Site- and species-specific responses of forest growth to climate across the European continent
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ABSTRACT

Aim To evaluate the climate sensitivity of model-based forest productivity estimates using a continental-scale tree-ring network.

Location Europe and North Africa (30–70° N, 10° W–40° E).

Methods We compiled close to 1000 annually resolved records of radial tree growth for all major European tree species and quantified changes in growth as a function of historical climatic variation. Sites were grouped using a neural network clustering technique to isolate spatiotemporal and species-specific climate response patterns. The resulting empirical climate sensitivities were compared with the sensitivities of net primary production (NPP) estimates derived from the ORCHIDEE-FM and LPJ-wsl dynamic global vegetation models (DGVMs).

Results We found coherent biogeographic patterns in climate response that depend upon (1) phylogenetic controls and (2) ambient environmental conditions delineated by latitudinal/elevational location. Temperature controls dominate forest productivity in high-elevation and high-latitude areas whereas moisture sensitive sites are widespread at low elevation in central and southern Europe. DGVM simulations broadly reproduce the empirical patterns, but show less temperature sensitivity in the boreal zone and stronger precipitation sensitivity towards the mid-latitudes.

Main conclusions Large-scale forest productivity is driven by monthly to seasonal climate controls, but our results emphasize species-specific growth patterns under comparable environmental conditions. Furthermore, we demonstrate that carry-over effects from the previous growing season can significantly influence tree growth, particularly in areas with harsh climatic conditions – an element not considered in most current-state DGVMs. Model–data discrepancies suggest that the simulated climate sensitivity of NPP will need refinement before carbon-cycle climate feedbacks can be accurately quantified.
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INTRODUCTION

Forests world-wide are known as an important net carbon sink and are thus a key component of the terrestrial carbon cycle. The total sink in established forests is currently estimated at 2.4 ± 0.4 Pg C year⁻¹ (Pan et al., 2011) and equals approximately 25% of the current global anthropogenic fossil fuel emissions (Friedlingstein et al., 2010). However, carbon fluxes and storage vary regionally and with interannual to long-term environmental change (Luyssaert et al., 2010). For example, it was estimated
that the 2003 summer drought in Europe caused a 30% reduction in continental-scale net primary productivity (NPP), temporarily turning terrestrial ecosystems into a net carbon source (Ciais et al., 2005). The impacts of this heatwave were spatially variable, particularly in regions characterized by complex topography. In the Swiss Alps for instance, increased productivity of the subalpine forests due to lengthening of the growing season was contrasted by decreased growth at lower elevations due to drought stress (Jolly et al., 2005). A higher frequency of drought events and other negative impacts on growth (increased autotrophic respiration and disturbances) are predicted to outweigh enhanced productivity due to increasing temperatures (Hoch & Körner, 2012) or CO₂ and nitrogen fertilization (Sitch et al., 2008). If this is correct, then future reductions in forest CO₂ uptake will have profound implications for the terrestrial carbon cycle and related climate feedbacks (Frank et al., 2010), as well as for species distribution ranges (Hickler et al., 2012) and forest management practices.

Considerable observational and modelling efforts have been invested to better constrain climate-induced changes in carbon pools. Global NPP was recently indicated to have decreased by 0.55 Pg C between 2000 and 2009, but when looked at in detail it is apparent that this reduction was driven by increased Southern Hemisphere drought which outweighed a warming-induced productivity increase in the northern boreal and temperate zones (Zhao & Running, 2010). NPP trends even differ strongly on a subcontinental scale, and estimates based on current-state vegetation models are subject to considerable uncertainty. Exact estimation of forest productivity is currently hampered by our limited understanding of the climatic drivers of wood formation as a function of species, ecological conditions and geographic location (Stegen et al., 2011). As a consequence, uncertainties in interannual to long-term variability in tree growth will continue to challenge large-scale NPP simulations until its climatic drivers are well understood.

