# Light and life form interact to shape stomatal ratio among British angiosperms[1]

Christopher D. Muir[2]

[1] Manuscript received _; revision accepted _.

[2] Biodiversity Research Centre and Botany Department, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z4, Canada

*Author for correspondence:*
*Christopher D. Muir*
*Tel:* +17782284851
*Email:* chrisdmuir@gmail.com
University of British Columbia
6270 University Blvd.
Vancouver, BC, Canada
V6T 1Z4

Short title: Shedding light on British herbs

Word count:
Summary:
Introduction:
Methods and Results:
Discussion:
# Figures and # Tables, # references

# Acknowledgements

# Abstract


- In most plants, stomata are located only on the abaxial leaf surface (hypostomy), but many plants have stomata on both surfaces (amphistomy). Variation in stomatal ratio (the ratio of ab- and adaxial stomatal densities) is probably adaptive, but the ecological conditions that favor amphistomy are not well understood. In particular, high light and herbaceous growth form have been hypothesized to favor amphistomy, but these hypotheses have not been rigourously tested together.
- I leveraged a large dataset including stomatal ratio, Ellenberg light indicator value, Raunkiær lifeform, and phylogenetic relationships on 374 species of British angiosperms. I used phylogenetic comparative methods to test how light and/or growth form influence stomatal ratio.
- (return to this) key results: L-value, growth form, and interaction are important
- I show for the first time that light and growth form interact to shape variation in stomatal ratio; amphistomy is advantageous in high light, but mostly for herbs. These results improve our understanding of the adaptive significance of

stomatal ratio, use stomatal ratio as proxy for paleo vegetation, and as a target for crop improvement.


## Keywords

Adaptation, amphistomy, Ellenberg light indicator value, growth form, phylogenetic comparative methods, stomata, stomatal ratio


# INTRODUCTION

Natural selection shapes leaf anatomy in order to optimize its photosynthetic function in a given environment (Haberlandt, 1914; Givnish, 1987; Smith et al., 1997). By understanding the adaptive significance of leaf anatomical variation we can learn about natural history, find targets for crop improvement, and identify anatomical proxies for paleoclimates preserved in the fossil record [CITE]. The size, density, and distribution of stomata on a leaf vary widely and impact functions like the maximum photosynthetic rate, water-use efficiency, photosynthetic nitrogen-use efficiency, and susceptibility to foliar pathogens that infect through stomata [CITATIONS]. Hence, stomata have been especially useful in understanding plastic and evolutionary re-

sponse to climate change and domestication (Royer, Ward, Woodward, Beerling, Milla et al...).

While the density and size of stomata have been researched extensively [CITATIONS], the adaptive significance of stomatal distribution is less well understood. Stomata are most often found only on the lower leaf surface (hypostomy), but occur on both surfaces (amphistomy) in many species (Metcalfe and Chalk, 1950; Parkhurst, 1978; Mott et al., 1984). Theory and experiments demonstrate that amphistomy increases photosynthetic rates under many conditions. By creating a second parallel pathway for $CO_2$ diffusion within the mesophyll, amphistomy optimally supplies $CO_2$ (Parkhurst, 1978; Gutschick, 1984; Jones, 1985). Amphistomy is correlated with greater $CO_2$ diffusion (Beerling and Kelly, 1996) and higher photosynthetic rates (McKown et al., 2014). These observations are corroborated by experiments demonstrating that amphistomy increases maximum photosynthetic rates by up to 20% (Parkhurst and Mott, 1990). However, amphistomy can increase transpiration (Jones, 1985; Foster and Smith, 1986), though empirical studies suggest great water-use efficiency in amphistomatous species (Bucher et al., 2017). Hence, amphistomy clearly should be favored when $CO_2$ limits photosynthetic rate, but the open questions are under what ecological conditions does $CO_2$ supply most strongly limit photosynthetic rate (Peat and Fitter, 1994) and when is photosynthetic rate

most important to fitness?

The leading, nonmutually exclusive hypotheses are that 1) open habitats favour amphistomy because $CO_2$ diffusion most strongly limits photosynthetic rate under high light and 2) herbaceous growth form favours amphistomy because traits that maximize photosynthetic rate are often under stronger selection in herbs. Salisbury (1927) first noted that amphistomy is most common in herbaceous plants from open habitat (i.e. high light) of the British flora. These observations have been replicated in other studies (Mott et al., 1984; Peat and Fitter, 1994; Jordan et al., 2014; Muir, 2015) and may support physiological and ecological hypotheses that $CO_2$ most strongly limits photosynthesis in high light and/or photosynthesis contributes most to fitness in herbaceous plants. Under high light, $CO_2$ can strongly limit maximum photosynthetic rates, espcecially in thick leaves (Jones, 1985). Hence, having stomata on both surfaces relieves this limitation by adding a second parallel pathway for $CO_2$ diffusion. Parkhurst 1978 argued that greater leaf thickness *per se* selected for amphistomy, but there is little evidence for correlations between leaf thickness and stomatal ratio independent of light (Mott et al., 1984; Gibson, 1996; Muir, 2015). Amphistomy is correlated with open habitat in warm desert plants of western North America (Mott et al., 1984; Gibson, 1996), among the Proteaceae (Jordan et al., 2014), and in continental European herbs (Bucher et al., 2017).

