

# Grephon: What we learned from the papers

Grephon group

May 5, 2023

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Quick results</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Questions I think we need to answer before entering more data...</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Next steps</b>	<b>6</b>

## 1 Quick results

Most folks submitted their tables trying to digest papers on growing season length relates to growth – thank you! We ended up with 42 rows of data across 24 papers. You can check out the merged file in the output folder here.

I did a quick review and then clean on some entries. You can look at the code (`tablemergeclean.R`) in the analyses folder. Here’s some info from that....

Most studies are temperate or boreal forests as best I can tell. Lots of *Pinus*, *Abies*, *Betula*, *Fraxinus*, *Quercus*, *Fagus*.

Growth metrics were dominated by tree rings (annual cores):

	1
NDVI/LAI	
	3
NEP and GPP (net ecosystem production and gross primary production)	
	1
annual core	
	10
biomass/height/R:S	
	8
dendrometer diameter	
	2
intra-annual core	
	6

leaf chlorophyll (SPAD meter)	
	1
other	
	4
photosynthesis	
	6

Study types were dominated by tree rings (intra and inter-annual) but then more diverse:

```
> table(d$study_type)

                2
continental scale obs phenology with model
                1
ecosystem carbon budget model
                1
greenhouse
                7
greenhouse or chamber
                1
greenhouse or chamber (technically CHN terrace)
                1
intra-annual cores (xylogenesis)
                2
phenology observations (PEP)
                1
provenance
                1
provenance trial
                3
satellite
                3
satellite data
                1
shade and climate manipulation experiments
                1
shade manipulation experiments
                1
synthesis
                1
tree ring
                15
```

In 8 papers and 14 rows of data, authors thought they found a relationship, but this varied with growth metric (you'll also see we're rather unsure about those intra-annual core studies):

```
> table(d$simple.growth.metric, d$simple.authorsthink.gslxgrowth)
```

	no
	0
NDVI/LAI	0
NEP and GPP (net ecosystem production and gross primary production)	0
annual core	3
biomass/height/R:S	1
dendrometer diameter	2
intra-annual core	2
leaf chlorophyll (SPAD meter)	0
other	2
photosynthesis	0
	not mentioned
	0
NDVI/LAI	3
NEP and GPP (net ecosystem production and gross primary production)	0
annual core	1
biomass/height/R:S	0
dendrometer diameter	0
intra-annual core	0
leaf chlorophyll (SPAD meter)	1
other	0
photosynthesis	2
	unsure
	0
NDVI/LAI	0
NEP and GPP (net ecosystem production and gross primary production)	0
annual core	0
biomass/height/R:S	0
dendrometer diameter	0
intra-annual core	4
leaf chlorophyll (SPAD meter)	0
other	0
photosynthesis	0
	yes
	0
NDVI/LAI	0

NEP and GPP (net ecosystem production and gross primary production)	1
annual core	4
biomass/height/R:S	6
dendrometer diameter	0
intra-annual core	0
leaf chlorophyll (SPAD meter)	0
other	2
photosynthesis	1

And we're not so sure more than one row of data includes a growth x growing season relationship:

```
> table(d$simple.authorsthink.gslxgrowth, d$simple.wethink.gslxgrowth)
```

	no unsure yes			
no	0	3	5	0
not mentioned	0	3	0	0
unsure	0	4	0	0
yes	1	0	9	4

## 2 Questions I think we need to answer before entering more data...

1. Was this data entry doable? It was easy enough for me to clean quickly, but I did not hear how it went for others doing entry?
2. I and Ailene want some of our papers reviewed by someone else, do we want to just have everything checked twice?
3. Adjustments to data entry ...
  - (a) What do we mean by 'did authors think they found evidence?' ... I still struggled with this. Do we mean in whatever way they defined it? Do we want or have a column for GSL x growth (our version ... and what is our version? We could have a couple, see list below)?
  - (b) Are we separating out leaf from wood phenology studies enough?
  - (c) How to enter xylogenesis studies?
  - (d) I like the study level question, but I think it needs refining. Ailene added "Strideck et al 2022 study created tree ring chronologies (by merging tree rings across individuals within sites- a common practices in tree ring research) so I selected 'Across sites' for study\_level. Might be worth a discussion as there may be other tree ring studies that use a similar approach." See below also ...

```
> table(d$study_level)
```

```

1
across individuals
11
across provenances within species
3
across sites
1
across sites/populations
9
across sites/populations across years within individuals
1
across species
1
across years within individuals
8
across years within individuals\302\240
2
across years within pixels (500 m pixels from 2001-2018 :MODIS)
1
across years within sites
1
within individuals
1
within individuals for < 1 year (April to October 2018)
1
within years within individuals
1
```

1. Can we write out the statements we want to make or line widths in a figure we want to define from this so we can make sure we're happy with the table?
2. What is our dream metric of GSL x growth?
  - (a) GSL must be start to end for me – NOT days growth >0 or such ...
  - (b) Does photosynthesis count as growth? What about the other random entries such as NDVI?

### 3 Next steps

1. Finalize the table again
2. Decide on how to assign additional reviews (re-reviewing) and assign!
3. Decide on aims to decide which papers we WOULD add

4. Do it ...