

# Using mechanistic insights to predict climate-induced expansion/contraction for a dioecious range-limited species

Jacob K. Moutouama<sup>1</sup>, Aldo Compagnoni<sup>2</sup>, and Tom E.X. Miller<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Program in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Department of BioSciences, Rice University, Houston, TX USA

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Biology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle, Germany; and German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv), Leipzig, Germany

June 14, 2023

\* Corresponding author: [jmoutouama@gmail.com](mailto:jmoutouama@gmail.com)

Submitted to *Ecological Monographs*

Manuscript type: Article

Open Research statement: All of our data and code are available during peer review at <https://github.com/jmoutouama/POAR-Forecasting>. This manuscript and its contents can be reproduced from this file: <https://github.com/jmoutouama/POAR-Forecasting/Manuscript/Forescasting.Rnw>. Upon acceptance, all data will be provided via creation and publication of an Environmental Data Initiative (EDI) data package, and code will

be archived via Zenodo.

## Abstract

Gender-specific response to rising temperature and drought raises the questions of whether global change could lead to a drastic change in the sex ratio and whether that change in the sex ratio could drive population extinction. Answering these questions requires an understanding of the mechanism by which a change in vital rates under future climate conditions for each sex, could be translated into a significant change in population dynamics. Here, we took the first step toward building a forecast model for dioecious plants by understanding sex-specific demographic responses to environmental change. Combining a demographic data set for a dioecious species with a Bayesian hierarchical modeling approach, we fit models in which vital rates are driven by seasonal precipitation and temperature.

## Keywords

## Introduction

Rising temperatures and extreme drought events have already caused broad-scale vulnerability of native species, leading to increased concern about how species will redistribute across the globe under future climate conditions. Dioecious species might be particularly vulnerable to climate change because they often display skewed sex ratios that are reinforced by differentiation of sexual niches (Tognetti, 2012). Accounting for such a niche differentiation between male and female within a population is a long-standing challenge in accurately predicting which sex will successfully track environmental change and how this will impact population dynamics (Jones et al., 1999). As a result, accurate forecasts of colonization-extinction dynamics for dioecious species under future climate scenarios are hampered by limited mechanistic research on the demographic response of these species to climate change.

The effect of climate conditions on species distributions is often derived by correlative relationships between species occurrence record or abundance patterns and current climate conditions (Elith and Leathwick, 2009). These established relationships serve as the basis for predicting how species will redistribute across the globe in a changing world. However, the responsiveness of species abundance patterns often lags behind environmental change, which can lead to pronounced mismatches in current and future climate conditions and colonization-extinction dynamics (Lee-Yaw et al., 2022). In addition, most of these models do not take into account niche difference between male and female because they rely on species occurrence. More recently, "mechanistic approaches" of species distribution model (SDM) using species physiology have been proposed as an alternative to the correlative approach of SDM. Although the application of these approaches have been successful for some species, these approaches have several limitations. First,

37 “mechanistic approaches” of SDM require details information that is not often available  
38 for most species. For example, getting information such as individual physiological pa-  
39 rameters (thermal conductivity, oxygen extraction efficiency, body posture change, diet)  
40 is often difficult. Second, this information if available; are often derived from allometric  
41 relation from related species. Thirdly, scaling up individual physiological information  
42 to the population or landscape level is very challenging. Finally, most of species distri-  
43 bution models do not take into account differentiation of sexes distribution base due to  
44 resource acquisition.

45 Theory predicts that if cost of reproduction for each sex is equal and if males and  
46 females differ in reproductive fitness equality with increasing size, then natural selection  
47 will act to balance a population sex ratio at 1:1 (Fisher, 1930). However, deviances from  
48 those assumptions have been observed. In several plant species, females are more sensi-  
49 tive to stress-related resource availability conditions than males, leading to high female  
50 mortality and, therefore, to a male bias sex ratio (Hultine et al., 2016; Freeman et al.,  
51 1976). Furthermore, the lower cost of reproduction of males may allow them to invest  
52 their energy in other functions that produce higher growth rates, higher clonality, or  
53 even higher survival rates compared to females (Bruijning et al., 2017), causing a skew  
54 sex ratio.

