



New Phytologist

Thermal sensitivity across forest vertical profiles: patterns, mechanisms, and ecological implications

Journal:	<i>New Phytologist</i>
Manuscript ID	NPH-TR-2021-38020.R1
Manuscript Type:	Tansley Review
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Vinod, Nidhi; Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, Conservation Ecology Center; University of California Los Angeles, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Slot, Martijn; Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, - McGregor, Ian; North Carolina State University, Center for Geospatial Analytics Ordway, Elsa; University of California Los Angeles, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Smith, Marielle; Michigan State University, Department of Forestry Taylor, Tyeen; University of Michigan, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering Sack, Lawren; University of California Los Angeles, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Buckley, Thomas; UC Davis, Plant Science Anderson-Teixeira, Kristina; Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, Conservation Ecology Center; Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Forest Global Earth Observatory
Key Words:	forest, vertical gradients, microclimate, leaf temperature, leaf traits, gas exchange, ecosystem, climate change

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title: Thermal sensitivity across forest vertical profiles: patterns, mechanisms, and ecological implications

Authors: Nidhi Vinod^{1,2}, Martijn Slot³, Ian R. McGregor⁴, Elsa M. Ordway^{2,5}, Marielle N. Smith⁶, Tyeen C. Taylor⁷, Lawren Sack², Thomas N. Buckley⁸, Kristina J. Anderson-Teixeira^{1,3*}

Author Affiliations:

1. Conservation Ecology Center; Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute; Front Royal, VA 22630, USA
2. Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90039, USA
3. Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute; Panama, Republic of Panama
4. Center for Geospatial Analytics; North Carolina State University; Raleigh, NC 27607, USA
5. Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA
6. Department of Forestry, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA
7. Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA
8. Department of Plant Sciences; University of California; Davis, CA, 95616, USA

*corresponding author: teixeirak@si.edu; +1 540 635 6546

Text	word		
	count	other	n
Total word count (excluding summary, references and legends)	9814	No. of figures	6 (all colour)
Summary	200	No. of Tables	2

Introduction	369	No of Supporting Information files	6
Review of vertical gradients	6954		
Implications	2244		
Conclusions	247		
Acknowledgments	44		

20

For Peer Review

21 **Summary**

22 Rising temperatures are influencing forests on many scales, with potentially strong
23 variation vertically across forest strata. Using published research and new analyses, we
24 evaluate how microclimate and leaf temperatures, traits, and gas exchange vary vertically
25 in forests, shaping tree ecology and ecosystem function. In closed-canopy forests, upper-
26 canopy leaves are exposed to the highest solar radiation and evaporative demand, which
27 can elevate leaf temperature (T_{leaf}), particularly when transpirational cooling is curtailed
28 by limited stomatal conductance. However, foliar traits also vary across height or light
29 gradients, partially mitigating and protecting against the elevation of upper-canopy T_{leaf} .
30 Leaf metabolism generally increases with height across the vertical gradient, yet
31 differences in thermal sensitivity across the gradient appear modest. Scaling from leaves to
32 trees, tall trees have higher absolute metabolic capacity and growth at both individual and
33 ecosystem levels, yet are disproportionately vulnerable to drought and damaging T_{leaf} ,
34 particularly under climate change. In contrast, understory trees experience fewer extreme
35 high T_{leaf} 's but have fewer cooling mechanisms and thus may be disproportionately
36 impacted under hot, humid conditions, or when exposed to harsher conditions through
37 canopy disturbance. As the climate changes, integrating the patterns and mechanisms
38 reviewed here into models will be critical to forecasting forest-climate feedbacks.

39 **Key words:** forest; vertical gradients; microclimate; leaf temperature; leaf traits; gas
40 exchange; ecosystem; climate change

41

I. Introduction

Global average temperatures have risen 1.2 °C since 1900 (Rohde & Hausfather, 2020) and are expected to reach +1.5 °C by 2040 (IPCC, 2021), accompanied by increasing severity and frequency of heat waves and hotter droughts (Meehl & Tebaldi, 2004; IPCC, 2021). These changes are affecting tree metabolism and forest ecosystem function (Breshears *et al.*, 2021; Pörtner *et al.*, 2021) by altering rates of photosynthesis and respiration (Breshears *et al.*, 2021; Scafaro *et al.*, 2021), causing foliar damage during heat waves (Corlett, 2011; O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2017), and reducing growth and elevating mortality during drought (McDowell *et al.*, 2020; Breshears *et al.*, 2021). The resulting feedbacks to climate and carbon storage, and changes in albedo and hydrology will in turn impact the future trajectory of climate change (Bonan, 2016), yet future forest dynamics remain one of the largest sources of uncertainty in Earth system model climate change projections (Friedlingstein *et al.*, 2006; Krause *et al.*, 2018; Arora *et al.*, 2020).

Future forest dynamics will depend on how climate change impacts trees of varying height and crown position. Forests are vertically stratified, and canopies moderate climatic conditions (Ozanne, 2003; Nakamura *et al.*, 2017), including buffering understory microclimates from extreme meteorological conditions (Zellweger *et al.*, 2019). Vertical gradients in biophysical variables such as temperature, light, wind, humidity and carbon dioxide (CO₂) concentrations influence leaf temperatures, traits, and metabolism, with implications for whole plant performance (Michaletz *et al.*, 2016; Fauset *et al.*, 2018). Although forest vertical stratification strongly influences plant metabolism, demography, and ecology, we lack comprehensive understanding of these gradients (but see Niinemets & Valladares, 2004). Importantly, this limits our ability to understand how warming temperatures will affect leaf-level metabolism, whole-plant performance, and, in turn, forest dynamics, biodiversity, energy balance, ecosystem function, and biosphere-atmosphere interactions.

Here, we review vertical gradients in the biophysical environment and plant form and function in forests, focusing on five themes (Fig. 1): (1) the biophysical environment; (2) leaf temperature (T_{leaf}); (3) the leaf traits that most strongly influence T_{leaf} and thermal

tolerance; (4) leaf gas exchange and its thermal sensitivity; and (5) tree and ecosystem ecology. We then consider the implications for understanding forest responses to global change and how they scale across space and time.




Figure 1. Schematic summarizing typical vertical gradients in (1) biophysical environment, (2) leaf temperature (T_{leaf}), (3) leaf traits, (4) leaf gas exchange, and (5) tree and ecosystem ecology within closed-canopy forests during daytime growing season conditions. Arrows indicate direction of increase, with double-pointed arrows indicating that the direction of the trend is uncertain or inconsistent. Patterns tend to be weaker, or sometimes reversed, in more open forests, when canopy trees are seasonally deciduous, or at nighttime. Abbreviations are as follows: T_{air} : air temperature, VPD: vapor pressure deficit; $T_{leaf} - T_{air}$: leaf-to-air temperature difference; LMA: leaf mass per area; T sensitivity: temperature sensitivity; ET: evapotranspiration. *Isoprene emission has also been observed to peak in mid-canopy (Table 1).

II. Review of vertical gradients

1. The biophysical environment

The biophysical environment, defined here to include the physical structure of the vegetation and associated micrometeorological conditions, varies vertically from the forest floor to the top of the canopy (Figs. 1, 2), with micrometeorological conditions largely determined by forest structure. In this section, we review of the existing literature and analyze data on vegetation structure and vertical microclimate profiles from forested sites within the U.S. National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON; Fig. 2, Supporting Information Methods S1, Supporting Information Figure S1). Although we focus on vertical gradients, it is important to note that in heterogeneous canopies with high gap fractions and large variation in tree height, or at forest edges, the biophysical environment can be more closely linked to the distance from the outer edge of vegetation than to height (Lowman & Rinker, 1995).




Figure 2. Vertical gradients in the biophysical environment for six US forest sites in the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON). Height profiles, normalized relative to

the top of the canopy, are shown for: growing season (a) modelled leaf area density, (b) estimated proportion of sun leaves, and (c) proportion of light incident to the top of the canopy (as fraction relative to top of canopy), and for July mean ± 1 standard deviation for (d) maximum photosynthetically active radiation (PAR), (e) maximum wind speed, (f) minimum humidity (min RH), (g) maximum air temperature (T_{air}), and (h) maximum biological temperature, (T_{bio}). Measurements extend from ground level (normalized height = 0 m) to the top of the canopy (horizontal dashed line at normalized height = 1) or above (d-g). Variables shown in panels a-c are derived from lidar, and those shown in panels d-h from micrometeorological tower data. Sites, which represent a variety of forest structures, include a mixed northern hardwood forest (Harvard Forest, MA; HARV), a subtropical longleaf pine savanna (Ordway-Swisher Biological Station, FL; OSBS), a tropical montane broadleaf evergreen forest (Pu'u Maka'ala Natural Area Reserve, Hawai'i; PUUM), two temperate broadleaf forests (Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute, VA, SCBI; Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, MD, SERC), and a coniferous forest (Wind River Experimental Forests, WA; WREF). Further site information is given in Supporting Information Table S1, and analysis details in Supporting Information Methods S1. Vertical profiles in micrometeorological variables (d-h) at all forested NEON sites are shown in Supporting Information Figure S1.

1.1 Foliage

Canopy foliage is the primary physical barrier between the atmosphere and the forest floor, buffering multiple aspects of the understory conditions from large fluctuations in conditions experienced above the canopy. It strongly influences – and is influenced by – the vertical biophysical gradient. Vertical patterns in leaf area density (i.e., leaf area per unit volume) differ across forests (Fig. 2a-b, Supporting Information Figure S1). In tropical and temperate forests with dense broadleaf canopies, leaf area density is generally highest in the canopy layer (i.e., that formed by the crowns of dominant trees), but understory leaf area density is often high as well, sometimes causing undulating patterns with height (Parker *et al.*, 1989; Ashton & Hall, 1992; Koike & Syahbuddin, 1993; Domingues *et al.*, 2005). In forests with more open upper canopies, including many needle-leaf forests, leaf

area density can be greatest in the lower canopy or understory (Baldocchi *et al.*, 1997; Law *et al.*, 2001; Bonan, 2016; Hanberry *et al.*, 2020). Soil moisture conditions, topography, and gap formations following disturbances all alter foliage patterns (Stark *et al.*, 2012; Bonan, 2016; Almeida *et al.*, 2016; Hanberry *et al.*, 2020). In addition, seasonally dry and wet conditions, deciduousness, and phenology contribute to temporally shifting leaf area density patterns (Tang & Dubayah, 2017; Smith *et al.*, 2019; Parker *et al.*, 2019; Nunes *et al.*, 2022). In this review, we focus on growing season conditions unless otherwise noted.

1.2 Light

The intensity of visible and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR, 400-700nm) decreases from the canopy top to the forest floor, with a profile whose shape is modified by leaf area density, leaf clumping, canopy height, and vertical structure across species and forest types (Fig. 2d, Supporting Information Figure S1, Koike *et al.*, 2001; Béland & Baldocchi, 2021; Bin *et al.*, 2022). Canopy foliage absorbs a large portion of PAR (400-700nm), and selectively filters light, thereby altering the spectrum of PAR received in the lower canopy and understory layers. The ratio of red (~685-690 nm) to far red (~730-740 nm) light declines along with total PAR with increasing depth in the canopy, and understories receive diffuse light enriched in near infrared radiation (700-1000 nm, de Castro, 2000; Poorter *et al.*, 2000). Mid-canopies and understories experience a highly dynamic light environment due to sunflecks, or brief increases in direct solar radiation, caused by small canopy gaps, wind-induced canopy movements or the sun's passage across a dynamically structured canopy surface (Way & Pearcy, 2012). This light gradient is more pronounced in dense canopies, including broad-leaf and mixed forests, than in forests with more open upper canopies, including many conifer forests [Fig. 2d, Supporting Information Figure S1, Chazdon & Fetcher (1984); ; Tymen *et al.* (2017); Parker *et al.* (2019); Bartemucci *et al.* (2006); Baldocchi *et al.* (1997)]. This light gradient drives variation in leaf temperature (section 2), traits (section 3), and photosynthesis (section 4.2).

1.3 Turbulent transport and wind

Vertical transport in forest canopies is dominated by turbulent transport, making vertical profiles of wind speed, water vapor, CO₂, and temperature more difficult to predict and to

generalize on the basis of theoretical first principles than radiation profiles. Above the canopy, turbulent transport typically mimics diffusion – that is, vertical fluxes of heat, mass and momentum are proportional to their respective vertical gradients, and to transfer coefficients (eddy diffusivities, Penman & Long, 1960)– such that wind speed declines logarithmically with proximity to the canopy surface (Monteith & Unsworth, 2013). Interaction with a plant canopy also attenuates wind, causing wind speed to decline through the canopy; for example, small plant elements can rapidly dissipate momentum within dense canopies (Raupach & Shaw, 1982; Baldocchi & Meyers, 1988). Within canopies, however, transport often fails to mimic diffusion – e.g., transport of momentum (Shaw, 1977) or heat (Raupach, 1987) may occur in the direction opposite to that predicted by gradients of wind speed or temperature, respectively – making vertical wind profiles difficult to generalize from first principles (Denmead & Bradley, 1987; Meyers & Paw U, 1987; Raupach, 1989; Katul & Albertson, 1999; Harman & Finnigan, 2007). Such counter-gradient transport may arise from the intermittent generation, at the canopy surface, of large wakes or coherent eddy structures that periodically dip down through the canopy, gathering packets of warmed, humidified and CO₂-enriched or depleted air from beneath and within the canopy and flushing them to the atmosphere above (Finnigan, 1979; Baldocchi & Meyers, 1991). These “sweep-eject” events can couple understory conditions more directly to conditions above the canopy than beneath.

Despite these complexities of within-canopy transport, wind speeds are generally much higher at the top of the canopy than within or beneath (Jiao-jun *et al.*, 2004; Jucker *et al.*, 2018). This holds true across the range of forest types (Fig. 2e, Supporting Information Figure S1, Barnard & Bauerle, 2016; Hanberry *et al.*, 2018, 2020; Jucker *et al.*, 2018; Muller *et al.*, 2021) and savannas (Johnston *et al.*, in press; Curtis *et al.*, 2019). As a result, upper canopy leaves have substantially higher boundary layer conductance (g_b) and therefore greater potential for exchange of both mass and sensible heat exchange (sections 2, 4.1).

1.4 Atmospheric concentrations of CO₂ and water vapor

Atmospheric CO₂ concentrations tend to be higher near the ground at night, associated with plant and soil respiration, but the elevated CO₂ quickly dissipates during the day such

that differences are negligible for most of the day when photosynthesis is occurring (Brooks *et al.*, 1997; Yang *et al.*, 1999; Koike *et al.*, 2001). While understory seedlings may benefit modestly from higher CO₂ concentrations near the ground during some parts of the day (e.g., 6% of C fixation from recently respired CO₂, Brooks *et al.*, 1997), gradients in CO₂ concentrations likely have little effect on energy balance and metabolism of trees across the vertical gradient (Brooks *et al.*, 1997).

Relative humidity (RH) tends to be higher in the understory and decreases with height, although this trend is absent in open forests (Fig. 2f, Supporting Information Figure S1, Jucker *et al.*, 2018; Bin *et al.*, 2022). Dense-canopy forests maintain higher daily maximum RH in the understory than open forests and nearby open areas, an effect that is greater in wetter conditions, and warmer months (von Arx *et al.*, 2012; Hanberry *et al.*, 2020). In combination with T_{air} and T_{leaf} , RH determines leaf-to-air vapor pressure deficit (VPD) – the driving force of water loss from leaves – which tends to be greater in the upper canopy and canopy gaps than in the understory (Niinemets & Valladares, 2004; Tymen *et al.*, 2017; Fauset *et al.*, 2018). Especially when canopy height and leaf area index (LAI) are large, maximum T_{air} and VPD are reduced in the understory (Jucker *et al.*, 2018). The implication is that upper canopy leaves have higher g_b and associated potential for water and heat loss (sections 2, 4.1).

1.5 Air temperature

Vertical gradients in air temperature (T_{air}) vary widely (Fig. 2, Supporting Information Figure S1), depending on factors such as vegetation type, local topography, vertical air mixing, cloud cover, sensible heat emissions, and times of day and year (Zellweger *et al.*, 2019; De Frenne *et al.*, 2021). Commonly, attenuation of radiation and vertical transport of sensible heat by the canopy buffers the lower canopy and understory from large diel and seasonal swings in air temperature (Zellweger *et al.*, 2019; De Frenne *et al.*, 2021; Haesen *et al.*, 2021). Diel temperature range is typically smaller beneath dense canopies than above, resulting from lower maximum daytime T_{air} and warmer nighttime minimum T_{air} than beneath open canopies or in nearby clearings (von Arx *et al.*, 2012; De Frenne *et al.*, 2021; Zellweger *et al.*, 2019). Notably, buffering against high maximum daytime T_{air}

becomes weaker and can be reversed as canopies become more open (Supporting Information Figure S1, Curtis *et al.*, 2019; Meeussen *et al.*, 2021). Analogous to a ‘canopy greenhouse effect’, in open forests, below-canopy maximum T_{air} can be warmer than canopy T_{air} , due to turbulent air mixing and interception of thermal radiative flux from the soil and the canopy by lower-canopy layers (e.g., OSBS, Fig. 2g, Supporting Information Figure S1b; Banerjee *et al.*, 2017; Curtis *et al.*, 2019; Muller *et al.*, 2021). These usually-modest gradients in T_{air} combine with the above-described gradients in micrometeorological conditions to shape T_{leaf} patterns within canopies.

2. Leaf temperature

T_{leaf} is strongly tied to, and usually within a few degrees of, T_{air} (Rey-Sánchez *et al.*, 2016; Drake *et al.*, 2020), but can be substantially warmer or cooler under certain conditions (Note S1, Doughty & Goulden, 2008; Vogel, 2009; Rey-Sánchez *et al.*, 2016). Deviation of T_{leaf} from T_{air} is influenced by other micrometeorological drivers and by leaf traits and stomatal conductance (g_s ; Fig. 3; Note S1), all of which vary across forest vertical gradients (Fig. 1). High radiation in the upper canopy implies that upper canopy leaves often have higher $T_{leaf} - T_{air}$, and thus are often warmer than understory leaves (Fig. 3a). However, higher wind speeds reduce $T_{leaf} - T_{air}$ (Fig. 3b, Niinemets & Valladares, 2004; Bonan, 2016). In addition, adaptive leaf traits that increase g_s and g_b , such as small size and high stomatal density (Note S1; sections 3, 4.1), mediate the direct effects of solar radiation on upper canopy leaves and result in higher rates of heat loss (Fig. 3b-e). In contrast, in the lower canopy, greater RH (reduced VPD) and lower wind speeds (reduced g_b) may limit leaf cooling via latent heat flux, increasing T_{leaf} (Tibbitts, 1979; Perez & Feeley, 2018). Leaves in these normally-shaded locations can experience rapid light and temperature surges during sunflecks (>10 °C, Way & Pearcy, 2012).




Figure 3. Theoretical expectations for variation in the difference between leaf and air temperatures, $T_{\text{Leaf}} - T_{\text{air}}$, in response to (a) shortwave radiation, (b) wind speed, (c) relative humidity, (d) leaf characteristic dimension, and (e) stomatal conductance. Leaf temperatures were modeled using the *tealeaves* R package of Muir (2019) parameterized to represent a broadleaf species (*Quercus rubra* L.) in a mesic temperate forest (Harvard Forest, Massachusetts, USA) under hypothetical moist and drought conditions, as detailed in Supplementary Information Methods S2. In each scenario, the independent variable was allowed to vary while other parameters were held constant at the values given in the table of biophysical constants. Dots along each line correspond to the biophysical constant assigned for the independent variable in the other scenarios, and therefore represent the modeled value for $T_{\text{Leaf}} - T_{\text{air}}$ with all parameters set to the biophysical constants given in the table. Biophysical constants in the table include: shortwave radiation (swr), wind speed (ws), relative humidity (rh), leaf characteristic dimension (lcd), stomatal conductance (gs), air temperature (tair).

Elevation of T_{leaf} above T_{air} varies with micrometeorological conditions. During drought (hot and dry, with higher-than-average solar radiation), when g_s is limiting, $T_{\text{leaf}} - T_{\text{air}}$ will tend to be higher in the upper canopy compared to the understory (Fig. 3). This is because sun leaves are exposed to higher irradiance and VPD, and therefore have stronger g_s limitation than shade leaves (Fig. 3e, Leigh *et al.*, 2017; Fauset *et al.*, 2018). In contrast,

under conditions conducive to stomatal opening, higher wind speeds and g_b enable cooling in the upper canopy, whereas lower wind and g_b in the understory limit evaporative cooling (Fig. 3b,d, Roberts *et al.*, 1990; Martin *et al.*, 1999; Leigh *et al.*, 2017). Thus, while understory and within-canopy shade leaves can remain cooler under lower radiation, their environment is less conducive to dissipating excess heat compared to upper-canopy leaves. Limitations in heat dissipation in shade leaves, together with physiological propensities, may cause above-optimal T_{leaf} under slight heat or drought stress or during sunflecks (Schymanski *et al.*, 2013; Leigh *et al.*, 2017; Song *et al.*, 2020). In addition to lower wind speeds, higher RH (lower VPD) in the understory and inner canopy also inhibits evaporative cooling, thus increasing $T_{leaf} - T_{air}$ (Fig. 3c, Tibbitts, 1979; Dietz *et al.*, 2007; Perez & Feeley, 2018; Song *et al.*, 2020; Konrad *et al.*, 2021).

