

The Lotic Intersite Nitrogen Experiments: an example of successful ecological research collaboration

LINX collaborators^{1,2,3}

¹Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506 USA

²The LINX participants who collaborated on this manuscript are listed in the supplementary online materials

Abstract: Collaboration is an essential skill for modern ecologists because it brings together diverse expertise, viewpoints, and study systems. The Lotic Intersite Nitrogen eXperiments (LINX I and II), a 17-y research endeavor involving scores of early- to late-career stream ecologists, is an example of the benefits, challenges, and approaches of successful collaborative research in ecology. The scientific success of LINX reflected tangible attributes including clear scientific goals (hypothesis-driven research), coordinated research methods, a team of cooperative scientists, excellent leadership, extensive communication, and a philosophy of respect for input from all collaborators. Intangible aspects of the collaboration included camaraderie and strong team chemistry. LINX further benefited from being part of a discipline in which collaboration is a tradition, clear data-sharing and authorship guidelines, an approach that melded field experiments and modeling, and a shared collaborative goal in the form of a universal commitment to see the project and resulting data products through to completion.

Key words: collaboration, LINX, ecology, science, stream ecology, nitrogen dynamics

This contribution is dedicated to the memory of Patrick J. Mulholland (Fig. 1) in recognition of the leadership, mentoring, and friendship he provided to the LINX group and the collaborative spirit he championed.

The grand challenges in ecology and environmental science increasingly require interdisciplinary teams to perform complex, coordinated research across diverse locations. Here we share our insights from creating and sustaining 2 collaborative projects over 17 y: the Lotic Intersite Nitrogen eXperiments (LINX I and II, funded by the US National Science Foundation [NSF]). Authors of this paper have been involved in many other collaborative projects. Here, we address why these 2 collaborations were particularly successful.

Numerous authors have described how collaborative groups are more successful than individuals (Hong and Page 2004, Hall et al. 2012, Uzzi et al. 2013), how scientific groups can work together successfully (e.g., Cheruvelil et al., in press), and various structures of collaborative groups (O'Sullivan and Azeem 2007, Goring et al. 2014). Most of

the research and suggestions from studies to date indicate that characteristics of successful collaborative teams include: 1) a diversity of researchers (Hong and Page 2004), 2) sensitivity to needs and enfranchisement of project participants at all levels (Goring et al. 2014), 3) good listening skills among group members (Thompson 2009), 4) development of the group process over time (Scott and Davis 2007, Thompson 2009), and 5) a willingness for individuals to bear a fair share of the costs of the collaboration (Goring et al. 2014). Our collaborative experiences in the LINX project are consistent with prior collaborative scientific research. Our success is built from a similar foundation of characteristics, as detailed herein.

The LINX collaboration joins many other excellent examples of successful collaboration, in disciplines ranging from mathematics to geography. Mathematicians and climatologists worked together to model ice movement and changes in ocean levels (Katsman et al. 2011). Relationships between land-surface and subsurface variability were quantified in permafrost environments using Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) technology and a surface geo-

E-mail address: ³wkdodds@ksu.edu

**The PERSPECTIVES section of the journal is for the expression of new ideas, points of view, and comments on topics of interest to aquatic scientists. The editorial board invites new and original papers as well as comments on items already published in Freshwater Science. Format and style may be less formal than conventional research papers; massive data sets are not appropriate. Speculation is welcome if it is likely to stimulate worthwhile discussion. Alternative points of view should be instructive rather than merely contradictory or argumentative. All submissions will receive the usual reviews and editorial assessments.*

DOI: 10.1086/676938. Received 02 April 2013; Accepted 07 January 2014; Published online 06 May 2014.
Freshwater Science. 2014. 33(3):700–710. © 2014 by The Society for Freshwater Science.



Figure 1. Patrick J. Mulholland (1952–2012), leader of the Lotic Intersite Nitrogen eXperiments (LINX).

physical data set (Zhang et al. 1999, Hubbard et al. 2013) through collaboration across the disciplines of hydrology, ecology, geography, and modeling. Collaboration between ecophysicists and hydrologists addressed the fate of water use by vegetation (Brooks et al. 2009). A large cross-continent experiment on terrestrial nutrient enrichment (NUTNET) has provided broad and general results (Borer et al. 2014). Like LINX, these studies were able to address large-scale scientific questions by applying disciplinary expertise to interdisciplinary problems through focused collaborative effort.

Our goal is to describe the specifics of the LINX collaborations, with the hope that others can build on our concrete examples to guide and design their own collab-

orations. We quantify our tangible collaborative products, discuss the intangible benefits of working as a group, and describe the group characteristics that led to our success. This article is not intended as a basic contribution on the social science of collaborative research, but rather a self-analysis of what was successful in our case, with references to social-science research for interested readers (see supplementary materials for more project details). We avoid reporting history that retrospectively assigns inevitable progress and success, but think that our assessment of the past in light of the present has intrinsic value (Mayr 1990). We anticipate our analysis will be useful for researchers, particularly early-career investigators as they design new collaborative projects. Collaboration is increasingly necessary, as is exemplified by recent expansion of groups, such as National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), Stream Experimental and Observational Network (STREON) embedded within NEON, and individual projects and cross-site initiatives in the Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) network. Recent funding opportunities requiring collaboration include NSF initiatives, such as LTER, Macrosystems Biology, Critical Zone Observatories, and Coupled Natural and Human Systems. These initiatives demand formation of large collaborative groups to obtain funding successfully and to carry out projects.

WHAT WAS LINX AND WHY DO WE CONSIDER IT SUCCESSFUL?

To our knowledge, the investigators who conducted LINX experiments were the first to characterize stream nutrient uptake and retention at the reach-scale across a wide array of biomes and land uses with consistent experimental methods. The LINX experiments were conceived to address questions about the role of stream ecosystems in processing and transforming N in roughly 0.2-km-long stream segments. The experiments, conducted across multiple North American biomes by regional teams, consisted of direct addition of a stable isotope (^{15}N) to streams using the same protocols at all sites. Results were synthesized within and across all sites, with models to quantify N uptake, transformation, and removal by streams.

The 1st experiment (LINX I) revealed the potential for small streams to assimilate, retain, and transform inorganic N. LINX I featured 6-wk additions of $^{15}\text{N-NH}_4^+$ to trace N uptake and cycling through stream food webs (Peterson et al. 2001). This experiment was conducted in 12 headwater streams draining catchments with predominantly native vegetation. LINX I demonstrated that small streams at baseflow retain, on average, 64% of terrestrial dissolved inorganic N inputs/stream km during biologically active seasons and, therefore, play a disproportionately large role in N transformations within fluvial networks (Peterson et al. 2001; Fig. 2A). LINX I also revealed the dynamics of N flow through aquatic food webs and the variable degree




Figure 2. A.—The Lotic Intersite Nitrogen eXperiments (LINX) conceptual view of N dynamics in streams as mediated by benthic biota (courtesy of Science, from Peterson et al. 2001). B.—Major findings of the LINX II project (courtesy of Nature, from Mulholland et al. 2008), including streamwater NO_3^- concentrations (left) and total biotic NO_3^- uptake per unit area of streambed (U ; right). Box plots display 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, and 90th percentiles, and individual data points outside the 10th and 90th percentiles. Land use had a significant effect on NO_3^- concentration (Kruskal–Wallis test, $p = 0.0055$) and U ($p = 0.0013$). Horizontal bars above plots labeled A or B denote significant differences determined by pairwise comparisons among land use categories with Bonferroni correction ($\alpha = 0.05$). Ref = reference streams, Agr = agricultural, Urb = urban.

to which stream food webs depend on in-stream primary production.

The subsequent LINX II experiment focused on quantifying uptake and transformation of NO_3^- based on 24-h

additions of $^{15}\text{N-NO}_3^-$ in 72 streams draining 3 land use types (urban, agriculture, and native vegetation) in each of 8 regions (Mulholland et al. 2008). LINX II provided knowledge on the functional relationship between NO_3^- loading

and uptake in streams draining catchments with varying land uses, including reach-scale measurements of denitrification in a wide variety of streams (Fig. 2B). Uptake and denitrification efficiency decrease with NO_3^- loading, which affects NO_3^- retention in downstream reaches of a stream network (Mulholland et al. 2008). LINX II also demonstrated that in-stream production and emission of the greenhouse gas N_2O (Beaulieu et al. 2011) are substantially greater than previously assumed in climate-change assessments by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. As human activities add more N to watersheds, LINX research has helped us understand the fate of some of this N across diverse stream types.

