

Forecasting range shifts of a dioecious plant species under climate change

Jacob K. Moutouama 0000-0003-1599-1671^{*1}, Aldo Compagnoni 0000-0001-8302-7492², and Tom E.X. Miller 0000-0003-3208-6067¹

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

²Institute

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

Running header: Forecasting range shifts

Keywords: demography, forecasting, global warming, matrix projection model, population dynamics, sex ratio, range limits

Submitted to: *Ecology letters* (Letter)

Data accessibility statement: All data used in this paper are publicly available and cited appropriately (Miller and Compagnoni, 2022a). Should the paper be accepted, all computer scripts supporting the results will be archived in a Zenodo package, with the DOI included at the end of the article. During peer review, our code (Stan, Bash and R) is available at <https://github.com/jmoutouama/POAR-Forecasting>.

Conflict of interest statement: None.

Authorship statement: A.C., J.K.M. and T.E.X.M. designed the study. A.C. and T.E.X.M. collected the data. All authors conducted the statistical analyses and modeling. J.K.M. drafted the manuscript, and T.E.X.M contributed to revisions.

Abstract:

Main Text:

Figures:

Tables:

References:

*Corresponding author: jmoutouama@gmail.com

¹ Abstract

² Global warming has triggered an urgent need for predicting the reorganization of Earth's
³ biodiversity under climate change. Currently, the vast majority of theory and models in
⁴ population biology, including those used to forecast biodiversity responses to climate change,
⁵ ignore the complication of sex structure. We developed demographic models of range
⁶ limitation, parameterized from geographically distributed common garden experiments
⁷ with females and males of a dioecious grass species (*Poa arachnifera*) throughout and beyond
⁸ its range in the south-central U.S. Female-dominant and two-sex model versions of the
⁹ demographic model both predict that future climate change will alter population viability
¹⁰ and will induce latitudinal niche extension beyond current northern limits. However, the
¹¹ magnitude of niche shift was overestimated by the female-dominant model, because females
¹² have broader temperature tolerance than males and become mate-limited under female-biased
¹³ sex ratios. Explicitly account for both sexes could enhance population viability forecasts and
¹⁴ conservation planning for dioecious species in response to climate change.

¹⁵ Introduction

¹⁶ Rising temperatures and extreme drought events associated with global climate change are
¹⁷ leading to increased concern about how species will become redistributed across the globe
¹⁸ under future climate conditions (Bertrand et al., 2011; Gamelon et al., 2017; Smith et al., 2024).
¹⁹ Dioecious species (most animals and ca. 7% of plant species) might be particularly vulnerable
²⁰ to the influence of climate change because they often display skewed sex ratios that are
²¹ generated or reinforced by sexual niche differentiation (distinct responses of females and males
²² to shared climate drivers) (Tognetti, 2012). Accounting for such a niche differentiation within
²³ a population is a long-standing challenge in accurately predicting which sex will successfully
²⁴ track environmental change and how this will impact population viability and range shifts
²⁵ (Gissi et al., 2023; Jones et al., 1999). The vast majority of theory and models in population
²⁶ biology, including those used to forecast biodiversity responses to climate change, **ignore the**
²⁷ **complication of sex structure**¹ (Ellis et al., 2017; Gissi et al., 2024; Pottier et al., 2021). Traditional
²⁸ approaches in population biology instead focus exclusively on females, assuming that males
²⁹ are in sufficient supply as to never limit female fertility (Miller and Inouye, 2011). As a
³⁰ result, forecasts of colonization-extinction dynamics for dioecious species under future climate
³¹ change that explicitly account for females, males, and their inter-dependence are limited.

³² Species's range limits, when not driven by dispersal limitation, should generally reflect
³³ the limits of the ecological niche (Lee-Yaw et al., 2016). Niches and geographic ranges are
³⁴ often limited by climatic factors including temperature and precipitation (Sexton et al., 2009).
³⁵ Therefore, any substantial changes in the magnitude of these climatic factors in a given location
³⁶ across the range could impact population viability, with implications for range expansions
³⁷ or contractions based on which regions become more or less suitable (Davis and Shaw,
³⁸ 2001; Pease et al., 1989). Forecasting range shifts for dioecious species is complicated by the
³⁹ potential for each sex to respond differently to climate variation (Hultine et al., 2016; Morrison
⁴⁰ et al., 2016; Pottier et al., 2021). Populations in which males are rare under current climatic
⁴¹ conditions could experience low reproductive success due to sperm or pollen limitation that
⁴² may lead to population decline in response to climate change that disproportionately favors
⁴³ females (Eberhart-Phillips et al., 2017). In contrast, climate change could expand male habitat
⁴⁴ suitability (e.g. upslope movement), which might increases seed set for pollen-limited females
⁴⁵ and favor range expansion (Petry et al., 2016). Although the response of species to climate
⁴⁶ warming is an urgent and active area of research, few studies have disentangled the interaction

¹ *It is unclear how you are citing these studies. Are they examples of ignoring sex structure? Or examples of accounting for sex structure?*

47 between sex and climate drivers to understand their combined effects on population dynamics
48 and range shifts, despite calls for such an approach (hultine2016climate,gissi2023exploring).

49 Tracking the impact of climate change on the population dynamics and range limits
50 of dioecious taxa depends on our ability to build mechanistic models that take into account
51 the spatial and temporal context in which sex specific response to climate change affects
52 population viability (Czachura and Miller, 2020; Davis and Shaw, 2001; Evans et al., 2016).
53 Structured population models built from demographic data collected from geographically
54 distributed observations or common garden experiments provide several advantages for
55 studying the impact of climate change on species' range shifts (Merow et al., 2017; Schultz
56 et al., 2022; Schwinnning et al., 2022). First, demographic models link individual-level life
57 history events (mortality, development, and regeneration) to population demography, allowing
58 the investigation of factors explaining vital rate responses to environmental drivers (Dahlgren
59 et al., 2016; Ehrlén and Morris, 2015; Louthan et al., 2022). Second, demographic models
60 have a natural interface with experimental treatments that can isolate spatial and temporal
61 correlations between environmental factors, thus overcoming a main disadvantage with many
62 types of correlative studies (Leicht-Young et al., 2007). Third, structured demographic models
63 can be used to identify which aspect of climate is more important for population dynamics.
64 For example, Life Table Response Experiments (LTRE) built from structured models have
65 become widely used to understand the relative importance of covariates in explaining
66 variation in population growth rate (Ellner et al., 2016; Hernández et al., 2023). LTRE is
67 also used to get a mechanistic understanding of how a given treatment (eg. temperature or
68 precipitation) could affect population dynamics through unique vital rate responses (Caswell,
69 1989; Iler et al., 2019; Morrison and Hik, 2007; O'Connell et al., 2024). ²

70 In this study, we used a mechanistic approach, combining geographically-distributed
71 field experiments, Bayesian statistical modeling, and two-sex population projection modeling,
72 to understand the demographic response of dioecious species to climate change and its
73 implications for past, present, and future range dynamics. Our work focused on the dioecious
74 grass species Texas bluegrass (*Poa arachnifera*), which is distributed along environmental
75 gradients in the south-central U.S. corresponding to variation in temperature across latitude
76 and precipitation across longitude. ³ Our previous study showed that, despite a differentiation
77 of climatic niche between sexes, the female niche mattered the most in driving the
78 environmental limits of population viability across longitude (Miller and Compagnoni, 2022b).
79 However, that study used a single proxy variable (longitude) to represent environmental

²*It is noticeable that you never mention SDMs as a point of contrast with demographic models. Are you intentionally avoiding that?*

³*I think it would be good to add some context about climate change in this study region – what has already occurred and what is projected.*

80 variation related to aridity. Developing a rigorous forecast for the implications of future
81 climate change requires that we transition from climate-implicit to climate-explicit treatment
82 of environmental drivers as we do here. Here, we asked four questions:

- 83 1. What are the sex-specific vital rate responses to variation in temperature and precipitation
84 across the species' range ?
- 85 2. How do sex-specific vital rates combine to determine the influence of climate variation
86 on population growth rate (λ) ?
- 87 3. What are the historical and projected dynamics of the Texas bluegrass geographic niche
88 and how does accounting for sex structure modify these predictions?
- 89 4. Which vital rates and climate covariates most strongly determine past and future changes
90 in the geographic niche?

91 Materials and methods

92 Study species

93 Texas bluegrass (*Poa arachnifera*) is a dioecious perennial, summer-dormant cool-season (C3)
94 grass that occurs in the south-central U.S. (Texas, Oklahoma, and southern Kansas) (Hitchcock,
95 1971)⁴. Latitudinal limits of the Texas bluegrass distribution span # to # in mean annual
96 temperature, and longitudinal limits span # to # in annual precipitation. Texas bluegrass
97 grows between October and May (growing season), with onset of dormancy often from June
98 to September (dormant season) (Kindiger, 2004).

99 Biological sex in Texas bluegrass is genetically based and the birth (seed) sex ratio
100 is 1:1 (CITE). Females and males are morphologically indistinguishable except for their
101 inflorescences. Flowering occurs in May and the species is wind pollinated (Hitchcock,
102 1971). Surveys of # natural populations throughout the species' distribution indicated that
103 operational sex ratio (the female fraction of flowering plants) ranged from # to # with a mean
104 of # (Miller and Compagnoni, 2022b).

⁴I would reference the map figure (current Fig. 1) here. I also suggest either adding the GBIF records to this figure or adding the county occurrences as in the Am Nat paper, because it is important for readers to see the natural distribution early in the paper. The natural population surveys can be cut from this figure because you don't say anything about them and you do not use the data here. Alternatively, there may be value in re-analyzing the sex ratio surveys with your climate covariates. Fig 1 also needs to be updated with labels and units on the climate variable color bars. I recommend putting panels A-C and B-D on the same climate scale.

