

# Supplementary Information

## Contents

Appendix S1. Methods for reconstruction of <i>DBH</i> . . . . .	2
Appendix S2. Methods for comparing climwin results with traditional methods . . . . .	3
Appendix S3. Dealing with rapidly changing climate and tree growth . . . . .	4
Table S1. Site Details . . . . .	5
Table S2. Species analyzed, their characteristics, and bark allometries applied . . . . .	6
Table S3. Sampling details for species by site . . . . .	7
Table S4. Allometric equations for bark thickness . . . . .	8
Table S5. Frequency of <i>DBH</i> -climate interactions across all sites and growth metrics . . . . .	9
Figure S1. Comparison of our approach with traditional methods of identifying climate signals . .	10
Figure S2. Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the temperature variable group at Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA) . . . . .	11
Figure S3. Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the precipitation variable group at Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA) . . . . .	12
Figure S4. Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the precipitation variable group at Harvard Forest (Massachusetts, USA) . . . . .	13
Figure S5. Best GLS models for Barro Colorado Island (Panama) . . . . .	14
Figure S6. Best GLS models for Huai Kha Khaeng (Thailand) . . . . .	15
Figure S7. Best GLS models for Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA) . . . . .	16
Figure S8. Best GLS models for Cedar Breaks (Utah, USA) . . . . .	17
Figure S9. Best GLS models for SCBI (Virginia, USA) . . . . .	18
Figure S10. Best GLS models for Lilly Dickey Woods (Indiana, USA) . . . . .	19
Figure S11. Best GLS models for Harvard Forest (Massachusetts, USA) . . . . .	20
Figure S12. Best GLS models for Niobrara/ Hansley (Nebraska, USA) . . . . .	21
Figure S13. Best GLS models for Zofin (Czech Republic) . . . . .	22
Figure S14. Best GLS models for Scotty Creek (NW Territories, Canada) . . . . .	23

## Appendix S1. Methods for reconstruction of DBH

*This is still rough/ mostly notes.*

For each core, *DBH* can be reconstructed outside-in (based on recent *DBH*, subtracting growth recorded in tree rings) or inside-out (summing  $\Delta r$  from the inside out). We generally gave precedence to the outside-in approach. Specifically, when *DBH* was taken at the time of coring,

At some of our sites where *DBH* was not taken at the time of coring (*SCBI*), *DBH* measurements taken before or slightly after the time of coring could be used. (see issue #19 in ForestGEO\_dendro) If before, ... If after... For all outside-in reconstructions, if a negative *DBH* was predicted...

When there were more than one cores for a tree, the *DBH* reconstructions from each core were averaged to produce a single estimate of the tree's *DBH* through time. When the start or end dates of the records from the cores differed, we extrapolated growth of the shorter core to match the years covered by the longer core. Specifically, to fill in years at the more recent end, we assumed that the average growth rate of the ten years prior to the missing records applied to the missing years. To fill in years at the beginning of the tree's lifespan, we likewise assumed that the ten years adjacent to the missing record applied to the missing years; however, if this yielded a negative *DBH* estimate for the earliest year in the reconstruction, we divided the existing minimum *DBH* by number of years missing and applied that value to each year. We note that these reconstructed growth records were used only for the reconstruction of *DBH* and were not included as response variables in any of our analyses.

In either case we need bark thickness—ideally allometries describing the relationship between *DBH* and bark thickness (Table S4). This is especially critical for thick-barked species. When bark thickness data were available, we generated allometries (issue #8 in ForestGEO\_dendro)... lognormal model with intercept forced to zero: `lm(bark_depth.mm ~ -1 + log(dbh_no_bark.cm+1):bark_species, data = bark)`. When bark thickness data were not available, we used published bark allometries from other sources (Table S4)

## **Appendix S2. Methods for comparing climwin results with traditional methods**

(\*\*ISSUE #35 in ForestGEO-climate-sensitivity

*This is in process. For ~4 selected species (well-studied), we will build chronologies that exactly match the data used in this analysis. We'll then generate a figure like Fig. S1. We expect a pretty good match, as our results are basically consistent with previous studies at all these sites.*

### **Appendix S3. Dealing with rapidly changing climate and tree growth**

#### ISSUE #25 in ForestGEO-climate-sensitivity

Our analysis included two sites where climate change has had pronounced effects on tree growth: Scotty Creek, NW Territories, Canada (SC) and Little Tesuque, New Mexico, USA (LT). At SC, [temperatures have increased by X ° over X years]..., resulting in negative growth trends in basal area index (*BAI*) starting around 1950 and significant growth declines since 1970 in 56% of trees [@sniderhan\_growth\_2016]. At LT, (*drought has increased dramatically*), resulting in many missing rings in recent years.