Vertical T_{leaf} gradients also vary with canopy structure (Fig. 2h, Supporting Information Figure S1). Forests with closed canopies and high LAI, including tropical and temperate broadleaf forests, act as a parasol, absorbing most incoming radiation and preventing vertical air mixing in the understory. Therefore, in these forests, leaves in the upper canopy can experience greater $T_{leaf} - T_{air}$ and higher maximum T_{leaf} than lower-canopy leaves, in some cases exceeding photosynthetic temperature optima (T_{opt}) because of g_s limitation and high radiation (Carter *et al.*, 2021; Doughty & Goulden, 2008; Mau *et al.*, 2018; Miller *et al.*, 2021). In contrast, open canopies with lower LAI allow more vertical air mixing and sunlight into the understory, which can either neutralize a T_{leaf} gradient or elevate $T_{leaf} - T_{air}$ at lower heights relative to the upper canopy (Martin *et al.*, 1999; Zweifel *et al.*, 2002; Muller *et al.*, 2021). The latter can result from a combination of still air at lower heights, sunflecks or the ‘canopy greenhouse effect’ (section 1.5), and the tendency for shade leaves to have lower g_s (section 3, Schymanski *et al.*, 2013; Hardwick *et al.*, 2015). Similarly, in very open forests or savannas, trees growing close to the ground can experience greater heat stress in their lower than upper canopies due to heat from the soil increasing T_{leaf} near the ground (Johnston *et al.*, in press; Hadley & Smith, 1987; Curtis *et al.*, 2019). One of the few studies combining drone lidar and thermal data found strong vertical gradients in midday plant temperature with $\sim 5^\circ\text{C}$ cooler temperatures lower in the vertical profile of a

dense subalpine stand in the alpine Eastern Swiss Alps (Webster *et al.*, 2018). However, the opposite trend was observed for a lone tree surrounded by grass in a California open oak woodland, with cooler temperatures at the top of the crown, indicating a strong influence of closed-canopy shading on vertical temperature gradients (Johnston *et al.*, in press).

3. Leaf traits

Anatomical, structural and biochemical leaf traits vary vertically across forest strata (Table 1, Sack *et al.*, 2006; Niinemets *et al.*, 2015a; Chen *et al.*, 2020), shaping vertical profiles of leaf temperature, gas exchange, and thermal sensitivity (Zwieniecki *et al.*, 2004; Michaletz *et al.*, 2015, 2016). Vertical variation in leaf structure and composition has long been recognized, with sun and shade leaf traits distinguished for over a century (Haberlandt, 1914; Salisbury, 1928). Early work attributed differences among leaves to sun versus shade (Wylie, 1951; Vogel, 1968), and this tendency grew given the parallel differences observed for plants grown in sun versus shade (Boardman, 1977; Abrams & Kubiske, 1990). More recent work has extended the focus from light alone to height in the vertical profile, as the latter shapes differences in leaf structure and function that can partially mitigate the effects of gravity and hydraulic pathlength on leaves higher up in the canopy (Koch *et al.*, 2004; Burgess *et al.*, 2006; Sack *et al.*, 2006). For example, leaf mass per area (LMA), photosynthetic capacity (A_{max} per area) and g_s have been observed to increase with height, independently of light (Cavender-Bares & Bazzaz, 2000; Thomas & Winner, 2002; Houter & Pons, 2012; Bin *et al.*, 2022). Thus, leaves develop differently according to the irradiance and hydraulic stress associated with their canopy location, height and evaporative load, with additional potential influences of branch ontogenetic stage (Sack *et al.*, 2006; Niinemets, 2010; Casas *et al.*, 2011; Niinemets *et al.*, 2015b; Keenan & Niinemets, 2016; Chen *et al.*, 2020; Carter *et al.*, 2021; Bin *et al.*, 2022). Plasticity throughout the canopy may emerge when development of new leaves is influenced by information from adjacent mature leaves or apical meristems, including a “memory” of previous conditions in that location, and may also acclimate during and after expansion to the current microclimate (Zwieniecki *et al.*, 2004). Overall, leaf biochemistry, anatomy and structure may be optimized to local conditions (Niinemets, 2007; Lloyd *et al.*, 2010; Hikosaka, 2014; Kitao *et*

al., 2018; Buckley, 2021). However, we lack a a cohesive framework for integrating the many differences in leaf traits throughout the canopy. Rather, much of our understanding of trait coordination is based on the leaf economics spectrum concept developed across diverse species using sun leaves (Wright *et al.*, 2004; Keenan & Niinemets, 2016; Chen *et al.*, 2020). As canopy shade is known to alter these trait relationships (Osnas *et al.*, 2018), further research is needed to characterize trait relationships and responses vertically through the full range of canopy microenvironments.

Across the vertical gradient, traits vary (1) within individuals, across height and light gradients (Zwieniecki *et al.*, 2004; Sack *et al.*, 2006; Bin *et al.*, 2022), (2) across individuals of the same species, often representing an ontogenetic trajectory from the understory to the canopy (Niinemets, 2010; Carter *et al.*, 2021), and (3) among understory and canopy species (Lloyd *et al.*, 2010). Most studies characterizing variation in leaf traits or metabolism examine intraspecific patterns (categories 1 and 2), which are therefore the main focus of this review (Table 1). Generally, the pattern of fundamental trait adaptations to light gradients across forest species is similar to within-species trends (Thomas & Winner, 2002; Rozendaal *et al.*, 2006; Cavaleri *et al.*, 2010; Lloyd *et al.*, 2010; Houter & Pons, 2012; Bin *et al.*, 2022); however, vertical trends vary across trees (Lloyd *et al.*, 2010), and counter-gradient variation can exist (Lusk *et al.*, 2008). Many leaf physiological parameters can be estimated based on foliage height profiles (Cavaleri *et al.*, 2010; Lloyd *et al.*, 2010).

Table 1. Summary of typically observed variation in leaf traits and its thermal sensitivity across the vertical gradient and/or between sun and shade leaves. Studies listed here were compiled using a systematic review process, as described in Supplementary Information Methods S3.

trait	symbol	units	response*	forest type(s) [†]	reference(s) [‡]
Leaf anatomy and morphological traits					
leaf area	<i>LA</i>	cm ²	↓ H	TrB, TeB, BoN	7, 8, 10
			↓ L	TrB, TeB, BoN	7, 8, 3, 10
leaf mass per area (or inverse of specific leaf area)	<i>LMA (or 1/SLA)</i>	g cm ⁻²	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN, BoN	1, 55, 64, 7, 2, 3, 4, 6
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, TeN, BoN	1, 7, 2, 3, 5, 6
leaf thickness		μm	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	15, 11, 2, 13, 16
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, TeN	11, 15, 2, 5
leaf density		g cm ⁻³	↑ H	TeB	2
			↑ L	TrB, TeB	6, 2
			≈ L	TeN	5
pinnate lobation		cm ²	↑ H	TeB	3
			↓ H	TeB	8
			↑ L	TeB	8, 3
leaf packing blade inclination angle (vertical)	<i>φB</i>	n /cm stem °	↑ L	TeN	25, 26
			↑ H	TrB, TeB	21, 22, 23
			↑ L	TrB, TeB	21, 24, 23, 22, 48
trichome density		mm ⁻²	↑ H	TrB	17
			↑ L	TrB, TeB	17, 18, 19, 20
stomatal density	<i>D_{stomata}</i>	mm ⁻²	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	11, 12, 3, 13, 4
			↑ L	TrB, TeB	12, 11, 3
total vein density	<i>VLA</i>	mm mm ⁻²	↑ H	TeB	46
			↑ L	TeB	46, 47
minor vein density	<i>VLA_{min}</i>	mm mm ⁻²	↑ H	TeB	14
			↑ L	TeB	14, 47
upper cuticle thickness	<i>CT</i>	μm	↑ H	TrB, TeN	27, 4
			↑ L	TrB, TeB	27, 28
Leaf optical properties					
PAR absorptance		%	≈ ↑ H	TrB	42, 45
			≈ ↑ L	TrB	42, 45
absorptance efficiency per unit biomass		% g ⁻¹	↓ H	TrB	42, 45
			↓ L	TrB	42, 45
PAR transmittance		%	↓ H	TrB	42, 45
			↓ L	TrB	42, 45
Reflectance		%	≈ H	TrB	42, 45
			↑ H	BoN	6
			≈ L	TrB	42, 45

For Peer Review

346 Table 1, cont.

trait	symbol	units	response*	forest type(s) [†]	reference(s) [‡]
Traits related to metabolic capacity and efficiency					
nitrogen content	<i>N</i>	g m^{-2}	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN, BoN	55, 64, 7, 29, 30, 32, 31, 9
		mg g^{-1}	≈↓ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	55, 15, 7, 29, 30, 32, 34
			≈↓ L	TrB, TeB, TeN	7, 35, 29, 30, 32, 5
phosphorous content	<i>P</i>	g m^{-2}	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	55, 15, 36, 1, 37
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, TeN	15, 5
			≈ L	TrB, TeB	1
		mg g^{-1}	≈↓ H	TrB	55, 15, 35, 1
			≈ L	TrB, TeB	15, 35, 1
chlorophyll content	<i>Chl</i>	mg cm^{-2}	↓ H	TrB, TeB	40, 41
			↓ L	TrB, TeB	42, 41
chlorophyll a/b ratio	<i>chl a/b</i>	mol mol^{-1}	↑ H	TrB, TeB, BoN	42, 30, 6
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, BoN	42, 30, 39, 22, 6
carbon isotope ratio	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$	‰	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	55, 64, 7, 43, 31
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, TeN	7, 29, 31
intercellular CO ₂ concentration	<i>C_i</i>	$\mu\text{mol mol}^{-1}$	↓ H	TeB, BoN	51, 30, 44
			↓ L	TeB	30, 44
Biochemical protection against light and heat damage					
β-carotene and lutein		$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB, BoN	30, 42, 6
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, BoN	30, 38, 6
xanthophyll cycle pigments	<i>VAZ</i>	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB	38, 30, 22
			↑ L	TrB, TeB	39, 30
abundance isoprene emitters		$\%$	↑ H (peak in mid-canopy)	TrB	49
			↑ L	TeB	50
isoprene emission rate	<i>I</i>	$\text{nmol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H (peak in mid-canopy)	TrB	49
			↑ H	TeB	32, 60
			↑ L	TeB	32, 61, 62
monoterpene emission rate	<i>MT</i>	$\mu\text{g m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H (peak in mid-canopy)	TeB	63
Thermal tolerance					
photosynthetic heat tolerance	<i>T</i> ₅₀	°C	↓ H**	TrS	52

347

348

349 Table 1, cont.

trait	symbol	units	response*	forest type(s) [†]	reference(s) [‡]
critical temperature beyond which Fv/Fm declines	T_{crit}	°C	≈↑ L	TrB, TeB	53, 54
			≈↑ L	TrB, TeB	53
Phenology					
bud break		day of year	↓ H	TeB	56
leaf lifespan		months	↓ H	TrB	57
			↓ L		
drought deciduous leaf habit		%	↑ H	TrB	58, 59

351 *Responses across height and light gradients are summarized, with up and down arrows
352 indicating significant increasing or decreasing trends, respectively, in response to height
353 (H) or light (L). ≈ indicates lack of any notable directional variation, and ≈ ↑ or ≈ ↓
354 indicate non-significant or mixed trends (e.g., significant in some but not all species
355 studied).

356 † Forest types are coded as follows: TrB = tropical broadleaf; TeB = temperate broadleaf;
357 TeN = temperate needleleaf (conifer); BoN= boreal needleleaf (conifer).

358 ‡ 1. Mau et al. 2018; 2. Coble and Cavaleri 2014; 3. Sack et al. 2006; 4. Chin and Sillett
359 2019; 5. Wyka et al. 2012; 6. Atherton et al. 2017; 7. Kenzo et al. 2015; 8. Kusi and Karasi
360 2020; 9. Dang et al. 1997; 10. Gebauer et al. 2015; 11. Marengo et al. 2017; 12. Kafuti et
361 al. 2020; 13. Van Wittenberghe et al. 2012; 14. Zhang et al. 2019; 15. Weerasinghe et
362 al. 2014; 16. Oldham et al. 2010; 17. Ichie et al. 2016; 18. Gregoriou et al. 2007; 19. Levizou
363 et al. 2005; 20. Liakoura 1997; 21. Fauset et al. 2018; 22. Niinemets et al. 1998, 23. Ishida et
364 al. 1998; 24. Millen and Clendon 1979; 25. Smith and Carter, 1988; 26. Hadley and Smith
365 1987; 28. Baltzer and Thomas 2005; 29. Coble et al. 2016; 30. Scartazza et al. 2016; 31.
366 Duursma and Marshall, 2006; 32. Harley et al. 1996; 33. Hernandez et al. 2020; 34.
367 Turnbull et al. 2003; 35. Chen et al. 2020; 36. van de Weg et al. 2012; 37. M.A Cavaleri et
368 al. 2008; 38. Koniger et al. 1995; 39. Mastubara et al. 2009; 40. Harris and Medina 2013; 41.
369 Hansen et al. 2001; 42. Poorter et al. 1995; 43. Coble et al. 2016; 44. Niinemets et al. 2004;
370 45. Poorter et al. 2000; 46. Zwieniecki et al. 2004; 47. Sack and Scoffoni, 2013; 48. Ball et al.,
371 1988; 49. Taylor et al. 2021; 50. Niinemets et al. 2010; 51. Brooks et al. 1997; 52. Curtis et
372 al. 2019; 53. Slot et al. 2019; 54. Hamerlynck and Knapp 1994; 55. Lloyd et al. 2010; 56.

373 Augspurger and Bartlett, 2003; 57. Osada et al. 2001; 58. Meakem et al. 2018; 59. Condit et
374 al. 2000; 60. Harley et al. 1997; 61. Niinemets and Sun, 2014; 62. Sharkey and Monson,
375 2014; 63. Simpraga et al. 2013; 64. Domingues et al. 2005

376

For Peer Review

3.1 Leaf anatomy and morphology

Sun leaves have anatomical, morphological, and physiological traits that reduce T_{leaf} through higher conductance (g_b or maximal g_s) and/or reflectance (Table 1). Thus, sun leaves are generally smaller and thicker, with higher LMA, and are more deeply lobed (Fig. 3, Vogel, 1968; Zwieniecki *et al.*, 2004; Sack *et al.*, 2006; Leigh *et al.*, 2017), but with greater leaf packing and clumping (which reduces g_b). Steeper leaf angles reduce mid-day radiation loads and thereby decrease $T_{leaf} - T_{air}$ (Ball *et al.*, 1988; Niinemets, 1998), while higher trichome density increases reflectance, also decreasing radiation load. Further, sun leaves tend to have higher stomatal and vein densities, which facilitate evaporative cooling by enabling higher g_s (section 4.1, Zwieniecki *et al.*, 2004). Yet sun leaves also have adaptations to limit water stress, particularly in drier climates, including greater cuticle thickness and higher trichome density (which may reduce or increase g_b , Schreuder *et al.*, 2001; Ichie *et al.*, 2016). In contrast, shade leaves have traits that maximize light capture (e.g., lower LMA and greater light absorptance per unit biomass), but larger leaves and lower transpiration make them more prone to overheating than sun leaves (Casas *et al.*, 2011; Schymanski *et al.*, 2013; Leigh *et al.*, 2017). In open canopies, where light is comparatively homogeneous, leaf traits may be shaped more by maximum T_{air} and VPD stress than by light (Mediavilla *et al.*, 2019).

3.2. Leaf optical properties

Leaf optical properties are influenced by anatomical, morphological, and biochemical traits that vary throughout the canopy (sections 3.1, 3.3). High in the canopy, high light absorptance can lead to photoinhibition and would be in part be mitigated by T_{leaf} regulation (sections 3.4, 3.5; Table 1). For leaves in higher light environments, light absorptance and thus heat load can be reduced by leaf surface modifications (e.g., trichomes, cuticle) that increase reflectance, and heat may be dissipated biochemically by carotenoids, including xanthophylls (Table 1, Lee *et al.*, 1990; Knapp & Carter, 1998). Further, sun leaves tend to be thicker, with more palisade layers, which act as “light pipes” that channel abundant light into deeper cell layers, enhancing photosynthetic capacity (Lee

et al., 1990; Poorter *et al.*, 1995). In contrast, shade leaves have lower LMA and absorb more light per unit mass investment, as well as denser chloroplasts layers and a greater proportion of spongy mesophyll, more effective for capturing diffuse light (Table 1, Lee *et al.*, 1990; Poorter *et al.*, 1995, 2000).

3.3. Metabolic capacity and efficiency

Most leaf biochemical traits also vary across light and height gradients (Table 1), both shaping and resulting from gradients in metabolism (section 4). Sun leaves have higher area-based concentrations of elements like nitrogen (N_{area}) and phosphorus (P_{area}) that are critical for respiration (Meir *et al.*, 2001; Weerasinghe *et al.*, 2014) and photosynthesis (Niinemets & Valladares, 2004; Weerasinghe *et al.*, 2014; Scartazza *et al.*, 2016). Increases in chlorophyll a/b ratios with height reflect greater light availability in the upper canopy, while greater chlorophyll concentrations at lower heights increase PAR absorptance efficiency of shade leaves (Table 1). Higher photosynthetic rates (area-based) and more frequent stomatal closure in sun exposed canopies (section 4), reduce intercellular CO₂ concentrations and increase leaf $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (Table 1).

3.4. Biochemical protection against foliage light and heat damage

Biochemical protection against light and heat damage increases with peak radiation loads and thus tends to be higher in the upper canopy, which is subject to higher T_{leaf} and hydraulic limitations, than in the understory (Table 1). More frequent stomatal closure in upper canopy leaves (section 4) reduces their capacity to use light energy for photochemistry, thereby requiring a high capacity to dissipate excess light energy and protect against photoinhibition (Niinemets, 2007). Accumulation of excess light energy causes overreduction of the electron transport chain and the formation of harmful reactive oxygen species (Niyogi, 2000; Suzuki & Mittler, 2006). A ubiquitous defense is a rapidly inducible non-photochemical quenching (NPQ) mechanism that responds to the increased thylakoid pH gradient caused by excess light (Niyogi, 2000; Goss & Lepetit, 2015). This form of NPQ entails interconversion of xanthophyll cycle pigments—violaxanthin, antheraxanthin, and zeaxanthin (VAZ)—which regulates the capacity for de-excitation of

chlorophyll through thermal dissipation instead of photochemistry. Leaves in higher light environments show a greater capacity for NPQ and higher concentrations of VAZ as well as other carotenoids (e.g., beta carotene and lutein) employed as antioxidant defenses (Table 1, Niinemets *et al.*, 1998; García-Plazaola *et al.*, 2004; Scartazza *et al.*, 2016). In contrast, to maximize photosynthesis and minimize damage during T_{leaf} surges caused by sunflecks (section 2), shade-acclimated leaves tend to induce photochemical processes more quickly (Urban *et al.*, 2007), and also show a steeper response of NPQ to light than sun-acclimated upper canopy leaves (Scartazza *et al.*, 2016).

Heat-sensitive, light-dependent (photosynthetically linked) emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), including isoprene and monoterpenes, enhances photosynthetic thermal tolerance by regulating antioxidant defenses and other metabolic processes (Copolovici *et al.*, 2005; Sharkey *et al.*, 2008; Vickers *et al.*, 2009; Riedlmeier *et al.*, 2017; Taylor *et al.*, 2019; Monson *et al.*, 2021). In contrast to VOCs stored in oils that are released passively by heat and wounding, such as the monoterpenes responsible for pine scent, light-dependent emissions are linked to photosynthetic substrate supply and are dynamically tuned to environmental and metabolic conditions as a component of metabolic regulatory processes (Laothawornkitkul *et al.*, 2009; Riedlmeier *et al.*, 2017; Lantz *et al.*, 2019; Monson *et al.*, 2021). Due to its much higher emission rate and relative ease of detectability, isoprene has received far more study in the field, though both isoprene and monoterpenes are expressed by many angiosperms and gymnosperms across all biomes (see Taylor *et al.*, 2021 and references therein).

Fewer than half of tree species express significant light-dependent isoprene emissions (Taylor *et al.*, 2018; Kesselmeier & Staudt), such that vertical variation in emissions is influenced by both vertical variation in species compositions and plasticity in emission rate capacities (Taylor *et al.*, 2021). Within species, isoprene emission tends to increase toward brighter and hotter microenvironments (Niinemets, 2007), and across landscapes, emitting species are more abundant in hotter climates, exceeding half of trees in warm tropical forests (Taylor *et al.*, 2018). However, a recent study found a contrasting interspecific vertical structuring of emission capacities, with more emitting species and higher species-maximum emission rates in the mid-canopy of an Amazonian forest (Table 1, Taylor *et al.*,

2021). Similarly, within European beech crowns, monoterpene emissions were highest in semi-shaded leaves beneath the canopy surface (Table 1, Šimpraga *et al.*, 2013). This pattern may indicate the importance of temporal variability in thermal conditions as distinct from the long-term average. Temperature-sensitive VOC emissions have been hypothesized to enable real-time acclimation to rapidly changing leaf thermal environments typical of the mid-canopy region (section 1, Sharkey *et al.*, 2008). Future work to understand how temporal dynamics of T_{leaf} vary with height and influence leaf function will be important for resolving the role of VOCs in forest thermal sensitivity across the vertical gradient. Given current understanding, we may hypothesize that light-dependent VOC emissions are important for mid-canopy thermal responses, while other traits play similar roles in upper-canopy leaves.

