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# Intro

* The vegetation response to water deficit was assessed using remote sensing information and dendrocronologial data.

### Sequías

Although summer drought is a characteristic feature of the Mediterranean climate (Lionello 2012), an increase in the frequency and severity of drought events have been recorded for the Mediterranean region (Hoerling et al. 2012), particularly for southern Europe (Vicente-Serrano et al. 2014, Spinoni et al. 2015, Stagge et al. 2017) where a trend towards drier summers has been reported for the last three decades (Spinoni et al. 2017a). Además las proyecciones apuntan a que este incremento en la frecuencia continuará (Spinoni et al. 2017b).

In the Iberian Peninsula, major drought episodies were recorded in 1981, 1995, 2000 and 2005 (Vicente-Serrano et al. 2014). The 2004/2005 and 2011/2012 hydrological years are considered two of the worst drought periods recorded in the Iberian Peninsula, particularly in the southern sector (García-Herrera et al. 2007, Trigo et al. 2013, Gouveia et al. 2015). These events were extreme in both its magnitude and spatial extent (Gouveia and Trigo 2014).

notas sequia

* the drought events have been longest and most severe in the period 1991-2010 for mediterranean are of Southern Europe
* Seasonally, drought frequency is projected to increase everywhere in Europe for both scenarios in spring and summer, especially over southern Europe, and less intensely in autumn (Spinoni et al. 2017b) Aumento de la frecuencia de sequías en spring and summer desde 1950 hasta 2014 (Spinoni et al. 2017a) Both for frequency and severity, the evolution towards drier conditions is more relevant in the last three decades over Mediterranean area in summer, an increase in the drought severity in the Iberian Peninsula has been observed in the last decades (Vicente-Serrano et al. 2014).

Althought several works have reported these two years as some of the worst drought events, we characterised the drought at several spatio-temporal scales in the study area. From a long-term perspective, we compare the accumulated monthly precipitation at a meteorological station (Granada, Base Aérea) during the hydrological years 2004-2005 and 2011-2012 with the average of accumulated monthly precipitation for the period 1950-2015.

### Extreme sequias y ecologia

* ojo hablar de que la sequía es un proceso natural, pero que se está viendo aumentado en los últimos años:

Drought is a natural phenomenon that occurs when water availability is significantly below normal levels over a long period and the supply cannot meet the existing demand.

ver intro Ecosphere: Drought affects ecological systems across every climatic zone worldwide and is exacerbated by climate change and increasing anthropogenic water demands (Mishra and Singh 2010). Characterized by below-normal precipitation (Dai 2011), meteorological drought results from complex interactions between the atmosphere and hydrologic processes within the biosphere. Unlike aridity, which is a permanent feature of climate (Wilhite 1992), drought is a temporary extreme event (Palmer 1965, Mishra and Singh 2010) that can persist for extended time periods (months to years; Mishra and Singh 2010). Drought can cause significant changes in ecosystem productivity and water dynamics, and it is one of the most economically and ecologically disruptive extreme events affecting millions of people globally (Dai 2011).

Extreme climate events (e.g. droughts) severely affect forests and grasslands throuhg changes in plant physiology, phenology and carbon allocation (Ummenhofer and Meehl 2017) (incluir citas para los efectos de la sequía sobre la vegetación).

No solo efectos aislados, sino también en conjunción con otros factores, sobre todo en el mediterráneo donde convergen muchos de los factores que pueden interaccionar:

* La sequía es un factor crucial a tener en cuenta, ya que es además de los efectos que puede tener de forma aislada, se ha visto que además presenta muchas interacciones con otros factores, siendo por tanto un factor crucial ($IMPROVE$ ver (Doblas-Miranda et al. 2017)):
* Some interactions alter the effects of a single factor, as drought enhances or decreases the effects of atmospheric components on plant ecophysiology
* Drought and land use changes, among others, alter water resources and lead to land degradation, vegetation regeneration decline, and expansion of forest diseases.
* Climate change, and especially drought, emerges as a crucial factor in most of the reviewed interactions and therefore it should be considered when it comes to designing and applying international management policies
* Drought should be considered when designing and applying management policies.