*This is in process. We will try and compare 3 methods: (1) our standard approach, (2) detrending the climate variables (#53), (3) applying the climwin step only for older records--before the most rapid climate change. We will work with SC and LT researchers to determine which makes most sense, and use that as the main approach for these sites.*

**Table S1. Site Details**

site code	site name	latitude	longitude	cores within ForestGEO plot?	canopy positions	tree statuses	date range	dormant season	months in climwin
BCI	Barro Colorado Island	9.15430	-79.8461	no	canopy	live, dead	1931-2014	Nov-Apr	pOct-cDec
HKK	Huai Kha Khaeng	15.63240	99.2170	no	all	live	1903-2011		pOct-cDec
LT	Little Tesuque	35.73838	-105.8382	n.a.	all	live	1903-2018		pMay-cAug
CB	Utah Forest Dynamics Plot	37.66150	-112.8525				1903-2007		pMay-cAug
SCBI	Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute	38.89350	-78.1454	yes	all	live, dead	1903-2017	Oct-Apr	pMay-cAug
LDW	Lilly Dickey Woods	39.23590	-86.2181		canopy	live, dead	1903-2019		pMay-cAug
HF	Harvard Forest	42.53880	-72.1755	yes	all	live, dead	1903-2014		pMay-cAug
NB	Niobrara/Hansley	42.78000	-100.0210						pMay-cAug
ZOF	Zofin Forest Dynamics Plot	48.66380	14.7073	some	all		1903-2013		pMay-cAug
SC	Scotty Creek	61.30000	-121.3000	no	all	live, dead	1903-2013		pMay-cAug

**Table S2. Species analyzed, their characteristics, and bark allometries applied**

(\*\*ISSUE #72 in ForestGEO-climate-sensitivity)

species code <i>species_code_in_sitespecies.csv</i>	family family in sitespecies.csv	latin name <i>latin_name</i> in sitespecies.csv	site(s) sampled site codes	leaf type <i>leaf_type</i> in sitespecies.csv	leaf phenology <i>leaf_phenology</i> in sitespecies.csv	light requirements <i>light_requirements</i> in sitespecies.csv	bark allometry* <i>*bark_species</i> in <i>bark_site</i> *
--	-------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	--	--	--	---

\*Bark allometry field indicates the species and site sampled to construct the bark allometry. When neither raw data nor an allometric equation for the study species was available, we selected the most appropriate equation that could be located for similar species. Equations are given in Table S4.

**Table S3. Sampling details for species by site**

(ISSUE #73 in ForestGEO-climate-sensitivity)

This will include:


site	species	n trees (all)	n cores (all)	n trees (DBH)	n cores (DBH)	DBH range: sampled	DBH range: reconstructed	date edge	collected by
------	---------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------	-----------------

**Table S4. Allometric equations for bark thickness**

species	equation	n	DBH.range.cm	site	source
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	bark.mm = 0.619 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	10	8.2-39.6	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Carya cordiformis</i>	bark.mm = 0.793 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	9	5.9-68.2	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Carya ovalis</i>	bark.mm = 1.531 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	8	6.4-63.1	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Carya ovata</i>	bark.mm = 1.035 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	8	19.1-78	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Carya tomentosa</i>	bark.mm = 1.105 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	8	5-57.3	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	bark.mm = 2.223 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	9	6.1-94.2	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Jacaranda copaia</i>	bark.mm = 2.993 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	5	45.6-75	Panama	Raquel Alfaro-Sanchez (unpublished data)
<i>Juglans nigra</i>	bark.mm = 2.107 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	9	13.6-85.4	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	bark.mm = 1.637 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	9	27.5-136.5	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Picea mariana</i>	bark.mm = 3.726 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	12	6.9-7.9	Scotty Creek	Anastasia Sniderhan and Jennifer Baltzer (unpublished data)
<i>Pinus flexilis</i>	bark.mm = (1.299 * $\sqrt{dbh.cm}$ ) <sup>0.609</sup> ) <sup>2</sup>	29	10-130	California (3 montane sites)	Zeibig-Kichas et al. (2016)
<i>Pinus ponderosa</i>	bark.mm = (1.298 * $\sqrt{dbh.cm}$ ) <sup>0.802</sup> ) <sup>2</sup>	81	5-160	California (4 montane sites)	Zeibig-Kichas et al. (2016)
<i>Pinus strobus</i>	bark.mm = 1.568 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	1	28.4-28.4	Illinois	Miles and Smith (2009)
<i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i>	bark.mm = (0.785 * $\sqrt{dbh.cm}$ ) <sup>2</sup>	30	10-200	California (3 montane sites)	Zeibig-Kichas et al. (2016)
<i>Quercus alba</i>	bark.mm = 1.828 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	10	9.3-101.8	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Quercus montana</i>	bark.mm = 2.083 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	8	5.8-99.1	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	bark.mm = 0.98 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	10	24.1-143.2	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Quercus velutina</i>	bark.mm = 1.394 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	8	16.2-110.7	SCBI	Anderson-Teixeira et al. (2015)
<i>Tetragastris panamensis</i>	bark.mm = 1.672 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	4	22.7-48.8	Panama	Raquel Alfaro-Sanchez (unpublished data)
<i>Trichilia tuberculata</i>	bark.mm = 1.367 * log(dbh.cm + 1)	12	21-40.5	Panama	Raquel Alfaro-Sanchez (unpublished data), Pete Kerby-Miller and Helene Muller-Landau (unpublished data)