Stomatal ratio is also associated with growth form. In the British flora, Salisbury (1927) found that trees and shurbs are nearly always hypostomatous, whereas herbs from open habitat are amphistomatous. This pattern holds when data are averaged by family to coarsely control for phylogenetic nonindependence (Peat and Fitter, 1994) or when using alternative classification schemes, such as Raunkiær life form (Peat and Fitter, 1994). Across plants from  90 familes worldwide, growth form is the strongest predictor of stomatal ratio when multiple factors are estimated simultaneously and controlling for phylogenetic nonindependence (Muir, 2015). These patterns are consistent with other data indicating that many herbaceous plants are under strong selection for high maximum photosynthetic rates. (Bazzaz, 1979; Körner et al., 1989). NEED MORE RECENT CITATIONS ON THIS.

Although previous comparative studies have tested whether open habitat and growth form influence stomatal ratio, we do not know if these effects are independent of one another. Open habitat and growth form are probably not independent because open habitat by definition consists of more short-statured, herbaceous plants. Even attempts to disentangle light and growth form by contrasting herbs from open and understory habiats (Salisbury, 1927) are problematic because high light habitats select for faster life history stratagies (Galloway and Etterson, 2007) [<– OTHER REFS IN THAT PAPER?]. Open habitat and groth form may also interact with

one another. For example, amphistomy may only favored when $CO_2$ strongly limits photosynthetic rate *and* photosynthetic rate strongly limits fitness.

To better understand the adapative significance of stomatal ratio, I asked three main questions:

1. Are light habitat and growth form correlated?
2. Do light habitat and growth form influence stomatal ratio additively, or do their effects interact?
3. Is evolution of stomatal ratio mediated by changes in stomatal density on the adaxial (upper) surface, abaxial (lower) surface, or both?

The final question is important for telling whether amphistomy is part of a coordinated syndrome of traits that promote higher photosynthetic rate, as both the light and growth form hypotheses assume. If evolved increases in stomatal ratio are mediated by shifting abaxial stomata to the adaxial surface, holding total stomatal density constant, then the overall increase in $CO_2$ diffusion would be limited. In contrast, if amphistomy evolves by increasing adaxial stomatal density while holding abaxial density constant, then *total* stomatal density must increase as well. Evolutionary coordination of amphistomy and high stomatal density would reinforce one another, increasing $CO_2$ supply to chloroplasts more than changes in either trait would in

isolation.

To address these questions, I reanalyzed existing data on stomatal ratio, light habitat, and growth form in British angiosperms (Fitter and Peat, 1994; BEF) using phylogenetic comparative methods. The British angiosperm flora is well suited for these questions because this flora has been comprehensively surveyed for many ecologically important traits, meaning it is probably the least biased survey of stomatal trait variation. Salisbury's observations on stomata and ecology in the British flora have heavily influenced plant ecophysiology, but many of his and subsequent authors' analyses have significant limitations because of inadequate statistical methods. For example, few analyses until recently account for phylogenetic nonindependence (Felsenstein, 1985), which can strongly influence inferences on stomatal traits and growth form (Kelly and Beerling, 1995). A species-level phylogeny of the entire British flora (Lim et al., 2014) now allows me to rigorously analyze evolutionary relationships between stomatal ratio, light, and growth form.

# METHODS

## Data on stomatal ratio, light habitat, growth form, and phylogenetic relationships

I obtained data on ab- and adaxial stomatal density on 370 species from British Ecological Flora (Fitter and Peat, 1994; BEF). I used Ellenberg light indicator values (Ellenberg, 1974) and Raunkiær life form (Raunkiær, 1934) as measures of light habitat and growth form, respectively. Hence, I am assuming that the species' light habitat is closely related to the type of habitat (open versus closed) where that species is found. Both attributes have been recently updated by taxonomic experts of the British flora (PLANTATT, Hill et al. (2004)). Ellenberg light indicator values are hereafter abbreviated L-value. I used a dated molecular phylogeny of the British flora (Lim et al., 2014) available from TreeBASE (http://treebase.org/; accession number 15105). Seventeen species (4.6%) in the dataset were not present in the phylogeny. For nine species, I used the position a congeneric species as a proxy for the focal species. When multiple congeneric species were present, I consulted the phylogenetic literature to identify the most closely related proxy species. For the remaining eight missing species, I positioned them in the tree based on phylogenetic relationships to other genera or families present in the tree. Because many phylogenetic comparative

methods do not allow polytomies, zero-length branches, and non-ultrametric trees, I made several small adjustments to the tree. I resolved polytomies randomly using the 'multi2di' function in **phytools** version 0.5-64 (Revell, 2012). I added 0.02 my to all zero-length branches, as this was approximately the length of the shortest nonzero branch length in the tree. After these changes, I slightly altered terminal branch lengths to make the tree precisely ultrametric.