Además la sequía se espera que tengan …Droughts are most likely to have the largest and most long-lasting impacts globally due to large indirect and lagged impacts and long recovery especially for forest ecosystems (ver 18 en Ummenhofer and Meehl (2017)). Así por ejemplo se ha visto que todos los biomas presentan una vulnerabilidad similar … En una revision sobre la vulnerabilidad del sistema de trasnporte en plantas al embolismo inducido por sequía, ha mostrado que una convergencia de la vulnerabilidad de los bosques a la sequía, mostrando que todos los biomas son igualmente vulnerables a los fallos hidráulicos independientemente del régimen de precipitación (Choat et al. 2012, <doi:10.1038/nature11688>)

– Existen evidencias que sugieren que muchos bosques son vulnerables a eventos climáticos extremos … (Zhang) y esto puede ser especialmente relevante para especies situadas en el rear edge (completar)

Una vez dicho esto…

* Como la dendro ayuda a evaluar las sequías (ver Gazol 2017)
* Remote sensing:
  + Uso de Remote sensing para estudiar la sequía –> Leer Zhang et al. (2013) y escribir algo. Drought monitoring using remote-sensing approach was originally applied to agriculture. Several remote-sensing derived indices have been used to study the drought effects on vegetation …
  + Leer también a AghaKouchak et al. (2015)

Climate change projections indicate that extreme events will become more common in the future (IPCC 2013), making it important that we understand how ecosystems respond to these events and the potential feedbacks to radiative forcing.

### 

Uso de NDVI como estimador de la NPP:

* The NDVI properties have allowed the use of this information for estimating the Net Primary Production (NPP) (Goward and Dye, 1987; Running et al., 2004; Hasenauer et al., 2012). Different studies have already found a strong relationship between NPP and radial growth (e.g., Granier et al., 2008; Babst et al., 2013, 2014a, 2014b; Vicente-Serrano et al., 2015), albeit with significant differences, particularly those related to species, sites and environmental conditions.
* Ver Gilaber et al. 2017 <http://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/9/3/193>

### Aims

$IMPROVE$

In this study we combined remote sensing information and dendroecological methods to evaluate the drought impacts in both greenees and growth of *Q. pyrenaica* forests in Sierra Nevada. Specifically,

The aims of this work were:

* To quantify how two extreme drought events influenced the greennes and radial growth of *Q. pyreancia* forests in their rear edge,
* to analyze the resilience of these forests to sucessive extrme drought events,
* and to explore differences in the resilience metrics between populations located in contrasting slopes within the rear edge of the distribution of this species.

## References

# Materials and methods

## Species and study site

The Pyrenean oak (*Quercus pyrenaica* Willd.) forests extend through south-western France and the Iberian Peninsula (Franco 1990) reaching its southern limit in north of Morocco. In the Iberian Peninsula these forests live under meso-supramediterranean and mesotemperate areas and subhumid, humid and hyperhumid ombroclimate (Rivas-Martínez et al. 2002) living on siliceous soils, or soils poor in basic ions (Serna 2014). *Q. pyrenaica* requires between 650 and 1200 mm of annual precipitation and a summer minimal precipitation between 100 and 200 mm (Martínez-Parras and Molero-Mesa 1982, García and Jiménez 2009), with summer rainfall being a key factor in the distribution of the species (Gavilán et al. 2007, Río et al. 2007).

This species reaches its southernmost European limit at Sierra Nevada, a high-mountain range located in southern Spain (37°N, 3°W) with elevations of between 860 m and 3482 m *a.s.l.*. The climate is Mediterranean, characterized by cold winters and hot summers, with pronounced summer drought (July-August). There are eight oak patches (2400 Has) identified (**Figure 1**) in this mountain range, ranging between 1100 and 2000 m *a.s.l.* and generally associated to major river valleys. Sierra Nevada is considered a glacial refugia for deciduous *Quercus* species during glaciation (Brewer et al. 2002, Olalde et al. 2002, Rodríguez-Sánchez et al. 2010) and these populations are considered as a rear edge of the habitat distribution, which is important in determining habitat responses to expected climate change (Hampe and Petit 2005).

:red\_circle: duda aqui Varias referencias hablan de los años 2005 y 2012 como extremadamente secos. Pero habría que hacer alguna referencia y/o análisis. Tengo dudas de si hemos de analizar (e incluir) que efectivamente los años 2005 y 2012 fueron caracterizados por un extrema sequía, por lo que habría que incluyendo referencia a apéndice

* O quizá un apartado llamado Drought episodes (similar a esto <https://www.nature.com/articles/srep28269>)

The populations of Pyrenean oak forests at Sierra Nevada are considered relict forests (Melendo and Valle 2000, Vivero et al. 2000), undergoing intensive anthropic use in the last few decades (Camacho-Olmedo et al. 2002, Valbuena-Carabaña et al. 2010). In fact, the status of conservation of this species for southern Spain is “Vulnerable” (Vivero et al. 2000). The relict presence of this species in Sierra Nevada is related both to its genetic resilience as well as to its high intraspecific genetic diversity (Valbuena-Carabaña and Gil 2013). However, they are also expected to suffer the impact of climate change, due to their climate requirements (wet summers). Thus, simulations of the climate change effects on this habitat forecast a reduction in suitable habitats for Sierra Nevada (Benito et al. 2011).