3.5. Thermal tolerance

Very high T_{leaf} ($\sim 40\text{--}60^\circ\text{C}$) irreversibly damages photosystem II, leading to leaf necrosis and death (Kunert, in press; Baker, 2008; Feeley *et al.*, 2020). Upper thermal thresholds for leaf survival can be approximated by assessing the photosystem II functioning via using chlorophyll fluorescence techniques (Krause *et al.*, 2010). Thermal tolerance is described in terms of the T_{leaf} s at which photosystem II efficiency starts to decrease (T_{crit}) is reduced by 50%, T_{50} (e.g., Slot *et al.*, 2021a). Thermal tolerances vary across species, being more closely linked to leaf traits than phylogeny (Feeley *et al.*, 2020; Slot *et al.*, 2021a), and being greater in leaves that experience higher maximum temperatures (Perez & Feeley, 2020). T_{50} and T_{crit} decrease across increasing latitudes, and with elevation among tropical forests (O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2017; Feeley *et al.*, 2020; Slot *et al.*, 2021a). However, they appear more closely adapted to microclimate than macroclimate (Feeley *et al.*, 2020; Slot *et al.*, 2021a).

Thermal tolerance is hypothesized to be greatest for the leaves with the greatest radiation loads and highest temperatures along the vertical gradient. Indeed, considering sun and shade leaf differences across the vertical profile of a closed-canopy forest in Panama, T_{50} was $0.7\text{--}1.4^\circ\text{C}$ lower for shade than sun leaves for two of three tree species (Table 1, Slot *et al.*, 2019). Similarly, within a very open canopy in *Acacia papyrocarpa* canopy, T_{50} was

highest (*albiet* by $<1^{\circ}\text{C}$) in the lower, north-facing leaves, which faced the greatest composite climate stress (low wind speed, greater radiation and T_{air} , and lower rates of heat dissipation) (Table 1, Curtis *et al.*, 2019). These modest differences in T_{50} coupled with larger differences in T_{leaf} across thermal microenvironments imply that more thermally tolerant sun leaves tend to operate closer to their thermal limits and could therefore be more vulnerable to heat anomalies (Perez & Feeley, 2020). However, not enough studies have evaluated thermal tolerances across vertical gradients to make robust inferences.

3.6. Leaf phenology

Leaf phenology influences the vertical structure of microenvironments, T_{leaf} , and forest photosynthetic capacity (Rey-Sánchez *et al.*, 2016). In deciduous forests, the timing and extent of seasonal leaf gain and loss is structured across the vertical profile. In temperate climates, seasonal warming occurs earlier in the sheltered understory, facilitating earlier spring bud-break compared to the cooler upper canopy (Augspurger & Bartlett, 2003). Early leaf-out gives saplings and seedlings a window for disproportionately high photosynthesis – contributing the majority of annual carbon fixation for some seedlings – before canopy foliage and reduces light availability (Augspurger & Bartlett, 2003; Lee & Ibáñez, 2021). Within tropical dry-season-deciduous species, the fraction of seasonally deciduous individuals is greater in larger trees in hotter, brighter environments, with understory individuals typically remaining evergreen (Condit *et al.*, 2000). Similarly, fractions of deciduous species increase with tree size class (Condit *et al.*, 2000; Meakem *et al.*, 2018). Even in evergreen tropical forests, seasonal variation in leaf quantities follows distinct vertical patterns throughout the vertical profile depending on height and light environments (Tang & Dubayah, 2017; Smith *et al.*, 2019; Nunes *et al.*, 2022). For instance, in a central Amazonian forest, the upper canopies of both interior and edge forests shed leaves when maximum daily T_{air} exceeded $\sim 35^{\circ}\text{C}$ (Nunes *et al.*, 2022). In evergreen forests, leaf turnover is faster in the upper canopy than the understory (Osada *et al.*, 2001), and as a result upper canopy leaves are, on average, younger than shade leaves. Leaf age distributions affect forest photosynthetic capacity (Wu *et al.*, 2016; Niinemets, 2016) and stress tolerance via age specific leaf function (Kikuzawa & Lechowicz, 2006; Albert *et al.*,

2018; Zhou *et al.*, 2015). Leaf phenology thereby both responds to and influences the vertical structure of forest microenvironments and function.

4. Leaf gas exchange and its thermal sensitivity

Leaf gas exchange is strongly shaped by environmental drivers, T_{leaf} , and traits, all of which vary across vertical forest gradients (sections 1-3), Fig. 1). However, as we detail below, few studies have evaluated how temperature responses of leaf metabolic rates are shaped by the varying environmental conditions across vertical forest gradients (Table 2).

For Peer Review

Table 2. Summary of observed variation in Leaf gas exchange and its thermal sensitivity across the vertical gradient and/or between sun and shade leaves. Studies listed here were compiled using a systematic review process, as described in Supplementary Information Methods S3.

trait	symbol	units	response*	forest type(s) [†]	reference(s) [‡]
Conductance					
boundary-layer conductance	g_b	$\text{mmol}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB	3
		mm s^{-1}	↑ H	TeN	12
			≈ L	TeN	12
leaf hydraulic conductance	K_{leaf}	$\text{m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ MPa}^{-1}$	↑ L	TeB	40
cuticle conductance	g_{min}	$\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	↑ L	TrB	41
max stomatal conductance	$g_{s \text{ max}}$	$\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB, BoN	1, 2, 4
stomatal conductance limitation	g_s	$\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	↑ L	TrB, TeB, TeN, BoN	8, 9, 10, 7, 4
			↑ H	TrB, TeN	9, 39, 5, 6, 7
stomatal conductance at optimal temperature	$g_s \text{ at } T_{opt}$	$\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	↑ L	TrB, TeN	9, 39, 7
			≈↑ H	TeB	11
			↓ H	TrB	39
			≈↑ L	TrB	8
Photosynthesis					
maximum photosynthetic capacity	A_{max}	$\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB, BoN	14, 11, 15, 4
			≈↓ H	TeB	16
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, TeN, BoN	14, 17, 18, 19, 10, 4
		$\text{nmol g}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$	≈ H	TrB	20, 21
			≈ L	TrB, TeB, TeN	20, 21, 19
			↑ H	TrB, TeB	22, 23
maximum light-saturated net photosynthesis	A_{sat}	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$			
A _{sat} at optimum temperature	A_{opt}	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	↑ L	TrB, TeB	8, 23
			≈↑ H	TrB, TeB	13, 11
			↑ H	TrB	39
			↑ L	TrB	8, 13

534 Table 2, cont.

trait	symbol	units	response*	forest type(s) [†]	reference(s) [‡]
optimum temperature for photosynthesis	T_{opt}	°C	≈ H	TrB, TeB	24, 11, 13
			↓ H	TrB	39
			≈ L	TrB, TeB	9, 8, 11
photosynthetic light compensation point	LCP	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	25, 16
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, TeN	8, 17, 16
maximal carboxylation rate	V_{cmax}	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB	2, 42, 23, 14
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, BoN	9, 42, 23, 14, 10
		$\text{nmol g}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	≈ H	TrB, TeB	2, 23
			≈ L	TrB, TeB	2, 23
		$\text{nmol CO}_2 \text{g}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	≈ ↓ L	TeB	26
optimum temperature for V_{cmax}	$V_{cmax}(T_{opt})$	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	≈ ↑ H	TeB	11
			≈ L	TrB	9
electron transport rate	J_{max}	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB	2, 42, 39, 23, 14
			↑ L	TrB, TeB	9, 42, 23, 27, 14
		$\text{nmol g}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	≈ H	TrB, TeB	2, 23
			≈ L	TrB, TeB	2, 23
		$\text{nmol e}^{-1} \text{g}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	≈ ↓ L	TeB	26
optimal temperature of J_{max}	T_{optETR}	°C	↓ H	TrB	39
	$J_{max}(T_{opt})$	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	≈ L	TrB	9
high-temperature CO_2 compensation point	T_{max}	°C	≈ H	TrB	22
			≈ L	TrB	8
Respiration					
respiration rate at 25 °C	R	$\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	39, 31, 32, 33
		$\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{kg}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	≈ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	31, 32
			↑ L	TrB, TeN	31, 33,
light respiration	R_L	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB	22
			↑ L	TrB	22

535

536

537 Table 2, cont.

trait	symbol	units	response*	forest type(s) [†]	reference(s) [‡]
dark respiration	R_{dark}	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB, BoN	22, 14, 34, 23, 38
			↑ L	TrB, TeB, TeN, BoN	22, 14, 23, 17, 10, 38
		$\text{nmol g}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	≈ ↑ H	TrB	2, 35
			≈ L	TrB	2, 35
R_{dark} at reference T	R_{dark} at reference T	$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	22, 14, 34, 32
temperature sensitivity of R_{dark}	Q_{10}	$\mu\text{mol (kg leaf)}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	22, 14, 34, 32
		$\mu\text{mol (kg N)}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ H	TeB, TeN	34, 32
		$\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$	↑ L	TrB, TeB	22, 8, 34.
		$^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$	≈ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	22, 39, 34, 33
			≈ ↑ H	TeB, TeN	36, 32
			≈ ↓ L	TrB, TeB, TeN	22, 34, 33
activation energy of R_{dark}	E_0	$\text{kJ mol}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$	↑ L	TeB	36
			≈ H	TrB, TeB, TeN	22, 37, 32
			≈ L	TrB	22, 8

539 *Responses across height and light gradients are summarized, with up and down arrows
540 indicating significant increasing or decreasing trends, respectively, in response to height
541 (H) or light (L). ≈ indicates lack of any notable directional variation, and ≈ ↑ or ≈ ↓
542 indicate non-significant or mixed trends (e.g., significant in some but not all species
543 studied).

544 † Forest types are coded as follows: TrB = tropical broadleaf; TeB = temperate broadleaf;
545 TeN = temperate needleleaf (conifer); BoN= boreal needleleaf (conifer).

546 ‡ 1. Kafuti et al. 2020; 2. Van Wittenberghe et al. 2012; 3. Roberts et al. 1990; 4. Dang et
547 al. 1997; 5. Marengo et al. 2017; 6. Ambrose et al. 2015; 7. Zweifel et al. 2001; 8. Slot et
548 al. 2019; 9. Hernandez et al. 2020; 10. Urban et al. 2007; 11. Carter and Cavaleri 2018; 12.
549 Martin et al. 1999; 13. Mau et al. 2018; 14. Kosugi et al. 2012; 15. Niinemets et al. 2015; 16.
550 Bachofen et al. 2020; 17. Hamerlynck and Knapp 1994; 18. Coble et al. 2017; 19. Wyka et
551 al. 2012; 20. Rijkerse et al. 2000; 21. Ishida et al. 1999; 22. Weerasinghe et al. 2014; 23.
552 Scartazza et al. 2016; 24. Miller et al. 2021; 25. Harris and Medina 2013; 26. Legner et

al. 2014; 27. Kitao et al. 2012; 28. Fauset et al. 2018; 29. Rey-Sanchez et al. 2016; 30. Muller et al. 2021; 31. Mier et al. 2001; 32. Turnbull et al. 2003; 33. Araki et al. 2017; 34. Bolstad et al. 1999; 35. Kenzo et al. 2015; 36. Harley et al. 1996; 37. Xu and Griffin 2006; 38. Atherton et al. 2017; 39. Carter et al. 2021; 40. Sack et al. 2003; 41. Slot et al. 2021; 42. Carswell et al. 2000

** composite climatic stress variable integrating temperature, vapour pressure deficit, and relative humidity is higher in lower canopy

4.1. Conductance

Leaf hydraulic, stomatal and boundary layer conductances are all critical for regulating T_{leaf} via latent heat loss (Fig. 3). Due to higher wind, lower RH, and smaller leaf sizes in the upper canopy (Fig. 2, Table 1), g_b increases with height (Table 2). Maximum g_s increases with light – typically tracking photosynthetic capacity (Wong *et al.*, 1979) – and is thus higher in the sun-exposed upper canopy than in sub-canopy or understory leaves (Table 2). However, water supply cannot meet the demands caused by the high radiation and g_b in sun leaves with fully open stomata, in part because of height-related constraints on water transport (e.g. Yoder *et al.*, 1994; Koch *et al.*, 2004; Sillett *et al.*, 2010) and/or increased leaf-air VPD caused by leaf warming in sunlit canopy locations (Buckley *et al.*, 2014). These constraints tend to reduce leaf water potential, making midday stomatal depression more prevalent in sun leaves than shade leaves in closed-canopy forests (Table 2), which drives the lower intracellular CO_2 and $\delta^{13}C$ (section 3.3, Table 1). Stomatal depression reduces transpirational cooling (Fig. 3e), thus amplifying the warming of sun leaves by high radiation (Koch *et al.*, 1994; Zwieniecki *et al.*, 2004; Kosugi & Matsuo, 2006; Sanches *et al.*, 2010). The temperature at which g_s is greatest, T_{opt} of g_s , did not differ significantly between sun and shade leaves in three tropical tree species (Slot *et al.*, 2019), but sun leaves in the upper canopy show a stronger decrease in g_s in response to rising T_{air} (driven by increased VPD) than lower-canopy shade leaves (Hernández *et al.*, 2020; Carter *et al.*, 2021). This, added to the tendency for sun leaves to have higher T_{leaf} , implies that high T_{air} should decrease g_s of upper canopy leaves more than understory leaves, particularly when water availability is limited.

4.2. Photosynthesis

Photosynthetic capacity is generally higher in exposed canopy positions – a fact that is both predicted by optimization theory (Field, 1983; Hirose & Werger, 1987) and observed in numerous field studies (Table 2).

Temperature can affect photosynthesis directly, by altering photosynthetic enzyme activity and the electron transport chain, and indirectly, by increasing VPD and closing stomata (Lloyd & Farquhar, 2008). Photosynthesis has a peaked response to T_{air} , with the optimum commonly corresponding to the prevalent ambient growing season temperature (Doughty & Goulden, 2008; Slot & Winter, 2017; Tan *et al.*, 2017). Beyond the optimum, photosynthesis decreases due to stomatal closure (Slot & Winter, 2017; Grossiord *et al.*, 2020; Smith *et al.*, 2020) and biochemical constraints (Kumarathunge *et al.*, 2019; Sharkey, 2005; Vårhammar *et al.*, 2015).

We have very little evidence about how the temperature sensitivity of photosynthesis compares between sun and shade leaves, and existing studies, which compare sun and shade leaves of the same trees, reveal no pronounced overall trend with height in photosynthetic temperature optima (Table 2). Based on consistent positive relationships between growth temperature and optimum temperature of photosynthesis (T_{opt}) across sites and seasons (e.g. Tan *et al.*, 2017; Kumarathunge *et al.*, 2019), one might expect sun leaves to have a stronger temperature-dependence and higher T_{opt} than shade leaves (Campbell & Norman, 1998; Niinemets *et al.*, 1999; Niinemets & Valladares, 2004). However, such a trend is not apparent among recent studies, where for three species in Panama, T_{opt} for sun leaves tended to be moderately, but not significantly, higher than that of shade leaves (Slot *et al.*, 2019; Hernández *et al.*, 2020). Similarly, T_{opt} of RuBP carboxylation (V_{cmax}) and regeneration rates (J_{max}) did not differ systematically between tropical sun and shade leaves (Hernández *et al.*, 2020), nor within-canopies of tropical and temperate trees (Mau *et al.*, 2018; Miller *et al.*, 2021). In contrast, tropical experimental warming observations showed that T_{opt} , and T_{opt} of J_{max} decrease from the understory to the top of the canopy, potentially linked to greater thermal sensitivity of g_s in upper canopy leaves (Carter *et al.*, 2021). The observed lack of sun-shade differences in T_{opt} may reflect

acclimation to similar temperatures of peak photosynthesis (Hernández *et al.*, 2020). Sun leaves experience higher temperatures, but maximum temperatures are associated with conditions of midday stomatal depression, and acclimation to optimize photosynthesis at these temperatures would not be advantageous. Shade leaves that do not experience midday depression continue to fix carbon even when afternoon air temperatures peak (Miller *et al.*, 2021). Evaluating this would require diurnal monitoring of net photosynthesis across a forest vertical profile. In the meantime, it remains unresolved whether photosynthesis is more affected by high temperatures in upper canopy or understory leaves, and how this might vary across forest types and environmental conditions.

4.3. Respiration

Similar to photosynthesis, respiration tends to be higher in upper-canopy sun leaves, but its temperature sensitivity (Q_{10} or E_0) shows no definite trend along the vertical gradient. Specifically, the temperature sensitivity of respiration can be constant within vertical profiles and in seedling sun vs. shade leaves, greater in upper-canopy leaves, or greater in the lower canopy (Table 2). This variation may be attributable to forest type, leaf traits and age (e.g., greater Q_{10} in younger leaves, Zhou *et al.*, 2015), or acclimation to high temperature that decreases Q_{10} (Slot & Kitajima, 2015; Carter *et al.*, 2021). Overall, however, we currently lack mechanistic understanding of how and why the temperature sensitivity of respiration varies across the forest vertical profile.

5. Tree and ecosystem ecology

Differences across forest vertical gradients in biophysical conditions, plant traits, and metabolism scale up to affect ecological rates and their temperature responses at tree and ecosystem levels (Fig. 1).

5.1. Tree metabolism, growth, and survival

Tree metabolism and growth are shaped by crown location in the vertical gradient. Tree height, crown volume, and foliage biomass all scale with diameter at breast height (DBH),

which strongly predicts tree transpiration (Meinzer *et al.*, 2001; Anderson-Teixeira *et al.*, 2015; Kunert *et al.*, 2017) photosynthesis, and intra-canopy trait variation (Bin *et al.*, 2022). Specifically, increases are linked to greater leaf area and the increasing probability that the crown is in the canopy (Muller-Landau *et al.*, 2006), where leaves receive more light and have higher leaf area-specific photosynthesis (Table 2). Photosynthate production is allocated among functions including respiration, aboveground woody growth, foliar turnover, root growth and allocation to root-associated microorganisms, reproduction, defense, and storage of non-structural carbohydrates (NSCs). Among these, the best-studied process is aboveground woody growth, which consumes only a modest fraction of total photosynthate ($\sim 1/6$ on the ecosystem level, Anderson-Teixeira *et al.*, 2021) but is disproportionately important to long-term forest dynamics and carbon cycling because woody tissues have a long residence time in the ecosystem (Russell *et al.*, 2014). Radial stem growth may increase or decrease over time as trees grow in DBH depending on the light environment (Anderson-Teixeira *et al.*, 2022). In open forests and for open-growth individual trees, growth rate declines with DBH, whereas growth rate consistently increases with DBH for trees established in the understory of a closed-canopy forest (Muller-Landau *et al.*, 2006; Anderson-Teixeira *et al.*, 2015, 2022). This points to a dominant role of vertical profiles in the biophysical environment, particularly light, in shaping tree growth rates within forests.

Vertical gradients also affect the climate sensitivity of metabolism and growth. Stomatal conductance can be strongly limited by high VPD even when soil water is plentiful (Corlett, 2011; Ruehr *et al.*, 2016; Novick *et al.*, 2016). Therefore, periods of high VPD, whether on time scales of hours, days, or seasons, tend to reduce transpiration and photosynthesis more in tall trees that occupy canopy positions in closed-canopy forests (Christoffersen *et al.*, 2016; Garcia *et al.*, 2021). This is consistent with observations that both dry season leaf loss (section 3.6, Table 1) and g_s limitation (section 4.1, Table 2) increase with height across the vertical profile. More active regulation of transpiration by tall canopy trees (e.g., Mediavilla & Escudero, 2004) – often combined with greater effective rooting depth – may offset greater xylem embolism risk (Olson *et al.*, 2018; Chitra-Tarak *et al.*, 2021; Garcia *et al.*, 2021) and reduce the need to adjust carbon metabolism traits during drought

(Bartholomew *et al.*, 2020). This reduces carbon isotope discrimination, indicative of greater g_s limitation, with increasing tree height (Table 1, McDowell *et al.*, 2011).