This paper began from group discussions on what made these collaborations successful. The 18 coauthors of this paper anonymously answered a questionnaire to quantify how many research projects in which they had been involved had ≥ 10 collaborators (with continued collaborations, such as LINX or LTER sites counting as a single collaboration). This self-reporting should be viewed with caution, but the results indicate that participants felt the collaboration was very successful. The number of collaborations in which respondents had participated ranged from 1–14 with a median of 5.5 collaborations. All but 2 respondents ranked LINX as the most successful collaboration of their career. The remaining 2 ranked LINX second. Success was defined based on productivity (see below), not camaraderie. Three senior researchers involved in ≥ 10 collaborative efforts all ranked LINX as the most productive.

We view LINX as a successful and productive collaboration for many reasons, including publications, future career opportunities, and training. The project has produced 74 peer-reviewed publications to date (Table 1; see sup-

plemental information for complete bibliography), including a number of first-time continent-wide assessments of stream N biogeochemistry, nutrient limitation, and ecosystem metabolism. The most cited papers (Peterson et al. 2001, Mulholland et al. 2008) had received 565 and 281 citations, respectively, as of January 2014 (Web of Science; Thomson Reuters, New York) and are still accruing references. At least 10 of the LINX papers have each received >50 citations. Results have been cited in textbooks to exemplify the nutrient-spiraling concept and the critical role that streams play in N processing (e.g., Hauer and Lamberti 2006, Allan and Castillo 2007). The LINX field and laboratory protocols continue to be used worldwide to address complementary questions (e.g., Simon et al. 2007, von Schiller et al. 2009, Riis et al. 2012). LINX results have been incorporated into management plans for watershed-scale N mitigation. For example, the role of N transformation in small streams is recognized as important in mitigating hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico (USEPA 2007). At regional scales, management plans have used LINX research to justify the protection of small streams to mitigate N pollution in drinking-water reservoirs (e.g., the Jordan Lake Rules; see Tetra Tech, Inc. 2003).

Beyond the scientific contributions, successful outcomes of the LINX projects include new research collaborations, training, and education involving >130 individuals (Table 1). Partnerships initially developed in LINX spawned new research projects on topics, such as mechanisms of N retention and processing, nutrient spiraling in large rivers, and scaling stream processes up to the entire watershed. The group responsible for the design and development of the STReam Experimental Observatory Network (STREON), the aquatic component of the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON), adopted LINX approaches to collaboration and the project was planned, in part, based on LINX results. Coordinated research networks on streams in Europe are also partially based on the LINX collaborative model (e.g., the STREAMES project of the European Union; <http://www.pcb.ub.edu/streames/overview.htm>).

LINX enhanced the training of graduate students and post-doctoral researchers (Table 1), and created a new group of highly collaborative scientists who are emerging leaders in the field. The LINX collaboration provided a springboard for the career trajectory of many graduate students and post-doctoral researchers, who have since started successful academic and research careers while continuing their collaborations with former LINX members. Participation in LINX during graduate school provided unique opportunities to work with prominent scientists across disciplines (stream ecology, ecosystem modeling, biogeochemistry, and hydrology) and to experience directly the leadership and team building required to collaborate successfully. Students and post-doctoral researchers also gained valuable training in science communication by contributing to multiple outreach products, ranging from high-

Table 1. Number of participants and research outputs from the Lotic Intersite Nitrogen eXperiments (LINX) I and LINX II collaborations to date.

Variable	LINX I	LINX II
Participants		
PhD scientists	31	23
Graduate students	38	41
Undergraduate students	22	41
Technicians	18	17
Nonprofessional volunteers	23	2
Total participants	132	124
Outputs		
Synthesis papers	8	8
Site-data papers	8	3
Other LINX-related papers	12	35
Theses and dissertations	7	11
Total peer-reviewed publications	28	46

impact, peer-reviewed papers to press releases and radio interviews.

In total, 79 graduate students (MS and PhD) participated in LINX. As metrics of accomplishment, students funded by LINX each received an advanced degree, collectively led authorship of >35 peer-reviewed papers, and have largely remained in science-related careers (~90% of former students). In addition, their experience with LINX created an informal network for career advice, friendly reviews, and grant collaborations. The value of the human resource achievements cannot be easily quantified.

HOW THE HISTORY OF STREAM ECOLOGY LAID THE GROUNDWORK FOR SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATION

Cross-site collaboration among stream ecologists began long before LINX, and this history fostered a culture for future collaboration. The International Biological Programme (IBP) established the idea that understanding ecology requires large-scale and cross-system ecological measurements. A propensity for collaboration among stream ecologists has its roots in 1974, when several stream ecologists from Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory (North Carolina, USA) and H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest (Oregon, USA) met to discuss research coordination associated with the IBP. They began cross-site comparisons that ultimately resulted in the River Continuum Concept. In stream-ecology research, the River Continuum Project exemplified the disciplinary advancement and research productivity that can ensue from collaborative and synthetic cross-site comparisons (Vannote et al. 1980, Minshall et al. 1985).

Following the 1980 initiation of the LTER program, collaboration among stream researchers continued through a series of LTER-sponsored workshops and meetings, including data syntheses (e.g., Webster and Meyer 1997) and research coordination. The LTER network promoted cross-site and collaborative research, and consideration of the regional to continental context. Tri-annual LTER “all scientists’ meetings” encouraged the formation of the LINX group (including the idea for the stream-modeling workshop described in the next section). The convivial evening gatherings at scientific meetings engaged new researchers, cultivating the excitement of collaboration among a new generation of stream ecologists.

The core theoretical underpinning of LINX research is the nutrient-spiraling concept, which links stream biological processes with hydrologic transport (Webster and Patten 1979, Newbold et al. 1981). Spiraling was first tested in whole streams using a radioisotopic P-tracer addition (e.g., Mulholland et al. 1985). The “Solute Dynamics in Stream Ecosystems” workshop, organized by Nick Aumen in 1989 and attended by many of the future LINX collaborators, introduced stream ecologists to hydrologists who had developed tools to model stream nutrient trans-

port (Stream Solute Workshop 1990). Ken Bencala’s presentation explored the relationship between the hydrologists’ solute-transport models (Bencala 1984) and the stream ecologists’ nutrient-spiraling models (Webster and Patten 1979, Newbold et al. 1981). This “aha moment” in the historical origins of the LINX collaboration illustrates how scientific progress often results from the juxtaposition of tools and concepts from diverse fields (Fisher 1997). Subsequently, the LINX projects investigated spiraling of NH_4^+ , NO_3^- , organic N, and gaseous forms of N. In all phases of this work, we tried to link our measurements with hydrologic foundations (e.g., N uptake length [S_w] linked with hydraulic retention, subsurface area, and hydraulic uptake length; Webster et al. 2003).

PLANNING AND FINDING FUNDING FOR LINX

Following the All Scientist Meeting, Judy Meyer obtained NSF funding for a stream-modeling workshop that was the seed from which LINX I grew. At this hands-on, feet-wet workshop at Coweeta Experimental Forest in 1995 (Fig. 3A), participants collected samples, viewed demonstrations of methods to release biologically active and conservative tracers into streams, learned about data analysis for isotope-tracer experiments, and created site-specific predictive models of N dynamics based on isotopic tracers. Workshop participants and others developed the LINX I proposal to the NSF Ecosystem Studies program for just >US\$1,000,000, in which they proposed to use these methods in coordinated experiments across the USA.

The success of LINX I led directly to the development of LINX II. LINX II moved beyond the use of a single reference stream in each biome to explore landuse influences on the fate of NO_3^- in streams. The LINX II research group evolved from LINX I, with junior LINX II principal investigators (PIs) recruited from LINX I students and post-docs, while simultaneously adding new students and post-docs to LINX II.

Denitrification was of particular interest in LINX II because it can mitigate downstream eutrophication. Thus, LINX II was based on 3 new ideas: 1) expanding the range of potential factors controlling in-stream N cycling, 2) increasing the diversity of stream types to include more variation in land use, and 3) quantifying denitrification at the stream-reach scale using whole-stream $^{15}\text{N}\text{-NO}_3^-$ tracer additions at 72 sites (Mulholland et al. 2004).

STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATION: WHY WAS LINX SUCCESSFUL?