## Datos de sequía.

* :red\_circle: Meter aquí algunos datos de sequia, similar a lo planteado por Gazol

### Greenness data

To characterize the vegetation greenness of *Q. pyrenaica* we used the *Enhanced Vegetation Index* (EVI) derived from MOD13Q1 product obtained by the *Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer* (MODIS) sensor (Didan 2015). EVI and NDVI (*Normalized Difference Vegetation Index*) are the most common greenness vegetation indices. We used EVI instead of NDVI because EVI is more sensitive to changes in high-biomass areas (a serious shortcoming of NDVI); EVI reduces the influence of atmospheric conditions on vegetation index values, and EVI corrects for canopy background signals (Huete et al. 2002, Cabello et al. 2012, Krapivin et al. 2015).

EVI data consits of 16-day maximun value composite images (23 per year) of the EVI value with a spatial resolution of 250 m x 250 m. We selected the pixels covering the distribution of *Q. pyrenaica* forests in Sierra Nevada (*n* = 928 pixels). MODIS EVI Data from Collection 6 were obtanied using Google Earth Engine platform for the period 2000 - 2016. A data filtering was applied to select EVI valid values. The filtering was done using quality flags and VI Usefulness Indices accompanying the EVI data. We filter out those values affected by high content of aerosols, clouds, shadows, snow or water.

Each 1 × 1 km2 16-day composite EVI value is considered valid when (a) EVI data is produced—‘MODLAND\_QA’ equals 0 (good quality) or 1 (check other QA), (b) VI usefulness is between 0 and 11, (c) clouds are absent—‘adjacent cloud detected’ (0), ‘mixed clouds’ (0) and ‘possible shadow’ (0), and (d) aerosol content is low or average—‘aerosol quantity’ (1 or 2). Note that ‘MODLAND\_QA’ checks whether EVI is produced or not, and if produced, its quality is good or whether other quality flags should also be checked. Besides, VI usefulness indices between 0 to 11 essentially include all EVI data. Thus, these two conditions serve as additional checks.

and then a quality assessment was carried out to filter the … (Reyes-Díez et al. 2015)

\* According to @Reyes2015 we must consider the shadow in the mountain, but we can discard the filter of adjacent clouds. On the other hand, the use of EVI mean is highly stable under the use of any filter [@Reyes2015]

The presence of clouds (adjacent clouds, mixed clouds and shadows) ‘obscures’ the surface in a radiometric sense, thus corrupting inferred EVI values. In addition, two types of aerosol loadings typically corrupt EVI—climatology and high aerosols. Use of aerosol climatology

The EVI data are geometrically and atmospherically corrected and include information about the quality ass….

$NOTA$: NDVI sirve para estimar la producción primaria neta. Existen diferentes estudio que han evaluado el efecto de la sequía sobre la producción primaria neta utilizando NDVI.

These data are geometrically and atmospherically corrected, and include an index of data quality (reliability, which range from 0 – good quality data – to 4 – raw data or absent for different reasons) based on the environmental conditions in which the data was recorded

We first used the Quality Assesment (QA band) information of this product to filter out those values affected by high content of aerosols, clouds, shadows, snow or water; and then a quality assessment was carried out to filter the … (Reyes-Díez et al. 2015)

:red\_circle: reescribir esto de la calidad. Ver Samanta et al 2012 y como describe el proceso de calidad

OJITO———- reescribir esto de arriba

After the filter out process, we built the annual EVI profile for each pixel and then computed the EVI’s annual mean values and the EVI anomaly for each pixel for the period 2000 - 2015. (:red\_circle: Hemos seleccionado EVI medio, además de por los consejos que me ha dicho Domingo, porque he comprobado que existe una correlación entre el evi medio y el evi estacional, sobre todo el de verano. Ver esto: <https://github.com/ajpelu/qpyr_modis_resilience/blob/master/analysis/prepare_modis_qa.md>. Además presenta alta correlaciones significativas con el EVI de verano: 0.88; de primavera: 0.76 y anual: 0.81)