In turn, the drought sensitivity of woody growth tends to be greater in upper-canopy trees than in smaller trees with less exposed crowns. Dendrochronologists generally agree that tree ring records of large, exposed trees are best suited for climate reconstructions because their annual growth is most sensitive to interannual climate variation (Fritts, 1976). However, few studies have directly examined drought- or temperature-sensitivities as a function of tree size. Most have found greater sensitivity to low precipitation or seasonally high temperatures among larger, more exposed trees (Fig. 4, Trouillier *et al.*, 2018; Gillerot *et al.*, 2020; McGregor *et al.*, 2021; Anderson-Teixeira *et al.*, 2022; Heilman *et al.*, 2022), corroborating evidence from global forest censuses that drought reduces growth more in large trees (Bennett *et al.*, 2015). Drought also causes greater mortality in larger trees (Bennett *et al.*, 2015; Stovall *et al.*, 2019). Mechanistically, this is likely driven in part by larger trees having their crowns in microenvironments that are more challenging during drought (Figs. 1 - 3, Scharnweber *et al.*, 2019), yet height itself also creates disadvantages (Couvreur *et al.*, 2018; Olson *et al.*, 2018). Indeed, despite the potential for shorter trees in open forests to experience greater environmental stress (Curtis *et al.*, 2019), greater drought sensitivity of larger trees has been observed in open as well as closed-canopy forests (Bennett *et al.*, 2015; Anderson-Teixeira *et al.*, 2022). However, evidence that short trees in young stands can be more drought-sensitive than taller trees in mature forests (Irvine *et al.*, 2004; Wang *et al.*, 2022) reinforces the importance of exposure in shaping drought sensitivity. The relative importance of exposure versus height in shaping drought sensitivity remains to be disentangled.

Although drought sensitivity clearly increases with crown height and hence with DBH, it remains unclear how growth sensitivity to high T_{air} , independent of drought, varies along the vertical gradient. High T_{air} is often associated with high VPD and atmospheric drought, likely explaining negative growth responses to T_{air} – particularly among larger trees – even if soil moisture remains high (Novick *et al.*, 2016), or when precipitation is statistically accounted for (Fig. 4, Anderson-Teixeira *et al.*, 2022). However, under well-watered

697 conditions conducive to high g_s , we do not necessarily expect higher thermal sensitivity of
698 photosynthesis (section 4.2) or woody growth in upper-canopy trees than their understory
699 counterparts. In eight mesic forests across the northeast United States, tree-ring records
700 showed steep growth declines of understory trees at higher T_{air} , contrasting with the
701 responses of canopy trees (Fig 4, Rollinson *et al.*, 2020). Additional research is required to
702 understand the mechanisms underlying these intriguing differences, and to disentangle
703 size-related tree growth responses to hot-wet versus hot-dry conditions.

For Peer Review





Figure 4. Examples of tree-ring analyses showing differential interannual temperature sensitivity of annual growth between large canopy versus smaller understory trees. In column (a), across three sites and species, trees with large diameter at breast height (DBH) had more negative growth responses to high temperatures during the current or previous growing season (denoted by c or p, respectively, on the x axes) than did small trees of the same species. Shown are tree ring width responses to the most influential temperature variable at the site (T_{max} or PET over various seasonal windows, where “c” and “p” represent months in the current and previous year, respectively) for the maximum and minimum tails of the DBH

distribution included in the analysis. Colored lines represent responses to the temperature variable in a model including a DBH - temperature interaction. Other model terms are held constant at their mean. Transparent ribbons indicate 95% confidence intervals. From Anderson-Teixeira *et al.* (2022). In column (b), understory trees of four species had more negative growth responses to high growing season temperatures across eight New England forests. Growth is expressed as relativized basal area increment (BAI), where values $>$ and $<$ 100% indicate higher- or lower- than-average growth, respectively. Again, colored lines indicate modeled mean temperature responses and transparent ribbons indicate 95% confidence intervals. From Rollinson *et al.* (2020).

5.2. C and water flux

Canopy trees account for the majority of forest ecosystem water and carbon cycling. While studies partitioning transpiration across forest vertical gradients are rare, both evapotranspiration (ET) and transpiration have been shown to increase with height in a *Picea abies* forest in Germany, where the upper half of the canopy contributed an estimated 80% of daytime ET (Staudt *et al.*, 2011). Similarly, in a tropical forest in the Brazilian Amazon, canopy and subcanopy trees jointly contributed $\sim 93\%$ of ET, or 88% of transpiration (Fig 5a, Kunert *et al.*, 2017), and trees >33 cm DBH contributed $>80\%$ of transpiration in a forest in Costa Rica (Moore *et al.*, 2018). In terms of C cycling, it has been estimated that the canopy strata contributes $\geq 64\%$ of net daytime CO_2 uptake (i.e., GPP - ecosystem respiration, including from soil, Misson *et al.*, 2007). Large trees also dominate woody aboveground net primary productivity ($ANPP_{\text{woody}}$) and mortality (M_{woody}), with trees $\geq 10\text{cm}$ DBH usually contributing $> 85\%$ of $ANPP_{\text{woody}}$ and M_{woody} across 25 globally distributed forests (Fig. 5b, Pioniot *et al.*, in press).



736

737

738

739

Figure 5. Vertical partitioning of (a) evapotranspiration and (b) C fluxes in tropical forests. Panel (a) is from Kunert et al. (2017); panel (b) presents averages for 14 tropical forests from Piponirot et al. (in press).

It is less clear how thermal sensitivity of water and carbon fluxes vary across strata, but probable responses can be inferred based on the patterns and mechanisms reviewed above. We expect that under conditions of moderate to high VPD, transpiration, GPP, and $ANPP_{woody}$ should all be more sensitive to high temperatures in the upper canopy than in the understory (Grossiord *et al.*, 2020; Nunes *et al.*, 2022). Because canopy trees dominate these fluxes (Fig. 5), their responses will strongly influence the whole-ecosystem response, potentially with modest buffering by the understory. Thus, for example, increases in canopy temperature reduce forest GPP in the tropics (Pau *et al.*, 2018). Yet evidence also suggests GPP and ecosystem respiration are less sensitive to heat and drought stress in older forests than in young forests (Xu *et al.*, 2020), perhaps in part because of more complex vertical structuring (Jones *et al.*, 2019; Nunes *et al.*, 2022). A rare example of a study comparing climate sensitivity of C fluxes across size classes (Meakem *et al.*, 2018) showed that M_{woody} was more strongly elevated among large than small trees during an *El Niño* drought in Panama, while the smallest trees had higher productivity during the drought, likely because of increased light in the understory. It remains far less clear how thermal sensitivity varies across forest strata under wet conditions, but both physiological mechanisms (Fig. 3) and tree ring evidence (Fig. 4) suggest that understory trees may respond more negatively to hot, wet conditions. Further research is required to better understand the thermal sensitivity of forest ecosystem function across strata.

III. Implications

Having established how physical conditions and biological form and function vary across vertical gradients (Fig. 1), we now turn to the implications of these patterns for understanding how forest ecosystems may be impacted by global change, and our ability to project this across space and time.

Global change responses

The complex interwoven relations between the biophysical environment and biological factors – leaf traits, metabolic processes, and distribution of species across forest strata –

are likely to produce amplifications and feedback loops in a warming world, with implications for forests on many levels.

Warming

As climate change progresses, we anticipate increases in both mean daytime and nighttime T_{air} , as well as increased maximum temperatures, with extreme increases during heat waves (IPCC, 2021). To the extent that warming is coupled to drought, we expect that tall trees with exposed crowns will usually be hardest-hit, particularly in severe drought, partly because their crowns are positioned in a more challenging microenvironment (section 5.1, Figs. 1- 4). In contrast, understory trees will be more sheltered during droughts and heat waves, and in some settings may benefit from increased light availability (Bennett *et al.*, 2015; Hogan *et al.*, 2019; Nunes *et al.*, 2022). It remains unclear how these patterns vary with the nature of the drought, including the relative contributions to stress from low soil moisture versus high VPD. While the two are coupled over longer time scales (Novick *et al.*, 2016; Humphrey *et al.*, 2021), the latter can be intense for short periods even when soil moisture is high (e.g., during a heat wave) and exerts a stronger influence on ET in many biomes (Novick *et al.*, 2016). Given the mechanisms reviewed here, we might expect that high VPD in particular skews the stress more towards the exposed canopy trees.

It remains uncertain how responses to warming will vary across vertical gradients under mesic conditions. Leaves display substantial plasticity to adapt to warmer temperatures (Cunningham & Read, 2003; Way, 2019; Slot *et al.*, 2021b) and to recover from heat stress (Smith *et al.*, 2020), yet failure to fully acclimate will reduce carbon sequestration at leaf, tree, and ecosystem levels (Tan *et al.*, 2017; Huang *et al.*, 2019; Way, 2019; Bennett *et al.*, 2021). As growing season T_{air} increasingly equals or exceeds photosynthetic optima (Slot & Winter, 2017; Mau *et al.*, 2018; Kumarathunge *et al.*, 2019; Huang *et al.*, 2019), exposed crowns are likely most vulnerable. Particularly in mid-latitude forests, which have the narrowest thermal safety margin between historical maximum temperatures and T_{crit} (O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2017), T_{leaf} of sun-exposed leaves may approach tolerance thresholds during heat waves, causing photosynthetic decline or even leaf death (Kunert, in press; O'Sullivan *et al.*, 2017; Tiwari *et al.*, 2021). In contrast, understory leaves and trees are

unlikely to face the same absolute extremes of T_{leaf} (unless exposed to sunflecks), but in some ways are likely to prove more sensitive to higher T_{air} . Protection from thermal stress associated with high direct radiation might allow shaded layers to photosynthesize longer in the day (He *et al.*, 2018; Miller *et al.*, 2021). However, with T_{air} more frequently equaling or exceeding photosynthetic optima, occasional exposure to sunflecks coupled with lower capacity to dissipate excess heat may prove disadvantageous. While it is currently difficult to predict whether canopy or understory photosynthesis will be more severely affected by warming (section 4.2), limited tree-ring evidence indicates that unusually hot growing seasons can reduce growth more for understory trees (Fig 4b, Rollinson *et al.*, 2020). Thus, while canopy trees are probably more vulnerable to mortality from distinct heat-related disturbances, such as drought or heat waves, trees in the understory might be more negatively affected by chronic stress from warming T_{air} , which may reduce growth and increase the risk of carbon starvation in these small trees, whose lower NSC reserves make them more vulnerable (Niinemets, 2010).

Canopy disturbance

Increasing severity and frequency of heat waves, accompanied with increases in VPD and ET, place canopy trees at particularly elevated risk of mortality (section 5.1), potentially causing large scale canopy die-back (Matusick *et al.*, 2013; Teskey *et al.*, 2015; Breshears *et al.*, 2021). Large trees are also disproportionately impacted by other climate-related disturbances (e.g., wind, lightning, Gora & Esquivel-Muelbert, 2021) that are expected to intensify with climate change (IPCC, 2021), and they are also targeted by selective logging (Miller *et al.*, 2011). Forest fragmentation also disproportionately kills large trees by making them more vulnerable to wind, desiccation, and liana infestation (Laurance *et al.*, 2006). Thus, canopies are becoming increasingly prone to disturbance and gap formation, which in turn increases radiation and temperatures within the forest (Jucker *et al.*, 2018; Stark *et al.*, 2020). Such changes often enhance growth of smaller trees, which benefit from increased light (Bennett *et al.*, 2015; Hogan *et al.*, 2019; Nunes *et al.*, 2022), and wetter forests can prove quite resilient to canopy disturbance (Miller *et al.*, 2011). However, this shift to hotter and drier microclimates makes some forests more susceptible to further

disturbances, for example, increasing fire risk (Brando *et al.*, 2014; Aragão *et al.*, 2018). Severe degradation can cause dramatic ecological state changes (e.g., the transition of tropical forests more open, savanna-like vegetation) and non-linear threshold responses in energy balance and associated microclimates, with implications for forest-atmosphere interactions (Stark *et al.*, 2020). Such dynamics will likely to be amplified by warming, such that climate change is pushing some of the world's forests into alternative stable states wherein forest can persist as long as the canopy remains largely intact, but may not recover and persist after severe canopy disturbance (Tepley *et al.*, 2017; Flores *et al.*, 2017; Miller *et al.*, 2019; McDowell *et al.*, 2020).

Canopy disturbance poses an increasing threat to the biodiversity of understory species that are otherwise buffered from climatic extremes (Scheffers *et al.*, 2013; Greiser *et al.*, 2019). Canopy structure affects understory species composition, which has been shown to shift under warming and canopy disturbance (Maes *et al.*, 2020; Majasalmi & Rautiainen, 2020; Bertrand *et al.*, 2020). In the understory, warming disproportionately affects less thermally-adapted plant species, causing thermophilization of the plant community (Duque *et al.*, 2015; Greiser *et al.*, 2019; Zellweger *et al.*, 2020). If compositional shifts towards more thermally-adapted species fail to keep pace with warming, the ecosystem-level resilience to canopy disturbance that is often provided by smaller trees (e.g., Miller *et al.*, 2011) will be destroyed, resulting in breakdown of canopy structure and the potential state changes described above.

Scaling across space and time

As we have reviewed here, vertical profiles in forests strongly shape forest dynamics and climate change responses. Ultimately, to achieve the important goal of understanding feedbacks between the world's forests and climate change, these mechanisms must be sufficiently represented in models and scaled spatially via remote sensing.

Representing Vertical Gradients in Models

Dynamic global vegetation models (DGVMs), which comprise the land surface models in Earth system models, are used to predict the global distribution of vegetation types and

biosphere-atmosphere feedbacks (Foley *et al.*, 1996; Sitch *et al.*, 2003; Woodward & Lomas,
 2004). DGVMs operate at a range of scales and vary in complexity, from detailed individual-
 based models (i.e., forest gap models), which represent vegetation at the level of individual
 plants, which capturing spatial variability in light environment and microclimates at high
 3D spatial resolution (Shugart *et al.*, 2018), to big-leaf models that reduce 3D vegetation
 structure to single vegetation layer, implicitly capturing vertical profiles in light,
 photosynthetic capacity and other features by assuming those profiles are exponential and
 thus can be integrated analytically (Bonan *et al.*, 2003; Krinner *et al.*, 2005). This
 simplification is computationally more efficient, but does not always capture observed
 vertical profiles (sections 1-4; for example, vertical shifts in the balance between stomatal
 conductance and photosynthetic capacity, sections 4.1-4.2) and cannot capture important
 demographic processes and vertical light competition (Hurtt *et al.*, 1998; Smith *et al.*, 2001;
 Krinner *et al.*, 2005). The computational middle-ground lies in cohort-based models, which
 represent vegetation as cohorts of individuals, grouped together based on properties
 including size, age, and functional type (Fisher *et al.*, 2018).

Owing to differences in the representation of forest vertical strata, DVGMs vary in their
 capacity to incorporate vertical variation in leaf traits and physiological processes. In
 general, however, this variation is accounted for via light competition. Models partition
 radiation above and within the forest vertical profile (i.e., direct vs. diffuse light) using
 radiative transfer models or a system of two coupled ordinary differential equations,
 referred to as a two-stream approximation (Sellers, 1985; Fisher *et al.*, 2018). Using the
 latter method, single canopy layers are divided into sun and shade fractions (e.g., in the
 Community Land Model), while models with multiple vegetative layers can analytically
 solve the two-stream approximation for each layer. Thus, even in single-layer models, key
 physiological parameters like V_{cmax} and J_{max} vary, decreasing with increasing cumulative
 LAI or lower light conditions (Table 2, e.g., Krinner *et al.*, 2005). Recent years have seen
 growing efforts to incorporate vertical variation more directly in models, specifically
 involving leaf water potential and light absorption, along with a increasing interest in
 confronting models directly with field measurements (Fisher & Koven, 2020). Recent
 model developments at the cutting edge of representing vertical variation (Bonan *et al.*,

2018; Chen *et al.*, 2019; Longo *et al.*, 2019) implement vertical gradients of irradiance, water content, T_{leaf} , and humidification of canopy air by transpiration, modulated by turbulence within the forest and a roughness layer that extends to roughly twice the canopy height (Fisher & Koven, 2020).

The findings of this review reinforce the notion that representing vertical structuring is essential to capturing forest dynamics under global change. Improved representation of vertical variation in forest structure and ecosystem function is critical for representing thermal sensitivity and has repeatedly been identified as important for reducing uncertainty and accurately characterizing of biologically mediated feedbacks (Moorcroft *et al.*, 2001; Banerjee & Linn, 2018; Bonan *et al.*, 2021). Moreover, given the anticipated importance of mid-canopy and understory trees in ecosystem resilience given increasing mortality of canopy trees, it is essential that models separately represent these strata. A key question is whether existing models adequately represent the processes that underpin understory and large tree responses to thermal stress. Most models have been developed to capture dynamics in the upper canopy, given the disproportionate role of large trees in ecosystem dynamics (Fig. 5). Less attention has focused on developing and validating understory tree dynamics and responses to perturbations in models, in large part to the paucity of observational and experimental studies needed to resolve key patterns and underlying mechanisms (sections 4, 5). Pairing of models with observational studies is key to further improving our mechanistic understanding of vertical gradients and their implications.

Though an improvement over big-leaf models, DGVMs that separate the canopy into only two layers (e.g., sunlit and shaded portions, De Pury & Farquhar, 1997) may not be able to capture important within-canopy variation in terms of leaf dynamics (e.g., seasonal shifts in vertical leaf area distributions, Table 1, Smith *et al.*, 2019) and functions (e.g., thermal responses, Table 2). Multi-layered ecosystem models will likely be necessary for accurately predicting future forest function (e.g., Bonan *et al.*, 2021). In addition, capturing vertical gradients in ET, GPP, respiration, and woody growth, and subsequently the net ecosystem effects, requires improved characterization of the functional response of leaf-level

processes to vertically varying abiotic conditions, and the role of traits in mediating responses to thermal sensitivity.

Scaling in situ data with remote sensing

Remote sensing data provide a valuable means to scale between *in situ* observations and DGVMs. Specifically, the increasing availability of airborne and spaceborne lidar and thermal remote sensing data offer a promising opportunity for mapping vertical thermal gradients and vegetation structure across scales (Fig. 6). Airborne, spaceborne and terrestrial laser scanning data yield detailed 3D reconstructions of whole tree and forest structure. These data can be combined with thermal remote sensing data from the spaceborne ECOSTRESS sensor (Hulley *et al.*, 2019; Fisher *et al.*, 2020) or drone- and tower-based infrared cameras.




Figure 6. Lidar and thermal remote sensing data can be used to measure vertical forest structure and plant thermal signatures at increasingly large scales. (a-b) Integrating *in situ* and remote sensing measurements will support our ability to scale understanding of vertical gradients within and across ecosystems. (c) In turn, these efforts can be used to directly inform ecosystem model development and parameterization. Vertically resolved *in situ* data could include any variable listed in Table 1 or 2. Panel b shows drone lidar point cloud data colored with thermal data from a savanna woodland in Kruger National Park, South Africa illustrating vertical and horizontal variation in vegetation temperature. Image courtesy of the Harvard Animal-Landscape Observatory, Peter B. Boucher and Andrew B. Davies.

Detailed structural information from lidar data can be used to measure tree height, DBH, and crown dimensions (Fisher *et al.*, 2020), evaluate spatial variation in vertical leaf area density profiles (Detto *et al.*, 2015), and resolve complex seasonal and diurnal variation in shortwave radiation forcing in ecosystems (Musselman *et al.*, 2013). Canopy shading can be better represented to predict understory temperatures by modeling the time-varying interaction of the forest canopy with solar radiation, as has been done in other lidar-based analyses (e.g., Davis *et al.*, 2019). Satellite and airborne thermal infrared remote sensing analyses are now being conducted at regional and continental scales, although few applications exist at finer-scales needed to understand vertical variation in canopy temperatures (Johnston *et al.*, in press). As an example of the type of insight possible with this approach, Pau *et al.* (2018) used data from a tower-based infrared camera in combination with eddy-covariance data and found that tropical forest GPP was more strongly associated with canopy temperature than T_{air} or VPD. In a western-U.S. savanna system in the western U.S., Johnston *et al.* (in press) found lower foliage temperatures at the tops of tree crowns than in the understory, which was influenced by very high grass temperatures, consistent with the principles outlined in sections 1-2 (Fig. S1). The growing availability of such data makes this an opportune time to link *in situ* measurements with fine- and landscape-scale measurements to further explore ecosystem-scale patterns in vertical temperature gradients seasonally and across biomes.

IV. Conclusions

Across vertical gradients, directional trends in the biophysical environment and leaf traits are the rule, driving variation in the physiology and ecology that have these as their underpinnings (Fig. 1). However, uncertainty remains about how temperature sensitivity of foliar gas exchange varies across these vertical gradients. Similarly, much remains unknown about how crown exposure influences the temperature sensitivity of woody stem growth. While most available data suggest that large canopy trees are the most vulnerable to warming when water is limited, far less is known about the responses of understory trees, which might be more vulnerable to chronic warming stress under relatively mesic conditions (Fig. 4).

As climate changes, patterns and processes across vertical gradients will likely to shift as well. In the historical climates to which trees adapted, the canopy was an advantageous place for photosynthesis and growth. However, as temperatures increase, it is likely that exposed canopy positions will become increasingly physiologically stressful. Ensuing increased mortality of canopy trees will create ever more gaps, changing understory conditions and community composition. Ultimately, mid- and understory tree communities will be critical to the resilience of forest ecosystems under changing climate, making improved understanding and model representation of their dynamics essential to understanding future forest dynamics. Integrating the patterns and mechanisms reviewed here, along with remote sensing data on forest structure and thermal environments, into cohort-based models that integrate with Earth system models will be crucial to understanding and forecasting forest-climate feedbacks in the coming decades.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Valentine Herrmann, Norbert Kunert, Camille Piponiot, Peter B. Boucher and Andrew B. Davies for providing figure materials. This manuscript benefited from feedback from Eleinis Ávila-Lovera and the ForestGEO Ecosystems & Climate lab at SCBI. Funding was provided by the Smithsonian Institution.

