

Dioecious range-limited species response to climate change

Jacob K. Moutouama^a, Aldo Compagnoni^b, and Tom E.X. Miller^a

^aProgram in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Department of BioSciences, Rice University, Houston, TX USA

^bInstitute of Biology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle, Germany; and German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv), Leipzig, Germany

June 10, 2023

* Corresponding author: 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 (Source). 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 (Source). 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 currently derived by correlative relationships between species occurrence record or abundance patterns and current climate conditions (Source). 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). Additionally, due to the difficulty in experimentally addressing how dioecious species respond demographically to climate change, most studies often focused only on how climate change affects the sex ratio and rarely on the impact of climate change on the population dynamics of dioecious species and its implications for range shifts .

Theory predicts that if cost of reproduction for each sex is equal and if males and

37 females differ in reproductive fitness equality with increasing size, then natural selection
38 will act to balance a population sex ratio at 1:1 (Fisher, 1930). However, deviances from
39 those assumptions have been observed. In several plant species, females are more sensi-
40 tive to stress-related resource availability conditions than males, leading to high female
41 mortality and, therefore, to a male bias sex ratio (Hultine et al., 2016). Furthermore, the
42 lower cost of reproduction of males may allow them to invest their energy in other func-
43 tions that produce higher growth rates, higher clonality, or even higher survival rates
44 compared to females (Bruijning et al., 2017), causing a skew sex ratio.

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

52 Our ability to track the impact of climate change on the population dynamics of dioe-
53 cious plants depends on our ability to build mechanistic models that take into account
54 the spatial and temporal context in which survival, reproduction, and growth occur due
55 to the sessile nature of these plants. Several studies found that climate change affects
56 demographic processes in distinctive and potentially contrasting ways (Dalglish et al.,
57 2011). For example, while climate has a significant effect on the probability of survival
58 and growth, it has no effect on the probability of flowering (Greiser et al., 2020). Addi-
59 tionally, under warmer conditions, some native species will fail to establish reproductive
60 populations due to the extremely low germination rate and seedling survival (Reed et al.,
61 2021a). Therefore, climate change will reduce the population growth rate and the range

62 size of these species (Reed et al., 2021b). Other species will persist or even increase their
63 range in response to climate change (Williams et al., 2015; Merow et al., 2017). In seabird
64 populations, climate change by increasing the survival rate of both sexes favored their
65 population growth rate (Gianuca et al., 2019).

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

76 **Materials and methods**

77 *Study system*

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

83 We studied n populations along the distribution of these species in the United States
84 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.
- Fisher, R. A. 1930. *The genetical theory of natural selection* .
- Gianuca, D., S. C. Votier, D. Pardo, A. G. Wood, R. B. Sherley, L. Ireland, R. Choquet, R. Pradel, S. Townley, J. Forcada, et al. 2019. Sex-specific effects of fisheries and climate on the demography of sexually dimorphic seabirds. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **88**:1366–1378.
- Greiser, C., K. Hylander, E. Meineri, M. Luoto, and J. Ehrlén. 2020. Climate limitation at the cold edge: contrasting perspectives from species distribution modelling and a transplant experiment. *Ecography* **43**:637–647.
- Hultine, K. R., K. C. Grady, T. E. Wood, S. M. Shuster, J. C. Stella, and T. G. Whitham. 2016. Climate change perils for dioecious plant species. *Nature Plants* **2**:1–8.
- Lee-Yaw, A. J., J. L. McCune, S. Pironon, and S. N. Sheth. 2022. Species distribution models rarely predict the biology of real populations. *Ecography* **2022**:e05877.
- Merow, C., S. T. Bois, J. M. Allen, Y. Xie, and J. A. Silander Jr. 2017. Climate change both facilitates and inhibits invasive plant ranges in New England. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**:E3276–E3284.

- 107 Miller, T. E., and A. Compagnoni. 2022. Two-Sex Demography, Sexual Niche Differen-
108 tiation, and the Geographic Range Limits of Texas Bluegrass (*Poa arachnifera*). *The*
109 *American Naturalist* **200**:17–31.
- 110 Morrison, C. A., R. A. Robinson, J. A. Clark, and J. A. Gill. 2016. Causes and conse-
111 quences of spatial variation in sex ratios in a declining bird species. *Journal of Animal*
112 *Ecology* **85**:1298–1306.
- 113 Petry, W. K., J. D. Soule, A. M. Iler, A. Chicas-Mosier, D. W. Inouye, T. E. Miller, and K. A.
114 Mooney. 2016. Sex-specific responses to climate change in plants alter population sex
115 ratio and performance. *Science* **353**:69–71.
- 116 Reed, P. B., S. D. Bridgham, L. E. Pfeifer-Meister, M. L. DeMarche, B. R. Johnson, B. A.
117 Roy, G. T. Bailes, A. A. Nelson, W. F. Morris, and D. F. Doak. 2021*a*. Climate warming
118 threatens the persistence of a community of disturbance-adapted native annual plants.
119 *Ecology* **102**:e03464.
- 120 Reed, P. B., M. L. Peterson, L. E. Pfeifer-Meister, W. F. Morris, D. F. Doak, B. A. Roy, B. R.
121 Johnson, G. T. Bailes, A. A. Nelson, and S. D. Bridgham. 2021*b*. Climate manipulations
122 differentially affect plant population dynamics within versus beyond northern range
123 limits. *Journal of Ecology* **109**:664–675.
- 124 Williams, J. L., H. Jacquemyn, B. M. Ochocki, R. Brys, and T. E. Miller. 2015. Life history
125 evolution under climate change and its influence on the population dynamics of a
126 long-lived plant. *Journal of Ecology* **103**:798–808.