



1 Effect of grazing on community structure and productivity of a Uruguayan 2 grassland

3 Alice Altesor¹, Martín Oesterheld², Elsa Leoni¹, Felipe Lezama¹ and
4 Claudia Rodríguez^{1,*}

5 ¹*Departamento de Ecología, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de la República, Igúá 4225, 11400 Montevideo,*
6 *Uruguay;* ²*IFEVA – Departamento de Ecología, Facultad de Agronomía, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Av.*
7 *San Martín 4453, 1430 Buenos Aires, Argentina; *Author for correspondence (e-mail: claudia@fcien.edu.uy)*

8 Received 13 November 2003; accepted in revised form 25 October 2004

9 *Key words:* Biomass, Diversity, Grazing, Primary production, Rio de la Plata

10 Abstract

11 Grasslands and their grazers provide some of the most compelling examples for studying the relationship
12 between diversity, productivity, and disturbance. In this study, we analyzed the impact of grazing-induced
13 changes in species composition and community structure upon the productivity of a grassland in the
14 Campos region, Uruguay. We compared three treatments: a continuously grazed area, a 9-year old
15 enclosure to domestic herbivores, and grazing-simulated plots inside the enclosure, which were clipped so
16 that their standing biomass resembled that of the grazed area. We studied the community composition of
17 the grazed and ungrazed situations, and determined biomass and above-ground net primary production
18 (ANPP) of the three treatments during 1 year. Grazed plots had higher species richness and diversity than
19 the enclosure. Grazing resulted in the replacement of some cool-season, tussock grasses by warm-season,
20 prostrate grasses. ANPP was 51% higher under grazing than in the enclosure, but the grazing-simulated
21 plots inside the enclosure were the most productive treatment, 29% higher than the grazed plots. Thus, two
22 components of grazing effect may be postulated for this grassland. The structural component resulted in
23 higher ANPP, probably due to the elimination of standing dead biomass. The species composition com-
24 ponent resulted in lower ANPP once the structural component was controlled, probably due to the shift to
25 warm-season phenology and prostrate habit. Our findings contrast with a similar experiment carried out in
26 the neighbouring Flooding Pampa region, which suggests that the relationship between grazing and
27 community structure and function is difficult to generalize.

31 Introduction

32 Grazing is a key disturbance that shapes the
33 structure and function of grassland communities
34 (McNaughton 1983a, 1985). Structurally, grazing
35 modifies the species composition, richness, verti-
36 cal profiles, plant traits, and a number of other
37 attributes of grasslands (Noy-Meir et al. 1989;
38 McIntyre and Lavorel 2001; Rodríguez et al.
39 2003). Functionally, grazing alters the flow of

energy and the cycling of materials, both directly,
through defoliation, trampling, and dung and ur-
ine depositions, and indirectly, through modifica-
tion of species composition and species
interactions (Schlesinger et al. 1990; Aguiar et al.
1996; Hobbs et al. 1996).

The relationships between a structural trait,
species diversity, and a functional trait, primary
productivity, is at the core of a current debate
within the more general, but also current