var. *calcareus* (RW butcher) C.D.K. Cook. Aquat. Bot. **2**: 51–73. doi:10.1016/0304-3770(76)90007-3

Dawson, F. 1989. Ecology and management of water plants in lowland streams, p. 43–60. *In* Fifty-seventh annual report for the year ended 31st March 1989 (Annual Report). Freshwater Biological Association.

De Lima, P. H., J. G. Janzen, and H. M. Nepf. 2015. Flow patterns around two neighboring patches of emergent vegetation and possible implications for deposition and vegetation growth. Environ. Fluid Mech. **15**: 881–898. doi:10.1007/s10652-015-9395-2

De Paoli, H. 2017. Restoring mussel beds: A guide on how to survive on an intertidal mudflat. Univ. Groningen. doi:10.3389/fphys.2017.01105

Folkard, A. M. 2005. Hydrodynamics of model *Posidonia oceanica* patches in shallow water. Limnol. Oceanogr. **50**: 1592–1600. doi:10.4319/lo.2005.50.5.1592

Folkard, A. M. 2011. Flow regimes in gaps within stands of flexible vegetation: Laboratory flume simulations. Environ. Fluid Mech. **11**: 289–306. doi:10.1007/s10652-010-9197-5

Fonseca, M. S., and S. S. Bell. 1998. Influence of physical setting on seagrass landscapes near Beaufort, North Carolina, USA. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **171**: 109–121. doi:10.3354/meps171109

Grabowski, R. C., and A. Gurnell. 2016. Hydrogeomorphology—ecology interactions in river systems. River Res. Appl. **32**: 139–141. doi:10.1002/rra.2974

Gurnell, A. 2014. Plants as river system engineers. Earth Surf. Process. Landf. **39**: 4–25. doi:10.1002/esp.3397

Gurnell, A. M., M. T. O'Hare, J. M. O'Hare, P. Scarlett, and T. M. Liffen. 2013. The geomorphological context and impact of the linear emergent macrophyte, *Sparganium erectum* L.: A statistical analysis of observations from British rivers. Earth Surf. Process. Landf. **38**: 1869–1880. doi:10.1002/esp.3473

Gurnell, A. M., and R. Grabowski. 2016. Vegetation–hydrogeomorphology interactions in a low-energy, human-impacted river. River Res. Appl. **32**: 202–215. doi:10.1002/rra.2922

Haslam, S. M. 1978. River plants: The macrophyte vegetation of watercourses. Cambridge Univ. Press.

Hendriks, I. E., T. Sintes, T. J. Bouma, and C. M. Duarte. 2008. Experimental assessment and modeling evaluation of the effects of the seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* on flow and particle trapping. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **356**: 163–173. doi:10.3354/meps07316

Jaffe, M., and S. Forbes. 1993. Thigmomorphogenesis: The effect of mechanical perturbation on plants. Plant Growth Regul. **12**: 313–324. doi:10.1007/BF00027213

Jones, C. G., J. H. Lawton, and M. Shachak. 1994. Organisms as ecosystem engineers, p. 130–147. *In* Ecosystem management. Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-4018-1_14

Kearney, W. S., and S. Fagherazzi. 2016. Salt marsh vegetation promotes efficient tidal channel networks. Nat. Commun. **7**: 12287. doi:10.1038/ncomms12287

Kondziolka, J. M., and H. M. Nepf. 2014. Vegetation wakes and wake interaction shaping aquatic landscape evolution. Limnol. Oceanogr.: Fluids Environ. **4**: 106–119. doi:10.1215/21573689-2846314

Kouwen, N., and T. E. Unny. 1973. Flexible roughness in open channels. J. Hydraul. Div. **99**: 713–728.