I excluded data from hyrdrophytes (14 species) because many of these species are hyperstomatous (Fig. S1) due to the fact that leaves may rest on the water's surface, selecting for stomata to be present on the upper surface only. I also excluded $C_4$ (3 species) and CAM (2 species) plants.. I limited this investigation to angiosperms because only 4 non-angiosperms had stomata data. The final dataset contained 374 species. The R code accompanying this paper documents these decisions with citations to the relevant literature (Muir, 2017).

Following Muir (2015), I calculated stomatal ratio in two different ways depending on what was most appropriate for the question:

$$\mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{propAd}} = \frac{\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ad}}}{\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{total}}} \tag{1}$$

$$\mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{even}} = \frac{\min\{\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ab}}, \mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ad}}\}}{\max\{\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ab}}, \mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ad}}\}} \tag{2}$$

154 $\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ab}}$ and $\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ad}}$ are the stomatal densities on abaxial or adaxial surface, respectively.
155 $\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{total}} = \mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ab}} + \mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ad}}$. $\mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{propAd}}$ is the proportion of stomata density on the adaxial
156 surface, which is useful for discriminating among hypostomatous ($\mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{propAd}} = 0$),
157 amphistomatous ($0 < \mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{propAd}} < 1$), and hyperstomatous species ($\mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{propAd}} = 1$).
158 $\mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{even}}$ indicates how evenly stomatal densities are distributed across both leaf sur-
159 faces. This expression is useful because several hypotheses are based on the fact that
160 a more even distribution should optimize leaf $CO_2$ diffusion.

## 161 Testing for an association between open habitat and growth
## 162 form

163 I tested whether Raunkiær life form was associated L-value values among British
164 angiosperms using ANOVA with Type-2 sum of squares. I did not use phylogenetic
165 ANOVA for this test because there was no phylogenetic signal in the regression fit
166 using **phylolm** version 2.5 (Ho and Ané, 2014). See the R code accompanying this
167 paper for further detail (Muir, 2017). I predicted that species with faster life histories,
168 especially therophytes (annuals), would have greater L-value than species with slower

life histories, especially phanerophytes, which are mostly long-lived trees.

## Open habitat, growth form, and stomatal ratio

I compared phylogenetic linear models to test whether Raunkiær life form, L-value, or interactions between them predicted $SR_{even}$. I used $SR_{even}$ rather than $SR_{propAd}$ as the response variable because the hypothesis is that faster life history and/or high light favor more even stomatal densities on each surface. I fit models using **phylolm** and extracted Akaike Information Criteria (AIC). For these and subsequent analyses, I assumed an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process model for the residuals with the root character state integrated over the stationary distribution. I used a 10,000 parametric bootstrap samples of the full model (including main effects and interactions) to calculate parameter confidence intervals (Boettiger et al., 2012). Likewise, to determine whether the interaction between Raunkiær life form and L-value was statistically significant, I used a parametric bootstrap to generate the null distribution of $\Delta$AIC values ($\Delta$AIC is the difference in AIC between competing models). Specifically, I sampled 1000 random datasets from the estimated model with main effects of Raunkiær life form and L-value but no interaction. I fit these simulated datasets to models with and without interactions and calculated $\Delta$AIC. The statistical significance of the observed $\Delta$AIC is the proportion of simulated $\Delta$AIC greater than the

observed.

## Does ab- or adaxial stomatal density contribute more to stomatal ratio evolution?

I used two complementary phylogenetic methods to assess the relative contribution of ab- versus adaxial stomatal density to light-mediated stomatal ratio evolution. The contribution of each can be formalized using standard variance decomposition methods as derived below. Because stomatal density is highly skewed, I log-transformed values for normality:

$$\mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{even}} = \frac{\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ad}}}{\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ab}}} \tag{3}$$

$$\log(\mathrm{SR}_{\mathrm{even}}) = \log(\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ad}}) - \log(\mathrm{SD}_{\mathrm{ad}}) \tag{4}$$

$$\mathrm{sr}_{\mathrm{even}} = \mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ad}} - \mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ad}} \tag{5}$$

Lowercase variables (sr, sd) indicate log-transformed values. Because some species

had zero adaxial stomata, I added one to all values prior to log-transformation. For simplicity, I have defined $SR_{even}$ here as the ratio of ad- to abaxial stomatal density because in most cases adaxial stomatal density is lower than abaxial (see Eq. 2). The variance in $sr_{even}$ can be decomposed into contributions of $sd_{ad}$, $sd_{ab}$, and their covariance:

$$\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{sr}_{\mathrm{even}}) = \mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ad}}) + \mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ad}}) - 2\mathrm{Cov}(\mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ad}}, \mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ab}}) \tag{6}$$