Author Contributions

NV and KAT planned and designed the research, with contributions from all authors. NV reviewed the literature. NV, IM, EMO and MNS contributed data and analyses. All authors contributed to writing and revising of the manuscript.

Data Availability

No new data were created in this study. New analyses are based upon data available from the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON; <https://www.neonscience.org/>). The R scripts used for new analyses are (*will be*) available via GitHub (<https://github.com/EcoClimLab/vertical-thermal-review>) and archived in Zenodo (DOI: [TBD]).

989 **SI files**

990 Note S1. Biophysical drivers of T_{leaf}

991 Methods S1. Methods for analyzing vertical gradients in the biophysical environment

992 Methods S2. Methods for leaf energy balance modeling

993 Methods S3. Methods for literature review

994 Table S1. National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON) sites included in the analysis of
995 vertical gradients of key biophysical characteristics

996 Figure S1. Vertical gradients in micrometeorological conditions for all forested sites in the
997 National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON)

998

999 **References**

- 1000 **Abrams MD, Kubiske ME. 1990.** Leaf structural characteristics of 31 hardwood and
 1001 conifer tree species in central Wisconsin: Influence of light regime and shade-tolerance
 1002 rank. *Forest Ecology and Management* **31**: 245–253.
- 1003 **Albert LP, Wu J, Prohaska N, de Camargo PB, Huxman TE, Tribuzy ES, Ivanov VY,**
 1004 **Oliveira RS, Garcia S, Smith MN, et al. 2018.** Age-dependent leaf physiology and
 1005 consequences for crown-scale carbon uptake during the dry season in an Amazon
 1006 evergreen forest. *New Phytologist* **219**: 870–884.
- 1007 **Almeida DRA de, Nelson BW, Schietti J, Gorgens EB, Resende AF, Stark SC, Valbuena R.**
 1008 **2016.** Contrasting fire damage and fire susceptibility between seasonally flooded forest
 1009 and upland forest in the Central Amazon using portable profiling LiDAR. *Remote Sensing of*
 1010 *Environment* **184**: 153–160.
- 1011 **Ambrose AR, Sillett SC, Koch GW, Van Pelt R, Antoine ME, Dawson TE. 2010.** Effects of
 1012 height on treetop transpiration and stomatal conductance in coast redwood (*Sequoia*
 1013 *sempervirens*). *Tree Physiol* **30**: 1260–1272.
- 1014 **Anderson-Teixeira KJ, Herrmann V, Banbury Morgan R, Bond-Lamberty B, Cook-**
 1015 **Patton SC, Ferson AE, Muller-Landau HC, Wang MMH. 2021.** Carbon cycling in mature
 1016 and regrowth forests globally. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16**: 053009.
- 1017 **Anderson-Teixeira KJ, Herrmann V, Rollinson CR, Gonzalez B, Gonzalez-Akre EB,**
 1018 **Pederson N, Alexander MR, Allen CD, Alfaro-Sánchez R, Awada T, et al. 2022.** Joint
 1019 effects of climate, tree size, and year on annual tree growth derived from tree-ring records
 1020 of ten globally distributed forests. *Global Change Biology* **28**: 245–266.
- 1021 **Anderson-Teixeira KJ, McGarvey JC, Muller-Landau HC, Park JY, Gonzalez-Akre EB,**
 1022 **Herrmann V, Bennett AC, So CV, Bourg NA, Thompson JR, et al. 2015.** Size-related
 1023 scaling of tree form and function in a mixed-age forest. *Functional Ecology* **29**: 1587–1602.

- 1024 **Aragão LEOC, Anderson LO, Fonseca MG, Rosan TM, Vedovato LB, Wagner FH, Silva**
 1025 **CVJ, Silva Junior CHL, Arai E, Aguiar AP, et al. 2018.** 21st Century drought-related fires
 1026 counteract the decline of Amazon deforestation carbon emissions. *Nat Commun* **9**: 536.
- 1027 **Araki MG, Gyokusen K, Kajimoto T. 2017.** Vertical and seasonal variations in
 1028 temperature responses of leaf respiration in a *Chamaecyparis obtusa* canopy. *Tree*
 1029 *Physiology* **37**: 1269–1284.
- 1030 **Arora VK, Katavouta A, Williams RG, Jones CD, Brovkin V, Friedlingstein P, Schwinger**
 1031 **J, Bopp L, Boucher O, Cadule P, et al. 2020.** Carbon–concentration and carbon–climate
 1032 feedbacks in CMIP6 models and their comparison to CMIP5 models. *Biogeosciences* **17**:
 1033 4173–4222.
- 1034 **Ashton PS, Hall P. 1992.** Comparisons of Structure Among Mixed Dipterocarp Forests of
 1035 North-Western Borneo. *Journal of Ecology* **80**: 459–481.
- 1036 **Atherton J, Olascoaga B, Alonso L, Porcar-Castell A. 2017.** Spatial Variation of Leaf
 1037 Optical Properties in a Boreal Forest Is Influenced by Species and Light Environment. *Front.*
 1038 *Plant Sci.* **8**.
- 1039 **Augspurger CK, Bartlett EA. 2003.** Differences in leaf phenology between juvenile and
 1040 adult trees in a temperate deciduous forest. *Tree Physiology* **23**: 517–525.
- 1041 **Bachofen C, D’Odorico P, Buchmann N. 2020.** Light and VPD gradients drive foliar
 1042 nitrogen partitioning and photosynthesis in the canopy of European beech and silver fir.
 1043 *Oecologia* **192**: 323–339.
- 1044 **Baker NR. 2008.** Chlorophyll Fluorescence: A Probe of Photosynthesis In Vivo. *Annu. Rev.*
 1045 *Plant Biol.* **59**: 89–113.
- 1046 **Baldocchi DD, Meyers TP. 1988.** A spectral and lag-correlation analysis of turbulence in a
 1047 deciduous forest canopy. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* **45**: 31–58.

- 1048 **Baldocchi DD, Meyers TP. 1991.** Trace gas exchange above the floor of a deciduous forest:
 1049 1. Evaporation and CO₂ efflux. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **96**: 7271–
 1050 7285.
- 1051 **Baldocchi DD, Vogel CA, Hall B. 1997.** Seasonal variation of energy and water vapor
 1052 exchange rates above and below a boreal jack pine forest canopy. *Journal of Geophysical*
 1053 *Research: Atmospheres* **102**: 28939–28951.
- 1054 **Ball MC, Cowan IR, Farquhar GD. 1988.** Maintenance of Leaf Temperature and the
 1055 Optimisation of Carbon Gain in Relation to Water Loss in a Tropical Mangrove Forest.
 1056 *Functional Plant Biol.* **15**: 263–276.
- 1057 **Baltzer JL, Thomas SC. 2005.** Leaf optical responses to light and soil nutrient availability
 1058 in temperate deciduous trees. *American Journal of Botany* **92**: 214–223.
- 1059 **Banerjee T, De Roo F, Mauder M. 2017.** Explaining the convective effect in canopy
 1060 turbulence by means of large-eddy simulation. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences* **21**:
 1061 2987–3000.
- 1062 **Banerjee T, Linn R. 2018.** Effect of Vertical Canopy Architecture on Transpiration,
 1063 Thermoregulation and Carbon Assimilation. *Forests* **9**: 198.
- 1064 **Barnard DM, Bauerle WL. 2016.** Seasonal Variation in Canopy Aerodynamics and the
 1065 Sensitivity of Transpiration Estimates to Wind Velocity in Broadleaved Deciduous Species.
 1066 *Journal of Hydrometeorology* **17**: 3029–3043.
- 1067 **Bartemucci P, Messier C, Canham CD. 2006.** Overstory influences on light attenuation
 1068 patterns and understory plant community diversity and composition in southern boreal
 1069 forests of Quebec. *Can. J. For. Res.* **36**: 2065–2079.
- 1070 **Bartholomew DC, Bittencourt PRL, Costa ACL da, Banin LF, Costa P de B, Coughlin SI,**
 1071 **Domingues TF, Ferreira LV, Giles A, Mencuccini M, et al. 2020.** Small tropical forest
 1072 trees have a greater capacity to adjust carbon metabolism to long-term drought than large
 1073 canopy trees. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **43**: 2380–2393.

- 1074 **Bennett AC, Arndt SK, Bennett LT, Knauer J, Beringer J, Griebel A, Hinko-Najera N,**
 1075 **Liddell MJ, Metzen D, Pendall E, *et al.* 2021.** Thermal optima of gross primary
 1076 productivity are closely aligned with mean air temperatures across Australian wooded
 1077 ecosystems. *Global Change Biology* **n/a**.
- 1078 **Bennett AC, McDowell NG, Allen CD, Anderson-Teixeira KJ. 2015.** Larger trees suffer
 1079 most during drought in forests worldwide. *Nature Plants* **1**: 15139.
- 1080 **Bertrand R, Aubret F, Grenouillet G, Ribéron A, Blanchet S. 2020.** Comment on ‘Forest
 1081 microclimate dynamics drive plant responses to warming’. *Science* **370**.
- 1082 **Béland M, Baldocchi DD. 2021.** Vertical structure heterogeneity in broadleaf forests:
 1083 Effects on light interception and canopy photosynthesis. *Agricultural and Forest*
 1084 *Meteorology* **307**: 108525.
- 1085 **Bin Y, Li Y, Russo SE, Cao H, Ni Y, Ye W, Lian J. 2022.** Leaf trait expression varies with
 1086 tree size and ecological strategy in a subtropical forest. *Functional Ecology* **n/a**.
- 1087 **Boardman NK. 1977.** Comparative Photosynthesis of Sun and Shade Plants. *Annual Review*
 1088 *of Plant Physiology* **28**: 355–377.
- 1089 **Bolstad PV, Mitchell K, Vose JM. 1999.** Foliar temperature–respiration response
 1090 functions for broad-leaved tree species in the southern Appalachians. *Tree Physiology* **19**:
 1091 871–878.
- 1092 **Bonan GB. 2016.** *Ecological climatology: Concepts and applications*. New York, NY, USA:
 1093 Cambridge University Press.
- 1094 **Bonan GB, Levis S, Sitch S, Vertenstein M, Oleson KW. 2003.** A dynamic global
 1095 vegetation model for use with climate models: Concepts and description of simulated
 1096 vegetation dynamics. *Global Change Biology* **9**: 1543–1566.
- 1097 **Bonan GB, Patton EG, Finnigan JJ, Baldocchi DD, Harman IN. 2021.** Moving beyond the
 1098 incorrect but useful paradigm: Reevaluating big-leaf and multilayer plant canopies to

- 1099 model biosphere-atmosphere fluxes – a review. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **306**:
1100 108435.
- 1101 **Bonan GB, Patton EG, Harman IN, Oleson KW, Finnigan JJ, Lu Y, Burakowski EA. 2018.**
1102 Modeling canopy-induced turbulence in the Earth system: A unified parameterization of
1103 turbulent exchange within plant canopies and the roughness sublayer (CLM-ml V0).
1104 *Geoscientific Model Development* **11**: 1467–1496.
- 1105 **Brando PM, Balch JK, Nepstad DC, Morton DC, Putz FE, Coe MT, Silvério D, Macedo**
1106 **MN, Davidson EA, Nóbrega CC, et al. 2014.** Abrupt increases in Amazonian tree mortality
1107 due to drought–fire interactions. *PNAS* **111**: 6347–6352.
- 1108 **Breshears DD, Fontaine JB, Ruthrof KX, Field JP, Feng X, Burger JR, Law DJ, Kala J,**
1109 **Hardy GESJ. 2021.** Underappreciated plant vulnerabilities to heat waves. *New Phytologist*
1110 **231**: 32–39.
- 1111 **Brooks JR, Flanagan LB, Varney GT, Ehleringer JR. 1997.** Vertical gradients in
1112 photosynthetic gas exchange characteristics and refixation of respired CO₂ within boreal
1113 forest canopies. *Tree Physiology* **17**: 1–12.
- 1114 **Buckley TN. 2021.** Optimal carbon partitioning helps reconcile the apparent divergence
1115 between optimal and observed canopy profiles of photosynthetic capacity. *New Phytologist*
1116 **230**: 2246–2260.
- 1117 **Buckley TN, Martorell S, Diaz-Espejo A, Tomàs M, Medrano H. 2014.** Is stomatal
1118 conductance optimized over both time and space in plant crowns? A field test in grapevine
1119 (*Vitis vinifera*). *Plant Cell Environ* **37**: 2707–2721.
- 1120 **Burgess SSO, Dawson TE, Burgess SSO. 2006.** Regressions of leaf traits.
- 1121 **Campbell G, Norman J. 1998.** *An Introduction to Environmental Biophysics*. New York:
1122 Springer.

- 1123 **Carswell FE, Meir P, Wandelli EV, Bonates LCM, Kruijt B, Barbosa EM, Nobre AD,**
 1124 **Grace J, Jarvis PG. 2000.** Photosynthetic capacity in a central Amazonian rain forest. *Tree*
 1125 *Physiology* **20**: 179–186.
- 1126 **Carter KR, Cavaleri MA. 2018.** Within-Canopy Experimental Leaf Warming Induces
 1127 Photosynthetic Decline Instead of Acclimation in Two Northern Hardwood Species. *Front.*
 1128 *For. Glob. Change* **1**.
- 1129 **Carter KR, Wood TE, Reed SC, Butts KM, Cavaleri MA. 2021.** Experimental warming
 1130 across a tropical forest canopy height gradient reveals minimal photosynthetic and
 1131 respiratory acclimation. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **44**: 2879–2897.
- 1132 **Casas RR de, Vargas P, Pérez-Corona E, Manrique E, García-Verdugo C, Balaguer L.**
 1133 **2011.** Sun and shade leaves of *Olea europaea* respond differently to plant size, light
 1134 availability and genetic variation. *Functional Ecology* **25**: 802–812.
- 1135 **Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG. 2010.** Height is more
 1136 important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. *Ecology* **91**: 1730–
 1137 1739.
- 1138 **Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Ryan MG. 2008.** Foliar and ecosystem respiration in an old-
 1139 growth tropical rain forest. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **31**: 473–483.
- 1140 **Cavender-Bares J, Bazzaz FA. 2000.** Changes in drought response strategies with
 1141 ontogeny in *Quercus rubra*: Implications for scaling from seedlings to mature trees.
 1142 *Oecologia* **124**: 8–18.
- 1143 **Chazdon RL, Fetcher N. 1984.** Photosynthetic Light Environments in a Lowland Tropical
 1144 Rain Forest in Costa Rica. *Journal of Ecology* **72**: 553–564.
- 1145 **Chen X, Massman WJ, Su Z. 2019.** A Column Canopy-Air Turbulent Diffusion Method for
 1146 Different Canopy Structures. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **124**: 488–506.

- 1147 **Chen X, Sun J, Wang M, Lyu M, Niklas KJ, Michaletz ST, Zhong Q, Cheng D. 2020.** The
 1148 Leaf Economics Spectrum Constrains Phenotypic Plasticity Across a Light Gradient. *Front.*
 1149 *Plant Sci.* **11**.
- 1150 **Chin ARO, Sillett SC. 2017.** Leaf acclimation to light availability supports rapid growth in
 1151 tall *Picea sitchensis* trees. *Tree Physiol* **37**: 1352–1366.
- 1152 **Chitra-Tarak R, Xu C, Aguilar S, Anderson-Teixeira KJ, Chambers J, Detto M,**
 1153 **Faybishenko B, Fisher RA, Knox RG, Koven CD, et al. 2021.** Hydraulically-vulnerable
 1154 trees survive on deep-water access during droughts in a tropical forest. *New Phytologist*
 1155 **231**: 1798–1813.
- 1156 **Christoffersen BO, Gloor M, Fauset S, Fyllas NM, Galbraith DR, Baker R, Kruijt B,**
 1157 **Rowland L, Fisher RA, Binks OJ, et al. 2016.** Linking hydraulic traits to tropical forest
 1158 function in a size-structured and trait-driven model (TFS v.1-Hydro). *Geosci. Model Dev.*: 29.
- 1159 **Coble AP, Cavaleri MA. 2014.** Light drives vertical gradients of leaf morphology in a sugar
 1160 maple (*Acer saccharum*) forest. *Tree Physiol* **34**: 146–158.
- 1161 **Coble AP, VanderWall B, Mau A, Cavaleri MA. 2016.** How vertical patterns in leaf traits
 1162 shift seasonally and the implications for modeling canopy photosynthesis in a temperate
 1163 deciduous forest. *Tree Physiology* **36**: 1077–1091.
- 1164 **Condit R, Watts K, Bohlman SA, Pérez R, Foster RB, Hubbell SP. 2000.** Quantifying the
 1165 deciduousness of tropical forest canopies under varying climates. *Journal of Vegetation*
 1166 *Science* **11**: 649–658.
- 1167 **Copolovici LO, Filella I, Llusà J, Niinemets Ü, Peñuelas J. 2005.** The Capacity for
 1168 Thermal Protection of Photosynthetic Electron Transport Varies for Different
 1169 Monoterpenes in *Quercus ilex*. *Plant Physiol* **139**: 485–496.
- 1170 **Corlett RT. 2011.** Impacts of warming on tropical lowland rainforests. *Trends in Ecology &*
 1171 *Evolution* **26**: 606–613.

- 1172 **Couvreur V, Ledder G, Manzoni S, Way DA, Muller EB, Russo SE. 2018.** Water transport
1173 through tall trees: A vertically explicit, analytical model of xylem hydraulic conductance in
1174 stems. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **41**: 1821–1839.
- 1175 **Cunningham SC, Read J. 2003.** Do temperate rainforest trees have a greater ability to
1176 acclimate to changing temperatures than tropical rainforest trees? *New Phytologist* **157**:
1177 55–64.
- 1178 **Curtis EM, Knight CA, Leigh A. 2019.** Intracanopy adjustment of leaf-level thermal
1179 tolerance is associated with microclimatic variation across the canopy of a desert tree
1180 (*Acacia papyrocarpa*). *Oecologia* **189**: 37–46.
- 1181 **Dang QL, Margolis HA, Sy M, Coyea MR, Collatz GJ, Walthall CL. 1997.** Profiles of
1182 photosynthetically active radiation, nitrogen and photosynthetic capacity in the boreal
1183 forest: Implications for scaling from leaf to canopy. *Journal of Geophysical Research:*
1184 *Atmospheres* **102**: 28845–28859.
- 1185 **Davis FW, Synes NW, Fricker GA, McCullough IM, Serra-Diaz JM, Franklin J, Flint AL.**
1186 **2019.** LiDAR-derived topography and forest structure predict fine-scale variation in daily
1187 surface temperatures in oak savanna and conifer forest landscapes. *Agricultural and Forest*
1188 *Meteorology* **269–270**: 192–202.
- 1189 **de Castro F. 2000.** Light spectral composition in a tropical forest: Measurements and
1190 model. *Tree Physiology* **20**: 49–56.
- 1191 **De Frenne P, Lenoir J, Luoto M, Scheffers BR, Zellweger F, Aalto J, Ashcroft MB,**
1192 **Christiansen DM, Decocq G, Pauw KD, et al. 2021.** Forest microclimates and climate
1193 change: Importance, drivers and future research agenda. *Global Change Biology* **27**: 2279–
1194 2297.
- 1195 **De Pury DGG, Farquhar GD. 1997.** Simple scaling of photosynthesis from leaves to
1196 canopies without the errors of big-leaf models. *Plant Cell Environ* **20**: 537–557.
- 1197 **Denmead OT, Bradley EF. 1987.** On Scalar Transport in Plant Canopies. *Irrig Sci* **8**: 131–
1198 149.

- 1199 **Detto M, Asner GP, Muller-Landau HC, Sonnentag O. 2015.** Spatial variability in tropical
 1200 forest leaf area density from multireturn lidar and modeling. *Journal of Geophysical*
 1201 *Research: Biogeosciences* **120**: 294–309.
- 1202 **Dietz J, Leuschner C, Hölscher D, Kreilein H. 2007.** Vertical patterns and duration of
 1203 surface wetness in an old-growth tropical montane forest, Indonesia. *Flora - Morphology,*
 1204 *Distribution, Functional Ecology of Plants* **202**: 111–117.
- 1205 **Domingues TF, Berry JA, Martinelli LA, Ometto JPHB, Ehleringer JR. 2005.**
 1206 Parameterization of Canopy Structure and Leaf-Level Gas Exchange for an Eastern
 1207 Amazonian Tropical Rain Forest (Tapajós National Forest, Pará, Brazil). *Earth Interactions*
 1208 **9**: 1–23.
- 1209 **Doughty CE, Goulden ML. 2008.** Are tropical forests near a high temperature threshold?
 1210 *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* **113**.
- 1211 **Drake JE, Harwood R, Vårhammar A, Barbour MM, Reich PB, Barton CVM, Tjoelker**
 1212 **MG. 2020.** No evidence of homeostatic regulation of leaf temperature in Eucalyptus
 1213 parramattensis trees: Integration of CO₂ flux and oxygen isotope methodologies. *New*
 1214 *Phytologist* **228**: 1511–1523.
- 1215 **Duque A, Stevenson PR, Feeley KJ. 2015.** Thermophilization of adult and juvenile tree
 1216 communities in the northern tropical Andes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **112**: 10744–10749.
- 1217 **Duursma RA, Marshall JD. 2006.** Vertical canopy gradients in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ correspond with leaf
 1218 nitrogen content in a mixed-species conifer forest. *Trees* **20**: 496–506.
- 1219 **Fauset S, Freitas HC, Galbraith DR, Sullivan MJP, Aidar MPM, Joly CA, Phillips OL,**
 1220 **Vieira SA, Gloor MU. 2018.** Differences in leaf thermoregulation and water use strategies
 1221 between three co-occurring Atlantic forest tree species. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **41**:
 1222 1618–1631.
- 1223 **Feeley K, Martinez-Villa J, Perez T, Silva Duque A, Triviño Gonzalez D, Duque A. 2020.**
 1224 The Thermal Tolerances, Distributions, and Performances of Tropical Montane Tree
 1225 Species. *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change* **3**.