Larsen, L. G., J. W. Harvey, and J. P. Crimaldi. 2007. A delicate balance: Ecohydrological feedbacks governing landscape morphology in a lotic peatland. Ecol. Monogr. **77**: 591–614. doi:10.1890/06-1267.1

Leonard, L. A., and M. E. Luther. 1995. Flow hydrodynamics in tidal marsh canopies. Limnol. Oceanogr. **40**: 1474–1484. doi:10.4319/lo.1995.40.8.1474

Liffen, T., A. Gurnell, and M. O'Hare. 2013. Profiling the below ground biomass of an emergent macrophyte using an adapted ingrowth core method. Aquat. Bot. **110**: 97–102. doi:10.1016/j.aquabot.2013.05.008

Lissaman, P., and C. A. Shollenberger. 1970. Formation flight of birds. Science **168**: 1003–1005. doi:10.1126/science.168.3934.1003

Liu, Q.-X., P. M. Herman, W. M. Mooij, J. Huisman, M. Scheffer, H. Olff, and J. Van De Koppel. 2014. Pattern

formation at multiple spatial scales drives the resilience of mussel bed ecosystems. Nat. Commun. **5**: 5234. doi: 10.1038/ncomms6234

Madsen, J. D., P. A. Chambers, W. F. James, E. W. Koch, and D. F. Westlake. 2001. The interaction between water movement, sediment dynamics and submersed macrophytes. Hydrobiologia **444**: 71–84. doi:10.1023/A:1017520800568

Marjoribanks, T. I., R. J. Hardy, S. N. Lane, and M. J. Tancock. 2017. Patch-scale representation of vegetation within hydraulic models. Earth Surf. Process. Landf. **42**: 699–710. doi:10.1002/esp.4015

Meire, D. W., J. M. Kondziolka, and H. M. Nepf. 2014. Interaction between neighboring vegetation patches: Impact on flow and deposition. Water Resour. Res. **50**: 3809–3825. doi:10.1002/2013WR015070

Murray, A., M. Knaapen, M. Tal, and M. Kirwan. 2008. Biomorphodynamics: Physical-biological feedbacks that shape landscapes. Water Resour. Res. **44**: W11301. doi:10.1029/2007WR006410

Nepf, H. M. 2012. Flow and transport in regions with aquatic vegetation. Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. **44**: 123–142. doi: 10.1146/annurev-fluid-120710-101048

Nepf, H. M., and E. Vivoni. 2000. Flow structure in depth-limited, vegetated flow. J. Geophys. Res. Oceans **105**: 28547–28557. doi:10.1029/2000JC900145

Portugal, S. J., T. Y. Hubel, J. Fritz, S. Heese, D. Trobe, B. Voelkl, S. Hailes, A. M. Wilson, and J. R. Usherwood. 2014. Upwash exploitation and downwash avoidance by flap phasing in ibis formation flight. Nature **505**: 399–402. doi: 10.1038/nature12939

Puijalon, S., J. P. Léna, N. Rivière, J. Y. Champagne, J. C. Rostan, and G. Bornette. 2008. Phenotypic plasticity in response to mechanical stress: Hydrodynamic performance and fitness of four aquatic plant species. New Phytol. **177**: 907–917. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2007.02314.x

Puijalon, S., T. J. Bouma, C. J. Douady, J. van Groenendael, N. P. Anten, E. Martel, and G. Bornette. 2011. Plant resistance to mechanical stress: Evidence of an avoidance–tolerance trade-off. New Phytol. **191**: 1141–1149. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8137.2011.03763.x

Rietkerk, M., M. C. Boerlijst, F. van Langevelde, R. HilleRisLambers, J. v. de Koppel, L. Kumar, H. H. Prins, and A. M. de Roos. 2002. Self-organization of vegetation in arid ecosystems. Am. Nat. **160**: 524–530. doi:10.1086/342078

Rietkerk, M., and J. Van de Koppel. 2008. Regular pattern formation in real ecosystems. Trends Ecol. Evol. **23**: 169–175. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2007.10.013

Riis, T. 2008. Dispersal and colonisation of plants in lowland streams: Success rates and bottlenecks. Hydrobiologia **596**: 341–351. doi:10.1007/s10750-007-9107-0

Riis, T., and B. J. Biggs. 2003. Hydrologic and hydraulic control of macrophyte establishment and performance in streams. Limnol. Oceanogr. **48**: 1488–1497. doi:10.4319/lo.2003.48.4.1488

Sand-Jensen, K. 1998. Influence of submerged macrophytes on sediment composition and near-bed flow in lowland streams. Freshw. Biol. **39**: 663–679. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2427.1998.00316.x

