Warnings & disclaimers: Currently not all studies included.... and I flip between counting papers at the start to looking more at rows, so you were forewarned on that.

1 Current take home results

Out of 30 papers (we have currently 43 rows of data) 16 found evidence for GS x growth (any which way) and 9 found evidence for our definition of GS x growth. Those papers with any evidence are:

> sort(unique(eviany\$paper_id))

```
[1] "Cuny2012" "Drew & Downes 2018"
```

[3] "Etzold2021" "Gao2022" [5] "Keenan et al 2014" "Moser2019"

[7] "Oddi2022" "Silvestro2023"

[9] "Soolananayakanahally2013" "Zhu2021"

[11] "delpierre2017" "francon2020" [13] "grossiord2022" "mckown2016" [15] "michelot2012" "wheeler2016"

And those papers with evidence of our definition are:

> sort(unique(eviour\$paper_id))

```
[1] "Cuny2012" "Drew & Downes 2018" "Oddi2022"
```

[4] "Silvestro2023" "Zhang2021" "delpierre2017" [7] "grossiord2022" "mckown2016" "michelot2012"

and they cover both wood and plant vegetative studies:

```
> table(eviour$gsl)
```

```
plant vegetative phenology satellite derived

5 1

wood phenology

5
```

Broadening beyond our definition includes studies where GS is not measured, or climate is used instead:

```
> table(eviour$gsl)
```

```
plant vegetative phenology satellite derived

5 1

wood phenology

5
```

I have not checked whether that is different than random, but you can contrast that with the overall suite of GSL metrics and it looks representative to me on quick glance:

> table(d\$gs1)

climate related to satellite phenology data

1
date
1
not measured
5
plant vegetative phenology
15
satellite derived
3
temperature or snow metric
5
wood phenology
12

They also cover a pretty wide diversity of growth metrics:

> table(eviany\$growth) # any definition

> table(eviour\$growth) # our definition

dendrometer/circumference	cell production (number of cells)
2	1
height	ecosystem fluxes
3	1
photosynthesis	intra-annual core (xylogeneis)
1	2
	root:shoot ratio
	1

Here's the full set of GS x growth that found it:

```
> table(eviany$gslxgrowth) # any definition
```

```
not measured x annual core

1 not measured x intra-annual core (xylogeneis)

1 plant vegetative phenology x height

4 plant vegetative phenology x intra-annual core (xylogeneis)

1 plant vegetative phenology x photosynthesis

1 plant vegetative phenology x root:shoot ratio

1 satellite derived x ecosystem fluxes

2 temperature or snow metric x annual core

2 temperature or snow metric x stem density

1 wood phenology x cell production (number of cells)

1 wood phenology x dendrometer/circumference

3 wood phenology x intra-annual core (xylogeneis)
```

> table(eviour\$gslxgrowth) # our definition

plant vegetative phenology x height

plant vegetative phenology x photosynthesis

plant vegetative phenology x root:shoot ratio

plant vegetative phenology x root:shoot ratio

satellite derived x ecosystem fluxes

wood phenology x cell production (number of cells)

wood phenology x dendrometer/circumference

wood phenology x intra-annual core (xylogeneis)

2

3

To contrast, here's what studies that did NOT find evidence looked like:

```
> table(noeviany$gslxgrowth) # any definition
climate related to satellite phenology data x dendrometer/circumference
                                                      date x annual core
                               plant vegetative phenology x annual core
    plant vegetative phenology x annual core (simulated to intraannual)
                                   plant vegetative phenology x biomass
                                        satellite derived x annual core
                               temperature or snow metric x annual core
                             wood phenology x dendrometer/circumference
                        wood phenology x intra-annual core (xylogeneis)
                                                                       2
> table(noeviour$gslxgrowth) # our definition
       plant vegetative phenology x annual core
                                               3
           plant vegetative phenology x biomass
     wood phenology x dendrometer/circumference
                                               1
wood phenology x intra-annual core (xylogeneis)
```

2 Getting back to writing our paper

Reminder of what we expected the table we worked on since April to help us with ...

- 1. Section: Review three reasons for not growing
 - (a) Overview paragraph of three reasons
 - i. Measurement see box/figure (include measurement only here or briefly so we move through it fast)

1

- ii. Resource limitation
- iii. Constraints

- (b) Resource limitation, evidence for an against
 - i. Nutrients
 - ii. Water
 - iii. Is this more species-specific?
- (c) Constraints, evidence for an against
 - i. Leaf life span
 - ii. Budset stuff ... (Zohner, Sool.)
 - iii. Evidence across species? Or which is species-specific
- 2. What do do next (The future! Is there a framework to our future directions? It would be nice if we found one)

So, we hoped these studies would help with the prevalence of evidence for external and endogenous factors. I haven't got as far on this (and we did not consistently enter whether growth or GSL or both was limiting) but here's a quick look at the 21 papers that found evidence of external factors and 8 that found evidence of endogenous (in contrast to 6 papers that looked but did not find evidence of external or 17 endogenous factors).

For those that did, they looked at these GSL metrics:

> table(exoyes\$gs1)

date	not measured
1	4
plant vegetative phenology 13	satellite derived 1
temperature or snow metric 4	wood phenology 5

> table(endoyes\$gs1)

And specifically:

> table(exoyes\$gs_metric_used)

start metric only start to end
4 14
start to end (I think for SFGCC) suitable days
1 1

This
needs a
total overhaul after
the table; figure
out the
section
headers

Table will help us

with this

Table will help us

with this

<pre>2 2 > table(endoyes\$gs_metric_used)</pre>				
none start metric only start to end				
1 1 8				
time with growth observed unsure				
1 2				
And these growth metrics (seems a bias towards annual core studies looking at external; we have 11 annual core results):				
> table(exoyes\$growth)				
NDVI/greenness annual core				
1 8				
annual core (simulated to intraannual) biomass				
1 2				
dendrometer/circumference ecosystem fluxes				
3 2				
height intra-annual core (xylogeneis)				
5 3				
photosynthesis root:shoot ratio				
2				
stem density				
1				
> table(endoyes\$growth)				
annual core biomass dendrometer/circumference				
1 2 4				
ecosystem fluxes growth anomalies height				
1 1 3				
photosynthesis root:shoot ratio				
1 1				