- 1226 **Field C. 1983.** Allocating leaf nitrogen for the maximization of carbon gain: Leaf age as a
1227 control on the allocation program. *Oecologia* **56**: 341–347.
- 1228 **Finnigan JJ. 1979.** Turbulence in waving wheat. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* **16**: 181–211.
- 1229 **Fisher RA, Koven CD. 2020.** Perspectives on the Future of Land Surface Models and the
1230 Challenges of Representing Complex Terrestrial Systems. *Journal of Advances in Modeling*
1231 *Earth Systems* **12**: e2018MS001453.
- 1232 **Fisher RA, Koven CD, Anderegg WRL, Christoffersen BO, Dietze MC, Farrior CE, Holm**
1233 **JA, Hurtt GC, Knox RG, Lawrence PJ, et al. 2018.** Vegetation demographics in Earth
1234 System Models: A review of progress and priorities. *Global Change Biology* **24**: 35–54.
- 1235 **Fisher JB, Lee B, Purdy AJ, Halverson GH, Dohlen MB, Cawse-Nicholson K, Wang A,**
1236 **Anderson RG, Aragon B, Arain MA, et al. 2020.** ECOSTRESS: NASA's Next Generation
1237 Mission to Measure Evapotranspiration From the International Space Station. *Water*
1238 *Resources Research* **56**: e2019WR026058.
- 1239 **Flores BM, Holmgren M, Xu C, Nes EH van, Jakovac CC, Mesquita RCG, Scheffer M.**
1240 **2017.** Floodplains as an Achilles' heel of Amazonian forest resilience. *PNAS* **114**: 4442–
1241 4446.
- 1242 **Foley JA, Prentice IC, Ramankutty N, Levis S, Pollard D, Sitch S, Haxeltine A. 1996.** An
1243 integrated biosphere model of land surface processes, terrestrial carbon balance, and
1244 vegetation dynamics. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **10**: 603–628.
- 1245 **Friedlingstein P, Cox P, Betts R, Bopp L, von Bloh W, Brovkin V, Cadule P, Doney S,**
1246 **Eby M, Fung I, et al. 2006.** Climate–Carbon Cycle Feedback Analysis: Results from the
1247 C4MIP Model Intercomparison. *J. Climate* **19**: 3337–3353.
- 1248 **Fritts HC. 1976.** *Tree rings and climate*. London; New York: Academic Press.
- 1249 **Garcia MN, Ferreira MJ, Ivanov V, dos Santos VAHF, Ceron JV, Guedes AV, Saleska SR,**
1250 **Oliveira RS. 2021.** Importance of hydraulic strategy trade-offs in structuring response of
1251 canopy trees to extreme drought in central Amazon. *Oecologia*.

- 1252 **García-Plazaola JI, Becerril JM, Hernández A, Niinemets Ü, Kollist H. 2004.** Acclimation
 1253 of antioxidant pools to the light environment in a natural forest canopy. *New Phytologist*
 1254 **163:** 87–97.
- 1255 **Gebauer R, Volařík D, Urban J, Børja I, Nagy NE, Eldhuset TD, Krokene P. 2015.** Effects
 1256 of prolonged drought on the anatomy of sun and shade needles in young Norway spruce
 1257 trees. *Ecol Evol* **5:** 4989–4998.
- 1258 **Gillerot L, Forrester DI, Bottero A, Rigling A, Lévesque M. 2020.** Tree Neighbourhood
 1259 Diversity Has Negligible Effects on Drought Resilience of European Beech, Silver Fir and
 1260 Norway Spruce. *Ecosystems* **24:** 20–36.
- 1261 **Gora EM, Esquivel-Muelbert A. 2021.** Implications of size-dependent tree mortality for
 1262 tropical forest carbon dynamics. *Nat. Plants* **7:** 384–391.
- 1263 **Goss R, Lepetit B. 2015.** Biodiversity of NPQ. *Journal of Plant Physiology* **172:** 13–32.
- 1264 **Gregoriou K, Pontikis K, Vemmos S. 2007.** Effects of reduced irradiance on leaf
 1265 morphology, photosynthetic capacity, and fruit yield in olive (*Olea europaea* L.).
 1266 *Photosynthetica* **45:** 172–181.
- 1267 **Greiser C, Ehrlén J, Meineri E, Hylander K. 2019.** Hiding from the climate: Characterizing
 1268 microrefugia for boreal forest understory species. *Global Change Biology* **26:** 471–483.
- 1269 **Grossiord C, Buckley TN, Cernusak LA, Novick KA, Poulter B, Siegwolf RTW, Sperry JS,**
 1270 **McDowell NG. 2020.** Plant responses to rising vapor pressure deficit. *New Phytologist* **226:**
 1271 1550–1566.
- 1272 **Haberlandt G. 1914.** *Physiological Plant Anatomy*. Macmillan and Company, limited.
- 1273 **Hadley JL, Smith WK. 1987.** Influence of Krummholz Mat Microclimate on Needle
 1274 Physiology and Survival. *Oecologia* **73:** 82–90.
- 1275 **Haesen S, Lembrechts JJ, De Frenne P, Lenoir J, Aalto J, Ashcroft MB, Kopecký M,**
 1276 **Luoto M, Maclean I, Nijs I, et al. 2021.** ForestTemp – Sub-canopy microclimate
 1277 temperatures of European forests. *Global Change Biology* **27:** 6307–6319.

- 1278 **Hamerlynck E, Knapp AK. 1996.** Photosynthetic and stomatal responses to high
 1279 temperature and light in two oaks at the western limit of their range. *Tree Physiology* **16**:
 1280 557–565.
- 1281 **Hanberry BB, Bragg DC, Alexander HD. 2020.** Open forest ecosystems: An excluded state.
 1282 *Forest Ecology and Management* **472**: 118256.
- 1283 **Hanberry BB, Bragg DC, Hutchinson TF. 2018.** A reconceptualization of open oak and
 1284 pine ecosystems of eastern North America using a forest structure spectrum. *Ecosphere* **9**:
 1285 e02431.
- 1286 **Hansen U, Fiedler B, Rank B. 2002.** Variation of pigment composition and antioxidative
 1287 systems along the canopy light gradient in a mixed beech/oak forest: A comparative study
 1288 on deciduous tree species differing in shade tolerance. *Trees* **16**: 354–364.
- 1289 **Hardwick SR, Toumi R, Pfeifer M, Turner EC, Nilus R, Ewers RM. 2015.** The relationship
 1290 between leaf area index and microclimate in tropical forest and oil palm plantation: Forest
 1291 disturbance drives changes in microclimate. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **201**: 187–
 1292 195.
- 1293 **Harley P, Guenther A, Zimmerman P. 1996.** Effects of light, temperature and canopy
 1294 position on net photosynthesis and isoprene emission from sweetgum (*Liquidambar*
 1295 *styraciflua*) leaves. *Tree Physiol* **16**: 25–32.
- 1296 **Harley P, Guenther A, Zimmerman P. 1997.** Environmental controls over isoprene
 1297 emission in deciduous oak canopies. *Tree Physiology* **17**: 705–714.
- 1298 **Harman IN, Finnigan JJ. 2007.** A simple unified theory for flow in the canopy and
 1299 roughness sublayer. *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* **123**: 339–363.
- 1300 **Harris NL, Medina E. 2013.** Changes in leaf properties across an elevation gradient in the
 1301 Luquillo Mountains, Puerto Rico. *Ecological Bulletins*: 169–180.

- 1302 **He L, Chen JM, Gonsamo A, Luo X, Wang R, Liu Y, Liu R. 2018.** Changes in the Shadow:
 1303 The Shifting Role of Shaded Leaves in Global Carbon and Water Cycles Under Climate
 1304 Change. *Geophysical Research Letters* **45**: 5052–5061.
- 1305 **Heilman KA, Dietze MC, Arizpe AA, Aragon J, Gray A, Shaw JD, Finley AO, Klesse S,**
 1306 **DeRose RJ, Evans MEK. 2022.** Ecological forecasting of tree growth: Regional fusion of
 1307 tree-ring and forest inventory data to quantify drivers and characterize uncertainty. *Global*
 1308 *Change Biology* **n/a**.
- 1309 **Hernández GG, Winter K, Slot M. 2020.** Similar temperature dependence of
 1310 photosynthetic parameters in sun and shade leaves of three tropical tree species. *Tree*
 1311 *Physiol* **40**: 637–651.
- 1312 **Hikosaka K. 2014.** Optimal nitrogen distribution within a leaf canopy under direct and
 1313 diffuse light. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **37**: 2077–2085.
- 1314 **Hirose T, Werger MJA. 1987.** Maximizing daily canopy photosynthesis with respect to the
 1315 leaf nitrogen allocation pattern in the canopy. *Oecologia* **72**: 520–526.
- 1316 **Hogan JA, McMahon SM, Buzzard V, Michaletz ST, Enquist BJ, Thompson J, Swenson**
 1317 **NG, Zimmerman JK. 2019.** Drought and the interannual variability of stem growth in an
 1318 aseasonal, everwet forest. *Biotropica* **51**: 139–154.
- 1319 **Houter NC, Pons TL. 2012.** Ontogenetic changes in leaf traits of tropical rainforest trees
 1320 differing in juvenile light requirement. *Oecologia* **169**: 33–45.
- 1321 **Huang M, Piao S, Ciais P, Peñuelas J, Wang X, Keenan TF, Peng S, Berry JA, Wang K,**
 1322 **Mao J, et al. 2019.** Air temperature optima of vegetation productivity across global biomes.
 1323 *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **3**: 772–779.
- 1324 **Hulley G, Shivers S, Wetherley E, Cudd R. 2019.** New ECOSTRESS and MODIS Land
 1325 Surface Temperature Data Reveal Fine-Scale Heat Vulnerability in Cities: A Case Study for
 1326 Los Angeles County, California. *Remote Sensing* **11**: 2136.

- 1327 **Humphrey V, Berg A, Ciais P, Gentine P, Jung M, Reichstein M, Seneviratne SI,**
 1328 **Frankenberg C. 2021.** Soil moisture– atmosphere feedback dominates land carbon uptake
 1329 variability. *Nature* **592**: 65–69.
- 1330 **Hurt GC, Moorcroft PR, And SWP, Levin SA. 1998.** Terrestrial models and global change:
 1331 Challenges for the future. *Global Change Biology* **4**: 581–590.
- 1332 **Ichie T, Inoue Y, Takahashi N, Kamiya K, Kenzo T. 2016.** Ecological distribution of leaf
 1333 stomata and trichomes among tree species in a Malaysian lowland tropical rain forest. *J*
 1334 *Plant Res* **129**: 625–635.
- 1335 **IPCC. 2021.** Climate Change 2021 The Physical Science Basis–IPCC.
- 1336 **Irvine J, Law BE, Kurpius MR, Anthoni PM, Moore D, Schwarz PA. 2004.** Age-related
 1337 changes in ecosystem structure and function and effects on water and carbon exchange in
 1338 ponderosa pine. *Tree Physiology* **24**: 753–763.
- 1339 **Jiao-jun Z, Xiu-fen L, Yutaka G, Takeshi M. 2004.** Wind profiles in and over trees. *Journal*
 1340 *of Forestry Research* **15**: 305.
- 1341 **Johnston MR, A. Andreu, J. Verfaillie and PRMoorcroft D. Baldocchi. in press.** What lies
 1342 beneath: Vertical heterogeneity in blue oak canopy temperatures. *Remote Sensing of*
 1343 *Environment*.
- 1344 **Jones SM, Bottero A, Kastendick DN, Palik BJ. 2019.** Managing red pine stand structure
 1345 to mitigate drought impacts. *Dendrochronologia* **57**: 125623.
- 1346 **Jucker T, Hardwick SR, Both S, Elias DMO, Ewers RM, Milodowski DT, Swinfield T,**
 1347 **Coomes DA. 2018.** Canopy structure and topography jointly constrain the microclimate of
 1348 human-modified tropical landscapes. *Global Change Biology* **24**: 5243–5258.
- 1349 **Kafuti C, Bourland N, De Mil T, Meeus S, Rousseau M, Toirambe B, Bolaluembe P-C,**
 1350 **Ndjele L, Beeckman H. 2020.** Foliar and Wood Traits Covary along a Vertical Gradient
 1351 within the Crown of Long-Lived Light-Demanding Species of the Congo Basin Semi-
 1352 Deciduous Forest. *Forests* **11**: 35.

- 1353 **Katul GG, Albertson JD. 1999.** Modeling CO₂ sources, sinks, and fluxes within a forest
1354 canopy. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* **104**: 6081–6091.
- 1355 **Keenan TF, Niinemets Ü. 2016.** Global leaf trait estimates biased due to plasticity in the
1356 shade. *Nature Plants* **3**: 1–6.
- 1357 **Kenzo T, Inoue Y, Yoshimura M, Yamashita M, Tanaka-Oda A, Ichie T. 2015.** Height-
1358 related changes in leaf photosynthetic traits in diverse Bornean tropical rain forest trees.
1359 *Oecologia* **177**: 191–202.
- 1360 **Kesselmeier J, Staudt M.** Biogenic Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC): An Overview on
1361 Emission, Physiology and Ecology. : 66.
- 1362 **Kikuzawa K, Lechowicz MJ. 2006.** Toward Synthesis of Relationships among Leaf
1363 Longevity, Instantaneous Photosynthetic Rate, Lifetime Leaf Carbon Gain, and the Gross
1364 Primary Production of Forests. *The American Naturalist* **168**: 373–383.
- 1365 **Kitao M, Kitaoka S, Harayama H, Tobita H, Agathokleous E, Utsugi H. 2018.** Canopy
1366 nitrogen distribution is optimized to prevent photoinhibition throughout the canopy
1367 during sun flecks. *Scientific Reports* **8**: 503.
- 1368 **Knapp AK, Carter GA. 1998.** Variability in leaf optical properties among 26 Species From
1369 A Broad Range Of Habitats. *American Journal of Botany* **85**: 940–946.
- 1370 **Koch GW, Amthor JS, Goulden ML. 1994.** Diurnal patterns of leaf photosynthesis,
1371 conductance and water potential at the top of a lowland rain forest canopy in Cameroon:
1372 Measurements from the Radeau des Cimes. *Tree Physiology* **14**: 347–360.
- 1373 **Koch GW, Sillett SC, Jennings GM, Davis SD. 2004.** The limits to tree height. *Nature* **428**:
1374 851–854.
- 1375 **Koike T, Kitao M, Maruyama Y, Mori S, Lei TT. 2001.** Leaf morphology and
1376 photosynthetic adjustments among deciduous broad-leaved trees within the vertical
1377 canopy profile. *Tree Physiology* **21**: 951–958.

- 1378 **Koike F, Syahbuddin. 1993.** Canopy Structure of a Tropical Rain Forest and the Nature of
 1379 an Unstratified Upper Layer. *Functional Ecology* **7**: 230–235.
- 1380 **Konrad W, Katul G, Roth-Nebelsick A. 2021.** Leaf temperature and its dependence on
 1381 atmospheric CO₂ and leaf size. *Geological Journal* **56**: 866–885.
- 1382 **Kosugi Y, Matsuo N. 2006.** Seasonal fluctuations and temperature dependence of leaf gas
 1383 exchange parameters of co-occurring evergreen and deciduous trees in a temperate broad-
 1384 leaved forest. *Tree Physiology* **26**: 1173–1184.
- 1385 **Königer M, Harris GC, Virgo A, Winter K. 1995.** Xanthophyll-Cycle Pigments and
 1386 Photosynthetic Capacity in Tropical Forest Species: A Comparative Field Study on Canopy,
 1387 Gap and Understory Plants. *Oecologia* **104**: 280–290.
- 1388 **Krause A, Pugh TAM, Bayer AD, Li W, Leung F, Bondeau A, Doelman JC, Humpenöder**
 1389 **F, Anthoni P, Bodirsky BL, et al. 2018.** Large uncertainty in carbon uptake potential of
 1390 land-based climate-change mitigation efforts. *Global Change Biology* **24**: 3025–3038.
- 1391 **Krause GH, Winter K, Krause B, Jahns P, García M, Aranda J, Virgo A. 2010.** High-
 1392 temperature tolerance of a tropical tree, *Ficus insipida*: Methodological reassessment and
 1393 climate change considerations. *Functional Plant Biol.* **37**: 890.
- 1394 **Krinner G, Viovy N, Noblet-Ducoudré N de, Ogée J, Polcher J, Friedlingstein P, Ciais P,**
 1395 **Sitch S, Prentice IC. 2005.** A dynamic global vegetation model for studies of the coupled
 1396 atmosphere-biosphere system. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **19**.
- 1397 **Kumarathunge DP, Medlyn BE, Drake JE, Tjoelker MG, Aspinwall MJ, Battaglia M,**
 1398 **Cano FJ, Carter KR, Cavaleri MA, Cernusak LA, et al. 2019.** Acclimation and adaptation
 1399 components of the temperature dependence of plant photosynthesis at the global scale.
 1400 *New Phytol* **222**: 768–784.
- 1401 **Kunert N. in press.** Summer temperatures reach the thermal tolerance threshold of
 1402 photosynthetic decline in temperate conifers. *Plant Biology*.

- 1403 **Kunert N, Aparecido LMT, Wolff S, Higuchi N, Santos J dos, Araujo AC de, Trumbore S.**
 1404 **2017.** A revised hydrological model for the Central Amazon: The importance of emergent
 1405 canopy trees in the forest water budget. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **239**: 47–57.
- 1406 **Kusi J, Karsai I. 2020.** Plastic leaf morphology in three species of *Quercus*: The more
 1407 exposed leaves are smaller, more lobated and denser. *Plant Species Biology* **35**: 24–37.
- 1408 **Lantz AT, Allman J, Weraduwege SM, Sharkey TD. 2019.** Isoprene: New insights into the
 1409 control of emission and mediation of stress tolerance by gene expression. *Plant, Cell &*
 1410 *Environment* **42**: 2808–2826.
- 1411 **Laothawornkitkul J, Taylor JE, Paul ND, Hewitt CN. 2009.** Biogenic volatile organic
 1412 compounds in the Earth system. *New Phytologist* **183**: 27–51.
- 1413 **Laurance WF, Nascimento HEM, Laurance SG, Andrade AC, Fearnside PM, Ribeiro JEL,**
 1414 **Capretz RL. 2006.** Rain Forest Fragmentation and the Proliferation of Successional Trees.
 1415 *Ecology* **87**: 469–482.
- 1416 **Law BE, Cescatti A, Baldocchi DD. 2001.** Leaf area distribution and radiative transfer in
 1417 open-canopy forests: Implications for mass and energy exchange. *Tree Physiology* **21**: 777–
 1418 787.
- 1419 **Lee DW, Bone RA, Tarsis SL, Storch D. 1990.** Correlates of Leaf Optical Properties in
 1420 Tropical Forest Sun and Extreme-Shade Plants. *American Journal of Botany* **77**: 370–380.
- 1421 **Lee BR, Ibáñez I. 2021.** Spring phenological escape is critical for the survival of temperate
 1422 tree seedlings. *Functional Ecology* **35**: 1848–1861.
- 1423 **Legner N, Fleck S, Leuschner C. 2014.** Within-canopy variation in photosynthetic
 1424 capacity, SLA and foliar N in temperate broad-leaved trees with contrasting shade
 1425 tolerance. *Trees* **28**: 263–280.
- 1426 **Leigh A, Sevanto S, Close JD, Nicotra AB. 2017.** The influence of leaf size and shape on
 1427 leaf thermal dynamics: Does theory hold up under natural conditions? *Plant, Cell &*
 1428 *Environment* **40**: 237–248.