105 **Common garden experiment**

106 We set up a common garden experiment throughout and beyond the range of Texas bluegrass
107 to quantify sex-specific demographic responses to climate. **The novelty of this study lies**
108 **in the fact that we use a precise climate variable to build a mechanistic model to forecast**
109 **the response of species to climate change.**⁵ Details of the experimental design are provided
110 in Miller and Compagnoni (2022b); we provide a brief overview here. The experiment was
111 installed at 14 sites throughout and, in some cases, beyond the species' natural range (Fig.1).
112 At each site, we established 14 blocks. For each block we planted three female and three male
113 individuals that were clonally propagated from females and males from eight natural source
114 populations (Fig.1); because sex is genetically-based, clones never deviated from their expected
115 sex. The experiment was established in November 2013 and was censused in May of 2014,
116 2015, and 2016. At each census, we collected individual demographic data including survival
117 (alive or dead), size (number of tillers), and number of panicles (reproductive inflorescences).
118 For the analyses that follow, we focus on the 2014-15 and 2015-16 transitions years, since the
119 start of the experiment did not include the full 2013-14 transition year.

⁵*This is not relevant to the description of the experiment.*




Figure 1: Maps of 30-year (1990-2019) normal climate and study sites used for demographic monitoring of *Poa arachnifera* in Texas, Kansas and Oklahoma in the United States. (A) Precipitation of the dormant season in mm , (B) temperature of the dormant season in °C , (C) precipitation of the growing season in mm , (D) temperature of the growing season in °C . We surveyed 22 natural populations (grey diamond). The common garden sites were installed on 14 sites (black circle) collected from 7 sources populations (red circle). Average temperatures along the distribution of the species tend to decrease northward as a result of the influence of latitude: lower latitudes receive more heat from the sun over the course of a year. Similarly, the average precipitation decreases eastward as a result of the influence of longitude: lower longitudes receive less precipitation over the year. See also Fig.S-1, Fig.S-2.

120 **Climatic data collection**

121 We gathered downscaled monthly temperature⁶ and precipitation⁷ for each site from Chelsa
122 to describe observed climate conditions during our study period (Karger et al., 2017). These
123 climate data were used as covariates in vital rate regressions. We aligned the climatic years to
124 match demographic transition years (May 1 – April 30)⁸ rather than calendar years. Based on
125 the natural history of this summer-dormant cool-season species, we divided each transition
126 year into dormant (June 1 through September 30) and growing (October 1 through May 31)
127 seasons. The 2014-15 transition year was substantially wetter and cooler across the study
128 region than 2015-16, especially during the growing season (figure⁹), so our study design
129 provides both spatial and inter-annual coverage of climate variables.

130 To back-cast and forecast demographic responses to changes in climate throughout the
131 study region, we downloaded projection data for three 30-year periods: “past” (1901-1930),
132 “current” (1990-2019) and “future” (2070-2100). Data for these climatic periods¹⁰ were
133 downloaded from four general circulation models (GCMs) selected from the Coupled Model
134 Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5). The GCMs are: Model for Interdisciplinary
135 Research on Climate (MIROC5), Australian Community Climate and Earth System Simulator
136 (ACCESS1-3), Community Earth System Model (CESM1-BGC), Centro Euro-Mediterraneo sui
137 Cambiamenti Climatici Climate Model (CMCC-CM). All the GCMs were downloaded from
138 chelsa (Sanderson et al., 2015). We evaluated future climate projections from two scenarios of
139 representative concentration pathways (RCPs): RCP4.5, an intermediate-to-pessimistic scenario
140 assuming a radiative forcing amounting to 4.5 W m^{-2} by 2100, and RCP8.5, a pessimistic
141 emission scenario which projects a radiative forcing of 8.5 W m^{-2} by 2100 (Schwalm et al.,
142 2020; Thomson et al., 2011).

143 **Sex ratio experiment**

144 ¹¹ We conducted a sex-ratio experiment at one site near the center of the range to estimate
145 the effect of sex-ratio variation on female reproductive success. Details of the experiment
146 are provided in Compagnoni et al. (2017) and Miller and Compagnoni (2022b). In short, we

⁶Give units

⁷Give units

⁸I think this is not right. I think we updated the transition year to be June 1 – May 31.

⁹I would like to use the figure I made called site-year-weather. However, I cannot tell from this figure whether the first year was unusually wet or the second year was unusually dry – this will take looking at the climate data more broadly. I am also not sure if this figure was made before or after we changed the dates of the transition year, so it may need to be updated

¹⁰The four GCMs only refers to the future data, right?

¹¹You say nothing about this experiment in the Results or Discussion, so in its current state this section serves no purpose in this paper.

147 established 124 experimental populations in plots measuring 0.4 x 0.4m and separated by at
148 least 15m from each other. We chose 15m because our pilot data showed that more than 90%
149 of wind pollination occurred within 13m. We varied population density (1-48 plants/plot)
150 and sex ratio (0%-100% female) across the experimental populations, and we replicated 34
151 combinations of density and sex ratio. We collected panicles from a subset of females in each
152 plot and recorded the number of seeds in each panicle. We assessed reproductive success (seeds
153 fertilized) using greenhouse-based germination and trazolium-based seed viability assays.

154 ¹²We used data from the sex-ratio experiment to estimate the probability of seed viability
155 and the germination rate. Seed viability was modeled with a binomial distribution where
156 the probability of viability (v) was given by:

$$v = v_0 * (1 - OSR^\alpha) \quad (1)$$

158 where OSR is the **operational sex ratio**¹³ (proportion of panicles that were female) in the
159 experimental populations. The properties of the above function is supported by our previous
160 work (Compagnoni et al., 2017). Here, seed viability is maximized at v_0 as OSR approaches
161 zero (strongly male-biased) and goes to zero as OSR approaches 1 (strongly female-biased).
162 Parameter α controls how viability declines with increasing female bias. ¹⁴

163 We used a binomial distribution to model the germination data from greenhouse trials.
164 Given that germination was conditional on seed viability, the probability of success was given
165 by the product $v * g$, where v is a function of OSR (Eq. 1) and g is assumed to be constant.¹⁵

166 Sex specific demographic responses to climate

167 ¹⁶ We used individual level measurements of survival, growth (number of tillers), flowering,
168 number of panicles to independently develop Bayesian mixed effect models describing how

¹²I think the data analysis methods could be better organized. Here you describe the experimental methods and data analysis in the same section, but for the common garden experiment you split them.

¹³I tried to add a little about this, but generally I think the concept of the operational sex ratio is under-developed throughout the manuscript. It is the main way through which sex-specific climate responses can feed back to influence lambda, so it warrants greater attention.

¹⁴Throughout the methods I recognize a lot of the text as coming directly from the Am Nat paper. I strongly recommend that you diversify your language and never use published text verbatim. Many journals use plagiarism detection software and this will raise a red flag, even if we are plagiarizing ourselves.

¹⁵You provide no information about how this model was fit. This echoes my previous comment that the data analysis should be better organized.

¹⁶This section needs to be more carefully edited, which I have not done. There is redundancy between the two paragraphs and most importantly, there is not enough biological rationale for the model that you fit. You do not describe which interactions you include, which you do not include, and why. This is a very complex model – 24 fixed-effect coefficients! – and it will get skepticism from reviewers. You need to justify why this is the right model, especially since you do not have any model selection or variable selection.

169 each vital rate varies as a function of sex, size, and four climate covariates (precipitation and
 170 temperature of growing and dormant seasons). We fit vital rate models with second-degree
 171 polynomial functions for the influence of climate. We included a second-degree polynomial
 172 because we expected that climate variables would affect vital rates through a hump-shaped
 173 relationship.

174 We centered and standardized all climatic predictors to facilitate model convergence.
 175 Size (number of tillers) was on a natural logarithm scale. We included site, source, and
 176 block as random effects. All the vital rate models used the same **linear predictor**¹⁷ for the
 177 expected value (μ) (Eq. 2). However, we applied a different link function ($f(\mu)$) depending
 178 on the distribution the vital rate. We modeled survival and flowering data with a Bernoulli
 179 distribution. We modeled the growth (tiller number) with a zero-truncated Poisson inverse
 180 Gaussian distribution. Fertility (panicle count) was model as zero-truncated negative binomial.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mu = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{size} + \beta_2 \text{sex} + \beta_3 \text{pptgrow} + \beta_4 \text{pptdorm} + \beta_5 \text{tempgrow} + \beta_6 \text{tempdorm} \\
 & + \beta_7 \text{pptgrow*sex} + \beta_8 \text{pptdorm*sex} + \beta_9 \text{tempgrow*sex} + \beta_{10} \text{tempdorm*sex} \\
 & + \beta_{11} \text{size*sex} + \beta_{12} \text{pptgrow*tempgrow} + \beta_{13} \text{pptdorm*tempdorm} \\
 & + \beta_{14} \text{pptgrow*tempgrow*sex} + \beta_{15} \text{pptdorm*tempdorm*sex} + \beta_{16} \text{pptgrow}^2 \\
 & + \beta_{17} \text{pptdorm}^2 + \beta_{18} \text{tempgrow}^2 + \beta_{19} \text{tempdorm}^2 + \beta_{20} \text{pptgrow}^2 * \text{sex} \\
 & + \beta_{21} \text{pptdorm}^2 * \text{sex} + \beta_{22} \text{tempgrow}^2 * \text{sex} + \beta_{23} \text{tempdorm}^2 * \text{sex} + \phi + \rho + \nu
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