Procedimiento de Filtrado de datos (ver <https://github.com/ajpelu/qpyr_modis_resilience/blob/master/analysis/prepare_modis_qa.md>)

* Información contenida en banda QA.
  + Nos quedamos con pixeles marcados como Good Data (57.89 %)
  + Filter out los marcados como Snow/Ice y/o Cloudy (2.57 + 7.08 = 9.65 %)
  + Pixeles marcados como Marginal Data (32.33 %) (ver siguiente paso)
* Explorar distribución temporal y analizar banda QA Detailed y llevar a cabo un filtrado siguiendo las especificaciones de Reyes-Díez et al. (2015).
  + Vemos los composites marcados con Aerosoles, Adjacent cluods, y Shadow.
  + According to Reyes-Díez et al. (2015) we must consider the shadow in the mountain, but we can discard the filter of adjacent clouds. On the other hand, the use of EVI mean is highly stable under the use of any filter (Reyes-Díez et al. 2015)
* Finalmente nos hemos quedado con las siguientes cifras. De un total de 360064 images composites for the study zone were downloaded (928 x 20 x 1 + 928 x 23 x 16 = 360064), tras el filtrado, nos quedamos con 286825 (79.65 %)

To explore the effect of drought events on greenness we calculated the EVI standardized anomaly (EVI~sa) pixel-by-pixel, since it minimizes biases in the evaluation of anomalies, providing more information about the magnitude of the anomalies (Samanta et al. 2012, Gao et al. (2016)). For each pixel we averaged all the EVI valid values within a year (:red\_filter: see quality filter), and then the standardized anomaly was computed as:

where is the EVI standardized anomaly for the year ; the annual mean value of EVI for the year ; the average of the annual EVI values for the period of reference (all except year), and the standard deviation for the reference period.

## Field sampling and dendrochronological methods

### Tree sampling

Samplig was carried during autumn of 2016. Trees were sampled at two locations in contrasting slopes of Sierra Nevada: San Juan (SJ; northern site) and Cáñar (CA; southern site) (Figure 1; Table 1). Two elevations were sampled for the southern site (CA-Low and CA-High). All the sites were oak monospecific and representatives of two of the three the population’s cluster identified for the specie in this mountain range (:red\_circle: mejorar; citar Pérz-Luque et al..). In each site between 15 and 20 dominant trees were randomly selected. Two cores of 5 mm of diameter were taken from each at breast heith (1.3 m) using an increment borer. For each tree, diameter at breat height (DBH) and total height were recorded. Increment cores were air dried, glued onto wooden mounts and sanded. Annual radial growth (ring width, RW) were measured with a LINTAB measuring device (Rinntech, Heidelberg, Germany) coupled to a stereomicroscope, with an accuracy of 0.01 mm. Individual ring series were visually and statistically cross-dated with TSAP software (Rinntech, Heidelberg, Germany), using the statistics Gleichläufigkeit (GLK), t-value and the crossdating index (CDI). Validation of the croos-dating was done using COFECHA software (Holmes 1983).

## Dendrochronological methods

* incluir citas a Frits; Cooks …
* site cronologies
* BAI
* GC Nowacki??

Site chronologies were built by averaging all tree BAI measurement of the same site. To explore similarity within locality, each site chronology was smoothed using centred moving averages with different window sizes, and then Pearson’s correlation coefficient between the two chronologies of the same locality (higher and lower elevation) were calculated. Significance was tested using 1000 boostrap replicates and with 95 % confidence intervals built using the R packgae boot (Canty and Ripley 2016)

## Resilience

To evaluate the effects of the disturbance events on greeennes and tree growth we used four resilience indices proposed by Lloret et al. (2011): resilience (*Rs*), resistance (*Rt*), recovery (*Rc*) and relative resilience (*RRs*).