I estimated the phylogenetic covariance matrix between L-value, $sd_{ab}$, and $sd_{ad}$ using a multivariate Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model fit in **Rphylopars** version 0.2.9 (Goolsby et al., 2016, 2017). From the covariance matrix, I estimated the contribution of abaxial density, adaxial density, and their covariance as:

$$\frac{\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ad}})}{\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{sr}_{\mathrm{even}})}, \frac{\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ab}})}{\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{sr}_{\mathrm{even}})}, \text{ and } \frac{\mathrm{Cov}(\mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ad}}, \mathrm{sd}_{\mathrm{ab}})}{\mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{sr}_{\mathrm{even}})}, \tag{7}$$

respectively. Note that when ab- and adaxial densities positively covary, the contribution will be negative because this reduces the variance in stomatal ratio.

I was interested in whether light-mediated evolution of stomatal ratio acted mostly by increasing adaxial stomatal density while maintaining abaxial density, or keeping

total stomatal density the same, but shifting a greater proportion to the adaxial surface. The first scenario predicts that the phylogenetic regression of L-value on $sd_{ad}$ is stronger than that for $sd_{ab}$. The second scenario predicts that L-value acts similarly on both and that there is a negative covariance $\mathrm{Cov}(sd_{ad}, sd_{ab}) < 0$. I tested these competing predictions by fitting a simple phylogenetic structural equation model (SEM). The model uses the phylogenetic covariance matrix to simultaneously estimate regressions of L-value on $sd_{ad}$ and $sd_{ab}$ while allowing covariance between them (i.e. estimating $\mathrm{Cov}(sd_{ad}, sd_{ab})$). To fit the SEM, I used the R package **lavaan** version 0.5-23.1097 (Rosseel, 2012). I tested whether parameter estimates were significantly different than zero using $z$-scores.

# RESULTS

## Light tolerance varies among Raunkiær life forms

Ellenberg light indicator values (L-value) differed significantly among life forms (Fig. 1;ANOVA - $F_{4,369} = 18.4$, $P = 8.1 \times 10^{-14}$). Therophytes (annuals), hemicryptophytes (perennial herbs with buds near the soil surface), and chamaephytes (subshrubs) had greater L-value than phanerophytes (large woody plants) and geophytes (perennial herbs with storage organs) (Fig. 1).

## Interactions between light and Raunkiær life form determine stomatal ratio

Overall, $SR_{even}$ increased with L-value, but there was a significant interaction between Raunkiær life form and L-value (Fig. 2). Both life form and L-value significantly increased model fit, though L-value had a markedly larger effect on model AIC (Table 1). The significant interaction is caused by different slopes between life forms. Among life forms with the overall greatest L-value (therophytes, hemicryptophytes, and chamaephytes, see Fig. 1), there was a strong positive relationship between L-value and $SR_{even}$. Parametrically bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals did not overlap zero (Fig. 2). The slope was weakly positive or not significantly different from zero in the most shade-adapted life forms (geophytes and phanerophytes), albeit the patterns were distinct in these groups. There were both hypostomatous ($SR_{even} \approx 0$) and amphistomatous ($SR_{even} \approx 1$) geophytes, but these were distibuted across L-values. In contrast, phanerophytes were nearly always hypostomatous regardless of L-value. Allowing slopes to vary across life form signicantly increased model fit (lower AIC, Table 1, parametric bootstrap $P = 0.002$).

## Adaxial stomatal density contributes most of the variation in stomatal ratio

Adaxial ('upper') stomatal density contributed most to the evolutionary variation in stomatal ratio. The contributions of adaxial density, abaxial density, and their covariance are 1.14, 0.39, and -0.53, respectively. Recall that values can be greater than one for adaxial stomatal density and negative for the covariance when the latter value is positive. This implies that evolutionary variation in adaxial stomatal density is greater than that for stomatal ratio due to positive covariance between ab- and adaxial stomatal density.

Similarly, the phylogenetic SEM showed that changes in stomatal ratio associated with L-value can be attributed mostly to evolution of adaxial stomatal density (Fig. 3). Both $sd_{ad}$ and $sd_{ab}$ increased with L-value ($P = 8.8 \times 10^{-7}$ and $4.9 \times 10^{-5}$, respectively). However, the regression of L-value on $sd_{ad}$ was 2.1× that of L-value on $sd_{ab}$ (0.2 versus 0.1). Because stomatal densities were natural log-transformed, this implies an increase in L-value by one leads to a 1.22-fold change in adaxial stomatal density versus a 1.1-fold change in abaxial stomatal density. The SEM also showed a significant positive covariance between stomatal densities on each surface ($P = 1.1 \times 10^{-11}$). These results together imply that total stomatal density increases with

L-value, but the response is mediated mostly by adaxial stomatal density.