181 where β_0 is the grand mean intercept, β_1 is the size dependent slopes. *size* was on a natural log-
 182 arithm scale. $\beta_2 \dots \beta_{13}$ represent the climate dependent slopes. $\beta_{14} \dots \beta_{23}$ represent the sex-climate
 183 interaction slopes. *pptgrow* is the precipitation of the growing season (standardized to mean
 184 zero and unit variance), *tempgrow* is the temperature of the growing season (standardized to
 185 mean zero and unit variance), *pptdorm* is the precipitation of the dormant season (standardized
 186 to mean zero and unit variance), *tempdorm* is the temperature of the dormant season (standard-
 187 ized to mean zero and unit variance). The model also includes normally distributed random
 188 effects for block-to-block variation ($\phi \sim N(0, \sigma_{block})$) and source-to-source variation that is
 189 related to the provenence of the seeds used to establish the common garden ($\rho \sim N(0, \sigma_{source})$),
 190 site to site variation ($\nu \sim N(0, \sigma_{site})$). We fit survival, growth, flowering models with generic
 191 weakly informative priors for coefficients ($\mu = 0, \sigma = 1.5$) and variances ($\gamma[0.1, 0.1]$). We fit
 192 fertility model with regularizing priors for coefficients ($\mu = 0, \sigma = 0.15$). We ran three chains
 193 for 1000 samples for warmup and 4000 for interactions, with a thinning rate of 3. We accessed
 194 the quality of the models using trace plots and predictive check graphs (Piironen and Vehtari,
 195 2017) (Fig. S-4). To understand the effect of climate on vital rates, we got the 95 % credible

¹⁷It is still a “linear predictor” even if it has quadratic terms.

¹⁹⁷ interval of the posterior distribution. Then we assumed that there is 95 % probability that the
¹⁹⁸ true (unknown) estimates would lie within that interval, given the evidence provided by the
¹⁹⁹ observed data for each vital rate. All models were fit in Stan (Stan Development Team, 2023).

²⁰⁰ Two-sex and climate-dependent matrix projection model

²⁰¹ To understand the effect of climate on population growth rate incorporating both female
²⁰² and male climate responses, we used the climate-dependent vital rate regressions to build
²⁰³ a matrix projection model (MPM) structured by size (number of tillers) and sex Let $F_{x,z,t}$ and
²⁰⁴ $M_{x,z,t}$ be the number of female and male plants of size x in year t present at a location that
²⁰⁵ has z as climate¹⁸, where $x \in \{1, 2, \dots, U\}$ and U is the maximum number of tillers a plant can
²⁰⁶ reach (here 95th percentile¹⁹ of observed maximum size). Let F_t^R and M_t^R be new recruits,
²⁰⁷ which we assume do not reproduce in their first year. We assume that the parameters of
²⁰⁸ sex ratio-dependent mating (Eq. 1) do not vary with climate. For a pre-breeding census, the
²⁰⁹ expected numbers of recruits in year $t+1$ is given by:

$$\text{210} \quad F_{t+1}^R = \sum_{x=1}^U [p^F(x,z) \cdot c^F(x,z) \cdot d \cdot v(\mathbf{F}_t, \mathbf{M}_t) \cdot m \cdot \rho] F_{x,z,t} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{211} \quad M_{t+1}^R = \sum_{x=1}^U [p^F(x,z) \cdot c^F(x,z) \cdot d \cdot v(\mathbf{F}_t, \mathbf{M}_t) \cdot m \cdot (1-\rho)] F_{x,z,t} \quad (4)$$

²¹² where p^F and c^F are flowering probability and panicle production for females of size x , d
²¹³ is the number of seeds per female panicle, v is the probability that a seed is fertilized, m is
²¹⁴ the probability that a fertilized seed germinates, and ρ is the primary sex ratio (proportion
²¹⁵ of recruits that are female), z is the climate. Seed fertilization depends on the OSR of panicles
²¹⁶ (following Eq. 1) which was derived from the $U \times 1$ vectors of population structure \mathbf{F}_t and \mathbf{M}_t :

$$\text{217} \quad v(\mathbf{F}_t, \mathbf{M}_t) = v_0 * \left[1 - \left(\frac{\sum_{x=1}^U p^F(x,z) c^F(x,z) F_{x,z,t}}{\sum_{x=1}^U p^F(x,z) c^F(x,z) F_{x,z,t} + p^M(x,z) c^M(x,z) M_{x,z,t}} \right)^\alpha \right] \quad (5)$$

²¹⁸ Thus, the dynamics of the size-structured component of the population are given by:

$$\text{219} \quad F_{y,t+1} = [\sigma \cdot g^F(y, x=1, z)] F_t^R + \sum_{x=1}^U [s^F(x,z) \cdot g^F(y, x, z)] F_{x,z,t} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{220} \quad M_{y,t+1} = [\sigma \cdot g^M(y, x=1, z)] M_t^R + \sum_{x=1}^U [s^M(x,z) \cdot g^M(y, x, z)] M_{x,z,t} \quad (7)$$

¹⁸The variable z is not used consistently or correctly. Notice in eq:viabMPM and eq:dynamics you use z in the RHS but not the LHS. CLimate is not a state variable.

¹⁹I remember you experimented with this. Is this the actual percentile you used or was this text from the Am Nat paper?

221 In the two formula above, the first term indicates seedlings that survived their first year and en-
 222 ter the size distribution of established plants. Instead of using *P. arachnifera* survival probability,
 223 we used the seedling survival probability (σ) from demographic studies of the hermaphroditic
 224 congener *Poa autumnalis* in east Texas (T.E.X. Miller and J.A. Rudgers, *unpublished data*), and we
 225 assume this probability was constant across sexes and climatic variables. We did this because
 226 we had little information on the early life cycle transitions of greenhouse-raised transplants.
 227 We also assume that $g(y, x = 1)$ is the probability that a surviving seedlings reach size y ,
 228 the expected future size of 1-tiller plants from the transplant experiment. The second term
 229 represents survival and size transition of established plants from the previous year, where
 230 s and g give the probabilities of surviving at size x and growing from sizes x to y , respectively,
 231 and superscripts indicate that these functions may be unique to females (F) and males (M).

232 Since the two-sex MPM is nonlinear (vital rates affect and are affected by population
 233 structure) we estimated the asymptotic geometric growth rate (λ) by numerical simulation,
 234 and repeated this across a range of climate²⁰.²¹

235 Life Table Response Experiments

236 To identify which aspect of climate is most important for population viability, we used a
 237 "random design" Life Table Response Experiment (LTRE). We used the RandomForest package
 238 to fit a regression model with seasonal climate²² (here θ) as predictors and λ as response
 239 (Ellner et al., 2016; Liaw et al., 2002). The LTRE approximates the variation in λ in response
 240 to seasonal climate covariates and their interaction (Caswell, 2000; Hernández et al., 2023):

$$241 \quad Var(\lambda_c) \approx \sum_{i=-1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n Cov(\theta_i, \theta_j, \theta_{ij}) + Var(\epsilon) \quad (8)$$

242 where, θ_i , θ_j , θ_{ij} represent respectively the fitted regression slope for the covariates of the dor-
 243 mant season, j the covariates of the growing season and ij the covariates of their interactions.²³

244 To identify the mechanism by which climate affects population growth rate for each sex,
 245 we decomposed the effect of each climate variable on population growth rate (λ) into contri-
 246 bution arising from the effect on each stage-specific vital rate²⁴ (Caswell, 2000). At this end we

²⁰Vague - needs more detail.

²¹Too much of this section is familiar to me from the Am Nat paper. I suggest you write this in your own voice. You also should provide an explanation for the female-dominant model.

²²It is unclear what variation in climate you are sampling over.

²³But you also have second-order terms, and I am not sure whether and how this LTRE accounts for that. Also, what is n here? Why does the summation over i start at -1? And why do you show only two variables, since you have four?

²⁴I don't know what you mean by "stage-specific"

247 used another LTRE with a "regression design".²⁵ The LTRE with a "regression design" approx-
248 imates the change in λ with climate as the product of the sensitivity of λ to the parameters
249 times the sensitivity of the parameters to climate, summed over all parameters (Caswell, 1989):

250

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \text{climate}} \approx \sum_i \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \theta_i^F} \frac{\partial \theta_i^F}{\partial \text{climate}} + \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial \theta_i^M} \frac{\partial \theta_i^M}{\partial \text{climate}} \quad (9)$$

251 where, θ_i^F and θ_i^M represent sex-specific parameters: the regression coefficients for the
252 intercepts and slopes of size-dependent vital rate functions. Because LTRE contributions are
253 additive, we summed across vital rates to compare the total contributions of female and male
254 parameters.²⁶

255 Impact of climate change on niche and range shifts

256 A species' ecological niche can be defined as the range of resources and conditions allowing
257 its populations to self-sustained ($\lambda > 1$) (Hutchinson et al., 1978; Maguire Jr, 1973). To
258 understand the impact of climate change on species niche shifts, we estimated the probability
259 of self-sustaining populations, which is $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$ conditional to two environmental axes:
260 (i) temperature and precipitation of the dormant season and (ii) temperature and precipitation
261 of the growing season.²⁷ $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$ was calculated using the proportion of the 300 Markov
262 chain Monte Carlo iterations that lead to a $\lambda > 1$ (Diez et al., 2014).²⁸

263 $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$ was also mapped onto geographic layers of three state (Texas, Oklahoma and
264 Kansas) to delineate past, current and future potential distribution of the species. To do so, we
265 estimated $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$ conditional to all climate covariates for each pixel ($\sim 340 \text{ km}^2$) across the
266 species range.²⁹ Then we add the current occurrences record of the species (1990-2019) from
267 Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) to validate the accuracy of our prediction³⁰
268 Because of the amount of the computation involved in the Markov chain Monte Carlo iterations,
269 use only 100 posterior samples to estimate $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$ across the Texas, Oklahoma and Kansas.