A solid scientific foundation

A key factor in the success of both LINX projects was relevant, hypothesis-driven, and novel science. The research agendas appealed to a wide range of stream ecologists and to funding panels because they had both basic and applied significance. The novelty of the research ap-



Figure 3. A.—Preliminary group of collaborators at Coweeta Hydrologic Laboratory in 1995 that led to formation of the LINX I group. B.—Lotic Intersite Nitrogen eXperiments (LINX) II collaborators at a synthesis workshop at the Sevilleta long-term ecological research site (LTER) near the end of the experiment in November 2006.

proach, which included whole-stream ^{15}N -tracer experiments bolstered by other ecosystem measurements, a cross-site comparative design, and integration of modeling and empirical approaches, also added to its appeal.

Models played a central role in both planning and synthesis stages of LINX. The initial LINX workshop (1995) focused not only on field and analytical techniques but also on the parameterization of an initial model to simulate ^{15}N fluxes downstream and through stream food webs. That modeling was subsequently reevaluated and refined as results became available (Hall et al. 1998, Wollheim et al.

1999, Hamilton et al. 2004). Models also were important in examining the implications of LINX results beyond the experimental sites to include broader spatial domains (Peterson et al. 2001, Mulholland et al. 2008). Models showed that N cycling in small streams could regulate N export from catchments (Peterson et al. 2001). These stream network models indicated that increased N loading to small streams diminishes NO_3^- removal efficiency, leading to the propagation of N saturation from headwaters to downstream reaches through a stream network (Mulholland et al. 2008). LINX researchers also identified the limits of un-

derstanding that could be achieved using field ^{15}N -tracer experiments conducted only in small streams (Helton et al. 2011) and helped clarify the role of streams and rivers in contributing to global N_2O emissions (Beaulieu et al. 2011).

As with all projects, LINX I and II had areas that could have been improved. The LINX studies would have been better served by a priori planning for integrated data management, including allocation of funding for a data manager and the use of new tools for data sharing and version control. Only now is the LINX group working to make data available online. The LINX II project was funded a few years before this approach became a popular (or required) goal.

Also of concern in cross-site studies is comparability of laboratory methods, including precision and detection limits. For LINX I, all stable-isotope samples were analyzed by the Marine Biological Laboratory at Woods Hole, Massachusetts. For LINX II, interlaboratory comparisons of some particularly challenging analyses (e.g., ^{15}N tracer in dissolved N_2 and N_2O gases) revealed that samples sent to some contract laboratories were not analyzed with the needed accuracy and precision. These challenges led to new and improved analytical methods and the decision to use a single laboratory at Michigan State University for N_2 analyses (Hamilton and Ostrom 2007), but LINX II data would have been more robust had analytical issues been identified earlier in the project. This experience underscores the importance of submitting known blind samples to any contract laboratories early in the experiment.

Several aspects might have been improved by garnering additional expertise. Data management was lacking, and the procedure of trading spreadsheets was not optimal. An information manager would have helped make that process more efficient. Gas tracer measurements were done with propane, but we now recognize that sulfur hexafluoride is more stable and sensitive. Consultation with physical limnologists experienced with inert gaseous tracers could have improved our precision and accuracy of aeration measurements.

Many aspects could have been improved with more financial resources. For example, both experiments occurred at all sites during low-flow periods of greatest seasonal activity. More resources would have allowed us to run the experiments at different times of the year. Additional resources also would have allowed us to expand the number of comparative sites in LINX I.

Good leaders, collaborators, planning, and communication

Leadership is paramount to collaborative science. Both LINX projects were fortunate to have a seminal group of leaders who worked well together. The LINX I and II projects benefited from the strong leadership of 4 senior investigators, Jack Webster, Judy Meyer, Bruce Peterson, and Pat Mulholland. These accomplished researchers set the tone for a collaborative scientific group. However, the

late Pat Mulholland (Fig. 1) played a key role in leadership by assuming many administrative duties and coordinating scientific discussion, particularly in the LINX II project. He exemplified a combination of scientific expertise, high standards, encouragement, patience, humor, and a willingness to invest time in project management that facilitated scientific communication. In the development of collaborative projects, effective communication is crucial (Thompson 2009). During our many extended meetings, from project design through final synthesis, Mulholland spotted and defused tension early on and brought out the best in the group, while motivating everyone and ensuring they were respected and treated justly. He did not lead aggressively, instead preferring to nudge participants to meet deadlines. Mulholland had only one hard line: a commitment to produce the very best science. He would accept nothing less.

The LINX participants were altruistic and willing to work hard to contribute to the project, but successful collaboration requires more than good intentions. The group included the strong personalities and viewpoints (and egos) characteristic of scientists. Many academic and research institutions encourage and reward competitive rather than collaborative behaviors. These and other factors made collaboration challenging, but the team established a productive group via leadership, developed a social norm of cooperation, and fostered open communication.

The project operated with a dispersed rather than a hierarchical structure (Goring et al. 2014), a successful model that has worked for other experimental ecological research groups (e.g., Borer et al. 2014) with each member of each research group providing input to experimental design and analysis. A dispersed project structure has some similarities to a “community of practice” (sensu O’Sullivan and Azeem 2007), wherein the group is self-organized and geographically dispersed, but individuals communicate regularly. The group could also be classified as a “participatory collaboration” (Shrum et al. 2007) in which members of the group belong to a single specialty and governance is egalitarian. A more detailed description of project structure can be found in the supplementary materials. This type of project structure worked well in LINX. All major decisions were made by group consensus, but that consensus could take some time to reach.

Willingness to meet for extended periods to work out details and wade through numerous e-mail discussions was essential. Extended meetings helped members learn particular methods, and address problems with approaches. A key point of contention was how many measurements should be added vs the time and money it took to make additional measurements. In a discussion of the idea that one 24-h measurement/stream at baseflow would be fairly specific to season and 1 flow condition, it became clear that we simply did not have the resources to cover multiple seasons and flow conditions and maintain spatial coverage. An additional example of this issue was the bihourly

diurnal measurements in LINX II. Once we learned that minor information was added for an extended 24-h of sampling, the group agreed to curtail that work for the 2nd y. Many discussions were spirited, but scientific disagreement was not taken personally and was viewed as part of the process. A commitment to communication was needed because substantial e-mailing, document sharing, and meeting time were required at every step of both projects.

LINX researchers convened annually at North American Benthological Society (NABS) meetings to discuss future plans, present results, develop analytical approaches, and initiate synthesis efforts. Annual meetings were known for their camaraderie, and the atmosphere was welcoming for new scientists. These meetings were always open to any interested participants. The success of LINX also was enhanced by linkages to LTER sites; most LINX studies were on or near LTER sites where detailed, long-term site data and resources were leveraged.

The success of LINX I was enhanced by a “traveling postdoc”, Jennifer Tank, who rotated among sites, coordinating with local PIs and graduate students to ensure execution of uniform experimental techniques and collection of consistent, high-quality data. Her technical proficiency, organization, interpersonal skills, positive outlook, and ability to work with many different personality types were critical.

LINX II involved 72 sites, and this traveling postdoc model was not feasible. Instead, building on experience gained from LINX I, more time and resources were invested in writing a detailed manual of methods via a series of group workshops. The final product explained clear, consensus-driven protocols that would work across many stream types and were linked to the key hypotheses. Any modifications in protocols made during the experiment were cleared with the whole group and this topic dominated mid-project group meetings. Investigators at individual sites also were encouraged to develop supplementary measurements or metrics to understand local patterns, which they then shared with the group for potential adoption project wide.

Intangible factors enhanced project success. The first workshop set a tone of equality and respect among early-career and established researchers. The opinions and ideas of early-career researchers were welcomed, and their involvement in central aspects of the collaboration was essential. In LINX II, early-career scientists were lead authors of several synthesis papers (e.g., Johnson et al. 2009, Bernot et al. 2010, Beaulieu et al. 2011, Helton et al. 2011). Frequent conversations via an e-mail LISTSERV maintained lines of communication between meetings.

Lively discussions among all participants, impromptu data presentations, and informal opportunities for learning characterized the numerous planning and synthesis meetings. For example, Bob Hall introduced structural equation modeling to the group, providing us with a new

tool that allowed exploration of cause and effect using experimental data from our complex systems (e.g., Hall et al. 2009, Bernot et al. 2010). In addition, the 1st y of LINX II data showed that existing methods for detecting tracer ¹⁵N in N₂ at low concentrations were inadequate. New methods were developed and reported at LINX meetings prior to their publication (Hamilton and Ostrom 2007). These 2 examples of early adoption of new methods illustrate the need for ongoing communication, that early-career researchers often have important ideas to contribute, and that adaptive research approaches are necessary in large collaborative projects.