- 1429 **Levizou E, Drilias P, Psaras GK, Manetas Y. 2005.** Nondestructive assessment of leaf
1430 chemistry and physiology through spectral reflectance measurements may be misleading
1431 when changes in trichome density co-occur. *New Phytologist* **165**: 463–472.
- 1432 **Liakoura V, Stefanou M, Manetas Y, Cholevas C, Karabourniotis G. 1997.** Trichome
1433 density and its UV-B protective potential are affected by shading and leaf position on the
1434 canopy. *Environmental and Experimental Botany* **38**: 223–229.
- 1435 **Lloyd J, Farquhar GD. 2008.** Effects of rising temperatures and [CO₂] on the physiology of
1436 tropical forest trees. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* **363**: 1811–1817.
- 1437 **Lloyd J, Patiño S, Paiva RQ, Nardoto GB, Quesada CA, Santos AJB, Baker TR, Brand WA,**
1438 **Hilke I, Gielmann H, et al. 2010.** Optimisation of photosynthetic carbon gain and within-
1439 canopy gradients of associated foliar traits for Amazon forest trees. *Biogeosciences* **7**:
1440 1833–1859.
- 1441 **Longo M, Knox RG, Medvigy DM, Levine NM, Dietze MC, Kim Y, Swann ALS, Zhang K,**
1442 **Rollinson CR, Bras RL, et al. 2019.** The biophysics, ecology, and biogeochemistry of
1443 functionally diverse, vertically and horizontally heterogeneous ecosystems: The Ecosystem
1444 Demography model, version 2.2 – Part 1: Model description. *Geoscientific Model*
1445 *Development* **12**: 4309–4346.
- 1446 **Lowman M, Rinker HB. 1995.** Forest Canopies. In: Endeavour.
- 1447 **Lusk CH, Reich PB, Montgomery RA, Ackerly DD, Cavender-Bares J. 2008.** Why are
1448 evergreen leaves so contrary about shade? *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **23**: 299–303.
- 1449 **Maes SL, Perring MP, Depauw L, Bernhardt-Römermann M, Blondeel H, Brūmelis G,**
1450 **Brunet J, Decocq G, Ouden J den, Govaert S, et al. 2020.** Plant functional trait response to
1451 environmental drivers across European temperate forest understorey communities. *Plant*
1452 *Biology* **22**: 410–424.
- 1453 **Majasalmi T, Rautiainen M. 2020.** The impact of tree canopy structure on understory
1454 variation in a boreal forest. *Forest Ecology and Management* **466**: 118100.

- 1455 **Marenco RA, Camargo MAB, Antezana-Vera SA, Oliveira MF. 2017.** Leaf trait plasticity
1456 in six forest tree species of central Amazonia. *Photosynthetica* **55**: 679–688.
- 1457 **Martin TA, Hinckley TM, Meinzer FC, Sprugel DG. 1999.** Boundary layer conductance,
1458 leaf temperature and transpiration of *Abies amabilis* branches. *Tree Physiology* **19**: 435–
1459 443.
- 1460 **Matsubara S, Krause GH, Aranda J, Virgo A, Beisel KG, Jahns P, Winter K, Matsubara S,**
1461 **Krause GH, Aranda J, et al. 2009.** Sun-shade patterns of leaf carotenoid composition in 86
1462 species of neotropical forest plants. *Functional Plant Biol.* **36**: 20–36.
- 1463 **Matusick G, Ruthrof KX, Brouwers NC, Dell B, Hardy GStJ. 2013.** Sudden forest canopy
1464 collapse corresponding with extreme drought and heat in a mediterranean-type eucalypt
1465 forest in southwestern Australia. *Eur J Forest Res* **132**: 497–510.
- 1466 **Mau A, Reed S, Wood T, Cavaleri M. 2018.** Temperate and Tropical Forest Canopies are
1467 Already Functioning beyond Their Thermal Thresholds for Photosynthesis. *Forests* **9**: 47.
- 1468 **McDowell NG, Allen CD, Anderson-Teixeira K, Aukema BH, Bond-Lamberty B, Chini L,**
1469 **Clark JS, Dietze M, Grossiord C, Hanbury-Brown A, et al. 2020.** Pervasive shifts in forest
1470 dynamics in a changing world. *Science* **368**: eaaz9463.
- 1471 **McDowell NG, Bond BJ, Hill L, Ryan MG, Whitehead D. 2011.** Relationship between tree
1472 height and carbon isotope discrimination. In: F.C. Meinzer and U. Niinemets, eds. Size and
1473 age related changes in tree structure and function. Springer Publishing, 255–286.
- 1474 **McGregor IR, Helcoski R, Kunert N, Tepley AJ, Gonzalez-Akre EB, Herrmann V, Zailaa**
1475 **J, Stovall AEL, Bourg NA, McShea WJ, et al. 2021.** Tree height and leaf drought tolerance
1476 traits shape growth responses across droughts in a temperate broadleaf forest. *New*
1477 *Phytologist* **231**: 601–616.
- 1478 **Meakem V, Tepley AJ, Gonzalez-Akre EB, Herrmann V, Muller-Landau HC, Wright SJ,**
1479 **Hubbell SP, Condit R, Anderson-Teixeira KJ. 2018.** Role of tree size in moist tropical
1480 forest carbon cycling and water deficit responses. *New Phytologist* **219**: 947–958.

- 1481 **Mediavilla S, Escudero A. 2004.** Stomatal responses to drought of mature trees and
 1482 seedlings of two co-occurring Mediterranean oaks. *Forest Ecology and Management* **187**:
 1483 281–294.
- 1484 **Mediavilla S, Martín I, Babiano J, Escudero A. 2019.** Foliar plasticity related to gradients
 1485 of heat and drought stress across crown orientations in three Mediterranean *Quercus*
 1486 species. *PLOS ONE* **14**: e0224462.
- 1487 **Meehl GA, Tebaldi C. 2004.** More Intense, More Frequent, and Longer Lasting Heat Waves
 1488 in the 21st Century. *Science* **305**: 994–997.
- 1489 **Meeussen C, Govaert S, Vanneste T, Bollmann K, Brunet J, Calders K, Cousins SAO, De**
 1490 **Pauw K, Diekmann M, Gasperini C, et al. 2021.** Microclimatic edge-to-interior gradients
 1491 of European deciduous forests. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **311**: 108699.
- 1492 **Meinzer FC, Clearwater MJ, Goldstein G. 2001.** Water transport in trees: Current
 1493 perspectives, new insights and some controversies. *Environmental and Experimental*
 1494 *Botany* **45**: 239–262.
- 1495 **Meir P, Grace J, Miranda AC. 2001.** Leaf respiration in two tropical rainforests:
 1496 Constraints on physiology by phosphorus, nitrogen and temperature. *Functional Ecology*
 1497 **15**: 378–387.
- 1498 **Meyers TP, Paw U KT. 1987.** Modelling the plant canopy micrometeorology with higher-
 1499 order closure principles. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **41**: 143–163.
- 1500 **Michaletz ST, Weiser MD, McDowell NG, Zhou J, Kaspari M, Helliker BR, Enquist BJ.**
 1501 **2016.** The energetic and carbon economic origins of leaf thermoregulation. *Nature Plants*
 1502 **2**: 16129.
- 1503 **Michaletz ST, Weiser MD, Zhou J, Kaspari M, Helliker BR, Enquist BJ. 2015.** Plant
 1504 Thermoregulation: Energetics, Trait–Environment Interactions, and Carbon Economics.
 1505 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **30**: 714–724.

- 1506 **Millen GGM, Clendon JHM. 1979.** Leaf Angle: An Adaptive Feature of Sun and Shade
1507 Leaves. *Botanical Gazette* **140**: 437–442.
- 1508 **Miller BD, Carter KR, Reed SC, Wood TE, Cavaleri MA. 2021.** Only sun-lit leaves of the
1509 uppermost canopy exceed both air temperature and photosynthetic thermal optima in a
1510 wet tropical forest. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **301–302**: 108347.
- 1511 **Miller SD, Goulden ML, Hutrya LR, Keller M, Saleska SR, Wofsy SC, Figueira AMS,**
1512 **Rocha HR da, Camargo PB de. 2011.** Reduced impact logging minimally alters tropical
1513 rainforest carbon and energy exchange. *PNAS* **108**: 19431–19435.
- 1514 **Miller AD, Thompson JR, Tepley AJ, Anderson-Teixeira KJ. 2019.** Alternative stable
1515 equilibria and critical thresholds created by fire regimes and plant responses in a fire-
1516 prone community. *Ecography* **42**: 55–66.
- 1517 **Misson L, Baldocchi DD, Black TA, Blanken PD, Brunet Y, Curiel Yuste J, Dorsey JR,**
1518 **Falk M, Granier A, Irvine MR, et al. 2007.** Partitioning forest carbon fluxes with overstory
1519 and understory eddy-covariance measurements: A synthesis based on FLUXNET data.
1520 *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **144**: 14–31.
- 1521 **Monson RK, Weraduwege SM, Rosenkranz M, Schnitzler J-P, Sharkey TD. 2021.** Leaf
1522 isoprene emission as a trait that mediates the growth-defense tradeoff in the face of climate
1523 stress. *Oecologia*.
- 1524 **Monteith JL, Unsworth MH. 2013.** *Principles of environmental physics: Plants, animals, and*
1525 *the atmosphere*. Amsterdam ; Boston: Elsevier/Academic Press.
- 1526 **Moorcroft PR, Hurtt GC, Pacala SW. 2001.** A Method for Scaling Vegetation Dynamics:
1527 The Ecosystem Demography Model (ed). *Ecological Monographs* **71**: 557–586.
- 1528 **Moore G, Orozco G, Aparecido L, Miller G. 2018.** Upscaling Transpiration in Diverse
1529 Forests: Insights from a Tropical Premontane Site. *Ecohydrology* **11**: e1920.
- 1530 **Muir CD. 2019.** Tealeaves: An R package for modelling leaf temperature using energy
1531 budgets. *AoB PLANTS* **11**.

- 1532 **Muller-Landau HC, Condit RS, Chave J, Thomas SC, Bohlman SA, Bunyavejchewin S,**
 1533 **Davies S, Foster R, Gunatilleke S, Gunatilleke N, *et al.* 2006.** Testing metabolic ecology
 1534 theory for allometric scaling of tree size, growth and mortality in tropical forests. *Ecology*
 1535 *Letters* **9**: 575–588.
- 1536 **Muller JD, Rotenberg E, Tatarinov F, Oz I, Yakir D. 2021.** Evidence for efficient non-
 1537 evaporative leaf-to-air heat dissipation in a pine forest under drought conditions. *bioRxiv*:
 1538 2021.02.01.429145.
- 1539 **Musselman KN, Margulis SA, Molotch NP. 2013.** Estimation of solar direct beam
 1540 transmittance of conifer canopies from airborne LiDAR. *Remote Sensing of Environment*
 1541 **136**: 402–415.
- 1542 **Nakamura A, Kitching RL, Cao M, Creedy TJ, Fayle TM, Freiberg M, Hewitt CN, Itioka T,**
 1543 **Koh LP, Ma K, *et al.* 2017.** Forests and Their Canopies: Achievements and Horizons in
 1544 Canopy Science. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **32**: 438–451.
- 1545 **Niinemets Ü. 1998.** Adjustment of foliage structure and function to a canopy light gradient
 1546 in two co-existing deciduous trees. Variability in leaf inclination angles in relation to petiole
 1547 morphology. *Trees* **12**: 446–451.
- 1548 **Niinemets Ü. 2007.** Photosynthesis and resource distribution through plant canopies.
 1549 *Plant, Cell & Environment* **30**: 1052–1071.
- 1550 **Niinemets Ü. 2010.** Responses of forest trees to single and multiple environmental
 1551 stresses from seedlings to mature plants: Past stress history, stress interactions, tolerance
 1552 and acclimation. *Forest Ecology and Management* **260**: 1623–1639.
- 1553 **Niinemets Ü. 2016.** Leaf age dependent changes in within-canopy variation in leaf
 1554 functional traits: A meta-analysis. *J Plant Res* **129**: 313–338.
- 1555 **Niinemets Ü, Bilger W, Kull O, Tenhunen JD. 1998.** Acclimation to high irradiance in
 1556 temperate deciduous trees in the field: Changes in xanthophyll cycle pool size and in
 1557 photosynthetic capacity along a canopy light gradient. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **21**: 1205–
 1558 1218.

- 1559 **Niinemets U, Copolovici L, Hueve K. 2010.** High within-canopy variation in isoprene
 1560 emission potentials in temperate trees: Implications for predicting canopy-scale isoprene
 1561 fluxes. *J. Geophys. Res.-Biogeosci.* **115**: G04029.
- 1562 **Niinemets Ü, Keenan TF, Hallik L. 2015a.** A worldwide analysis of within-canopy
 1563 variations in leaf structural, chemical and physiological traits across plant functional types.
 1564 *New Phytologist* **205**: 973–993.
- 1565 **Niinemets Ü, Kull O, Tenhunen JD. 2015b.** Variability in Leaf Morphology and Chemical
 1566 Composition as a Function of Canopy Light Environment in Coexisting Deciduous Trees.
 1567 *International Journal of Plant Sciences.*
- 1568 **Niinemets Ü, Oja V, Kull O. 1999.** Shape of leaf photosynthetic electron transport versus
 1569 temperature response curve is not constant along canopy light gradients in temperate
 1570 deciduous trees. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **22**: 1497–1513.
- 1571 **Niinemets Ü, Sonninen E, Tobias M. 2004.** Canopy gradients in leaf intercellular CO₂
 1572 mole fractions revisited: Interactions between leaf irradiance and water stress need
 1573 consideration. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **27**: 569–583.
- 1574 **Niinemets Ü, Sun Z. 2015.** How light, temperature, and measurement and growth [CO₂]
 1575 interactively control isoprene emission in hybrid aspen. *J Exp Bot* **66**: 841–851.
- 1576 **Niinemets Ü, Valladares F. 2004.** Photosynthetic Acclimation to Simultaneous and
 1577 Interacting Environmental Stresses Along Natural Light Gradients: Optimality and
 1578 Constraints. *Plant Biology* **6**: 254–268.
- 1579 **Niyogi KK. 2000.** Safety valves for photosynthesis. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology* **3**: 455–
 1580 460.
- 1581 **Novick KA, Ficklin DL, Stoy PC, Williams CA, Bohrer G, Oishi AC, Papuga SA, Blanken**
 1582 **PD, Noormets A, Sulman BN, et al. 2016.** The increasing importance of atmospheric
 1583 demand for ecosystem water and carbon fluxes. *Nature Climate Change* **6**: 1023–1027.

- 1584 **Nunes MH, Camargo JLC, Vincent G, Calders K, Oliveira RS, Huete A, Mendes de Moura**
 1585 **Y, Nelson B, Smith MN, Stark SC, *et al.* 2022.** Forest fragmentation impacts the
 1586 seasonality of Amazonian evergreen canopies. *Nat Commun* **13**: 1–10.
- 1587 **O’Sullivan OS, Heskell MA, Reich PB, Tjoelker MG, Weerasinghe LK, Penillard A, Zhu L,**
 1588 **Egerton JG, Bloomfield KJ, Creek D, *et al.* 2017.** Thermal limits of leaf metabolism across
 1589 biomes. *Global Change Biology* **23**: 209–223.
- 1590 **Oldham AR, Sillett SC, Tomescu AMF, Koch GW. 2010.** The hydrostatic gradient, not light
 1591 availability, drives height-related variation in *Sequoia sempervirens* (Cupressaceae) leaf
 1592 anatomy. *American Journal of Botany* **97**: 1087–1097.
- 1593 **Olson ME, Soriano D, Rosell JA, Anfodillo T, Donoghue MJ, Edwards EJ, León-Gómez C,**
 1594 **Dawson T, Martínez JJC, Castorena M, *et al.* 2018.** Plant height and hydraulic
 1595 vulnerability to drought and cold. *PNAS* **115**: 7551–7556.
- 1596 **Osada N, Takeda H, Furukawa A, Awang M. 2001.** Leaf Dynamics and Maintenance of
 1597 Tree Crowns in a Malaysian Rain Forest Stand. *Journal of Ecology* **89**: 774–782.
- 1598 **Osnas JLD, Katabuchi M, Kitajima K, Wright SJ, Reich PB, Van Bael SA, Kraft NJB,**
 1599 **Samaniego MJ, Pacala SW, Lichstein JW. 2018.** Divergent drivers of leaf trait variation
 1600 within species, among species, and among functional groups. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **115**:
 1601 5480–5485.
- 1602 **Ozanne CMP. 2003.** Biodiversity Meets the Atmosphere: A Global View of Forest Canopies.
 1603 *Science* **301**: 183–186.
- 1604 **Panditharathna PAKAK, Singhakumara BMP, Griscom HP, Ashton MS. 2008.** Change in
 1605 leaf structure in relation to crown position and size class for tree species within a Sri
 1606 Lankan tropical rain forest. *Botany* **86**: 633–640.
- 1607 **Parker GG, Fitzjarrald DR, Gonçalves Sampaio IC. 2019.** Consequences of environmental
 1608 heterogeneity for the photosynthetic light environment of a tropical forest. *Agricultural and*
 1609 *Forest Meteorology* **278**: 107661.

- 1610 **Parker GG, O'Neill JP, work(s): DHR. 1989.** Vertical Profile and Canopy Organization in a
 1611 Mixed Deciduous Forest. *Vegetatio* **85**: 1–11.
- 1612 **Pau S, Detto M, Kim Y, Still CJ. 2018.** Tropical forest temperature thresholds for gross
 1613 primary productivity. *Ecosphere* **9**: e02311.
- 1614 **Penman HL, Long IF. 1960.** Weather in wheat : An essay in micro-meteorology. *Quarterly*
 1615 *Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **86**: 16–50.
- 1616 **Perez TM, Feeley KJ. 2018.** Increasing Humidity Threatens Tropical Rainforests. *Front.*
 1617 *Ecol. Evol.* **6**: 68.
- 1618 **Perez TM, Feeley KJ. 2020.** Photosynthetic heat tolerances and extreme leaf
 1619 temperatures. *Functional Ecology* **34**: 2236–2245.
- 1620 **Piponiot C, KJ A-T, Davies S, Allen D B Bourg NA, DFRP, Cárdenas D, Chang-Yang C-H,**
 1621 **Chuyong G, Cordell S, Dattaraja HS, Duque Á, Ediriweera S, Ewango C, Ezedin Z, Filip J,**
 1622 **Giardina C, Howe R, Hsieh, C-F, Hubbell S, Inman-Narahari FM, Itoh A, Janik D,**
 1623 **Kenfack D, Kral K, Lutz JA, Makana J-R, McMahon S, McShea W, Mi X, Mohamad M,**
 1624 **Novotny V, O'Brien MJ, Ostertag R, Parker G, Pérez R, Ren H-B, Reynolds, G, Sabri**
 1625 **MDM, Sack L, Shringi A, Su S-H, Sukumar R, Sun I-F, Suresh HS, et al. in press.**
 1626 Distribution of biomass dynamics in relation to tree size in forests across the world. *New*
 1627 *Phytologist*.
- 1628 **Poorter L, Kwant R, Hernández R, Medina E, Werger MJA. 2000.** Leaf optical properties
 1629 in Venezuelan cloud forest trees. *Tree Physiology* **20**: 519–526.
- 1630 **Poorter L, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB. 1995.** Leaf Optical Properties Along a Vertical
 1631 Gradient in a Tropical Rain Forest Canopy in Costa Rica. *American Journal of Botany* **82**:
 1632 1257–1263.
- 1633 **Pörtner H-O, Scholes RJ, Agard J, Archer E, Arneth A, Bai X, Barnes D, Burrows M,**
 1634 **Chan L, Cheung WL(William), et al. 2021.** Scientific outcome of the IPBES-IPCC co-
 1635 sponsored workshop on biodiversity and climate change.

- 1636 **Raupach MR. 1987.** A lagrangian analysis of scalar transfer in vegetation canopies.
 1637 *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* **113**: 107–120.
- 1638 **Raupach. 1989.** Turbulent transfer in plant canopies. In: Plant canopies. Cambridge
 1639 University Press, 41–62.
- 1640 **Raupach MR, Shaw RH. 1982.** Averaging procedures for flow within vegetation canopies.
 1641 *Boundary-Layer Meteorol* **22**: 79–90.
- 1642 **Rey-Sánchez A, Slot M, Posada J, Kitajima K. 2016.** Spatial and seasonal variation in leaf
 1643 temperature within the canopy of a tropical forest. *Climate Research* **71**: 75–89.
- 1644 **Riedlmeier M, Ghirardo A, Wenig M, Knappe C, Koch K, Georgii E, Dey S, Parker JE,**
 1645 **Schnitzler J-P, Vlot AC. 2017.** Monoterpenes Support Systemic Acquired Resistance within
 1646 and between Plants. *The Plant Cell* **29**: 1440–1459.
- 1647 **Rijkers T, Pons TL, Bongers F. 2000.** The effect of tree height and light availability on
 1648 photosynthetic leaf traits of four neotropical species differing in shade tolerance.
 1649 *Functional Ecology* **14**: 77–86.
- 1650 **Roberts J, Cabral OMR, Aguiar LFD. 1990.** Stomatal and Boundary-Layer Conductances in
 1651 an Amazonian terra Firme Rain Forest. *The Journal of Applied Ecology* **27**: 336.
- 1652 **Rohde RA, Hausfather Z. 2020.** The Berkeley Earth Land/Ocean Temperature Record.
 1653 *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **12**: 3469–3479.
- 1654 **Rollinson CR, Alexander MR, Dye AW, Moore DJP, Pederson N, Trouet V. 2020.** Climate
 1655 sensitivity of understory trees differs from overstory trees in temperate mesic forests.
 1656 *Ecology* **102**: e03264.
- 1657 **Rozendaal DMA, Hurtado VH, Poorter L. 2006.** Plasticity in leaf traits of 38 tropical tree
 1658 species in response to light; relationships with light demand and adult stature. *Functional*
 1659 *Ecology* **20**: 207–216.
- 1660 **Ruehr NK, Gast A, Weber C, Daub B, Arneth A. 2016.** Water availability as dominant
 1661 control of heat stress responses in two contrasting tree species. *Tree Physiol* **36**: 164–178.