# DISCUSSION

The ratio of stomatal densities on the abaxial ('lower') to that of the adaxial ('upper') surface varies greatly across plant species, but the adaptive significance is not clear. Comparative studies correlating stomatal ratio to ecological factors can distinguish among competing hypotheses and reveal critical experiments for future work. Previous comparative studies suggested that high light and herbaceous growth form favor amphistomy (Mott et al., 1984; Jordan et al., 2014; Muir, 2015; Bucher et al., 2017), particularly in the British flora (Salisbury, 1927; Peat and Fitter, 1994). However, none of these studies have accounted for the fact thats light and growth form are often confounded – open, high light habitats are necessarily dominated by herbs – or the fact that species are not independent because of shared evolutionaey hisory. Here, I reanalyzed data on stomata, light tolerance, and growth form in British angiosperms using phylogenetic comparative methods. As expected, species' light tolerance (Ellenberg light indicator or L-value) is confounded with growth form (Raunkiær life form; Fig. 1). Nevertheless, both L-value and Raunkiær life form affect stomatal ratio, but these factors also interact; the influence of L-value on stomatal ratio varies

277 across forms. These novel findings provide further evidence that variation in stomatal
278 ratio is adaptive and have important implications for interpreting changes in stom-
279 atal ratio through the paleo record (Jordan et al., 2014) and during domestication
280 (Milla et al., 2013).

## 281 Adaptive significance of amphistomy

282 Previously, associations between light, growth form, and stomatal ratio have been
283 interpreted in isolation as indicating that either high light and/or herbaceous growth
284 form favors amphistomy. In British angiosperms, both factors are important, though
285 statistical analyses suggest that light may be a stronger determinant than growth
286 form (Table 1). Unlike previous studies, I found a significant interaction between
287 light and growth form among British angiosperms, which suggests that amphistomy
288 may only be strongly favored when $CO_2$ strongly limits photosynthesies *and* pho-
289 tosynthesis strongly limits fitness. The ideal way to test this would be to measure
290 selection on stomatal ratio in a species that varied quantitatively in both stomatal
291 ratio and life history (e.g. containing both annual and perennial forms). I predict
292 that amphistomy will be favored much more strongly in the annual form grown under
293 high light compared to an annual under low light or a perennial in high light. Similar
294 experiments could also be performed to test if and when light-mediated plasticity in

stomatal ratio is adaptive (Gay and Hurd, 1975; Mott and Michaelson, 1991).

The prevalence of amphistomatous species in high light habitats supports the hypothesis that amphistomy is an adaptation to maximize photosynthetic rates by increasing $CO_2$ diffusion (Jones, 1985). It is also evidence against the hypothesis that the principle fitness cost of amphistomy is water loss (Darwin, 1886; Foster and Smith, 1986) or dehydration of pallisade mesophyll (Buckley et al., 2015). Since evaporative demand increases under high insolation, under these hypotheses we would expect plants in high light to be hypostomatous. Because stomatal conductances on each surface can be regulated independently in response to the environment (Darwin, 1898; Pospíšilová and Solárová, 1984; Smith, 1981; Reich, 1984; Mott and O'Leary, 1984), amphistomatous leaves likely cope with these stresses by rapidly closing adaxial stomata when water supply cannot match evaporative demands. Instead, patterns in the British flora are at least consistent with the idea that adaxial stomata increase susceptibility to foliar pathogens (Gutschick, 1984; McKown et al., 2014). The cost of adaxial stomata may be greater in the shade because greater leaf wetness and lower ultraviolet light provide a more suitable microclimate for many foliar pathogens.

## Amphistomy as a proxy for open habitat

These observations from the British flora strongly support the hypothesis that amphistomy can be used a proxy for open habitat in paleoenvironment reconstruction (Carpenter, 1994; Jordan et al., 2014; Carpenter et al., 2015), but also point out previously unknown subtleties. These previous studies based their conclusions on data from Proteaceae, in which there is little quantitative variation in stomatal ratio; species are either completely hypostomatous ($SR_{propAd} \approx 0$) or completely amphistomatous ($SR_{propAd} \approx 0.5$). Stomatal ratio in British angiosperms is also bimodal (Peat and Fitter, 1994), but across many families there is also quantiative variation. Importantly, this means that quantitative variation in stomatal ratio may provide a more precise, quantiative indicator of vegetation type, rather than simply 'open' or 'closed'. A quantitative relationship between L-value and stomatal ratio has already been shown for herbaceous perennials (Bucher et al., 2017), but we now know that it holds among annuals (therophytes), subshrubs (chamaephytes), and, to a lesser extent, geophytes as well (Fig. 2).

The nonsignificant relationship between L-value and stomatal ratio in geophytes and phanerophytes suggests that in some cases amphistomy may not reliably indicate open habitat without further information. For example, perhaps amphistomatous geophytes from partially shaded habitats are spring ephemerals, so they experience

high light during their growth phase, but this has not been tested. Likewise, phanerophytes (most tall trees) are almost always hypostomatous (see also Muir (2015)). Most British phanerophytes are tall, hypostomatous trees, but the exceptions are telling. For example, the most amphistomatous phanerophyte in this dataset is *Brassica oleracea*, a short-statured biennial that has more in common physiologically with hemicryptophytes than other phanerophytes. The other amphistomatous phanerophytes in this data set (*Populus nigra* and *Lavatera arborea*) are fast-growing pioneer species.