Clear definition of roles and responsibilities

Disagreements about authorship and data sharing can plague collaborations and are best prevented through openness, transparency, and advanced planning. Policies for data sharing and authorship in LINX were thoroughly vetted among participants early in the collaboration (Table 2), and presentation, publication, and authorship ideas were discussed before the work began. This early investment in potential problem solving is a key to maintaining long-term positive communication within a collaborative group (Thompson 2009). A number of our subsequent projects and others have adopted the LINX data sharing and authorship agreement as a template for their own projects. The LINX policy defined expectations for lead authors and supporting authors, the obligations of lead authors to provide ample time and opportunity for supporting authors to contribute in meaningful ways, and the obligations of supporting authors to provide substantive input and feedback. These policies were discussed and reevaluated regularly and used as guide for the sharing of unpublished data with other investigators.

CONCLUSION

The LINX team structure was built upon a strong foundation of existing interpersonal relationships and led to a social norm of cooperation among participants. This more-horizontal (as opposed to hierarchical) structure relied on regular communication and transparency, while addressing issues of recognition and authorship in a forthright consensus-driven manner, which was characterized by respect for all participants without regard to rank. The LINX team was fortunate to have drawn in collaborators who made up such a collegial team, and even more fortunate to have had one of the central leaders, Pat Mulholland, who always promoted and worked hard to facilitate scientific progress within the group. Ideas, hypotheses, and techniques were developed through a process of collaborative brainstorming and intense vetting, made possible because the LINX team enjoyed a certainty that these ideas, and the data collected, would be shared. These intangible aspects of the LINX collaboration were critical to fostering

Table 2. Summary of Lotic Intersite Nitrogen eXperiments (LINX) publication policies based on LINX II June 2006 version (complete text available in the Supplementary Materials). PI = principal investigator.

Aspect	Policy
Site papers	Each site has control over its own data and its publication. No limitations on when publications can be submitted. If data from other sites are used, then offer coauthorship opportunity to ≥ 1 person from that site.
Synthesis papers	If a synthesis analysis is used in a site paper in any significant way, then the synthesis leader should be a coauthor. Synthesis papers will not be submitted for publication prior to 1 January 2007 (~1 y after all experiments are complete) unless there is a specific need and all project PIs and coPIs are in agreement. All sites will attempt to have raw data submitted to the data management system for all releases within 6 mo of their last ^{15}N release (i.e., by 1 August 2006). There will be ≥ 1 coauthorship offered to each site (in some cases ≥ 2 may be appropriate) on all synthesis papers that use data from that site. It is expected that all coauthors will comment on each manuscript or contribute in some fashion in addition to allowing their site's data to be used. Topics and authorship of all synthesis papers will be discussed with all project PIs and coPIs prior to substantial amounts of writing (preferably at a project meeting) and consensus agreement should be reached. At a minimum, approximate paper title, tentative coauthor list, and a few sentences on scope and data used will be sent to all project PIs and coPIs for discussion and agreement prior to writing the paper.
All papers	A copy of all papers (site and synthesis) should be sent for comment to all project PIs and coPIs prior to submission to a journal. Comment period is limited to a maximum of 3 wk for site papers and 2 mo for synthesis papers.
Talk abstracts	Abstracts for talks and posters also should follow the guidelines above, except that purely site papers need not be sent to the entire project group for comment prior to submission and the review period for synthesis abstracts by all project PIs and coPIs is only 1 wk.
Accepting authorship offers	Did I make an intellectual contribution to the topics covered in the paper? Did I participate in preparing the paper by writing or providing substantive input (extensive comments, figures, etc.)? Can I explain and or defend the methods and results in the paper?

trust and strong interpersonal relationships, which in turn allowed ideas to flourish and a true synergy of effort and expertise to emerge. The organizational structure, communication model, and leadership style of the LINX collaboration were not novel among potential group approaches to collaboration, but we think that this combination was critical to the success of LINX, and would be ideal for many other groups. The lesson learned is that scientific collaboration can be one of the most intellectually and personally fulfilling avenues to success in ecological research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all LINX participants, including undergraduates and technicians, for their hard work and dedication. We thank the US National Science Foundation for funding the LINX grants and the LTER grants that provided logistical support, the numerous federal, state, and private landowners who provided site access, and the LINX universities and institutes that provided additional support and facilities.

LITERATURE CITED

Allan, J. D., and M. M. Castillo. 2007. Stream ecology: structure and function of running waters. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

Beaulieu, J. J., J. L. Tank, S. K. Hamilton, W. M. Wollheim, R. O. Hall, P. J. Mulholland, B. J. Peterson, L. R. Ashkenas, L. W. Cooper, C. N. Dahm, W. K. Dodds, N. B. Grimm, S. L. Johnson, W. H. McDowell, G. C. Poole, H. M. Valett, C. P. Arango, M. J. Bernot, A. J. Burgin, C. L. Crenshaw, A. M. Helton, L. T. Johnson, J. M. O'Brien, J. D. Potter, R. W. Sheibley, D. J. Sobota, and S. M. Thomas. 2011. Nitrous oxide emission from denitrification in stream and river networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 108:214–219.

Bencala, K. E. 1984. Interactions of solutes and streambed sediment: 2. A dynamic analysis of coupled hydrologic and chemical processes that determine solute transport. *Water Resources Research* 20:1804–1814.

Bernot, M. J., D. J. Sobota, R. O. Hall, P. J. Mulholland, W. K. Dodds, J. R. Webster, J. L. Tank, L. R. Ashkenas, L. W. Cooper, C. N. Dahm, S. V. Gregory, N. B. Grimm, S. K. Hamilton, S. L. Johnson, W. H. McDowell, J. L. Meyer, B. J. Peterson, G. C. Poole, H. M. Valett, C. Arango, J. J. Beaulieu, A. J. Burgin, C. L. Crenshaw, A. M. Helton, L. T. Johnson, J. L. Merriam, B. R. Niederlehner, J. M. O'Brien, J. D. Potter, R. W. Sheibley, S. M. Thomas, and K. Wilson. 2010. Land use homogenizes stream ecosystem function: inter-regional comparison of land-use effects on whole-stream metabolism. *Freshwater Biology* 55:1874–1890.

Borer, E. T., W. S. Harpole, P. B. Adler, E. M. Lind, J. L. Orrock, E. W. Seabloom, and M. D. Smith. 2014. Finding generality in