The resistance index (*Rt*) quantifies the severity of the impact of the disturbance in the year it occurred. It is estimated as the ratio between the performance during and befor the disturbance:

Resistance (*Rt*) = Drought / Predrought

The Recovery index (*Rc*) is the ability to recover from disturbance relative to its severity, and it is estimated as the ratio between performance after and during disturbance:

Recovery (*Rc*) = Postdrought / Drought

The Resilience index (*Rs*) is the capacity to reach pre-disturbance performance levels, and it is estimated as the ratio between the performance after and before disturbance:

Resilience (*Rs*) = Postdrought / Predrought

The Relative Resilience (*RRs*) is the resilience weighted by the severity of the disturbance, and it is estimated as:

Relative Resilience (*RRs*) = (Postdrought - Drought) / Predrought

We computed the values of these indices for tree growth and greenness during each drought event. We considered 2005 and 2012 as singles drought events. The predrought and postdrought values of each target variable (i.e.: tree growth or EVI) we computed as the mean value during a period of three years before and after the disturbance events respectively. A period of three years was chosen because we found similar results comparing periods of two, three and four years (:red\_circle: incluir tabla de coeficientes y/o gráfica?? como suplement, see Gazol 2017)

## Statistical analysis

* Explore anomalies EVI
* Explore long and short term trends in RW :red\_circle: ver correo Guillermo
* ANOVA analysis EVI events and populations

We tested for significant differences between drought events (2005 and 2012) and oak population (northern and southern slopes) for each of the resilience indices. Robust two-way ANOVAs were used beacuse original and log-transformed data both did not match the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance (Wilcox 2012). Robust measures of central tendency (M-estimator based on Huber’s Psi) were used since they were close to mean value in all cases (Wilcox 2012). When running the robust ANOVA test, data were boostrapped 3000 times and trimmed automatically to control the potential influence of outliers (Field et al. 2012, Wilcox (2012)). Post-hoc differences were assessed pairwise using a similar boostrap test. All the robust ANOVA and post-hoc tests were carried out using the WRS2 (Mair et al. 2017) and rcompanion (Mangiafico 2017) R packages. The level of significance was set at 0.05 and adjusted for multiple comparisons.

## References

# Results

## Vegetation Greenness

referencia a las tendencias en EVI (lo hemos vuelto a calcular y además en el trabajo de ontologías también nos sale)

Standardized a

Cuando exploramos las anomalías (brutas, estandarizadas y normalizadas) observamos valores muy negativos para el año 2005. Sin embargo vemos valores menos negativos para 2005. Tukey posthoc testing (lsmeans package CITAR) was conducted for pairwise comparisons among the slopes and the disturbance years

Las anomalías (sa) fueron significativamente menores en 2005 (-2.285 masmenos 0.029)que para 2012 (-0.418 masmenos 0.029), (LSMEANS, t.ratio = -45.358; p\_value < 0.0001)

Vegetation greenness of *Quercus pyrenaica* forests were lower during the 2005 and 2012 year than the greenness observed for the reference period (:red\_circle: Fig 1a EVI profile comparison), particu

Del análisis de las anomalías observamos:

* En 2005 y en 2012 las anomalías fueron negativas.
* 2005 las anomalías fueron mucho mas negativas que para 2012.
* Analizar magnitud de las anomalías para 2005 y 2012 (comparación entre ellas y entre NyS):

Reduction in annual EVI mean was considerably higher in northern populations than in southern ones during the 2005 drought.

* 2005 fue el año en el que las anomalías fueron mas negativas, siendo de las anomalías de mas magnitud negativa en las poblaciones del norte.
* Si atendemos a las sa (standardized anomalíes) y aplicamos el criterio de Gao, podemos decir que en 2005 se observó un bronwing en los bosques de Q. pyrenaica, sobre todo en las situadas en el northern slopes.
* Asimismo, las anomalías 2012 fueron negativas pero