Finally, phylogenetic information should improve inferences about paleoclimates because there is appreciable phylogenetic signal in stomatal ratio. The phylogenetic half-life of stomatal ratio evolution, after accounting for L-value and Raunkiær life form, is $\log(2)/\alpha = 1.5$ my (see Table 1 for maximum likelihood estimates of $\alpha$). This lag time may indicate that evolving to the 'optimum' is constrained by the shape of the fitness landscape (Muir, 2015) or that other unmeasured factors which affect stomatal ratio have some phylogenetic signal. Regardless of the mechanism, this fact means that researchers may be able to use data from closely related species to improve paleoenvironment reconstruction.

## Why does adaxial stomatal density control stomatal ratio?

Variation in stomatal ratio is determined primarily by evolution of adaxial stomatal density and is coordinated with increases in total leaf stomatal density summed across both surfaces. Phylogenetic analyses show that changes in stomatal ratio and total stomatal density, especially in response to L-value, are predominantly mediated by changes in adaxial stomatal density. This highly nonrandom pattern among British angiosperms mirrors evolutionary changes wrought by domesication (Milla et al., 2013); crops species tend to have higher adaxial stomatal density than their wild relatives. Note here that I am referring only to evolutionary variation in stomatal ratio among species; different processes may mediate within species variation or plastic responses.

There are at least two hypotheses that could explain why adaxial stomatal density is the most responsive. The first I refer to as the 'real estate' hypothesis. In hypostomatous plants, the lower surface is already crowded with stomata, and hence plants must increase the real estate available for stomata by develping them on the upper surface whenever there is selection for greater stomatal density. When stomata are packed too densely on one surface, stomatal interference limits their functioning and hence may create a strong selective pressure for amphistomy (Parlange and Waggoner, 1970; Dow et al., 2014).

I refer to the second hypothesis as the 'coordination' hypothesis. In this scenario, ecological conditions such as high light select for both increased total stomatal density and for amphistomy because these traits work well in coordination with one another. For example, if stomatal density were very high on a hypostomatous plant, then $CO_2$ would be more strongly limited by the mesophyll. Adding a second parallel pathway for diffusion by developing stomata on both surfaces would restore a more optimal balance between stomatal and mesophyll limitations. Conversely, there would be little benefit to amphistomy when total stomatal density is low because $CO_2$ diffusion is strongly limited by stomatal resistance, and therefore photosynthetic rate is not sensitive to changes in mesophyll diffusion mediated by stomatal ratio.

## Conclusions - finish when analysis is complete

# References


???? URL http://www.ecoflora.co.uk.

Bazzaz, F., 1979. The physiological ecology of plant succession. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 10:351–71.

Beerling, D. J. and C. K. Kelly, 1996. Evolutionary comparative analyses of the relationship between leaf structure and function. New Phytologist 134:35–51.

Boettiger, C., G. Coop, and P. Ralph, 2012. Is your phylogeny informative? measuring the power of comparative methods. Evolution 66:2240–2251.

Bucher, S. F., K. Auerswald, C. Grün-Wenzel, S. I. Higgins, J. G. Jorge, and C. Römermann, 2017. Stomatal traits relate to habitat preferences of herbaceous species in a temperate climate. Flora .

Buckley, T. N., G. P. John, C. Scoffoni, and L. Sack, 2015. How does leaf anatomy influence water transport outside the xylem? Plant Physiology 168:1616–1635.

Carpenter, R. J., 1994. Cuticular morphology and aspects of the ecology and fossil history of North Queensland rainforest Proteaceae. Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society 116:249. URL + http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8339.1994.tb00434.x.

Carpenter, R. J., M. K. Macphail, G. J. Jordan, and R. S. Hill, 2015. Fossil evidence for open, Proteaceae-dominated heathlands and fire in the Late Cretaceous of Australia. American Journal of Botany 102:2092–2107.

Darwin, F., 1886. On the relation between the "bloom" on leaves and the distribution of the stomata. Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society 22:99–116.

———, 1898. Observations on stomata. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 190:531–621.

Dow, G. J., J. A. Berry, and D. C. Bergmann, 2014. The physiological importance of developmental mechanisms that enforce proper stomatal spacing in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. New Phytologist 201:1205–1217.

Ellenberg, H., 1974. Indicator values of vascular plants in central Europe, *Scripta Geobotanica*, vol. 9. Springer-Verlag, Göttingen, Germany.

Felsenstein, J., 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. The American Naturalist 1:1–15.

Fitter, A. and H. Peat, 1994. The ecological flora database. Journal of Ecology 82:415–425.