- ecology: a model for globally distributed experiments. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 5:65–73.
- Brooks, J. R., H. R. Barnard, R. Coulombe, and J. J. McDonnell. 2009. Ecohydrologic separation of water between trees and streams in a Mediterranean climate. *Nature Geoscience* 3: 100–103.
- Cheruvilil, K. S., P. A. Soranno, K. C. Weathers, P. C. Hanson, and S. Goring. Creating and maintaining high-performing collaborative research teams: the importance of diversity and socio-cognitive skills. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* (in press).
- Fisher, S. G. 1997. Creativity, idea generation, and the functional morphology of streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 16:305–318.
- Goring, S., K. C. Weathers, W. K. Dodds, P. A. Soranno, L. C. Sweet, K. S. Cheruvilil, J. S. Kominski, J. Rüggen, A. M. Thorn, and R. M. Utz. 2014. Improving the culture of interdisciplinary collaboration in ecology by expanding measures of success. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 12:39–47.
- Hall, K. L., D. Stokols, B. A. Stipelman, A. L. Vogel, A. Feng, B. Masimore, G. Morgan, R. P. Moser, S. E. Marcus, and D. Berrigan. 2012. Assessing the value of team science: a study comparing center- and investigator-initiated grants. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 42:157–163.
- Hall, R. O., B. J. Peterson, and J. L. Meyer. 1998. Testing a nitrogen cycling model of a forest stream by using a nitrogen-15 tracer addition. *Ecosystems* 1:283–298.
- Hall, R. O., J. L. Tank, D. J. Sobota, P. J. Mulholland, J. M. O'Brien, W. K. Dodds, J. R. Webster, H. M. Valett, G. C. Poole, B. J. Peterson, J. L. Meyer, W. H. McDowell, S. L. Johnson, S. K. Hamilton, N. B. Grimm, S. B. Gregory, C. N. Dahm, L. W. Cooper, L. R. Ashkenas, S. M. Thomas, R. W. Sheibley, J. D. Potter, B. R. Neiderlehner, L. T. Johnson, A. M. Helton, C. L. Crenshaw, A. J. Burgin, M. J. Bernot, J. J. Beaulieu, and C. P. Arango. 2009. Nitrate removal in stream ecosystems measured by ^{15}N addition experiments: total uptake. *Limnology and Oceanography* 54:653–665.
- Hamilton, S. K., and N. E. Ostrom. 2007. Measurement of the stable isotope ratio of dissolved N_2 in ^{15}N tracer experiments. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods* 5:233–240.
- Hamilton, S. K., J. L. Tank, D. F. Raikow, E. Siler, N. J. Dorn, and N. Leonard. 2004. The role of instream vs allochthonous N in stream food webs: modeling the results of a nitrogen isotope addition experiment. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 23:429–448.
- Hauer, F. R., and G. A. Lamberti (editors). 2006. *Methods in stream ecology*. Academic Press, New York.
- Helton, A. M., G. C. Poole, J. L. Meyer, W. M. Wollheim, B. J. Peterson, P. J. Mulholland, E. S. Bernhardt, J. A. Stanford, C. Arango, L. R. Ashkenas, L. W. Cooper, W. K. Dodds, S. V. Gregory, R. O. Hall, S. K. Hamilton, S. L. Johnson, W. H. McDowell, J. D. Potter, J. L. Tank, S. M. Thomas, H. M. Valett, J. R. Webster, and L. H. Zeglin. 2011. Thinking outside the channel: modeling nitrogen cycling in networked river ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 9:229–238.
- Hong, L., and S. E. Page. 2004. Groups of diverse problem solvers can outperform groups of high-ability problem solvers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101:16385–16389.
- Hubbard, S. S., C. Gangodagamage, B. Dafflon, H. Wainwright, J. E. Peterson, A. Gusmeroli, C. Ulrich, Y. Wu, C. Wilson, J. Rowland, C. Tweedie, and S. D. Wulfschleger. 2013. Quantifying and relating land-surface and subsurface variability in permafrost environments using LiDAR and surface geophysical datasets. *Hydrogeology Journal* 21:129–149.
- Johnson, L. T., J. L. Tank, and W. K. Dodds. 2009. The influence of land use on stream biofilm nutrient limitation across eight North American ecoregions. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 66:1081–1094.
- Katsman, C. A., A. Sterl, J. J. Beersma, H. W. van den Brink, J. A. Church, W. Hazeleger, and R. Weisse. 2011. Exploring high-end scenarios for local sea level rise to develop flood protection strategies for a low-lying delta—the Netherlands as an example. *Climatic Change* 109:617–645.
- Mayr, E. 1990. When is historiography whiggish? *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51:301–309.
- Minshall, G. W., K. W. Cummins, R. C. Petersen, C. E. Cushing, D. A. Bruns, J. R. Sedell, and R. L. Vannote. 1985. Developments in stream ecosystem theory. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 42:1045–1055.
- Mulholland, P. J., A. M. Helton, G. C. Poole, R. O. Hall, S. K. Hamilton, B. J. Peterson, J. L. Tank, L. R. Ashkenas, L. W. Cooper, C. N. Dahm, W. K. Dodds, S. Findlay, S. V. Gregory, N. B. Grimm, S. L. Johnson, W. H. McDowell, J. L. Meyer, H. M. Valett, J. R. Webster, C. Arango, J. J. Beaulieu, M. J. Bernot, A. J. Burgin, C. L. Crenshaw, L. Johnson, J. Merriam, B. R. Neiderlehner, J. M. O'Brien, J. D. Potter, R. W. Sheibley, D. J. Sobota, and S. M. Thomas. 2008. Stream denitrification across biomes and its response to anthropogenic nitrate loading. 2008. *Nature* 452:202–205.
- Mulholland, P. J., J. D. Newbold, J. W. Elwood, L. A. Ferren, and J. R. Webster. 1985. Phosphorus spiraling in a woodland stream: seasonal variations. *Ecology* 66:1012–1023.
- Mulholland, P. J., H. M. Valett, J. R. Webster, S. A. Thomas, L. W. Cooper, S. K. Hamilton, and B. J. Peterson. 2004. Stream denitrification and total nitrate uptake rates measured using a field ^{15}N tracer addition approach. *Limnology and Oceanography* 49:809–820.
- Newbold, J. D., J. W. Elwood, R. V. O'Neil, and W. Van Winkle. 1981. Measuring nutrient spiraling in streams. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 38:860–863.
- O'Sullivan, K. J., and S. W. Azeem. 2007. An analysis of collaborative group structure technological facilitation from knowledge and management perspectives. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management* 5:223–230.
- Peterson, B. J., W. M. Wollheim, P. J. Mulholland, J. R. Webster, J. L. Meyer, J. L. Tank, E. Martí, W. B. Bowden, H. M. Valett, A. E. Hershey, W. H. McDowell, W. K. Dodds, S. K. Hamilton, S. V. Gregory, and D. D. Morrall. 2001. Control of nitrogen export from watersheds by headwater streams. *Science* 292: 86–90.
- Riis, T., W. K. Dodds, P. B. Kristensen, and J. Baisner. 2012. Nitrogen cycling and dynamics in a macrophyte-rich stream as determined by a $^{15}\text{N-NH}_4^+$ release. *Freshwater Biology* 57: 1579–1591.
- Scott, W. R., and G. F. Davis. 2007. *Organizations and organizing: rational, natural, and open systems perspectives*. Pearson, Prentice and Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

- Shrum, W., J. Genuth, and I. Chompalov. 2007. Structures of scientific collaboration. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Simon, K. S., D. K. Niyogi, R. D. Frew, and C. R. Townsend. 2007. Nitrogen dynamics in grassland streams along a gradient of agricultural development. *Limnology and Oceanography* 52:1246–1257.
- Stream Solute Workshop. 1990. Concepts and methods for assessing solute dynamics in stream ecosystems. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 9:95–119.
- Tetra Tech, Inc. 2003. B. Everett Jordan Lake TMDL Watershed Model Development. Contract Number EW030318, Project Number 1-2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina. (Available from: <http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/jordanlake/7>)
- Thompson, J. L. 2009. Building collective communication competence in interdisciplinary research teams. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 37:278–297.
- USEPA (US Environmental Protection Agency). 2007. Hypoxia in the northern Gulf of Mexico: an update by the EPA Science Advisory Board. EPA-SAB-08-004. US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.
- Uzzi, B., S. Mukherjee, M. Stringer, and B. Jones. 2013. Atypical combinations and scientific impact. *Science* 342:468–472.
- Vannote, R. L., G. W. Minshall, K. W. Cummins, J. R. Sedell, and C. E. Cushing. 1980. The river continuum concept. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 37:130–137.
- von Schiller, D., E. Martí, and J. L. Riera. 2009. Nitrate retention and removal in Mediterranean streams bordered by contrasting land uses: a ^{15}N tracer study. *Biogeosciences* 6: 181–196.
- Webster, J. R., and J. L. Meyer. 1997. Stream organic matter budgets: an introduction. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 16:3–4.
- Webster, J. R., P. J. Mulholland, J. L. Tank, H. M. Valett, W. K. Dodds, B. J. Peterson, W. B. Bowden, C. N. Dahm, S. Findlay, S. V. Gregory, N. B. Grimm, S. K. Hamilton, S. L. Johnson, E. Martí, W. H. McDowell, J. L. Meyer, D. D. Morrall, S. A. Thomas, and W. M. Wollheim. 2003. Factors affecting ammonium uptake in streams—an inter-biome perspective. *Freshwater Biology* 48:1329–1352.
- Webster, J. R., and B. C. Patten. 1979. Effects of watershed perturbation on stream potassium and calcium dynamics. *Ecological Monographs* 49:51–72.
- Wollheim, W. M., B. J. Peterson, L. A. Deegan, M. Bahr, J. E. Hobbie, D. Jones, W. B. Bowden, A. E. Hershey, G. W. Kling, and M. C. Miller. 1999. A coupled field and modeling approach for the analysis of nitrogen cycling in streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 18:199–221.
- Zhang, T., R. G. Barry, K. Knowles, J. A. Heginbottom, and J. Brown. 1999. Statistics and characteristics of permafrost and ground-ice distribution in the Northern Hemisphere. *Polar Geography* 23:132–154.