## Resiliencia EVI

* Resistencia
  + Los robledales mostraron menor resistencia a la sequía de 2005 que a la de 2012 [2005: 0.858 (0.853-0.863); 2012: 0.943 (0.939 - 0.947); p <0.0001]
  + Menor resistencia de las poblaciones del Norte a los eventos de sequía que las del Sur [N: 0.883 (0.877-0.889); S: 0.921 (0.918 - 0.925); p <0.0001]
  + La resistencia varió en función de la sequía y de la población. Las poblaciones mostraron una resistencia similar al evento de sequía de 2012 (padj = 0.172), sin embargo las poblaciones del N fueron mucho menos resistentes que las del Sur durante la sequía de 2005 [N: 0.819 (0.814-0.824); S: 0.902 (0.896 - 0.907); p <0.0001]
* Recovery
  + La recuperación de los robledales fue mayor tras la sequía de 2005 que tras la de 2012 [2005: 1.120 (1.113-1.126); 2012: 1.057 (1.054 - 1.060); p <0.0001]
  + Los robledales de la cara sur mostraron una menor recuperación que los de la cara norte [N: 1.102 (1.096-1.108); S: 1.069 (1.065 - 1.073); p <0.0001]
  + Las poblaciones del sur mostraron una recuperación similar ante la sequía de 2005 y 2012 (p = 0.186), cosa que no ocurrió para las poblaciones N (p < 0.0001), que mostró una recuperación mayor para la sequía de 2005 que para la de 2012 [2005: 1.169 (1.161-1.177); 2012: 1.042 (1.036 - 1.047); p <0.0001]. En 2005, las poblaciones del S mostraron menor recuperación; mientras que en 2012 ocurrión un patrón inverso, mostrando un patron mayor que las del norte.
* Resilience
  + La resiliencia de los robledales fue mayor para la sequía de 2012 que para la de 2005 [2005: 0.958 (0.955-0.962); 2012: 0.995 (0.991 - 0.998); p <0.0001]
  + Los robledales del sur mostraron mayor resiliencia que los del norte [N: 0.970 (0.966-0.974); S: 0.983 (0.980 - 0.986); p <0.0001], aunque para 2005 ambas poblaciones no mostraron diferencias en la resiliencia (padj = 0.152). En 2012 se observó mayor resiliencia en las del S que en la del N (p<0.0001)
* Relative Resilience
* Los robledales mostraron mayor resiliencia relativa a la sequía de 2005 que a la de 2012 [2005: 0.099 (0.095-0.105); 2012: 0.053 (0.050 - 0.056); p <0.0001]
* Las poblaciones del sur mostraron menor resiliencia relativa que las del norte [N: 0.086 (0.082-0.092); S: 0.063 (0.060 - 0.066); p <0.0001], debido sobre todo a la diferencia en la resiliencia relativa para las poblaciones del norte entre los dos eventos de sequía (mucha mayor resiliencia relativa en 2012 que en 2005 para las poblaciones del N)
* Las poblaciones del sur no mostraron diferencias en cuanto a la resiliencia relativa entre los dos eventos de sequía (padj = 0.152)

## Resiliencia BAI

* Resistance:
* No diferencias significativas entre la resistencia mostrada por los robledales a los eventos de sequía de 2005 y 2012. Valores de resistencia menor al evento de 2005. [2005: 0.721 (0.6437-0.7984); 2012: 0.8193 (0.7758 - 0.8628); p = 0.03]
* Diferentes resistencias a los eventos de sequía en función del sitio (p <0.0001). Las localidades del sur (CaLow y CAHigh no mostraron diferencias en cuanto a la resistencia p.adjust = 0.012) mostraron una resistencia mayor a los eventos de sequía que la observada a la localidad del norte [caH: 0.8157 (0.7549 - 0.8764) (a); caL: 0.9209 (0.8834 - 0.9584) (a); SJ: 0.6116 (0.5387 - 0.6846) (b)].
* La interacción también fue significativa. De hecho, si miramos las gráfica, observamos como la resistencia a la sequía de 2005 fue significativamente menor en SJ que la resistancia mostrada, tanto por las otras poblaciones para 2005, como la mostrada por SJ para el año 2012 –¿¿¿ Podemos decir que la sequía de 2005 afectó mucho mas a la población de SJ???
* Recovery
  + En general mayor recuperación para el evento de 2012 que para el evento de 2005 [2005: 0.9462 (0.8794-1.013); 2012: 1.161 (1.081 - 1.24); p < 0.001]

## References

# Discussions notes

## Dos cronos en Cañar

* Gea-Izquierdo and Cañellas (2014) muestrea solo en CA-Low (QUPY10) y obtiene resultados similares a CA-Low.
* En tan poco espacio hay diferencias enormes entre las dos cronos
* *Las tendencias de BAI de Cáñar baja altitud son diferentes a las del norte, las cuales se parecen mucho a las que suelen encontrarse en la mayoría de sitios. Puedes mirar por ejemplo las tendencias de las líneas negras (de más de 100 años, sobre todo) en la Fig 2 del artículo de Ecosystems… fíjate que QUPY3 se parece más a QUPY10… y QUPY3 era la única dehesa (en parte) y uno de los sitios más secos (por otro lado, aunque frío). En fin, todo esto es algo especulativo, pero sirva como exploración de tus cronos, y para mostrar que me parece muy interesante la diferencia entre Cáñar alto y bajo (y nuevo).*
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