²⁵I think you need greater clarification about what different information you get out of the two LTREs, and how they relate to the motivating biological questions. I understand this, of course, but I think readers will be confused.

²⁶I don't really understand how this LTRE works because your climate variables interact. So this should not decompose as cleanly as the equation implies.

²⁷As a general comment, I find it difficult to follow which analyses are explicitly spatial (i.e., mapping quantities as rasters) and which are not – I think the methods can be sharpened around this.

²⁸I suggest you bring this up much earlier, in the Intro probably. I think you under-sell the value of this approach, particularly related to accounting for uncertainty. You also need to describe which types of uncertainty are accounted for here, i.e., process error and estimation error.

²⁹I think you did this separately for past, present, and future, and for multiple futures? Needs to be explained.

³⁰If you actually intend this as model validation then it needs to be presented more thoroughly and analyzed more rigorously.

270 All the analyses were performed in R 4.3.1 (R Core Team, 2023) However the estimation
271 of the impact of climate change on niche and range shifts were processed in parallel using
272 open-source software on the Rice Super computer (NOTS) and the German Centre for
273 Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) High-Performance Computing Cluster.³¹

³¹*I am not sure you need this – it was still done in R.*

274 **Results**

275 **Variation in sex-ratio along climate gradient**




Figure 2: Variation in Operational Sex-ratio accross climate gradient. (A, B) Proportion of panicules that were females across precipitation and temperature of the growing season; (C, D) Proportion of of panicules that were females across precipitation and temperature of the dormant season. Statistical results are shown in Fig. S-6.

276 **Sex specific demographic response to climate change**

277 Most vital rates were strongly climate dependent, but the magnitude of their response were sim-
278 ilar between sexes suggesting no sex-specific demographic response to climate³². Survival and

³²A few comments here: 1-This undermines the entire premise of the paper! If that's the result, it is what it is, but it suggests that the current Introduction does not serve the Results very well. 2-Your figure masks a lot of variation and

279 flowering were strongly more dependent on climate than growth (number of tillers) and panicle
280 production (Fig.S-5; Fig. S-8).³³ In addition, we found opposite patterns in the direction of the
281 effect on seasonal climate on the probability of survival and flowering. Growing season precip-
282 itation has a negative effect on the probability of survival, number of tillers, and the probability
283 of flowering, whereas dormant season precipitation has a positive effect on these vital rates.³⁴
284 Unlike precipitation, temperature of the growing season has a positive effect of the probability
285 of survival, a negative effect of the probability of flowering, and the number of tillers, but no
286 significant effect on the number of panicles. Further, there was a female survival and flowering
287 advantage across both climatic seasons³⁵ (Figures. 3A-3D, 3I-3L). On the contrary, there was a
288 male panicle advantage across all climatic variables (Figure3M-3P).³⁶ Counter-intuitively, there
289 was no significant sex growth advantage in all season climatic variables (Figures. 3E-3H).^{37 38}

interactions, and I think these are worth looking into more deeply. 3-This result is inconsistent with what we found in the Am Nat paper, and that concerns me, and will concern reviewers. 4-The niche plot indicates differences between two-sex and female dominant, which could only happen if there were sex-specific responses in the vital rates.

³³*I am not sure this is true. The scales are very different.*

³⁴*I think these trends are conditional on temperature - see other comments.*

³⁵*I am not sure what you mean by "climatic seasons". More precise language will help.*

³⁶*The points and lines look very similar*

³⁷*I cannot follow what this sentence is saying or why it is counter-intuitive.*

³⁸*I found this paragraph difficult to read, and obviously there are a lot of results to explain. I suggest you put some thought into how to organize these results in a way that communicates what you think are the most important points and makes it easier to digest. I think you also need to be careful about providing statistical support for your assertions.*




Figure 3: Sex specific demographic response to climate across species range. (A, B) Probability of survival during the growing season; (C, D) Probability of survival during the dormant season; (E, F) Change in number of tillers during the growing season; (F, G) Change in number of tillers during the dormant season; (I, J), Probability of flowering during the growing season; (K, L) Probability of flowering during the dormant season; (M, N), Change in number of panicles produced given flowering during the growing season; (O, P) Change in number of panicles produced given flowering during the dormant season. Points show means by site for females (orange) and males (green). Points sizes are proportional to the sample sizes of the mean and are jittered. Lines show fitted statistical models for females (orange) and males (green) based on posterior mean parameter values. Lower panels below each data panel show the posterior distribution of the difference between females and males as a function of climate (positive and negative values indicate female and male advantage, respectively); dashed horizontal line shows zero difference. Statistical results are shown in Fig. S-8.

290 **Climate change alters population viability**

291 We estimated population growth rate response to seasonal climate gradients using two
292 models: a female dominant model and a two-sex model³⁹. Consistent with the effect of
293 climate on the individual vital rate, we found a strong effect of seasonal climate on population
294 fitness (Fig.4).⁴⁰ For both models, population growth rate decreased toward high precipitation
295 of growing season (Fig.4 A, C). In contrast population growth rate increased with an increase
296 in precipitation of the dormant season. Furthermore, population growth rate was maximized
297 between 14 and 17 °C and decreased below zero beyond 18 °C during the growing season
298 (Fig.4 B). Similarly population fitness was maximized between 27 and 31 °C and decreasesd
299 bellow zero just beyond 20 °C during the dormant season (Fig.4 D).⁴¹

300 We have also detected a strong effect of the past and future climate on population growth
301 rate. However, the magnitude of the effect of future climate on population growth rate was
302 different between emissions scenarios. Under past climate conditions, population growth
303 rate decreased below one for temperature of the growing season. A moderate emission gas
304 scenario (RCP4.5) has a no effect on the population growth rate while a high emission scenario
305 (RCP8.5) has a strong negative effect on population growth rate (Fig.4 B, D).^{42 43}

³⁹You do not provide any methods for this contrast.

⁴⁰Here and in the preceding figure, I think we need to be more transparent about at what climate values we are purely extrapolating. If I recall correctly, the "present" ranges shown in the lambda figure are not the actual range you fit the models over.

⁴¹I would like to discuss possibly not using this figure. I actually think the 2-D niche plots are the better representation of these results, because there are temp*precip interactions that you cannot see here but you can see in the 2-D niche plot. For example, the result that lambda increases with lower temperature is kind of weird, but you can see in the 2-D plot that this is only true at low temperature, and it reverses at high temperature. There are probably important interactions that we should try to visualize in the vital rates.

⁴²I understand what you are describing here, but I would not say that this shows "effects of climate change on population growth". Rather it shows what we predict lambda would be in different ranges of climate. That is a subtle distinction but I think it is important because "effects of climate change" depend on where in the range you are. All this might be moot if we don't use figure, although I love the way you show changes in climate from past to future, so we should find a way to keep that.

⁴³I cannot write comments in the figure captions, so this comment applies to "Lower panels below each data panel".THis is not an adequate explanation of what is shown here. These are the ranges (min-max) of monthly climate values for the entire set of experimental sites over specific years, which need to be identified here.




Figure 4: Population growth rate (λ) as a function of seasonal climate. (A) Precipitation of the growing season, (B) Temperature of the growing season, (C) Precipitation of the dormant season, (D) Temperature of the dormant season. The grey curve shows prediction by the two-sex matrix projection model that incorporates sex-specific demographic responses to climate with sex ratio dependent seed fertilization. The orange curve represents the prediction by the female dominant matrix projection model. The dashed horizontal line indicates the limit of population viability ($\lambda = 1$). Lower panels below each data panel show climate values at different time periods (past climate, present and future climates). For future climate, we show a Representative Concentration Pathways (RCP) 4.5 and 8.5. Values of (λ) are derived from the mean climate variables across 4 GCMs (MIROC5, ACCESS1-3, CESM1-BGC, CMCC-CM).

306 Temperature as a driver of population growth rate decline

307 Population growth rate was most sensitive to change in temperature of the growing season
 308 and temperature of the dormant season (Supporting Information S-9). LTRE decomposition
 309 revealed that, for each sex, the reduction of λ for high value of temperature of the growing
 310 season was driven by a reduction of survival rate, growth rate, and a reduction in number
 311 of panicles (Fig.?? A, B). **However, the reduction of population growth rate for higher value**
 312 **of temperature of the dormant season was driven by only female individuals(Fig.?? C, D).**

³¹³ ⁴⁴ The increase of the probability of flowering was sufficient to prevent population growth
³¹⁴ rate from declining for high tmeprature of the dormant season (Fig.?? C). ⁴⁵

³¹⁵ Climatic change induce niche and range shifts

³¹⁶ ⁴⁶ Our results suggested niche sifts for both models (female dominant and two-sex) during the
³¹⁷ dormant and growing season (Fig. 5). ⁴⁷ However, the female dominant model overestimated
³¹⁸ the magnitude of niche shifts (Fig. 5 D). ⁴⁸ Further, our demographically based range
³¹⁹ predictions broadly captured the known distribution of the species. More specifically, the
³²⁰ predicted probabilities of self- sustaining ($\lambda > 1$) matches the presence and absence of the
³²¹ species (Fig. 6 B, Fig. 6 F). ⁴⁹ Furthermore, viable populations of *P. arichnifera* were only
³²² predicted at the center of the range for current climatic conditions (Fig. 6 B). Although *P.*
³²³ *arichnifera* was predicted to have suitable habitats in the center of the range under current
³²⁴ climate, global warming (regardless of the future scenario of carbon emission used) is
³²⁵ predicted to reduce much of these suitable habitats (Fig. 6 C, D). Most of the current suitable
³²⁶ habitats will move toward the Northern range edge.