55 Climate change could therefore magnify skewed sex ratios and potentially reduced  
56 population growth rate if individuals are unable to find a mate and reproduce (Morrison  
57 et al., 2016). Furthermore, as the drier, warmer climate moves “up slope”, so will adapt  
58 arid males shift the sex ratios (Petry et al., 2016). Because of this, populations in which  
59 males are rare under current climatic conditions could experience less mate limitation,  
60 allowing females to successfully produce more seed under warmer conditions and favor  
61 range shifts (Petry et al., 2016).

62 Our ability to track the impact of climate change on the population dynamics of dioe-  
63 cious plants depends on our ability to build mechanistic models that take into account  
64 the spatial and temporal context in which survival, reproduction, and growth occur due  
65 to the sessile nature of these plants. Several studies found that climate change affects  
66 demographic processes in distinctive and potentially contrasting ways (Dalglish et al.,  
67 2011). For example, while climate has a significant effect on the probability of survival  
68 and growth, it has no effect on the probability of flowering (Greiser et al., 2020). Addi-  
69 tionally, under warmer conditions, some native species will fail to establish reproductive  
70 populations due to the extremely low germination rate and seedling survival (Reed et al.,  
71 2021a). Therefore, climate change will reduce the population growth rate and the range  
72 size of these species (Reed et al., 2021b). Other species will persist or even increase their  
73 range in response to climate change (Williams et al., 2015; Merow et al., 2017). In seabird  
74 populations, climate change by increasing the survival rate of both sexes favored their  
75 population growth rate (Gianuca et al., 2019).

76 In this study, we combined a demographic survey and a Bayesian hierarchical model  
77 to understand the demographic response of dioecious species to climate change and  
78 its implications on range dynamics. Our study system is a dioecious plant species (*Poa*  
79 *arachnifera*) distributed along an aridity gradient. A previous study on the system showed  
80 that, despite the differentiation of the niche between sexes, the female niche mattered the  
81 most in driving the environmental limits of the viability of *Poa arachnifera* populations  
82 (Miller and Compagnoni, 2022). Thus, under current climate conditions, we hypothe-  
83 sized that a high value of the growing temperature and a lower value of precipitation  
84 have negative effects on the population growth rate through a reduction in the growth of  
85 female survival and the flowering rate. Under future climate will, we hypothesized that

## Materials and methods

### *Study system*

Texas blue grass (*Poa arachnifera*) is a perennial cool season plant. The species occurs in Texas, Oklahoma, and Southern Kansas. Texas blue produces a dark green ground cover throughout the summer between October and May, with onset of Dormancy often from June to September. When flowering, males often have anthers, and females have stigmas. The species is pollinated by wind.

We studied  $n$  populations along the distribution of these species in the United States in 2014 and 2015.

### Literature Cited

Bruijning, M., M. D. Visser, H. C. Muller-Landau, S. J. Wright, L. S. Comita, S. P. Hubbell, H. de Kroon, and E. Jongejans. 2017. Surviving in a cosexual world: A cost-benefit analysis of dioecy in tropical trees. *The American Naturalist* **189**:297–314.

Dalgleish, H. J., D. N. Koons, M. B. Hooten, C. A. Moffet, and P. B. Adler. 2011. Climate influences the demography of three dominant sagebrush steppe plants. *Ecology* **92**:75–85.

Elith, J., and J. R. Leathwick. 2009. Species distribution models: ecological explanation and prediction across space and time. *Annual review of ecology, evolution, and systematics* **40**:677–697.

Fisher, R. A. 1930. *The genetical theory of natural selection* .