On Line Supplementary Material

This material includes:

- 1) Complete author list**
- 2) Extended bibliography**
- 3) Additional information on project structure**
- 4) Original data and publication agreement**

Lotic Intersite Nitrogen eXperiment (LINX) collaborators author list for this publication: These are not all the LINX participants, it is a subset who participated in writing this paper. Author order determined first by contribution and when this became too difficult to determine, alphabetically by first name from that point on.

Walter K. Dodds
Jackson R. Webster
Chelsea L. Crenshaw
Ashley M. Helton
Jonathan M. O'Brien
Eugènia Martí
Anne E. Hershey
Jennifer. L. Tank
Amy J. Burgin
Nancy B. Grimm
Stephen K. Hamilton
Daniel J. Sobota
Geoffrey C. Poole
Jake J. Beaulieu
Laura T. Johnson
Linda R. Ashkenas
Robert O. Hall, Jr.
Sherri L. Johnson
Wilfred M. Wollheim
William B. Bowden

Item 1. Extended LINX Bibliography (13 Sep 2012)

1. Arango CP and Tank JL. 2008. Land use influences the spatiotemporal controls on nitrification and denitrification in headwater streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **27**: 90–107.
2. Arango CP, Tank JL, Johnson LT, and Hamilton SK. 2008. Assimilatory uptake rather than nitrification and denitrification determines nitrogen removal patterns in streams of varying land use. *Limnology and Oceanography* **53**: 2558–2572.
3. Arango CP, Riley LA, Tank JL, and Hall RO. 2009. Herbivory by an invasive snail increases nitrogen fixation in a nitrogen-limited stream. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **66**: 1309–1317.
4. Arango CP, Tank JL, Schaller JL, *et al.* 2007. Benthic organic carbon influences denitrification in streams with high nitrate concentration. *Freshwater Biology* **52**: 1210–1222.
5. Ashkenas L R, Johnson SL, Gregory SV, *et al.* 2004. A Stable isotope tracer study of nitrogen uptake and transformation in an old-growth forest stream. *Ecology* **85**: 1725–1739.
6. Beaulieu JJ, Arango CP, Hamilton SK, and Tank JL. 2007. The production and emission of nitrous oxide from headwater streams in the Midwestern United States. *Global Change Biology* **14**: 878–894.
7. Beaulieu JJ, Arango CP, and Tank JL. 2009. The effects of season and agriculture on nitrous oxide production in headwater streams. *Journal of Environmental Quality* **38**: 637–46.
8. Beaulieu JJ, Tank JL, Hamilton SK, *et al.* 2011. Nitrous oxide emission from denitrification in stream and river networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **108**: 214–9.
9. Beaulieu J J, Tank JL, and Kopacz M. 2008. Sorption of imidazolium-based ionic liquids to aquatic sediments. *Chemosphere* **70**: 1320–8.
10. Bernot M J and Dodds WK. 2005. Nitrogen Retention, Removal, and Saturation in Lotic Ecosystems. *Ecosystems* **8**: 442–453.
11. Bernot M J, Tank JL, Royer TV, and David MB. 2006. Nutrient uptake in streams draining agricultural catchments of the midwestern United States. *Freshwater Biology* **51**:499–509.
12. Bernot MJ, Dodds WK, Gardner WS, *et al.* 2003. Comparing Denitrification estimates for a Texas estuary by using acetylene inhibition and Membrane Inlet Mass Spectrometry. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* **69**: 5950–5956.
13. Bernot MJ, Sobota DJ, Hall RO, *et al.* 2010. Inter-regional comparison of land-use effects on stream metabolism. *Freshwater Biology* **55**: 1874–1890.
14. Bruesewitz D A, Tank JL, Bernot MJ, *et al.* 2006. Seasonal effects of the zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) on sediment denitrification rates in Pool 8 of the Upper Mississippi River. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **63**: 957–969.
15. Burgin AJ and Hamilton SK. 2007. Have we overemphasized the role of denitrification in aquatic ecosystems? A review of nitrate removal pathways. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **5**: 89–96.
16. Crenshaw CL, Valett HM, and Tank JL. 2002. Effects of coarse particulate organic matter on fungal biomass and invertebrate density in the subsurface of a headwater stream. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **21**: 28–42.
17. David MB, Wall LG, Royer TV, and Tank JL. 2006. Denitrification and the nitrogen budget of a reservoir in an agricultural landscape. *Ecological Applications* **16**: 2177–2190.

18. Dent CL, Grimm NB, Martí E, *et al.* 2007. Variability in surface-subsurface hydrologic interactions and implications for nutrient retention in an arid-land stream. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **112**; doi: 10.1029/2007JG000467.
19. Dodds WK. 2006. Eutrophication and trophic state in rivers and streams. *Limnology and Oceanography* **51**: 671–680.
20. Dodds WK, Evans-White MA, Gerlanc NM, *et al.* 2000. Quantification of the nitrogen cycle in a prairie stream. *Ecosystems* **3**: 574–589.
21. Dodds WK, López AJ, Bowden WB, *et al.* 2002. N Uptake as a function of concentration in streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **21**: 206–220.
22. Dodds WK, Martí E, Tank JL, *et al.* 2004. Carbon and nitrogen stoichiometry and nitrogen cycling rates in streams. *Oecologia* **140**: 458–67.
23. Earl SR, Valett HM, and Webster JR. 2006. Nitrogen saturation in stream ecosystems. *Ecology* **87**: 3140–3151.
24. Earl SR, Valett HM, and Webster JR. 2007. Nitrogen spiraling in streams: Comparisons between stable isotope tracer and nutrient addition experiments. *Limnology and Oceanography* **52**: 1718–1723.
25. Evans-White MA, Dodds WK, Gray LJ, and Frit K. 2001. A comparison of the trophic ecology of the crayfishes (*Orconectes nais* (Faxon) and *Orconectes neglectus* (Faxon)) and the central stoneroller minnow (*Campostoma anomalum* (Rafinesque)): omnivory in a tallgrass prairie stream. *Hydrobiologia* **462**: 131–144.
26. Findlay SEG, Mulholland PJ, Hamilton SK, *et al.* 2010. Cross-stream comparison of substrate-specific denitrification potential. *Biogeochemistry* **104**: 381–392.
27. Findlay S, Tank J, Dye S, *et al.* 2002. A cross-system comparison of bacterial and fungal biomass in detritus pools of headwater streams. *Microbial Ecology* **43**: 55–66.
28. Gooseff MN, Hall RO, and Tank JL. 2007. Relating transient storage to channel complexity in streams of varying land use in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. *Water Resources Research* **43**; doi: 10.1029/2005WR004626.
29. Grimm NB, Sheibley RW, Crenshaw CL, *et al.* 2005. N retention and transformation in urban streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **24**: 626–642.
30. Hall RO and Tank JL. 2005. Correcting whole-stream estimates of metabolism for groundwater input. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods* **3**: 222–229.
31. Hall RO, Tank JL, Sobota DJ, *et al.* 2009. Nitrate removal in stream ecosystems measured by N-15 addition experiments: Total uptake. *Limnology And Oceanography* **54**: 653–665.
32. Hamilton SK, Kurzman AL, Arango C, *et al.* 2007. Evidence for carbon sequestration by agricultural liming. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **21**: 1–12.
33. Hamilton SK and Ostrom NE. 2007. Measurement of the stable isotope ratio of dissolved N₂ in ¹⁵N tracer experiments. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods* **5**: 233–240.
34. Hamilton SK, Tank JL, Raikow DF, *et al.* 2004. The role of instream vs allochthonous N in stream food webs: modeling the results of an isotope addition experiment. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **23**: 429–448.
35. Hamilton SK, Tank JL, Raikow DF, *et al.* 2001. Nitrogen uptake and transformation in a midwestern U . S . stream : A stable isotope enrichment study. *Biogeochemistry* **54**: 297–340.
36. Helton AM, Poole GC, Meyer JL, *et al.* 2011. Thinking outside the channel: modeling nitrogen cycling in networked river ecosystems. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **9**: 229–238.