Annual radial growth increment, i.e. tree-ring width, is an important parameter that allows tree growth and climate variability to be connected on local to continental scales. Radial growth data from increment cores are shown to be broadly compatible with productivity estimates from forest inventory data (Metsaranta & Lieffers, 2009), eddy-covariance measurements (Zweifel et al., 2010) and carbon budget models (Metsaranta & Kurz, 2012); however, the suitability of tree-rings to serve as a direct proxy for ecosystem productivity has not yet been fully tested. Recent studies have shown growth to be highly correlated at different stem heights (van der Maaten-Theunissen & Bouriaud, 2012), demonstrating that cores taken from near the stem base are tightly linked with both total stem productivity and stand-level NPP (Bouriaud et al., 2005). Numerous dendroclimatological studies have provided insights in the influence of tree age (Esper et al., 2008), altitude (Levanic et al., 2009) and site ecology (Neuwirth et al., 2004) on the climate sensitivity of tree growth. Furthermore, the establishment of regional-scale networks allowed the spatial and species-specific growth response patterns to be connected with thermal and moisture variations within particular climatic zones (Frank & Esper, 2005; Büntgen et al., 2007; Friedrichs et al., 2009; Affolter et al., 2010). Only a few studies, however, have addressed large-scale climate responses of forests in Europe (Briffa et al., 2002; Wettstein et al., 2011). These studies did not resolve topographic and species-specific characteristics and therefore are not adequate for the validation and improvement of vegetation and carbon cycle models. Thus, a well-replicated, continental scale assessment of the climate response of forests is needed to: (1) determine the temporal and spatial scales at which climate limits tree growth, (2) quantify the sensitivity of growth to changes in climate, and (3) test if vegetation models correctly handle the response of NPP to climate variability.

Here, we perform a Europe-wide analysis of tree growth response patterns based on tree-ring data and modelled NPP from two process-based dynamic global vegetation models (DGVMs). We compiled chronologies from 36 coniferous and broadleaf species to assess the climate forcing of radial tree growth. A nonlinear classification approach known as self-organizing maps (SOMs) was applied to group sites with similar climate responses. These site groups were then assessed to detect first-order patterns in climate forcing as a function of: (1) geographic position, (2) mean climatology and (3) tree species. In addition to the empirical growth quantification, monthly NPP was estimated using two process-based DGVMs (ORCHIDEE-FM, LPJ-wsl). As a first test to evaluate DGVMs with tree-ring networks, correlation analyses were used to compare the spatial distribution and magnitude of climate sensitivity of modelled NPP to the patterns suggested by annually resolved tree-ring data.

DATA AND METHODS

Tree-ring network

We compiled tree-ring width (TRW) information from approximately 1000 sites into a dataset covering most of Europe and parts of North Africa (30°–70° N, 10° W–40° E), with sites ranging from sea level to 2500 m a.s.l. in Mediterranean mountain ranges (Fig. 1a). Standardized data are provided in Appendices S3 and S4 in Supporting Information. Prior analyses on portions of this dataset including the greater Alpine region (Frank & Esper, 2005), central Germany (Friedrichs et al., 2009), the Tatra Mountains (Büntgen et al., 2007), the Scottish High-lands (Wilson et al., 2012), the Pirin Mountains (Panayotov et al., 2010), the eastern Alps (Levanic et al., 2009), northeastern France (Tegel et al., 2010), the Apennines (Carrer et al., 2010), central (Neuwirth et al., 2004) and northern Europe (e.g. Gouirand et al., 2008) have generally been directed at quantifying local to regional growth variability.

The network contains 36 tree species, the most common of which are shown in Fig. 1b. We will subsequently use the following abbreviations: PCAB (Picea abies), PISY (Pinus sylvestris), ABAL (Abies alba), LADE (Larix decidua), PICE (Pinus cembra), FASY (Fagus sylvatica), QURO (Quercus robur), QUPE (Quercus petraea). Less frequently represented species are combined under the ‘other conifers’ and ‘other broadleaf’ categories.
To investigate the effect of climate forcing on radial tree growth, it is necessary to remove the biological age trend that is present in raw TRW measurement series (e.g. Esper et al., 2002). This was accomplished using a spline with a 50% frequency cutoff response at 32 years. Our choice of detrending will remove most of the variance related to multidecadal or longer-term climatic trends, and this study will thus focus on interannual to decadal variability. Removing the age-related trend with a 300-year spline, and thus preserving more low-frequency variability, did not significantly alter the strength or patterns of climate response. Prior to detrending, the heteroscedastic variance structure related to the age trend was stabilized using an adaptive power transformation (Cook & Peters, 1997) before calculating residuals from detrending functions. This procedure introduces a nonlinear transformation that may be relevant for the quantification of climate sensitivities. Tests on a random network subset, however, demonstrated that the impact of variance stabilization on TRW correlations with climate data is negligible (Appendix S2 and Fig. S1).