Sand-Jensen, K., and T. Vindbœk Madsen. 1992. Patch dynamics of the stream macrophyte, *Callitriche cophocarpa*. Freshw. Biol. **27**: 277–282. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.1992.tb00539.x

Sand-Jensen, K., and J. R. Mebus. 1996. Fine-scale patterns of water velocity within macrophyte patches in streams. Oikos **76**: 169–180. doi:10.2307/3545759

Sand-Jensen, K., K. Andersen, and T. Andersen. 1999. Dynamic properties of recruitment, expansion and mortality of macrophyte patches in streams. Int. Rev. Hydrobiol. **84**: 497–508. doi:10.1002/iroh.199900044

Schoelynck, J., T. De Groote, K. Bal, W. Vandenbruwaene, P. Meire, and S. Temmerman. 2012. Self-organised patchiness and scale-dependent bio-geomorphic feedbacks in aquatic river vegetation. Ecography **35**: 760–768. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0587.2011.07177.x

Schutten, J., J. Dainty, and A. Davy. 2005. Root anchorage and its significance for submerged plants in shallow lakes. J. Ecol. **93**: 556–571. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2745.2005.00980.x

Sukhodolov, A. N., and T. A. Sukhodolova. 2009. Case study: Effect of submerged aquatic plants on turbulence structure in a lowland river. J. Hydraul. Eng. **136**: 434–446. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)HY.1943-7900.0000195

Tal, M., and C. Paola. 2007. Dynamic single-thread channels maintained by the interaction of flow and vegetation. Geology **35**: 347–350. doi:10.1130/G23260A.1

Temmerman, S., T. Bouma, J. Van de Koppel, D. Van der Wal, M. De Vries, and P. Herman. 2007. Vegetation causes channel erosion in a tidal landscape. Geology **35**: 631–634. doi:10.1130/G23502A.1

van de Koppel, J., M. Rietkerk, N. Dankers, and P. M. Herman. 2005. Scale-dependent feedback and regular spatial patterns in young mussel beds. Am. Nat. **165**: E66–E77. doi:10.1086/428362

van de Koppel, J., J. C. Gascoigne, G. Theraulaz, M. Rietkerk, W. M. Mooij, and P. M. Herman. 2008. Experimental evidence for spatial self-organization and its emergent effects in mussel bed ecosystems. Science **322**: 739–742. doi:10.1126/science.1163952

Vandenbruwaene, W., et al. 2011. Flow interaction with dynamic vegetation patches: Implications for biogeomorphic evolution of a tidal landscape. J. Geophys. Res. Earth **116**: F01008. doi:10.1029/2010JF001788

Van der Wal, D., A. Wielemaker-Van den Dool, and P. M. Herman. 2008. Spatial patterns, rates and mechanisms of saltmarsh cycles (Westerschelde, The Netherlands). Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci. **76**: 357–368. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2007.07.017

van Wesenbeeck, B. K., J. Van De Koppel, P. M. J. Herman, and T. J. Bouma. 2008. Does scale-dependent feedback explain spatial complexity in salt-marsh ecosystems? Oikos **117**: 152–159. doi:10.1111/j.2007.0030-1299.16245.x

Weimerskirch, H., J. Martin, Y. Clerquin, P. Alexandre, and S. Jiraskova. 2001. Energy saving in flight formation. Nature **413**: 697–698. doi:10.1038/35099670

Wharton, G., J. A. Cotton, R. S. Wotton, J. A. Bass, C. M. Heppell, M. Trimmer, I. A. Sanders, and L. L. Warren. 2006. Macrophytes and suspension-feeding invertebrates modify flows and fine sediments in the Frome and Piddle catchments, Dorset (UK). J. Hydrol. **330**: 171–184. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2006.04.034

Zong, L., and H. Nepf. 2011. Spatial distribution of deposition within a patch of vegetation. Water Resour. Res. **47**: W03516. doi:10.1029/2010WR009516

Zong, L., and H. Nepf. 2012. Vortex development behind a finite porous obstruction in a channel. J. Fluid Mech. **691**: 368–391. doi:10.1017/jfm.2011.479

Conflict of Interest

None declared.