Foster, J. and W. Smith, 1986. Influence of stomatal distribution on transpiration in low-wind environments. Plant, Cell & Environment 9:751–759.

Galloway, L. F. and J. R. Etterson, 2007. Transgenerational plasticity is adaptive in the wild. Science 318:1134–1136.

Gay, A. and R. Hurd, 1975. The influence of light on stomatal density in the tomato. New Phytologist 75:37–46.

Gibson, A. C., 1996. Structure-Function Relations of Warm Desert Plants. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Givnish, T. J., 1987. Comparative studies of leaf form: assessing the relative roles of selective pressures and phylogenetic constraints. New Phytologist 106:131–160.

Goolsby, E. W., J. Bruggeman, and C. Ané, 2016. Rphylopars: Phylogenetic Comparative Tools for Missing Data and Within-Species Variation. URL `https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Rphylopars`. R package version 0.2.9.

———, 2017. Rphylopars: fast multivariate phylogenetic comparative methods for missing data and within-species variation. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 8:22–27.

Gutschick, V. P., 1984. Photosynthesis model for $C_3$ leaves incorporating $CO_2$ transport, propagation of radiation, and biochemistry 2. ecological and agricultural utility. Photosynthetica 18:569–595.

Haberlandt, G., 1914. Physiological Plant Anatomy. Macmillan and Co., London.

Hill, M., C. Preston, and D. Roy, 2004. PLANTATT - Attributes of British and Irish Plants: Status, Size, Life History, Geography and Habitats. Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire.

Ho, L. S. T. and C. Ané, 2014. Intrinsic inference difficulties for trait evolution with Ornstein-Uhlenbeck models. Methods in Ecology and Evolution 5:1133–1146.

Jones, H. G., 1985. Adaptive significance of leaf development and structural responses to environment. Pp. 155–173, *in* N. R. Baker, W. Davies, and C. K. Ong, eds. Control of Leaf Growth, *Society for Experimental Biology Seminar Series*, vol. 27. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Jordan, G. J., R. J. Carpenter, and T. J. Brodribb, 2014. Using fossil leaves as evidence for open vegetation. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 395:168–175.

Kelly, C. and D. Beerling, 1995. Plant life form, stomatal density and taxonomic relatedness: a reanalysis of Salisbury (1927). Functional Ecology 9:422–431.

Körner, C., M. Neumayer, S. P. Menendez-Riedl, and A. Smeets-Scheel, 1989. Functional morphology of mountain plants. Flora 182:353–383.

Lim, J., M. J. Crawley, N. De Vere, T. Rich, and V. Savolainen, 2014. A phylogenetic

448 analysis of the British flora sheds light on the evolutionary and ecological factors
449 driving plant invasions. Ecology and Evolution 4:4258–4269.

450 McKown, A. D., R. D. Guy, L. Quamme, J. Klápště, J. La Mantia, C. Constabel,
451 Y. A. El-Kassaby, R. C. Hamelin, M. Zifkin, and M. Azam, 2014. Association
452 genetics, geography and ecophysiology link stomatal patterning in *Populus tri-*
453 *chocarpa* with carbon gain and disease resistance trade-offs. Molecular Ecology
454 23:5771–5790.

455 Metcalfe, C. R. and L. Chalk, 1950. Anatomy of the dicotyledons, Vols. 1 & 2. First
456 ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

457 Milla, R., N. de Diego-Vico, and N. Martín-Robles, 2013. Shifts in stomatal traits
458 following the domestication of plant species. Journal of Experimental Botany
459 64:3137–3146.

460 Mott, K. A., A. C. Gibson, and J. W. O'Leary, 1984. The adaptive significance of
461 amphistomatic leaves. Plant, Cell & Environment 5:455–460.

462 Mott, K. A. and O. Michaelson, 1991. Amphistomy as an adaptation to high light
463 intensity in *Ambrosia cordifolia* (Compositae). American Journal of Botany 78:76–
464 79.

465 Mott, K. A. and J. W. O'Leary, 1984. Stomatal behavior and $CO_2$ exchange char-

466 acteristics in amphistomatous leaves. Plant physiology 74:47–51.

467 Muir, C. D., 2015. Making pore choices: repeated regime shifts in stomatal ratio.
468 Proc. R. Soc. B 282:20151498.

469 ———, 2017. Data from: Hight light interacts with herbaceous
470 growth form to favor amphistomy in British angiosperms. URL
471 http://dx.doi.org/10.5061/dryad.?????

472 Parkhurst, D. F., 1978. The adaptive significance of stomatal occurrence on one or
473 both surfaces of leaves. The Journal of Ecology 66:367–383.

474 Parkhurst, D. F. and K. A. Mott, 1990. Intercellular diffusion limits to $CO_2$ uptake
475 in leaves studied in air and helox. Plant Physiology 94:1024–1032.

476 Parlange, J.-Y. and P. E. Waggoner, 1970. Stomatal dimensions and resistance to
477 diffusion. Plant Physiology 46:337–342.