⁴⁴*This is not how I interpret the figure.*

⁴⁵*I don't think readers will understand how to process these results, or what they mean with respect to the motivating questions. I think this can be presented in a more reader-friendly way that connects more clearly to the conceptual aims of the study.*

⁴⁶*General comment on this section: these are the most important results of the paper but they are described only briefly and without much statistical support. That is true for much of the Results section. I think this could be strengthened. I also think for both the niche and the map figures we need a more visually intuitive way to contrast the two-sex and female-dominant models.*

⁴⁷*I do not understand this statement.*

⁴⁸*This needs to be quantified more rigorously and statistically better supported. This also is inconsistent with the result that there were no sex-specific climate reponses, because that is the only way the predictions could differ.*

⁴⁹*Again, these results need to be reported in a more quantitatively rigorous way. I also do not agree that the model captures the known distribution. I think it drastically over-predicts known occurrence, and that warrants some attention.*




Figure 5: A two-dimensional representation of the predicted niche shift over time (past, present and future climate conditions). Contours show predicted probabilities of self-sustaining populations, $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$ conditional on precipitation and temperature of the dormant and growing season. (A) Niche of dormant season for the two sex model, (B) Niche of growing season for the two sex model, (C) Niche of dormant season for female dominant model, (D) Niche of growing season for female dominant model. "o": Past, "+": Current, "*": RCP 4.5, "■": RCP 8.5.




Figure 6: Climate change favors range shift toward the North edge of the current range. (A) Past, (B) Current, (C and D) Future predicted range shift based on the predicted probabilities of self- sustaining populations, $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$, using the two-sex model that incorporates sex- specific demographic responses to climate with sex ratio dependent seed fertilization. (E) Past, (F) Current, (G and H) Future predicted range shift based on the predicted probabilities of self- sustaining populations, $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$, using the female dominant model. Future projections were based on the CMCC-CM model. The black dots on panel B and F indicate all known presence points collected from GBIF from 1990 to 2019, which corresponds to the current condition in our prediction. The occurrences of GBIFs are distributed in with higher population fitness habitat $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$, confirming that our study approach can reasonably predict range shifts.

327 **Discussion**

328 Dioecious species make up a large fraction of Earth's biodiversity – most animals and
329 many plants – yet we have little knowledge about how **skewness in sex ratio**⁵⁰ will affect
330 population viability and range shifts of dioecious species under climate change. Three
331 general patterns emerged from our analysis of range-wide common garden experiments
332 and sex-structured, climate-explicit demographic models. First, our Bayesian mixed effect
333 model predicts that seasonal climate (temperature and precipitation) affects sex-demographic
334 processes in **distinctive and contrasting ways**⁵¹. While climate has a significant effect on
335 the probability of survival and growth, it has no effect on the number of panicles. Second,
336 future climate, by increasing **seasonal temperature**⁵², **will reduce survival rate, growth rate**
337 **and reproduction and thereby alter population viability.**⁵³ In addition, climate change favors
338 range shifts. Third, **using only one sex to forecast range shifts of dioecious under climate**
339 **change could lead to an overestimation of the impact of climate change on species.**⁵⁴

340 Our results indicate no sex-specific demographic response to climate change.⁵⁵ However,
341 females have higher survival rate and fertility rate than males. **This result**⁵⁶ is not unique to
342 our study system and has been observed in **a range of pollen dispersal species across climatic**
343 **gradients**⁵⁷ (Sasaki et al., 2019; Welbergen et al., 2008; Zhao et al., 2012). Several hypotheses
344 could explain the observed demographic advantage of females over males for survival and
345 flowering and the opposite for growth and number of panicles. The trade-off between fitness
346 traits (survival, growth, fertility) due to resource limitation and the pollination mode of our
347 study species (wind pollinated) could explain such a result (Cipollini and Whigham, 1994;
348 Freeman et al., 1976). For most species, the cost of reproduction is often higher for females
349 than males due to the requirement to develop seeds and fruits (Hultine et al., 2016). However,
350 several studies reported a higher cost of reproduction for males in wind pollinated species
351 due to the larger amounts of pollen they produce (Bruijning et al., 2017; Bürli et al., 2022;
352 Cipollini and Whigham, 1994; Field et al., 2013). **In addition to life history trade-off, difference**

⁵⁰ You have not described anything about skewness in sex ratio, either from the model or in the data, and this is a glaring omission because as you correctly observe here, it is the way that sex structure matters for population viability

⁵¹ I am not sure whether this is referring to distinct and contrasting climate variables or sex differences.

⁵² I don't know what you mean by "seasonal temperature" – be more specific

⁵³ It will not do so everywhere – in some places these metrics will increase in others they will decrease, hence the range shifts.

⁵⁴ This result needs a clearer biological mechanism.

⁵⁵ Again, if this is true then there should be no difference between the female-dominant and two-sex models.

⁵⁶ Which result are you referring to?

⁵⁷ Not sure what this means.

353 in non-climatic factors such as soil, or biotic interactions could explain decline in vital rate as
354 an indirect effects of increase in temperature (Alexander et al., 2015; Schultz et al., 2022).⁵⁸

355 Under current conditions, most populations across the range are viable.⁵⁹ This result could
356 be explained by two hypotheses. First, demographic compensation whereby an increase of
357 one vital rate is coupled with a decrease of another vital rate could explain viable populations
358 in harsh conditions at the range edge (Doak and Morris, 2010; Nomoto and Alexander, 2021;
359 Villegas et al., 2015). In our system, a decrease in fertility and survival rate was counterbalanced
360 by an increase in flowering rate, preventing the population growth rate from declining even
361 at range edge⁶⁰ during the dormant season⁶¹. Second, local adaptation at the edge of the
362 range could explain the viable populations throughout the range (Miller and Compagnoni,
363 2022b). Our study was based on a common garden experiment; therefore, individuals planted
364 in climatic conditions that are similar to their source populations climatic conditions were less
365 impacted by stressful environmental conditions.⁶² An important question to ask is: what is the
366 role of local adaptation in buffering species response against climate change. Unfortunately,
367 our model does not shed light on that question. Adding another predictor to our complex
368 model would have lead to overfitting. Therefore, the role of local adaptation in mitigating
369 population response to climate should be the next step in forecasting species response to
370 climate.⁶³

371 Our LTRE analysis reveals that a small change in temperature of the growing and dor-
372 mant season could have a larger impact on population viability. Temperature can impact plant
373 populations through different mechanisms. Increasing temperature could increase evaporative
374 demand, affect plant phenology (Iler et al., 2019; McLean et al., 2016; Sherry et al., 2007), and
375 germination rate (Reed et al., 2021). The potential for temperature to influence these different
376 processes changes seasonally (Konapala et al., 2020). For example, studies suggested that
377 species that are active during the growing season such as cool grass species can have delayed
378 phenology in response to global warming, particularly if temperatures rise above their physio-
379 logical tolerances (Cleland et al., 2007; Williams et al., 2015). In addition, high temperature dur-
380 ing the growing season by affecting pollen viability, fertilization could affect seed formation and
381 germination (Hatfield and Prueger, 2015; Sletvold and Ågren, 2015). Temperature also affected

⁵⁸This seems like a general comment about climate effects whereas I thought the paragraph was focused on sex differences.

⁵⁹I don't think this statement is well-supported. We don't have any data from natural populations.

⁶⁰Not sure I follow this - if lambda was not declining it would not be a range edge

⁶¹Population growth rate is an annual measure, it does not refer to any season. I think what you mean here is that dormant season weather can affect population growth rate.

⁶²This statement lacks evidence.

⁶³I don't think this is a very effective use of the Discussion. If you want to address local adaptation maybe that can go in an appendix. I don't actually understand the point of this paragraph but maybe I am not understanding something.

382 operational sex ratio (OSR) (Fig.S-15). That variation in OSR could affect population growth
383 rate by altering females' fitness (Haridas et al., 2014; Knight et al., 2005; Petry et al., 2016).⁶⁴

384 We found evidence of climatic niche shifts for the female dominant model and the
385 two-sex model. However the female dominant model overestimated species niche, suggesting
386 that using one sex to predict niche shifts could be misleading.⁶⁵ Despite that overestimation for
387 the female dominant model, both models agree on the fact that climatic conditions that are not
388 optimal under current conditions will be optimal for the species over the next years particularly
389 at the edge of species⁶⁶. Further, pollen dispersal may allow plants to resist climate change be-
390 cause pollen dispersal may provide the local genetic diversity necessary to adapt at the leading
391 edge of the population (Corlett and Westcott, 2013; Duputié et al., 2012; Kremer et al., 2012).
392 Since wind pollination is most effective at short distances, it is most often found in plant species
393 growing at high density such as our study species, it is less likely that dispersal limitation affect
394 niche shift in our study system.⁶⁷ However, others biotic factors such as species competition
395 might constrain the species to a narrower realized niche (Aguilée et al., 2016; Pulliam, 2000).

396 Our results suggest that climate change will drive range shifts and the magnitude and
397 rate of that range shift could be overestimated when tracking only one sex (Fig. S-12, Fig.
398 S-13, Fig. S-14). This overestimation of the impact of climate change using a female dominant
399 model could be due to several factors.⁶⁸ First, small change in seasonal temperature affects
400 population viability for both sexes⁶⁹. Second, operational sex ratio in *Poa arachnifera* become
401 female biased in areas with lower temperature of growing season such as Northern range edge
402 (Fig.S-15 B). Our results converge with previous studies that have found the same pattern⁷⁰ for
403 other dioecious species (Varga and Soulsbury, 2020; Woldemelak et al., 2021). Our finding also
404 contrast with a previous study suggesting that an increase in male frequency induce range
405 shifts by reducing pollen limitation in conditions that were not suitable (Petry et al., 2016).