To ensure a certain degree of robustness in our growth–climate analyses, site chronologies were required to meet the following criteria: (1) sample replication at site level was greater than five series and the expressed population signal (EPS) of the chronologies was above 0.85 (Wigley et al., 1984); (2) the period 1920–70 was entirely covered by the time series to ensure sufficient overlap with instrumental measurements.

A total of 992 sites were retained for final analysis, making this the most comprehensive investigation of climate forcing on tree growth.

Climate data
A downscaled climatology was employed to consider topographic effects on local climate. We used the gridded 0.5° × 0.5° CRU TS 3.0 global temperature and precipitation datasets (Mitchell & Jones, 2005) as a basis and downscaled them to 1-km spatial resolution using the WorldClim database of climate normals based upon the GTOPO30 digital elevation model (Hijmans et al., 2005). For temperature, absolute anomalies were calculated by subtracting the long-term (1950–2000, corresponding to WorldClim) monthly means from the entire CRU TS 3.0 time series (1901–2005) and relative anomalies were calculated for precipitation (observed precipitation divided by monthly means). The monthly anomalies were then bilinearly interpolated to 1-km resolution and added to (or multiplied by in the case of precipitation) the WorldClim baseline climatology. Additional analyses were also performed with the gridded self-calibrating Palmer drought severity index data (scPDSI; van der Schrier et al., 2006) at 0.5° resolution.

Geographic coordinates associated with tree-ring sites were sometimes coarse (e.g. 0.5° precision), leading to a mismatch in the elevations of metadata and respective WorldClim grid cells in mountainous areas. To minimize these altitudinal (and implied climate) deviations, climate data from the closest grid cell with a matching elevation were assigned to each tree-ring site. This procedure was chosen because the altitudinal precision recorded in the tree-ring metadata was often greater than the geographic precision. In most cases a suitable grid point was located within a few kilometres of the indicated site position.

Climate forcing of tree growth
The current study is a continental-scale approach dealing with multiple species and thus a great variety of growth conditions, site ecologies and growing season lengths. To address the resulting heterogeneity in climate responses, we based analyses on monthly resolved climate correlation functions (CCFs) between TRW indices and temperature and precipitation (Cook et al.,...
RESULTS

Monthly and seasonal climate response

The climate response of tree-ring width (TRW) chronologies was assessed over two growing seasons including the winter in between. Figure 2 provides a broad spatial overview of the climate sensitivities (mean JJA temperatures, precipitation sums and scPDSI values), and species-specific monthly climate response patterns are shown in Fig. S2 (Appendix S2). The strongest positive relationships between TRW and temperature \((r > 0.6)\) occur in cold and humid areas, such as the Scandes mountain range, northernmost Great Britain, the central Alpine tree line, and the Dinaric Mountains (Fig. 2). In similarly cool but drier areas (e.g. eastern Scandinavia, high-elevation Alpine valleys, the Pyrenees, and Mediterranean tree-line sites), temperature correlation coefficients decrease to 0.4–0.6 or less. Trees in temperate and Mediterranean lowland regions generally revealed no distinct thermal signal. Negative correlations between TRW and JJA temperature occur mainly around the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea and in northern Africa. Sporadically, negative correlations with temperatures were also observed at dry sites in the mid-latitudes, located in the rain shadow of mountain ranges such as the Vosges, the Bavarian Forest and in inner-Alpine dry valleys.

The spatial distribution of precipitation signals is more diffuse and correlation coefficients are generally lower \((r = 0.2–0.4;\) Fig. 2). Positive JJA correlations were found in the central European lowlands, southern Great Britain, the Iberian Peninsula as well as in Anatolia and northernmost Africa. Strongly responsive sites \((r > 0.4)\) are scarce and located at the bottom of Alpine dry valleys and in central Germany, as well as in the lee of the Alps and the northern Scandes. Pronounced negative correlations with JJA precipitation were found in the Dinaric Mountains and along the central and western Scandes.