106 Freeman, D. C., L. G. Klikoff, and K. T. Harper. 1976. Differential resource utilization by  
107 the sexes of dioecious plants. *Science* **193**:597–599.

108 Gianuca, D., S. C. Votier, D. Pardo, A. G. Wood, R. B. Sherley, L. Ireland, R. Choquet,  
109 R. Pradel, S. Townley, J. Forcada, et al. 2019. Sex-specific effects of fisheries and  
110 climate on the demography of sexually dimorphic seabirds. *Journal of Animal Ecology*  
111 **88**:1366–1378.

112 Greiser, C., K. Hylander, E. Meineri, M. Luoto, and J. Ehrlén. 2020. Climate limitation  
113 at the cold edge: contrasting perspectives from species distribution modelling and a  
114 transplant experiment. *Ecography* **43**:637–647.

115 Hultine, K. R., K. C. Grady, T. E. Wood, S. M. Shuster, J. C. Stella, and T. G. Whitham.  
116 2016. Climate change perils for dioecious plant species. *Nature Plants* **2**:1–8.

117 Jones, M. H., S. E. Macdonald, and G. H. Henry. 1999. Sex-and habitat-specific responses  
118 of a high arctic willow, *Salix arctica*, to experimental climate change. *Oikos* pages  
119 129–138.

120 Lee-Yaw, A. J., J. L. McCune, S. Pironon, and S. N. Sheth. 2022. Species distribution  
121 models rarely predict the biology of real populations. *Ecography* **2022**:e05877.

122 Merow, C., S. T. Bois, J. M. Allen, Y. Xie, and J. A. Silander Jr. 2017. Climate change  
123 both facilitates and inhibits invasive plant ranges in New England. *Proceedings of the*  
124 *National Academy of Sciences* **114**:E3276–E3284.

125 Miller, T. E., and A. Compagnoni. 2022. Two-Sex Demography, Sexual Niche Differen-  
126 tiation, and the Geographic Range Limits of Texas Bluegrass (*Poa arachnifera*). *The*  
127 *American Naturalist* **200**:17–31.



- 128 Morrison, C. A., R. A. Robinson, J. A. Clark, and J. A. Gill. 2016. Causes and conse-  
129 quences of spatial variation in sex ratios in a declining bird species. *Journal of Animal*  
130 *Ecology* **85**:1298–1306.
- 131 Petry, W. K., J. D. Soule, A. M. Iler, A. Chicas-Mosier, D. W. Inouye, T. E. Miller, and K. A.  
132 Mooney. 2016. Sex-specific responses to climate change in plants alter population sex  
133 ratio and performance. *Science* **353**:69–71.
- 134 Reed, P. B., S. D. Bridgham, L. E. Pfeifer-Meister, M. L. DeMarche, B. R. Johnson, B. A.  
135 Roy, G. T. Bailes, A. A. Nelson, W. F. Morris, and D. F. Doak. 2021a. Climate warming  
136 threatens the persistence of a community of disturbance-adapted native annual plants.  
137 *Ecology* **102**:e03464.
- 138 Reed, P. B., M. L. Peterson, L. E. Pfeifer-Meister, W. F. Morris, D. F. Doak, B. A. Roy, B. R.  
139 Johnson, G. T. Bailes, A. A. Nelson, and S. D. Bridgham. 2021b. Climate manipulations  
140 differentially affect plant population dynamics within versus beyond northern range  
141 limits. *Journal of Ecology* **109**:664–675.
- 142 Tognetti, R. 2012. Adaptation to climate change of dioecious plants: does gender balance  
143 matter? *Tree Physiology* **32**:1321–1324. URL [https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/](https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tps105)  
144 [tps105](https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tps105).
- 145 Williams, J. L., H. Jacquemyn, B. M. Ochocki, R. Brys, and T. E. Miller. 2015. Life history  
146 evolution under climate change and its influence on the population dynamics of a  
147 long-lived plant. *Journal of Ecology* **103**:798–808.