406 Three years represent a relatively decent time for demographic study for common garden
407 experiments across climatic gradient.⁷¹ Thus our models can only capture a certain range
408 of demographic and environmental variability (Fig. S-11). Moreover, our future projections
409 require extrapolation to warmer or colder conditions than observed in our experiment

⁶⁴These results need to be better developed because they underlie all the other results. And again, the only way you can get an effect on temperature on OSR is if there were sex-specific responses to climate, but you say there were none.

⁶⁵Again – what is the biological explanation for this result?

⁶⁶Which edge? I am not sure which specific results you are referring to here.

⁶⁷I do not find this particularly relevant for interpreting the result that opens this paragraph.

⁶⁸OK I was expecting this earlier.

⁶⁹Population viability is a property of the entire population, so females and males cannot have their own population viability.

⁷⁰Unclear what pattern you are referring to

⁷¹I am not sure whether this is intended to mean that three years is short or long – can you sharpen this?

410 and subsequently should be interpreted with caution (Chen et al., 2024). ⁷² Despite all
411 these limitations, the qualitative implications of a negative response of species to increase
412 temperature (dormant and growing season)⁷³ seems consistent across all GCMs. Most of the
413 suitable areas move toward the North of the current range in response to climate change.
414 Climate change will affect population growth rate primarily through the response of female
415 which is more sensitive to climate change (Miller and Compagnoni, 2022b).⁷⁴ Males also have
416 a significant contribution to population growth rate particularly for temperature.⁷⁵ Our work
417 suggest that current climate may not affect population viability⁷⁶, but populations may be
418 impacted negatively over the next decades in response to a climate change. This is key because
419 most conservation actions are design from data on current responses to climate, rather than
420 future response to climate (Sletvold et al., 2013). Moreover, management strategies that focus
421 on both sexes would be effective and will enhance population growth rate in response to
422 global warming.

423 Conclusion

424 We have investigated the potential consequence of skewness in sex ratio on population
425 dynamics and range shift in the context of climate change. We found that future climate will
426 affect population growth rate at the center of species range.⁷⁷ This reduction in population
427 growth rate will induce a range shift to the northern edge of the species current range. Our
428 results also suggest that tracking only one sex could lead to an overestimation of the effect
429 of climate change on population dynamics. Our work provides a framework for predicting
430 the impact of global warming on species using population demography.

431 Acknowledgements

432 ⁷⁸ We are thankful to Dariusz Malinowski, Jason Goldman, Tom Arsuffi, Alan Byboth, John
433 Walker, Kenneth Steigman, Steven Gibson, Wesley Newman, Kerry Griffis, Liz Martin, Melanie
434 Hartman, Brian Northup, Le-land Russell, Dexter R. Mardis, and Dixie Smith for facilitating

⁷²*This is a good point, and it needs to be shown more clearly in methods and results.*

⁷³*Again, it is not negative everywhere. Northern populations with benefit from warming, so these results need to be described with greater nuance.*

⁷⁴*This paper says the opposite.*

⁷⁵*I do not know what this is saying.*

⁷⁶*This statement does not make sense to me. Our data show that population viability is sensitive to climate under current (observed) conditions.*

⁷⁷*I do not follow what this is referring to.*

⁷⁸*Much of this looks like it is copied from the Am Nat paper.*

435 our fieldwork. We acknowledge Marion Donald, Kory Kolis, Nakian Kim, and Alex Espana for
436 valuable assistance in the field, laboratory, and greenhouse. We want also to acknowledge the
437 network of biological field stations that hosted our geographically distributed experiment. We
438 are also grateful to Sam Houston State University, Texas A& M University, University of Texas,
439 Texas Tech University, Pittsburgh State University, and Wichita State University for investing
440 in field stations and making these facilities available to us. This research was supported by
441 National Science Foundation Division of Environmental Biology awards 1543651 and 1754468
442 and by the Rice University Faculty Initiatives Fund. This work was supported partially by
443 the Big-Data Private-Cloud Research Cyberinfrastructure MRI-award funded by NSF under
444 grant CNS-1338099 and by Rice University's Center for Research Computing (CRC).

445 **References**

- 446 Aguilée, R., Raoul, G., Rousset, F., and Ronce, O. (2016). Pollen dispersal slows geographical
447 range shift and accelerates ecological niche shift under climate change. *Proceedings of the
448 National Academy of Sciences*, 113(39):E5741–E5748.
- 449 Alexander, J. M., Diez, J. M., and Levine, J. M. (2015). Novel competitors shape species'
450 responses to climate change. *Nature*, 525(7570):515–518.
- 451 Bertrand, R., Lenoir, J., Piedallu, C., Riofrío-Dillon, G., De Ruffray, P., Vidal, C., Pierrat, J.-C.,
452 and Gégout, J.-C. (2011). Changes in plant community composition lag behind climate
453 warming in lowland forests. *Nature*, 479(7374):517–520.
- 454 Bruijning, M., Visser, M. D., Muller-Landau, H. C., Wright, S. J., Comita, L. S., Hubbell, S. P.,
455 de Kroon, H., and Jongejans, E. (2017). Surviving in a cosexual world: A cost-benefit
456 analysis of dioecy in tropical trees. *The American Naturalist*, 189(3):297–314.
- 457 Bürli, S., Pannell, J. R., and Tonnabel, J. (2022). Environmental variation in sex ratios and
458 sexual dimorphism in three wind-pollinated dioecious plant species. *Oikos*, 2022(6):e08651.
- 459 Caswell, H. (1989). Analysis of life table response experiments i. decomposition of effects
460 on population growth rate. *Ecological Modelling*, 46(3-4):221–237.
- 461 Caswell, H. (2000). *Matrix population models*, volume 1. Sinauer Sunderland, MA.
- 462 Chen, X., Liang, Y., and Feng, X. (2024). Influence of model complexity, training collinearity,
463 collinearity shift, predictor novelty and their interactions on ecological forecasting. *Global
464 Ecology and Biogeography*, 33(3):371–384.
- 465 Cipollini, M. L. and Whigham, D. F. (1994). Sexual dimorphism and cost of reproduction
466 in the dioecious shrub *lindera benzoin* (lauraceae). *American Journal of Botany*, 81(1):65–75.
- 467 Cleland, E. E., Chuine, I., Menzel, A., Mooney, H. A., and Schwartz, M. D. (2007). Shifting
468 plant phenology in response to global change. *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 22(7):357–365.
- 469 Compagnoni, A., Steigman, K., and Miller, T. E. (2017). Can't live with them, can't live
470 without them? balancing mating and competition in two-sex populations. *Proceedings of
471 the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284(1865):20171999.
- 472 Corlett, R. T. and Westcott, D. A. (2013). Will plant movements keep up with climate change?
473 *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 28(8):482–488.

- 474 Czachura, K. and Miller, T. E. (2020). Demographic back-casting reveals that subtle
475 dimensions of climate change have strong effects on population viability. *Journal of Ecology*,
476 108(6):2557–2570.
- 477 Dahlgren, J. P., Bengtsson, K., and Ehrlén, J. (2016). The demography of climate-driven and
478 density-regulated population dynamics in a perennial plant. *Ecology*, 97(4):899–907.
- 479 Davis, M. B. and Shaw, R. G. (2001). Range shifts and adaptive responses to quaternary
480 climate change. *Science*, 292(5517):673–679.
- 481 Diez, J. M., Giladi, I., Warren, R., and Pulliam, H. R. (2014). Probabilistic and spatially variable
482 niches inferred from demography. *Journal of ecology*, 102(2):544–554.
- 483 Doak, D. F. and Morris, W. F. (2010). Demographic compensation and tipping points in
484 climate-induced range shifts. *Nature*, 467(7318):959–962.
- 485 Duputié, A., Massol, F., Chuine, I., Kirkpatrick, M., and Ronce, O. (2012). How do genetic cor-
486 relations affect species range shifts in a changing environment? *Ecology letters*, 15(3):251–259.
- 487 Eberhart-Phillips, L. J., Küpper, C., Miller, T. E., Cruz-López, M., Maher, K. H., Dos Remedios,
488 N., Stoffel, M. A., Hoffman, J. I., Krüger, O., and Székely, T. (2017). Sex-specific early
489 survival drives adult sex ratio bias in snowy plovers and impacts mating system and
490 population growth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(27):E5474–E5481.
- 491 Ehrlén, J. and Morris, W. F. (2015). Predicting changes in the distribution and abundance
492 of species under environmental change. *Ecology letters*, 18(3):303–314.
- 493 Ellis, R. P., Davison, W., Queirós, A. M., Kroeker, K. J., Calosi, P., Dupont, S., Spicer, J. I.,
494 Wilson, R. W., Widdicombe, S., and Urbina, M. A. (2017). Does sex really matter? explaining
495 intraspecies variation in ocean acidification responses. *Biology letters*, 13(2):20160761.
- 496 Ellner, S. P., Childs, D. Z., Rees, M., et al. (2016). Data-driven modelling of structured
497 populations. *A practical guide to the Integral Projection Model*. Cham: Springer.
- 498 Evans, M. E., Merow, C., Record, S., McMahon, S. M., and Enquist, B. J. (2016). Towards
499 process-based range modeling of many species. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 31(11):860–871.
- 500 Field, D. L., Pickup, M., and Barrett, S. C. (2013). Comparative analyses of sex-ratio variation
501 in dioecious flowering plants. *Evolution*, 67(3):661–672.
- 502 Freeman, D. C., Klikoff, L. G., and Harper, K. T. (1976). Differential resource utilization by
503 the sexes of dioecious plants. *Science*, 193(4253):597–599.