478 Peat, H. and A. Fitter, 1994. A comparative study of the distribution and density of
479 stomata in the British flora. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 52:377–393.

480 Pospíŝilová, J. and J. Solárová, 1984. Environmental and biological control of diffu-
481 sive conductances of adaxial and abaxial leaf epidermes. Photosynthetica 18:445–
482 453.

Raunkiær, C. C., 1934. The Life Forms of Plants and Statistical Plant Geography. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Reich, P., 1984. Relationships between leaf age, irradiance, leaf conductance, $CO_2$ exchange, and water-use efficiency in hybrid poplar. Photosynthetica 18:445–453.

Revell, L. J., 2012. phytools: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things). Methods in Ecology and Evolution 3:217–223.

Rosseel, Y., 2012. lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. Journal of Statistical Software 48:1–36.

Salisbury, E., 1927. On the causes and ecological significance of stomatal frequency, with special reference to the woodland flora. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B 216:1–65.

Smith, W., 1981. Temperature and water relation patterns in subalpine understory plants. Oecologia 48:353–359.

Smith, W. K., T. C. Vogelmann, E. H. DeLucia, D. T. Bell, and K. A. Shepherd, 1997. Leaf form and photosynthesis. BioScience 11:785–793.

Table 1: Interaction beween species' Ellenberg light indicator value (L-value) and Raunkiær lifeform shape stomatal ratio ($SR_{even}$). I compared phylogenetic linear models using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), where $AIC = 2k - 2\log(\mathcal{L})$. $k$ is the number of model parameters and $\mathcal{L}$ is the model likelihood. Given a set of candidate models, the difference in AIC between a model and the lowest AIC ($\Delta$AIC) indicates the relative fit of competing models. The correlation coefficient $r^2$ is another indicator of model fit. $\alpha$ and $\sigma^2$ are the return rate and diffusion parameters of the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model of trait evolution.

| Model: $SR_{even} \sim$ | $\alpha$ | $\sigma^2$ | $r^2$ | $k$ | $\log(\mathcal{L})$ | AIC | $\Delta$AIC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| L-value × lifeform | 0.46 | 0.068 | 0.34 | 12 | -32.6 | 89.2 | 0 |
| L-value + lifeform | 0.47 | 0.071 | 0.32 | 8 | -39.8 | 95.6 | 6.3 |
| L-value | 0.65 | 0.109 | 0.26 | 4 | -58.9 | 125.9 | 36.6 |
| lifeform | 0.34 | 0.066 | 0.15 | 7 | -79.2 | 172.4 | 83.2 |
| 1 | 0.29 | 0.068 | 0 | 3 | -107.9 | 221.7 | 132.5 |




Figure 1: Lifeforms have different tolerances for sun and shade among British angiosperms. Each panel is the distribution of Ellenberg light indicator values on an integer scale of 1-9 for different Raunkiær life forms. Height of the bars indicate the raw proportion of species in each bin for that lifeform. The sample size for each lifeform is listed next in parentheses. The mean (open circle) and 95% confidence intervals (black line) around the mean Ellenberg light indicator value for each lifeform based on phylogenetic regression are above the histogram.




Figure 2: The effect of light on stomatal ratio depends on Raunkiær life form. Greater Ellenberg light indicator values (L-value) are associated with greater stomatal ratio ($SR_{even}$) in therophytes, hemicryptophytes, and chamaephytes but not geophytes and phanerophytes. The maximum likelihood slope from phylogenetic regression is given with statistical significance based on 1000 parametric bootstrap samples. Numbers in parentheses next to Raunkiær life form are the sample sizes in the final dataset. Estimated slopes (solid line) and 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals (gray polygon between dashed lines) are plotted against raw data. Points have been jittered for visial clarity.




Figure 3: Light-mediated evolution of stomatal ratio is mostly driven by increased adaxial ('upper') stomatal density (Panel A), whereas abaxial ('lower') stomatal density (Panel B) is similar across Ellenberg light indicator values (L-value $x$-axis). The violin plot shows stomatal density ($y$-axis, log-scale) as a function of L-value. The width of the grey polygons indicates the density of data. Length of grey polygon indicate the range of the data; the point indicates the median; the thick lines indicate the 0.25 and 0.75 quantiles. Points outside the polygons are statistical outliers.

# Supporting Information




Figure S1: Most hydrophytes are hyperstomatous, having most stomata on the adaxial ('upper') surface (high $SD_{propAd}$). The violin plot shows stomatal ratio as a function of Raunkiær lifeform. The width of the grey polygons indicates the density of data. Length of grey polygon indicate the range of the data; the point indicates the median; the thick lines indicate the 0.25 and 0.75 quantiles. Sample sizes per lifeform in the dataset are given above the upper plot margin. $SD_{ad}$ and $SD_{total}$ stand for the stomatal density on the adaxial surface and the total leaf surface (adaxial plus abaxial), respectively.