

Outline paper 1

Elsevier¹

Radarweg 29, Amsterdam

Elsevier Inc^{a,b}, Global Customer Service^{b,}*

^a*1600 John F Kennedy Boulevard, Philadelphia*

^b*360 Park Avenue South, New York*

Abstract

Keywords: `elsarticle.cls`, L^AT_EX, Elsevier, template

2010 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

1. Introduction

2. The model

The active-structural allocation trade-off, base of multi-dimensional strategy space.

- 5 Spatially explicit light and water competition (with spatial heterogeneity for water).

Phenotypic plasticity in allocation: objective functions and plastic dimensions and memory.

10

[☆]Fully documented templates are available in the elsarticle package on CTAN.

^{*}Corresponding author

Email address: `support@elsevier.com` (Global Customer Service)

URL: `www.elsevier.com` (Elsevier Inc)

¹Since 1880.

3. Results

3.1. Calibration

3.2. Basic plasticity allocation behaviour

(here or in the Thesis, needed anyway). Evolution of carbon pools and
15 eventually traits between the different algorithms.

3.3. Response to a gradient

Hypothesis: More conservative strategies will have better 20*20 root strategies, along 20 water gradient

Show the ability of the model to have different optimum depending on the
20 resource availability. Needed for heterogeneity to have a positive impact on functional diversity. The effect is a bit weak, but should be enough.

Phenotypic plasticity doesn't change a lot (but already caped for gradient high part).

25 Water availability memory is need for equilibrium, check if there is a good alignment between memory and water availability.

there is a little offset toward higher $w_i n_i$, probably because invest more in shoot tissues with higher organ efficiency

3.4. Study of a parameter space

strategy space (15^3 strategies)*20 parameters*2 conditions (high resources and low resources :
1/4)

Does plasticity work? Could it improve coexistence and limit invasion?

is there an overlapping between the best per former strategies (for a given position in the 2D space, within 0.9–1 relative perf) between the two conditions. Does that change with plasticity? – plasticity make the plant explore less. Look at overlapping of "equivalent strategies".

3.5. *Response to variable environment*

30 No particular benefit of plasticity but going to a better strategy sub-space.
Even between best strategies, plastic plant should have advantage over the non
plastic ones.

Hyp: the time variability of the resource may lead to different optimum
35 phenotype despite the same average because of evaporation and feedback on
resource: the average realised water availability may change. This effect should
be reduced by plasticity that will promote tissue efficiency over equilibrium.

Hyp: plasticity advantage is better perceived in variable environment. In-
40 creasing temporal variability of water resource should increase the advantage of
plastic plants over best non plastic plant.