- 504 Gamelon, M., Grøtan, V., Nilsson, A. L., Engen, S., Hurrell, J. W., Jerstad, K., Phillips, A. S.,
505 Røstad, O. W., Slagsvold, T., Walseng, B., et al. (2017). Interactions between demography
506 and environmental effects are important determinants of population dynamics. *Science*
507 *Advances*, 3(2):e1602298.
- 508 Gissi, E., Bowyer, R. T., and Bleich, V. C. (2024). Sex-based differences affect conservation.
509 *Science*, 384(6702):1309–1310.
- 510 Gissi, E., Schiebinger, L., Hadly, E. A., Crowder, L. B., Santoleri, R., and Micheli, F. (2023).
511 Exploring climate-induced sex-based differences in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems to
512 mitigate biodiversity loss. *nature communications*, 14(1):4787.
- 513 Haridas, C., Eager, E. A., Rebarber, R., and Tenhumberg, B. (2014). Frequency-dependent
514 population dynamics: Effect of sex ratio and mating system on the elasticity of population
515 growth rate. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 97:49–56.
- 516 Hatfield, J. and Prueger, J. (2015). Temperature extremes: effect on plant growth and
517 development. *weather clim extrem* 10: 4–10.
- 518 Hernández, C. M., Ellner, S. P., Adler, P. B., Hooker, G., and Snyder, R. E. (2023). An exact
519 version of life table response experiment analysis, and the r package exactltre. *Methods*
520 *in Ecology and Evolution*, 14(3):939–951.
- 521 Hitchcock, A. S. (1971). *Manual of the grasses of the United States*, volume 2. Courier Corporation.
- 522 Hultine, K. R., Grady, K. C., Wood, T. E., Shuster, S. M., Stella, J. C., and Whitham, T. G. (2016).
523 Climate change perils for dioecious plant species. *Nature Plants*, 2(8):1–8.
- 524 Hutchinson, G. E. et al. (1978). *Introduction to population ecology*.
- 525 Iler, A. M., Compagnoni, A., Inouye, D. W., Williams, J. L., CaraDonna, P. J., Anderson, A., and
526 Miller, T. E. (2019). Reproductive losses due to climate change-induced earlier flowering are
527 not the primary threat to plant population viability in a perennial herb. *Journal of Ecology*,
528 107(4):1931–1943.
- 529 Jones, M. H., Macdonald, S. E., and Henry, G. H. (1999). Sex-and habitat-specific responses
530 of a high arctic willow, *salix arctica*, to experimental climate change. *Oikos*, pages 129–138.
- 531 Karger, D. N., Conrad, O., Böhner, J., Kawohl, T., Kreft, H., Soria-Auza, R. W., Zimmermann,
532 N. E., Linder, H. P., and Kessler, M. (2017). Climatologies at high resolution for the earth’s
533 land surface areas. *Scientific data*, 4(1):1–20.

- 534 Kindiger, B. (2004). Interspecific hybrids of *poa arachnifera* × *poa secunda*. *Journal of New
535 Seeds*, 6(1):1–26.
- 536 Knight, T. M., Steets, J. A., Vamosi, J. C., Mazer, S. J., Burd, M., Campbell, D. R., Dudash,
537 M. R., Johnston, M. O., Mitchell, R. J., and Ashman, T.-L. (2005). Pollen limitation of plant
538 reproduction: pattern and process. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.*, 36:467–497.
- 539 Konapala, G., Mishra, A. K., Wada, Y., and Mann, M. E. (2020). Climate change will affect
540 global water availability through compounding changes in seasonal precipitation and
541 evaporation. *Nature communications*, 11(1):3044.
- 542 Kremer, A., Ronce, O., Robledo-Arnuncio, J. J., Guillaume, F., Bohrer, G., Nathan, R., Bridle,
543 J. R., Gomulkiewicz, R., Klein, E. K., Ritland, K., et al. (2012). Long-distance gene flow and
544 adaptation of forest trees to rapid climate change. *Ecology letters*, 15(4):378–392.
- 545 Lee-Yaw, J. A., Kharouba, H. M., Bontrager, M., Mahony, C., Csergő, A. M., Noreen, A. M.,
546 Li, Q., Schuster, R., and Angert, A. L. (2016). A synthesis of transplant experiments and
547 ecological niche models suggests that range limits are often niche limits. *Ecology letters*,
548 19(6):710–722.
- 549 Leicht-Young, S. A., Silander, J. A., and Latimer, A. M. (2007). Comparative performance of
550 invasive and native *celastrus* species across environmental gradients. *Oecologia*, 154:273–282.
- 551 Liaw, A., Wiener, M., et al. (2002). Classification and regression by randomforest. *R news*,
552 2(3):18–22.
- 553 Louthan, A. M., Keighron, M., Kiekebusch, E., Cayton, H., Terando, A., and Morris, W. F.
554 (2022). Climate change weakens the impact of disturbance interval on the growth rate of
555 natural populations of venus flytrap. *Ecological Monographs*, 92(4):e1528.
- 556 Maguire Jr, B. (1973). Niche response structure and the analytical potentials of its relationship
557 to the habitat. *The American Naturalist*, 107(954):213–246.
- 558 McLean, N., Lawson, C. R., Leech, D. I., and van de Pol, M. (2016). Predicting when climate-
559 driven phenotypic change affects population dynamics. *Ecology Letters*, 19(6):595–608.
- 560 Merow, C., Bois, S. T., Allen, J. M., Xie, Y., and Silander Jr, J. A. (2017). Climate change both
561 facilitates and inhibits invasive plant ranges in new england. *Proceedings of the National
562 Academy of Sciences*, 114(16):E3276–E3284.

- 563 Miller, T. and Compagnoni, A. (2022a). Data from: Two-sex demography, sexual niche
564 differentiation, and the geographic range limits of texas bluegrass (*Poa arachnifera*). *American*
565 *Naturalist*, Dryad Digital Repository,. <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.kkwh70s5x>.
- 566 Miller, T. E. and Compagnoni, A. (2022b). Two-sex demography, sexual niche differentiation,
567 and the geographic range limits of texas bluegrass (*poa arachnifera*). *The American*
568 *Naturalist*, 200(1):17–31.
- 569 Miller, T. E. and Inouye, B. D. (2011). Confronting two-sex demographic models with data.
570 *Ecology*, 92(11):2141–2151.
- 571 Morrison, C. A., Robinson, R. A., Clark, J. A., and Gill, J. A. (2016). Causes and consequences
572 of spatial variation in sex ratios in a declining bird species. *Journal of Animal Ecology*,
573 85(5):1298–1306.
- 574 Morrison, S. F. and Hik, D. S. (2007). Demographic analysis of a declining pika *ochotona*
575 *collaris* population: linking survival to broad-scale climate patterns via spring snowmelt
576 patterns. *Journal of Animal ecology*, pages 899–907.
- 577 Nomoto, H. A. and Alexander, J. M. (2021). Drivers of local extinction risk in alpine plants
578 under warming climate. *Ecology Letters*, 24(6):1157–1166.
- 579 O'Connell, R. D., Doak, D. F., Horvitz, C. C., Pascarella, J. B., and Morris, W. F. (2024). Nonlinear
580 life table response experiment analysis: Decomposing nonlinear and nonadditive population
581 growth responses to changes in environmental drivers. *Ecology Letters*, 27(3):e14417.
- 582 Pease, C. M., Lande, R., and Bull, J. (1989). A model of population growth, dispersal and
583 evolution in a changing environment. *Ecology*, 70(6):1657–1664.
- 584 Petry, W. K., Soule, J. D., Iler, A. M., Chicas-Mosier, A., Inouye, D. W., Miller, T. E., and
585 Mooney, K. A. (2016). Sex-specific responses to climate change in plants alter population
586 sex ratio and performance. *Science*, 353(6294):69–71.
- 587 Piironen, J. and Vehtari, A. (2017). Comparison of bayesian predictive methods for model
588 selection. *Statistics and Computing*, 27:711–735.
- 589 Pottier, P., Burke, S., Drobniak, S. M., Lagisz, M., and Nakagawa, S. (2021). Sexual (in) equality?
590 a meta-analysis of sex differences in thermal acclimation capacity across ectotherms.
591 *Functional Ecology*, 35(12):2663–2678.