- 1662 **Russell MB, Woodall CW, Fraver S, D'Amato AW, Domke GM, Skog KE. 2014.** Residence
1663 Times and Decay Rates of Downed Woody Debris Biomass/Carbon in Eastern US Forests.
1664 *Ecosystems* **17**: 765–777.
- 1665 **Sack L, Cowan PD, Jaikumar N, Holbrook NM. 2003.** The “hydrology” of leaves: Co-
1666 ordination of structure and function in temperate woody species. *Plant, Cell & Environment*
1667 **26**: 1343–1356.
- 1668 **Sack L, Melcher PJ, Liu WH, Middleton E, Pardee T. 2006.** How strong is intracanopy leaf
1669 plasticity in temperate deciduous trees? *American Journal of Botany* **93**: 829–839.
- 1670 **Sack L, Scoffoni C. 2013.** Leaf venation: Structure, function, development, evolution,
1671 ecology and applications in the past, present and future. *New Phytologist* **198**: 983–1000.
- 1672 **Salisbury EJ. 1928.** On the Causes and Ecological Significance of Stomatal Frequency, with
1673 Special Reference to the Woodland Flora. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of*
1674 *London. Series B, Containing Papers of a Biological Character* **216**: 1–65.
- 1675 **Sanches MC, Ribeiro SP, Dalvi VC, Barbosa da Silva Junior M, Caldas de Sousa H, Pires**
1676 **de Lemos-Filho J. 2010.** Differential leaf traits of a neotropical tree *Cariniana legalis*
1677 (Mart.) Kuntze (Lecythidaceae): Comparing saplings and emergent trees. *Trees* **24**: 79–88.
- 1678 **Scafaro AP, Fan Y, Posch BC, Garcia A, Coast O, Atkin OK. 2021.** Responses of leaf
1679 respiration to heatwaves. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **44**: 2090–2101.
- 1680 **Scartazza A, Di Baccio D, Bertolotto P, Gavrichkova O, Matteucci G. 2016.** Investigating
1681 the European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.) Leaf characteristics along the vertical canopy
1682 profile: Leaf structure, photosynthetic capacity, light energy dissipation and
1683 photoprotection mechanisms. *Tree Physiol* **36**: 1060–1076.
- 1684 **Scharnweber T, Heinze L, Cruz-García R, van der Maaten-Theunissen M, Wilmking M.**
1685 **2019.** Confessions of solitary oaks: We grow fast but we fear the drought.
1686 *Dendrochronologia* **55**: 43–49.

- 1687 **Scheffers B, Edwards D, Diesmos A, Williams S, Evans T. 2013.** Microhabitats reduce
1688 animal's exposure to climate extremes. *Global change biology* **20**.
- 1689 **Schreuder MDJ, Brewer CA, Heine C. 2001.** Modelled Influences of Non-exchanging
1690 Trichomes on Leaf Boundary Layers and Gas Exchange. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **210**:
1691 23–32.
- 1692 **Schymanski SJ, Or D, Zwieniecki M. 2013.** Stomatal Control and Leaf Thermal and
1693 Hydraulic Capacitances under Rapid Environmental Fluctuations. *PLOS ONE* **8**: e54231.
- 1694 **Sellers PJ. 1985.** Canopy reflectance, photosynthesis and transpiration. *International*
1695 *Journal of Remote Sensing* **6**: 1335–1372.
- 1696 **Sharkey TD. 2005.** Effects of moderate heat stress on photosynthesis: Importance of
1697 thylakoid reactions, rubisco deactivation, reactive oxygen species, and thermotolerance
1698 provided by isoprene. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **28**: 269–277.
- 1699 **Sharkey TD, Monson RK. 2014.** The future of isoprene emission from leaves, canopies and
1700 landscapes. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **37**: 1727–1740.
- 1701 **Sharkey TD, Wiberley AE, Donohue AR. 2008.** Isoprene Emission from Plants: Why and
1702 How. *Annals of Botany* **101**: 5–18.
- 1703 **Shaw R. 1977.** Secondary Wind Speed Maxima Inside Plant Canopies. *Journal of Applied*
1704 *Meteorology* **16**: 514–521.
- 1705 **Shugart HH, Wang B, Fischer R, Ma J, Fang J, Yan X, Huth A, Armstrong AH. 2018.** Gap
1706 models and their individual-based relatives in the assessment of the consequences of global
1707 change. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **13**: 033001.
- 1708 **Sillett SC, Van Pelt R, Koch GW, Ambrose AR, Carroll AL, Antoine ME, Mifsud BM.**
1709 **2010.** Increasing wood production through old age in tall trees. *Forest Ecology and*
1710 *Management* **259**: 976–994.
- 1711 **Sitch S, Smith B, Prentice IC, Arneth A, Bondeau A, Cramer W, Kaplan JO, Levis S,**
1712 **Lucht W, Sykes MT, et al. 2003.** Evaluation of ecosystem dynamics, plant geography and

- 1713 terrestrial carbon cycling in the LPJ dynamic global vegetation model. *Global Change*
1714 *Biology* **9**: 161–185.
- 1715 **Slot M, Cala D, Aranda J, Virgo A, Michaletz ST, Winter K. 2021a.** Leaf heat tolerance of
1716 147 tropical forest species varies with elevation and leaf functional traits, but not with
1717 phylogeny. *Plant Cell Environ* **44**: 2414–2427.
- 1718 **Slot M, Kitajima K. 2015.** General patterns of acclimation of leaf respiration to elevated
1719 temperatures across biomes and plant types. *Oecologia* **177**: 885–900.
- 1720 **Slot M, Krause GH, Krause B, Hernández GG, Winter K. 2019.** Photosynthetic heat
1721 tolerance of shade and sun leaves of three tropical tree species. *Photosynth Res* **141**: 119–
1722 130.
- 1723 **Slot M, Rifai SW, Winter K. 2021b.** Photosynthetic plasticity of a tropical tree species,
1724 *TABEBUIA ROSEA*, in response to elevated temperature and [CO₂]. *Plant Cell Environ*:
1725 pce.14049.
- 1726 **Slot M, Winter K. 2017.** In situ temperature response of photosynthesis of 42 tree and
1727 liana species in the canopy of two Panamanian lowland tropical forests with contrasting
1728 rainfall regimes. *New Phytologist* **214**: 1103–1117.
- 1729 **Smith WK, Carter GA. 1988.** Shoot Structural Effects on Needle Temperatures and
1730 Photosynthesis in Conifers. *American Journal of Botany* **75**: 496–500.
- 1731 **Smith B, Prentice IC, Sykes MT. 2001.** Representation of vegetation dynamics in the
1732 modelling of terrestrial ecosystems: Comparing two contrasting approaches within
1733 European climate space. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **10**: 621–637.
- 1734 **Smith MN, Stark SC, Taylor TC, Ferreira ML, Oliveira E de, Restrepo-Coupe N, Chen S,**
1735 **Woodcock T, Santos DB dos, Alves LF, et al. 2019.** Seasonal and drought-related changes
1736 in leaf area profiles depend on height and light environment in an Amazon forest. *New*
1737 *Phytologist* **222**: 1284–1297.

- 1738 **Smith MN, Taylor TC, van Haren J, Rosolem R, Restrepo-Coupe N, Adams J, Wu J, de**
 1739 **Oliveira RC, da Silva R, de Araujo AC, *et al.* 2020.** Empirical evidence for resilience of
 1740 tropical forest photosynthesis in a warmer world. *Nature Plants* **6**: 1225–1230.
- 1741 **Song Q, Sun C, Deng Y, Bai H, Zhang Y, Yu H, Zhang J, Sha L, Zhou W, Liu Y. 2020.** Tree
 1742 Surface Temperature in a Primary Tropical Rain Forest. *Atmosphere* **11**: 798.
- 1743 **Stark SC, Breshears DD, Aragón S, Villegas JC, Law DJ, Smith MN, Minor DM, Assis RL**
 1744 **de, Almeida DRA de, Oliveira G de, *et al.* 2020.** Reframing tropical savannization: Linking
 1745 changes in canopy structure to energy balance alterations that impact climate. *Ecosphere*
 1746 **11**: e03231.
- 1747 **Stark SC, Leitold V, Wu JL, Hunter MO, de Castilho CV, Costa FRC, McMahon SM, Parker**
 1748 **GG, Shimabukuro MT, Lefsky MA, *et al.* 2012.** Amazon forest carbon dynamics predicted
 1749 by profiles of canopy leaf area and light environment. *Ecology Letters* **15**: 1406–1414.
- 1750 **Staudt K, Serafimovich A, Siebicke L, Pyles RD, Falge E. 2011.** Vertical structure of
 1751 evapotranspiration at a forest site (a case study). *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **151**:
 1752 709–729.
- 1753 **Stovall AEL, Shugart H, Yang X. 2019.** Tree height explains mortality risk during an
 1754 intense drought. *Nature Communications* **10**: 4385.
- 1755 **Suzuki N, Mittler R. 2006.** Reactive oxygen species and temperature stresses: A delicate
 1756 balance between signaling and destruction. *Physiologia Plantarum* **126**: 45–51.
- 1757 **Šimpraga M, Verbeeck H, Bloemen J, Vanhaecke L, Demarcke M, Joó E, Pokorska O,**
 1758 **Amelynck C, Schoon N, Dewulf J, *et al.* 2013.** Vertical canopy gradient in photosynthesis
 1759 and monoterpenoid emissions: An insight into the chemistry and physiology behind.
 1760 *Atmospheric Environment* **80**: 85–95.
- 1761 **Tang H, Dubayah R. 2017.** Light-driven growth in Amazon evergreen forests explained by
 1762 seasonal variations of vertical canopy structure. *PNAS* **114**: 2640–2644.

- 1763 **Tan Z-H, Zeng J, Zhang Y-J, Slot M, Gamo M, Hirano T, Kosugi Y, da Rocha HR, Saleska**
 1764 **SR, Goulden ML, *et al.* 2017.** Optimum air temperature for tropical forest photosynthesis:
 1765 Mechanisms involved and implications for climate warming. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **12**: 054022.
- 1766 **Taylor TC, McMahon SM, Smith MN, Boyle B, Violle C, Haren J van, Simova I, Meir P,**
 1767 **Ferreira LV, Camargo PB de, *et al.* 2018.** Isoprene emission structures tropical tree
 1768 biogeography and community assembly responses to climate. *New Phytologist* **220**: 435–
 1769 446.
- 1770 **Taylor TC, Smith MN, Slot M, Feeley KJ. 2019.** The capacity to emit isoprene
 1771 differentiates the photosynthetic temperature responses of tropical plant species. *Plant Cell*
 1772 *Environ* **42**: 2448–2457.
- 1773 **Taylor TC, Wisniewski WT, Alves EG, Oliveira RC de, Saleska SR. 2021.** A new field
 1774 instrument for leaf volatiles reveals an unexpected vertical profile of isoprenoid emission
 1775 capacities in a tropical forest. *bioRxiv*: 2021.02.15.431157.
- 1776 **Tepley AJ, Thompson JR, Epstein HE, Anderson-Teixeira KJ. 2017.** Vulnerability to
 1777 forest loss through altered postfire recovery dynamics in a warming climate in the Klamath
 1778 Mountains. *Global Change Biology* **23**: 4117–4132.
- 1779 **Teskey R, Wertin T, Bauweraerts I, Ameye M, McGuire MA, Steppe K. 2015.** Responses
 1780 of tree species to heat waves and extreme heat events. *Plant, Cell & Environment* **38**: 1699–
 1781 1712.
- 1782 **Thomas SC, Winner WE. 2002.** Photosynthetic differences between saplings and adult
 1783 trees: An integration of field results by meta-analysis. *Tree Physiology* **22**: 117–127.
- 1784 **Tibbitts TW. 1979.** Humidity and Plants. *BioScience* **29**: 358–363.
- 1785 **Tiwari R, Gloor E, Cruz WJA da, Marimon BS, Marimon-Junior BH, Reis SM, Souza IA**
 1786 **de, Krause HG, Slot M, Winter K, *et al.* 2021.** Photosynthetic quantum efficiency in south-
 1787 eastern Amazonian trees may be already affected by climate change. *Plant, Cell &*
 1788 *Environment* **44**: 2428–2439.

- 1789 **Trouillier M, van der Maaten-Theunissen M, Scharnweber T, Würth D, Burger A,**
 1790 **Schnittler M, Wilmking M. 2018.** Size matters—a comparison of three methods to assess
 1791 age- and size-dependent climate sensitivity of trees. *Trees* **33**: 183–192.
- 1792 **Turnbull MH, Whitehead D, Tissue DT, Schuster WSF, Brown KJ, Griffin KL. 2003.**
 1793 Scaling foliar respiration in two contrasting forest canopies. *Functional Ecology* **17**: 101–
 1794 114.
- 1795 **Tymen B, Vincent G, Courtois EA, Heurtebize J, Dauzat J, Marechaux I, Chave J. 2017.**
 1796 Quantifying micro-environmental variation in tropical rainforest understory at landscape
 1797 scale by combining airborne LiDAR scanning and a sensor network. *Annals of Forest Science*
 1798 **74**: 32.
- 1799 **Urban O, Kosvancová M, Marek MV, Lichtenthaler HK. 2007.** Induction of
 1800 photosynthesis and importance of limitations during the induction phase in sun and shade
 1801 leaves of five ecologically contrasting tree species from the temperate zone. *Tree Physiol*
 1802 **27**: 1207–1215.
- 1803 **van de Weg MJ, Meir P, Grace J, Ramos GD. 2012.** Photosynthetic parameters, dark
 1804 respiration and leaf traits in the canopy of a Peruvian tropical montane cloud forest.
 1805 *Oecologia* **168**: 23–34.
- 1806 **Van Wittenberghe S, Adriaenssens S, Staelens J, Verheyen K, Samson R. 2012.**
 1807 Variability of stomatal conductance, leaf anatomy, and seasonal leaf wettability of young
 1808 and adult European beech leaves along a vertical canopy gradient. *Trees* **26**: 1427–1438.
- 1809 **Vårhammar A, Wallin G, McLean CM, Dusenge ME, Medlyn BE, Hasper TB, Nsabimana**
 1810 **D, Uddling J. 2015.** Photosynthetic temperature responses of tree species in Rwanda:
 1811 Evidence of pronounced negative effects of high temperature in montane rainforest climax
 1812 species. *New Phytologist* **206**: 1000–1012.
- 1813 **Vickers CE, Gershenzon J, Lerdau MT, Loreto F. 2009.** A unified mechanism of action for
 1814 volatile isoprenoids in plant abiotic stress. *Nat Chem Biol* **5**: 283–291.

- 1815 **Vogel S. 1968.** "Sun Leaves" and "Shade Leaves": Differences in Convective Heat
1816 Dissipation. *Ecology* **49**: 1203–1204.
- 1817 **Vogel S. 2009.** Leaves in the lowest and highest winds: Temperature, force and shape. *New*
1818 *Phytologist* **183**: 13–26.
- 1819 **von Arx G, Dobbertin M, Rebetez M. 2012.** Spatio-temporal effects of forest canopy on
1820 understory microclimate in a long-term experiment in Switzerland. *Agricultural and Forest*
1821 *Meteorology* **166–167**: 144–155.
- 1822 **Wang B, Chen T, Li C, Xu G, Wu G, Liu G. 2022.** Discrepancy in growth resilience to
1823 drought among different stand-aged forests declines going from a semi-humid region to an
1824 arid region. *Forest Ecology and Management* **511**: 120135.
- 1825 **Way DA. 2019.** Just the right temperature. *Nat Ecol Evol* **3**: 718–719.
- 1826 **Way DA, Pearcy RW. 2012.** Sunflecks in trees and forests: From photosynthetic
1827 physiology to global change biology. *Tree Physiology* **32**: 1066–1081.
- 1828 **Webster C, Westoby M, Rutter N, Jonas T. 2018.** Three-dimensional thermal
1829 characterization of forest canopies using UAV photogrammetry. *Remote Sensing of*
1830 *Environment* **209**: 835–847.
- 1831 **Weerasinghe LK, Creek D, Crous KY, Xiang S, Liddell MJ, Turnbull MH, Atkin OK. 2014.**
1832 Canopy position affects the relationships between leaf respiration and associated traits in a
1833 tropical rainforest in Far North Queensland. *Tree Physiol* **34**: 564–584.
- 1834 **Wong SC, Cowan IR, Farquhar GD. 1979.** Stomatal conductance correlates with
1835 photosynthetic capacity. *Nature* **282**: 424–426.
- 1836 **Woodward FI, Lomas MR. 2004.** Vegetation dynamics – simulating responses to climatic
1837 change. *Biological Reviews* **79**: 643–670.
- 1838 **Wright IJ, Reich PB, Westoby M, Ackerly DD, Baruch Z, Bongers F, Cavender-Bares J,**
1839 **Chapin T, Cornelissen JHC, Diemer M, et al. 2004.** The worldwide leaf economics
1840 spectrum. *Nature* **428**: 821–827.

- 1841 **Wu J, Albert LP, Lopes AP, Restrepo-Coupe N, Hayek M, Wiedemann KT, Guan K, Stark**
 1842 **SC, Christoffersen B, Prohaska N, *et al.* 2016.** Leaf development and demography explain
 1843 photosynthetic seasonality in Amazon evergreen forests. *Science* **351**: 972–976.
- 1844 **Wyka TP, Oleksyn J, Żytkowiak R, Karolewski P, Jagodziński AM, Reich PB. 2012.**
 1845 Responses of leaf structure and photosynthetic properties to intra-canopy light gradients:
 1846 A common garden test with four broadleaf deciduous angiosperm and seven evergreen
 1847 conifer tree species. *Oecologia* **170**: 11–24.
- 1848 **Wylie RB. 1951.** Principles of Foliar Organization Shown by Sun-Shade Leaves from Ten
 1849 Species of Deciduous Dicotyledonous Trees. *American Journal of Botany* **38**: 355–361.
- 1850 **Xu B, Arain MA, Black TA, Law BE, Pastorello GZ, Chu H. 2020.** Seasonal variability of
 1851 forest sensitivity to heat and drought stresses: A synthesis based on carbon fluxes from
 1852 North American forest ecosystems. *Global Change Biology* **26**: 901–918.
- 1853 **Xu C-Y, Griffin KL. 2006.** Seasonal variation in the temperature response of leaf
 1854 respiration in *Quercus rubra*: Foliage respiration and leaf properties. *Functional Ecology*
 1855 **20**: 778–789.
- 1856 **Yang PC, Black TA, Neumann HH, Novak MD, Blanken PD. 1999.** Spatial and temporal
 1857 variability of CO₂ concentration and flux in a boreal aspen forest. *Journal of Geophysical*
 1858 *Research: Atmospheres* **104**: 27653–27661.
- 1859 **Yoder BJ, Ryan MG, Waring RH, Schoettle AW, Kaufmann MR. 1994.** Evidence of
 1860 Reduced Photosynthetic Rates in Old Trees. *Forest Science* **40**: 513–527.
- 1861 **Zellweger F, Coomes D, Lenoir J, Depauw L, Maes SL, Wulf M, Kirby KJ, Brunet J,**
 1862 **Kopecký M, Máliš F, *et al.* 2019.** Seasonal drivers of understorey temperature buffering in
 1863 temperate deciduous forests across Europe (A Algar, Ed.). *Global Ecology and Biogeography*
 1864 **28**: 1774–1786.
- 1865 **Zellweger F, De Frenne P, Lenoir J, Vangansbeke P, Verheyen K, Bernhardt-**
 1866 **Römermann M, Baeten L, Hédli R, Berki I, Brunet J, *et al.* 2020.** Forest microclimate
 1867 dynamics drive plant responses to warming. *Science* **368**: 772–775.

- 1868 **Zhang J-L, Poorter L, Hao G-Y, Cao K-F. 2012.** Photosynthetic thermotolerance of woody
1869 savanna species in China is correlated with leaf life span. *Annals of Botany* **110**: 1027–1033.
- 1870 **Zhou H, Xu M, Pan H, Yu X. 2015.** Leaf-age effects on temperature responses of
1871 photosynthesis and respiration of an alpine oak, *Quercus aquifolioides*, in southwestern
1872 China. *Tree Physiology* **35**: 1236–1248.
- 1873 **Zweifel R, Bohm JP, Hasler R. 2002.** Midday stomatal closure in Norway spruce–reactions
1874 in the upper and lower crown. *Tree Physiology* **22**: 1125–1136.
- 1875 **Zwieniecki MA, Boyce CK, Holbrook NM. 2004.** Hydraulic limitations imposed by crown
1876 placement determine final size and shape of *Quercus rubra* L. leaves. *Plant, Cell &*
1877 *Environment* **27**: 357–365.