37. Inwood SE, Tank JL, and Bernot MJ. 2005. Patterns of denitrification associated with land use in 9 midwestern headwater streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **24**: 227–245.
38. Inwood SE, Tank JL, and Bernot MJ. 2007. Factors controlling sediment denitrification in midwestern streams of varying land use. *Microbial Ecology* **53**: 247–58.
39. Johnson LT and Tank JL. 2009. Diurnal variations in dissolved organic matter and ammonium uptake in six open-canopy streams. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **28**: 694–708.
40. Johnson LT, Tank JL, and Arango CP. 2009. The effect of land use on dissolved organic carbon and nitrogen uptake in streams. *Freshwater Biology* **54**: 2335–2350.
41. Johnson LT, Tank JL, and Dodds WK. 2009. The influence of land use on stream biofilm nutrient limitation across eight North American ecoregions. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **66**: 1081–1094.
42. Knapp CW, Dodds WK, Wilson KC, *et al.* 2009. Spatial heterogeneity of denitrification genes in a highly homogenous urban stream. *Environmental Science & Technology* **43**: 4273–4279.
43. Martin LA, Mulholland PJ, Webster JR, and Valett HM. 2001. Denitrification potential in sediments of headwater streams in the southern Appalachian Mountains, USA. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **20**: 505–519.
44. Merriam JL, McDowell WH, Tank JL, *et al.* 2002. Characterizing nitrogen dynamics, retention and transport in a tropical rainforest stream using an in situ ¹⁵N addition. *Freshwater Biology* **47**: 143–160.
45. Mulholland PJ, Fellows CS, Tank JL, *et al.* 2001. Inter-biome comparison of factors controlling stream metabolism. *Freshwater Biology* **46**: 1503–1517.
46. Mulholland PJ, Helton AM, Poole GC, *et al.* 2008. Stream denitrification across biomes and its response to anthropogenic nitrate loading. *Nature* **452**: 202–205.
47. Mulholland PJ, Tank JL, Sanzone DM, *et al.* 2000a. Food resources of stream macroinvertebrates determined by natural-abundance stable C and N isotopes and a ¹⁵N tracer addition. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **19**: 145–157.
48. Mulholland PJ, Tank JL, Sanzone DM, *et al.* 2000b. Nitrogen cycling in a forest stream determined by a ¹⁵N tracer addition. *Ecological Monographs* **70**: 471–493.
49. Mulholland PJ, Tank JL, Sanzone DM, *et al.* 2001. Ammonium and nitrate uptake lengths in a small forested stream determined by ¹⁵N tracer and short-term nutrient enrichment experiments. *Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol.* **27**: 1320–1325.
50. Mulholland PJ, Tank JL, Webster JR, *et al.* 2002. Can uptake length in streams be determined by nutrient addition experiments? Results from an interbiome comparison study. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **21**: 544–560.
51. Mulholland PJ, Valett HM, Webster JR, *et al.* 2004. Stream denitrification and total nitrate uptake rates measured using a field ¹⁵N tracer addition approach. *Limnology and Oceanography* **49**: 809–820.
52. Mulholland PJ, Hall RO, Sobota DJ, *et al.* 2009. Nitrate removal in stream ecosystems measured by ¹⁵N addition experiments: Denitrification. *Limnology and Oceanography* **54**: 666–680.
53. O'Brien JM and Dodds WK. 2007. Ammonium uptake and mineralization in prairie streams: chamber incubation and short-term nutrient addition experiments. *Freshwater Biology* **53**: 102–112.

54. O'Brien JM and Dodds WK. 2010. Saturation of NO_3^- uptake in prairie streams as a function of acute and chronic N exposure. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **29**: 627–635.
55. O'Brien JM, Dodds WK, Wilson KC, *et al.* 2007. The saturation of N cycling in Central Plains streams: ^{15}N experiments across a broad gradient of nitrate concentrations. *Biogeochemistry* **84**: 31–49.
56. Payn R, Webster JR, Mulholland PJ, Valett HM, and Dodds WK. 2005. Estimation of stream nutrient uptake from nutrient addition experiments. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods* **3**: 174–182.
57. Peterson BJ, Wollheim WM, Mulholland PJ, *et al.* 2001. Control of nitrogen export from watersheds by headwater streams. *Science*. **292**: 86–90.
58. Potter JD, McDowell WH, Merriam JL, *et al.* 2010. Denitrification and total nitrate uptake in streams of a tropical landscape. *Ecological Applications* **20**: 2104–2115.
59. Raikow DF and Hamilton SK. 2001. Bivalve diets in a midwestern U.S. stream: A stable isotope enrichment study. *Limnology and Oceanography* **46**: 514–522.
60. Rezanka KM and Hershey AE. 2003. Examining primary producer-consumer interactions in a Lake Superior tributary using ^{15}N -tracer, grazer-reduction, and nutrient-bioassay experiments. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **22**: 371–387.
61. Sanzone DM, Tank JL, Meyer JL, Mulholland PJ, and Findlay SEG. 2001. Microbial incorporation of nitrogen in stream detritus. *Hydrobiologia* **464**: 27–35.
62. Sanzone DM, Meyer JL, Marti E, *et al.* 2003. Carbon and nitrogen transfer from a desert stream to riparian predators. *Oecologia* **134**: 238–50.
63. Schade JD, Welter JR, Marti E, and Grimm NB. 2005. Hydrologic exchange and N uptake by riparian vegetation in an arid-land stream. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **24**: 19–28.
64. Sobota DJ, Johnson SL, Gregory SV, and Ashkenas LR. 2011. A stable isotope tracer study of the influences of adjacent land use and riparian condition on fates of nitrate in streams. *Ecosystems* **15**: 1–17.
65. Tank JL and Dodds WK. 2003. Nutrient limitation of epilithic and epixylic biofilms in ten North American streams. *Freshwater Biology* **48**: 1031–1049.
66. Tank JL, Meyer JL, Sanzone DM, *et al.* 2000. Analysis of nitrogen cycling in a forest stream during autumn using a ^{15}N -tracer addition. *Limnology and Oceanography* **45**: 1013–1029.
67. Tank JL, Mulholland PJ, Meyer JL, *et al.* 2001. Contrasting food web linkages for the grazing pathway in three temperate forested streams using ^{15}N as a tracer. *Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol.* **27**: 2832–2835.
68. Taylor BW, Keep CF, Hall RO, *et al.* 2007. Improving the fluorometric ammonium method: matrix effects, background fluorescence, and standard additions. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **26**: 167–177.
69. Wall LG, Tank JL, Royer TV, and Bernot MJ. 2005. Spatial and temporal variability in sediment denitrification within an agriculturally influenced reservoir. *Biogeochemistry* **76**: 85–111.
70. Webster JR. 2000. An Example to Follow: Intersite Research among Stream Ecologists at LTER sites. The Network Newsletter 13:8–9. <http://news.lternet.edu/node/942/> Viewed 12 Sep 2012.
71. Webster JR, Mulholland PJ, Tank JL, *et al.* 2003. Factors affecting ammonium uptake in streams - an inter-biome perspective. *Freshwater Biology* **48**: 1329–1352.

72. Wilson KC and Dodds WK. 2008. Centimeter-scale stream substratum heterogeneity and metabolic rates. *Hydrobiologia* **623**: 53–62.
73. Wollheim WM, Peterson BJ, Deegan LA, *et al.* 2001. Influence of stream size on ammonium and suspended particulate nitrogen processing. *Limnology and Oceanography* **46**: 1–13.
74. Wollheim WM, Peterson BJ, Thomas SM, *et al.* 2008. Dynamics of N removal over annual time periods in a suburban river network. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **113**; doi: 10.1029/2007JG000660.

Details of the LINX I and LINX II project mechanics

Funding for LINX I was granted to Virginia Tech (administered by Jack Webster) from 1996-1999; Pat Mulholland was the scientific leader and all principal investigators (PIs) and senior personnel functioned as a scientific leadership committee.

LINX II was funded by NSF's Integrated Research Challenges in Environmental Biology program, which supported complex research projects requiring large teams with diverse expertise, and was granted to the University of Tennessee, funded from 2001-2006, with Pat Mulholland as lead PI and project manager.