**Table S5.** Frequency of *DBH*-climate interactions across all sites and growth metrics

**Figure S1.** Comparison of our approach with traditional methods of identifying climate signals




**Figure S1 | (Comparison of traditional approaches with ours).** (THIS FIGURE IS JUST A MOCK-UP TO SHOW VALENTINE WHAT I HAVE IN MIND.)

**Figure S2. Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the temperature variable group at Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA)**




**Figure S2 | Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the temperature variable group at Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA).** Here, *climwin* identified potential evapotranspiration (*PET*) as the strongest climate variable across all three metrics of growth ( $\Delta r$ , BAI,  $\Delta AGB$ ) and regardless of whether all cores were included in the analysis, or only those for which DBH could be reconstructed ( $\Delta r$ -trees with *DBH*, BAI,  $\Delta AGB$ ).

**Figure S3. Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the precipitation variable group at Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA)**




**Figure S3 | Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the precipitation variable group at Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA).** Here, *climwin* identified precipitation (PRE) as the strongest climate variable for  $\Delta r$  and BAI, but precipitation day frequency (WET) as the strongest climate variable for  $\Delta AGB$ .

**Figure S4.** Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the precipitation variable group at Harvard Forest (Massachusetts, USA)




**Figure S4 | Comparison of climwin output across growth metrics for the precipitation variable group at Harvard Forest (Massachusetts, USA).** Here, *climwin* identified precipitation frequency (WET) as the strongest climate variable for  $\Delta r$ , but precipitation amount (PRE) as the strongest climate variable for BAI and  $\Delta AGB$ . The optimal time window (circled) also differed across growth metrics.

**Figure S5. Best GLS models for Barro Colorado Island (Panama)**




**Figure S5 | Best GLS models for Barro Colorado Island (Panama)** for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ , BAI, and  $\Delta AGB$ . Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.

**Figure S6. Best GLS models for Huai Kha Khaeng (Thailand)**



**Figure S6 | Best GLS models for Huai Kha Khaeng (Thailand) for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ , BAI, and  $\Delta AGB$ .** Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.

**Figure S7. Best GLS models for Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA)**




**Figure S7 | Best GLS models for Little Tesuque (New Mexico, USA) for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ , BAI, and  $\Delta AGB$ .** Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.

**Figure S8. Best GLS models for Cedar Breaks (Utah, USA)**


[Figure S8 | Best GLS models for Cedar Breaks (Utah, USA) for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ ,  $BAI$ , and  $\Delta AGB$ . Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.]

**Figure S9. Best GLS models for SCBI (Virginia, USA)**




**Figure S9 | Best GLS models for SCBI (Virginia, USA) for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ , BAI, and  $\Delta AGB$ .** Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.

**Figure S10. Best GLS models for Lilly Dickey Woods (Indiana, USA)**



**Figure S10 | Best GLS models for Lilly Dickey Woods (Indiana, USA) for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ , BAI, and  $\Delta AGB$ .** Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.


**Figure S11. Best GLS models for Harvard Forest (Massachusetts, USA)**



**Figure S11 | Best GLS models for Harvard Forest (Massachusetts, USA) for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ ,  $BAI$ , and  $\Delta AGB$ .** Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.


**Figure S12.** Best GLS models for Niobrara/ Hansley (Nebraska, USA)

**Figure S13. Best GLS models for Zofin (Czech Republic)**



**Figure S13 | Best GLS models for Zofin (Czech Republic) for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ , BAI, and  $\Delta AGB$ .** Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.

**Figure S14. Best GLS models for Scotty Creek (NW Territories, Canada)**



**Figure S14 | Best GLS models for Scotty Creek (NW Territories, Canada) for all three growth metrics:  $\Delta r$ , BAI, and  $\Delta \text{AGB}$ .** Precipitation and temperature group variables are as selected by *climwin*. For each species, relationships are plotted if included in top model, with dashed lines indicating terms that do not significantly improve the model (relative to a model without). Vertical grey lines indicate the long-term mean for the climate variable, shading indicates 1 SD.