

1 Woody plant phenological responses are strongly associated
2 with key functional traits

3 Deirdre Loughnan¹, Faith A M Jones¹, Geoffrey Legault¹, Mira Garner²,
Darwin Sodhi³, Daniel Buonaiuto⁴, Catherine Chamberlain⁵, Ignacio Morales Castilla⁶,
Ailene Ettinger⁷, and E M Wolkovich¹

4 May 6, 2022

5 ¹ Department of Forest and Conservation, Faculty of Forestry, University of British Columbia, 2424
6 Main Mall Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 1Z4.

7
8 ² Arnold Arboretum of Harvard University, 1300 Centre Street, Boston, Massachusetts, USA;
9

10
11 ³ Organismic & Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts,
12 USA;

13
14 ⁴ XXXX

15
16 ⁵ XXXX

17
18 ⁶ Edificio Ciencias, Campus Universitario 28805 Alcalá de Henares, Madrid, Spain

19
20 ⁷ XXXX

21
22 Corresponding Author: Deirdre Loughnan deirdre.loughnan@ubc.ca
23

1 Summary

Key Words: Budburst phenology, functional traits, Trees, climate change

2 Introduction

3 Methods

4 Results

1. Traits differed in whether they strengthen or weaken species advances with increasing cues.
 - (a) Reference Fig. 1
 - (b) unique responses in height to forcing, a smaller advance in budburst with increasing forcing when height effects were included
 - (c) increasing chilling & photoperiod led to a stronger advance in budburst when height's effects were included
 - (d) the trait effect of SLA resulted in a smaller shift in budburst in response to increased forcing and chilling cues, but a larger shift with longer photoperiods.
 - (e) For both log10 seed mass and LNC the trait effect was consistent across all three cues
 - (f) the advance in budburst dates with increasing cues were greater when the effect of log10 seed mass was accounted for
 - (g) in contrast, the the advance when the effects of LNC were included was smaller as cues increased
2. Functional traits did influence the timing of budburst date in response to forcing, chilling, and photoperiod cues
 - (a) but varied by trait and species whether responses in cue slopes followed the predicted gradients in trait values
 - (b) strongest effects for chilling
 - (c) weakest effects observed for photoperiod
3. The strength of species cue responses were associated with species trait values: referencing Fig. 2
 - (a) taller species and species with larger seeds had larger cue responses to chilling (-0.5 m per standardized chilling; 90% uncertainty interval interval: -1, -0.1) and (-1.1 mg per standardized chilling; -2.8, 0.7, respectively) and photoperiod (-0.3 m per standardized photoperiod; -0.6, 0 for height and -0.6 mg per standardized photoperiod; -1.6, 0.4 for seed mass)
 - (b) but taller species had weaker responses with forcing (0.2 m per standardized forcing; -0.1, 0.5), while large seeded species had stronger cue responses to forcing (-0.3 mg per standardized forcing; -1.4, 0.8), as we predicted
 - (c) Species with large trait values of both leaf traits, SLA and LNC, had weaker cue responses to forcing and chilling (0.2 mm²/mg per standardized forcing; -0.1, 0.4, 0.3 mm²/mg per standardized chilling; -0.1, 0.7 for SLA and 0.5 mg/g per standardized forcing; 0.1, 0.9) and (0.7 mg/g per standardized; 0.2, 1.2 for LNC)

- (d) but species with large SLA had stronger responses to photoperiod cues ($-0.2 \text{ mm}^2/\text{mg}$ per standardized photoperiod; $-0.4, 0$), while large LNC species had weaker photoperiod cue responses (0.3 mg/g per standardized photoperiod; $0, 0.7$)
4. Our trait model includes partial pooling across studies, allowing us to better partition the variance caused by study level differences: reference Fig. 3
- (a) see a lot of variation in height data, which is our most commonly measured trait with measurements from 22 studies
- (b) Seed mass comes from five studies and is least variable




Figure 1: Comparisons of estimated cue responses of a representative species with a trait value associated with acquisitive growth strategies, shown in green, or conservative growth strategies, shown in purple. Points represent the raw budburst data for each respective species. Dark bands represent the 50% uncertainty interval for the posterior cue estimates for the full model, while opaque bands represent the 50% uncertainty interval interval for the posterior cue estimates with a trait effect of zero.

5 Discussion




Figure 2: Estimated trait values for height (a-c) and SLA (d-f) traits, correlated against species level cue responses to forcing (a & d), chilling (b & e), and photoperiod cues (c & f). Parameters were estimated using our joint trait-phenology model, with the grey line depicting the mean linear relationship between estimated trait effects and the slope of the cue response. The pink shading represents the distribution of the posterior estimates. The species depicted in Fig 1 are highlighted in each panel, with the acquisitive species shown in green, and the conservative species, shown in purple.




Figure 3: Comparisons of estimated model fits and raw data from joint models of trait effects on budburst phenological cues for 37 species of woody deciduous plants. Four functional traits – a. height, b. SLA, c. seed mass, and d. LNC – were modelled individually, with the calculated trait value being used to jointly model species responses to standardized chilling, forcing, and photoperiod cues. Model posteriors are shown in black, with the thicker line depicting the 66% interval and the thinner black line the 97% interval. Overall species level model posterior distributions were well aligned with the raw data, shown in red, and the species level means from the raw data, denoted as a purple stars.