In both proposals funding decisions were made at the time of the proposal submission, with each institution estimating what would be required to accomplish its work and subcontract levels set on those demands. Some sites had greater travel costs, others greater research overhead rates, and still others were doing extra work or measurements, so subcontracts were not evenly divided. Pat Mulholland worked privately with each investigator at each institution to be certain they were satisfied with the level of support to accomplish the work. Both projects included mid project research meetings at the annual North American Benthological Society (NABS, now the Society for Freshwater Science) meetings as well as through annual workshops focused on methods development and data analysis. The meetings at NABS were open to anybody who wished to attend and we shared our methods with any interested researchers to allow others to pursue similar experiments.

PIs and senior personnel from these experiments were from Research I Universities or research centers (e.g. Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute and Oak Ridge National Laboratory) in the United States. Most of the participants were stream biogeochemists or ecologists, though some were modelers or specialists in analytical chemistry.

Personnel changed between the projects for several reasons. First, the Alaska site was not appropriate anymore due to a lack of urban and agricultural influences on the tundra. Second, investigators who were LINX I graduate students or non-tenured professors were offered signatory PI status (only 5 were allowed by the NSF). Third, some investigators on the second grant had conflicts and could not be primary investigators. Finally, we needed more modeling and mapping expertise as well as isotopic analysis specialization.

Face-to-face meetings were necessary as video conferencing was not widely available at this time. Both projects had initial multi-day workshops to fine-tune methods, annual meetings during experiments (one day) to update progress and adjust methodology, and several multi-day meetings following field work for synthesis. Most other communication occurred via email lists.

In both projects, detailed methods manuals were developed to insure consistency in methodology across sites. In LINX I, the travelling postdoc travelled to most of the sites and stayed there for the first month of the project, ensuring they were set up correctly and all personnel were trained the same for sampling and analysis techniques.

Table 1. Self-assessment of success as categorized by the scheme “Classification of Success” from Table 4.1 in Olsen et al. (2003) Note, some categories irrelevant to the LINX projects listed in the Olsen et al. table are not listed here.

Category	LINX I and LINX II
Effects on Science	
Discoveries (new, more rapid)	Yes, new methods developed and rapidly spread across research institutions
New ways of working	Yes, developed whole stream denitrification measures
Change in mix of normal and revolutionary science	Yes, methods adopted by others and become new benchmarks
Conceptual revolution	Facilitated a broader understanding that streams are functionally much more than just pipes
New model of science	No, continues a tradition in the field
More high-quality research	Yes
Facilitation of existing collaborations	Yes
Broader geographic and disciplinary collaboration	Yes
More joint authored papers written	Yes
More papers published	Yes
Greater willingness to share ideas	Difficult to establish
Findings disseminated more quickly	Difficult to establish
Theoretical discussions stimulated	Difficult to establish
Greater success in competitive arenas	Yes, funding for LINX II depended on results and model of LINX I
Science careers	
Greater diversity	Greater representation of women students than traditionally in biogeochemistry
Participation outside of US R1	Modest
Facilitate tenure of junior faculty	Likely, particularly those involved in LINX I as students or postdocs who were also involved in LINX II
Learning and science education	
New scientists attracted to field	Yes, the projects were very attractive to graduate students
More students mentored	Yes
Seminars with broader reach	Yes, the large group brought high visibility at professional meetings
Material used in classrooms	Yes, and text books
New distance learning	No
Inspiration to others	
New collaborations developed	Yes, within US and internationally
New software developed	No

Funding and public perception	
Collaboratory re-funded	Yes, LINX II
Public becomes more interested	Possibly, the press releases surrounding papers from the LINX I were among the first that many Universities dispersed widely on the internet.
Public participation increases	No
Congress interest	No
New funding initiatives appear	Perhaps, the macro approach has gained more acceptance
Tool use	
New software	No
New tool demonstrations	No
Demand for software	No

Table 2. Self-assessment of success according as categorized by the scheme “Classification of Success” from Table 4.2 in Olsen et al. (2003). Note, some irrelevant categories listed in the Olsen et al. table are not listed here.

Success factors	LINX
Nature of work	
Participants can work somewhat independently	Yes
Work unambiguous	Yes, same protocols everywhere
Common ground	
Previous collaboration successful within group	Somewhat with LINX I but some new investigators, more so in LINX II
Participants share common vocabulary	Mostly
Participants share common management/ working style	Yes
Collaboration readiness	
The culture is naturally collaborative	Yes, see section of paper on history of collaboration within the field
The goals are aligned in each subcommunity	Yes, very clearly
Motivation for work driven from inside the group, not by funding agency	Yes, funds sought on self generated proposal and ideas
Participants trust each other	Yes
Participants have a sense of collective efficacy	Yes
Management, planning, decision making	
Principles have time to do the work	Variable
Distributed groups can communicate more than 4 hours a day	Variable, most of these groups are traditional small labs with graduate students and technicians, some of which communicate more than others
Critical mass at each location	Variable, lab size varied across locations
Point person at each location	Yes
Management plan in place	No
Project manager is respected	Yes
Project manager has real management experience	Not in traditional sense, but had managed groups of researchers before on other smaller collaborative projects
Project manager exhibits strong leadership	Yes
A communication plan in place	No, other than plans for regular meetings
Plan is adaptive	Yes, protocols were changed
Money distributed to fit work not politics	Yes, though due to logistics (e.g.. Remote field sites, varied overhead rates) money not exactly evenly split
Knowledge management system in place	No
Decision making free of favoritism	Yes
Decisions based on fair and open criteria	Yes
Everybody has opportunity to influence	Yes

decisions	
Leadership sets culture, management plan, and makes laboratory visible.	Yes, although group self promotion was not very strong
Technology readiness	
Collaboration	Minimal, email and sharing data files via email
If data sharing is a goal, standard in place and shared by participants	There was a data sharing agreement, though data standards were only minimally agreed upon up front

Olson, J. S., E. C. Hofer, N. Bos, A. Zimmerman, G. M. Olson, D. Cooney, and I. Faniel. 2008.
A theory of remote scientific collaboration. *Scientific Collaboration on the internet* 1:73.

Web Box 2. LINX II Publication policy as of June 2006

LINX II Publication Policies

Site papers: Each site has control over their own data and its publication. No limitations on when publications can be submitted. If data from other sites are used, then offer co-authorship opportunity to at least 1 person from that site. If a synthesis analysis is used in a site paper in any significant way then the synthesis leader should be a co-author (e.g., Mel's metabolism calculations, Rich's transient storage calculations, Ashley's landscape analysis).

Synthesis papers: Synthesis papers will not be submitted for publication prior to Jan. 1, 2007 (approximately one year after all experiments are complete) unless there is a specific need and all project PI's and co-PI's are in agreement. All sites will attempt to have raw data submitted to the data management system for all releases within 6 months of their last 15N release (i.e. by Aug. 1, 2006). There will be at least 1 co-authorship offered to each site (in some cases two or more may be appropriate) on all synthesis papers that use data from that site. It is expected that all co-authors will comment on each manuscript or contribute in some fashion in addition to allowing their site's data to be used. Topics and authorship of all synthesis papers will be discussed with all project PI's and co-PI's prior to substantial amounts of writing (preferably at a project meeting) and consensus agreement should be reached. At a minimum, approximate paper title, tentative co-author list, and a few sentences on scope and data used will be sent to all project PI's and co-PI's for discussion and agreement (it is suggested that this be done through Mulholland to make this process more efficient) prior to writing the paper.

All papers: A copy of all papers (site and synthesis) should be sent for comment to all project PI's and co-PI's prior to submission to a journal. Comment period is limited to a maximum of 3 weeks for site papers and 2 months for synthesis papers. This will also ensure that they are entered into a publication list that Mulholland will compile for the project.

Talk abstracts: Abstracts for talks and posters should also follow the guidelines above, except that purely site papers need not be sent to the entire project group for comment prior to submission and the review period for synthesis abstracts by all project PI's and co-PI's is only 1 week. However, send Mulholland the authors, title, venue, and dates for all abstracts when they are submitted to ensure that they are recorded in the project publication list.

Decisions about whether to accept authorship offer: It is suggested that the following be used as a guide as to whether to accept an offer of authorship:

- 1) Did I make an intellectual contribution to the topics covered in the paper?
- 2) Did I participate in preparing the paper by either writing or provide substantive input (extensive comments, figures, etc.)?
- 3) Can I explain and or defend the methods and results in the paper?

Therefore, one only accepts authorship when one feels like they've made a real contribution to the work, can defend the work, and perhaps most importantly, has (or will make) the time to be actively involved in the process of writing (may involve mostly critically reviewing) the paper.