- 592 Pulliam, H. R. (2000). On the relationship between niche and distribution. *Ecology letters*,
593 3(4):349–361.
- 594 R Core Team (2023). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation
595 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 596 Reed, P. B., Peterson, M. L., Pfeifer-Meister, L. E., Morris, W. F., Doak, D. F., Roy, B. A., Johnson,
597 B. R., Bailes, G. T., Nelson, A. A., and Bridgman, S. D. (2021). Climate manipulations
598 differentially affect plant population dynamics within versus beyond northern range limits.
599 *Journal of Ecology*, 109(2):664–675.
- 600 Sanderson, B. M., Knutti, R., and Caldwell, P. (2015). A representative democracy to reduce
601 interdependency in a multimodel ensemble. *Journal of Climate*, 28(13):5171–5194.
- 602 Sasaki, M., Hedberg, S., Richardson, K., and Dam, H. G. (2019). Complex interactions
603 between local adaptation, phenotypic plasticity and sex affect vulnerability to warming
604 in a widespread marine copepod. *Royal Society open science*, 6(3):182115.
- 605 Schultz, E. L., Hülsmann, L., Pillet, M. D., Hartig, F., Breshears, D. D., Record, S., Shaw, J. D.,
606 DeRose, R. J., Zuidema, P. A., and Evans, M. E. (2022). Climate-driven, but dynamic and
607 complex? a reconciliation of competing hypotheses for species' distributions. *Ecology letters*,
608 25(1):38–51.
- 609 Schwalm, C. R., Glendon, S., and Duffy, P. B. (2020). Rcp8. 5 tracks cumulative co2 emissions.
610 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(33):19656–19657.
- 611 Schwinning, S., Lortie, C. J., Esque, T. C., and DeFalco, L. A. (2022). What common-garden
612 experiments tell us about climate responses in plants.
- 613 Sexton, J. P., McIntyre, P. J., Angert, A. L., and Rice, K. J. (2009). Evolution and ecology of
614 species range limits. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.*, 40:415–436.
- 615 Sherry, R. A., Zhou, X., Gu, S., Arnone III, J. A., Schimel, D. S., Verburg, P. S., Wallace,
616 L. L., and Luo, Y. (2007). Divergence of reproductive phenology under climate warming.
617 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(1):198–202.
- 618 Sletvold, N. and Ågren, J. (2015). Climate-dependent costs of reproduction: Survival and
619 fecundity costs decline with length of the growing season and summer temperature.
620 *Ecology Letters*, 18(4):357–364.

- 621 Sletvold, N., Dahlgren, J. P., Øien, D.-I., Moen, A., and Ehrlén, J. (2013). Climate warming
622 alters effects of management on population viability of threatened species: results from
623 a 30-year experimental study on a rare orchid. *Global Change Biology*, 19(9):2729–2738.
- 624 Smith, M. D., Wilkins, K. D., Holdrege, M. C., Wilfahrt, P., Collins, S. L., Knapp, A. K., Sala,
625 O. E., Dukes, J. S., Phillips, R. P., Yahdjian, L., et al. (2024). Extreme drought impacts have
626 been underestimated in grasslands and shrublands globally. *Proceedings of the National
627 Academy of Sciences*, 121(4):e2309881120.
- 628 Stan Development Team (2023). RStan: the R interface to Stan. R package version 2.21.8.
- 629 Thomson, A. M., Calvin, K. V., Smith, S. J., Kyle, G. P., Volke, A., Patel, P., Delgado-Arias,
630 S., Bond-Lamberty, B., Wise, M. A., Clarke, L. E., et al. (2011). Rcp4. 5: a pathway for
631 stabilization of radiative forcing by 2100. *Climatic change*, 109:77–94.
- 632 Tognetti, R. (2012). Adaptation to climate change of dioecious plants: does gender balance
633 matter? *Tree Physiology*, 32(11):1321–1324.
- 634 Varga, S. and Soulsbury, C. D. (2020). Environmental stressors affect sex ratios in sexually
635 dimorphic plant sexual systems. *Plant Biology*, 22(5):890–898.
- 636 Villegas, J., Doak, D. F., García, M. B., and Morris, W. F. (2015). Demographic compensation
637 among populations: what is it, how does it arise and what are its implications? *Ecology
638 letters*, 18(11):1139–1152.
- 639 Welbergen, J. A., Klose, S. M., Markus, N., and Eby, P. (2008). Climate change and the
640 effects of temperature extremes on australian flying-foxes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society
641 B: Biological Sciences*, 275(1633):419–425.
- 642 Williams, J. L., Jacquemyn, H., Ochocki, B. M., Brys, R., and Miller, T. E. (2015). Life
643 history evolution under climate change and its influence on the population dynamics of
644 a long-lived plant. *Journal of Ecology*, 103(4):798–808.
- 645 Woldemelak, W. A., Ladányi, M., and Fail, J. (2021). Effect of temperature on the sex ratio
646 and life table parameters of the leek-(l1) and tobacco-associated (t) thrips tabaci lineages
647 (thysanoptera: Thripidae). *Population ecology*, 63(3):230–237.
- 648 Zhao, H., Li, Y., Zhang, X., Korpelainen, H., and Li, C. (2012). Sex-related and stage-dependent
649 source-to-sink transition in populus cathayana grown at elevated co 2 and elevated
650 temperature. *Tree Physiology*, 32(11):1325–1338.

Supporting Information




Figure S-1: Precipitation variation accross the study sites from 1990 to 2100. ds:Dormant season, dg:Growing season.




Figure S-2: Temperature variation accross the study sites from 1990 to 2100, ds: Dormant season, dg: Growing season.




Figure S-3: Relation between precipitation and temperature for each season (growing and dormant). R^2 indicates the value of proportion of explained variance between the temperature and precipitation




Figure S-4: Posterior predictive checks. Consistency between real data and simulated values suggests that the fitted model accurately describes the data. Graph shows density curves for the observed data (light blue) along with the simulated values (dark blue). The first column shows the linear models and the second column shows the 2 degree polynomial models.




Figure S-5: Variation in sex-ratio across climate gradient. (A, B) Proportion of plants that were females across precipitation and temperature of the growing season; (C, D) Proportion of plants that were females across precipitation and temperature of the dormant season. Statistical results are shown in Fig. S-7.




Figure S-6: Mean parameter values and 95% credible intervals of the posterior probability distributions. pptgrow is the precipitation of growing season, Tempgrow is the temperature of growing season, pptdorm is the temperature of dormant season, Tempdorm is the temperature of dormant season.




Figure S-7: Mean parameter values and 95% credible intervals of the posterior probability distributions. pptgrow is the precipitation of growing season, Tempgrow is the temperature of growing season, pptdorm is the temperature of dormant season, Tempdorm is the temperature of dormant season.




Figure S-8: Mean parameter values and 95% credible intervals of the posterior probability distributions. pptgrow is the precipitation of growing season, Tempgrow is the temperature of growing season, pptdorm is the temperature of dormant season, Tempdorm is the temperature of dormant season.




Figure S-9: Life Table Response Experiment: The bar represent the relative importance of each predictors




Figure S-10: Life table response experiment decomposition of the sensitivity of λ to seasonal climate into additive vital rate contributions of males and females based on posterior mean parameter estimates. (A) Precipitation of growing season (contribution of female), (B) Precipitation of growing season (contribution of male), (C) Precipitation of dormant season (contribution of female) and (D) Precipitation of dormant season (contribution of male).




Figure S-11: Population growth rate (λ) as a function of seasonal climate (2015-2017), predicted by the two-sex matrix projection model that incorporates sex-specific demographic responses to climate with sex ratio-dependent seed fertilization. We show the mean posterior distribution of λ in solid lines, and the 5, 25, 50, 75, and 95% percentiles of parameter uncertainty in shaded gold color. The dashed horizontal line indicates the limit of population viability ($\lambda = 1$)




Figure S-12: Climate change favors range shift toward the North edge of the current range. (A) Past, (B) Current, (C and D) Future predicted range shift based on the predicted probabilities of self- sustaining populations, $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$, using the two-sex model that incorporates sex- specific demographic responses to climate with sex ratio dependent seed fertilization. (E) Past, (F) Current, (G and H) Future predicted range shift based on the predicted probabilities of self- sustaining populations, $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$, using the female dominant model. Future projections were based on the CESM1-BGC model. The black dots on panel B and F indicate all known presence points collected from GBIF from 1990 to 2019, which corresponds to the current condition in our prediction. The occurrences of GBIFs are distributed in with higher population fitness habitat $\Pr(\lambda > 1)$, confirming that our study approach can reasonably predict range shifts.




Figure S-13: Climate change favors range shift toward the North edge of the current range. (A) Past, (B) Current, (C and D) Future predicted range shift based on the predicted probabilities of self-sustaining populations, $\text{Pr}(\lambda > 1)$, using the two-sex model that incorporates sex-specific demographic responses to climate with sex ratio dependent seed fertilization. (E) Past, (F) Current, (G and H) Future predicted range shift based on the predicted probabilities of self-sustaining populations, $\text{Pr}(\lambda > 1)$, using the female dominant model. Future projections were based on the ACCESS model. The black dots on panel B and F indicate all known presence points collected from GBIF from 1990 to 2019, which corresponds to the current condition in our prediction. The occurrences of GBIFs are distributed in with higher population fitness habitat $\text{Pr}(\lambda > 1)$, confirming that our study approach can reasonably predict range shifts.




Figure S-14: Climate change favors range shift toward the North edge of the current range. (A) Past, (B) Current, (C and D) Future predicted range shift based on the predicted probabilities of self- sustaining populations, $\text{Pr}(\lambda > 1)$, using the two-sex model that incorporates sex- specific demographic responses to climate with sex ratio dependent seed fertilization. (E) Past, (F) Current, (G and H) Future predicted range shift based on the predicted probabilities of self- sustaining populations, $\text{Pr}(\lambda > 1)$, using the female dominant model. Future projections were based on the MIROC5 model. The black dots on panel B and F indicate all known presence points collected from GBIF from 1990 to 2019, which corresponds to the current condition in our prediction. The occurrences of GBIFs are distributed in with higher population fitness habitat $\text{Pr}(\lambda > 1)$, confirming that our study approach can reasonably predict range shifts.




Figure S-15: A two-dimensional representation of the Operational Sex Ratio (OSR) over time (past, present and future climate conditions). OSR represents the proportion of females. Contours show predicted values of OSR conditional on precipitation and temperature of the dormant and growing season. Operational Sex Ratio during the dormant season for the two sex model (A), Operational Sex Ratio during the growing season for the two sex model (B). "o": Past, "+": Current, "*": RCP 4.5, "■": RCP 8.5.