Drought stress, integrating both evaporative demand and water availability, was assessed through correlations with scPDSI, and was shown to strongly influence many sites where positive temperature responses were not found. The distribution of scPDSI sensitive sites is comparable to the pattern revealed by precipitation-positive correlations but the signal is often considerably stronger \((r > 0.4–0.6)\). The highest correlations were obtained in central Germany, France, Anatolia and northernmost Africa. Sites in southern Great Britain, south-western Finland and on the Iberian Peninsula also responded positively to scPDSI.

Climate response patterns (SOMs)

The seasonality in the climate responses of European trees varies considerably with species as well as geographic location and we therefore computed SOMs to identify broad patterns within the network. Resulting SOM nodes were grouped into three response categories based on the interpretation of the average CCF of each node and the arrangement of the nodes in the SOM array (Fig. 3a): ‘temperature signal’ \((N2, N3 \text{ and } N6)\), ‘precipitation signal’ \((N4, N7 \text{ and } N8)\) and ‘mixed signal’ \((N1, N5 \text{ and } N8)\).
Figure 2  Correlations between tree-ring width (TRW) and current year June–August (JJA) temperature means (left), cumulative June–August precipitation amounts (middle) as well as the self-calibrating Palmer drought severity index (scPDSI, right). Map area: 30–70° N, 10° W–40° E.

Figure 3  Nine nodes (clusters N1–N9) derived from the self-organizing maps (SOMs) algorithm applied to monthly climate correlations with radial growth at all sites in the tree-ring network. (a) The classification of nodes in the SOM array according to temperature, precipitation and mixed sensitivity is shown. Additionally, the number of sites compiled in each node is indicated. (b) Correlations between average radial growth of each node and mean monthly temperature (top) and precipitation (bottom) are presented for the previous (pApr to pDec, shaded in grey) and current growing seasons. Nodes have been grouped according to their climate sensitivity.
Climate sensitivity of forest growth across Europe

The empirical analysis of the climate dependency of radial growth across Europe presents an interesting opportunity to benchmark and evaluate the ORC and LPJ NPP simulations. We find that ORC performs slightly better in reproducing the positive summer (Fig. 6) and annual (Appendix S2, Fig. S3) temperature responses found in the tree-ring network. However, in Central Europe and the Mediterranean region, ORC NPP is negatively correlated ($r < -0.4$) with temperature and simultaneously positively and strongly correlated ($r > 0.4$) with summer precipitation. LPJ NPP values on the other hand are strongly negatively correlated with summer temperature in southern Fennoscandia ($r < -0.4$) and moderately negatively correlated in central Europe and the Mediterranean area ($r = -0.2$ to $-0.4$). Furthermore, LPJ results are most precipitation sensitive in southern Europe ($r > 0.6$) and southern Scandinavia ($r = 0.2$ to $0.4$). These relationships among the climate sensitivities of the two DGVMs and comparisons with the tree-ring network are confirmed by the regression analyses and contour plots shown in Fig. 6 (insets). The correspondence to the empirical tree-ring data is slightly stronger for ORC NPP, but both models show a lower temperature sensitivity in Scandinavia and generally higher precipitation sensitivities than tree rings. The strong positive temperature response of LPJ in the Alps (cold and humid) and very low correlations in northern Scandinavia (cold and dry) is further indicative of a stronger drought sensitivity compared with tree rings. The same effect is to a lesser extent visible in ORC and confirmed by high correlations with summer precipitation in the Mediterranean and central Europe. NPP shown in Fig. 6 was calculated using the FAO soil input data (Zobler, 1986), which is likely to be consistent with the parameterization for drought stress in both DGVMs. More extreme European-wide drought stress is suggested when simulations are driven using the shallower JRC soil dataset (see Appendix S2, Fig. S4).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We established an extensive network of TRW data over Europe to assess growth–climate relationships on a continental scale. Our results reveal consistent climate response patterns that help
Figure 4 Spatial distribution of the nine nodes over Europe based on self-organizing maps (SOMs). The colours represent the most frequent conifer and broadleaf species. Additionally, the correlations with monthly temperature (top, mean displayed in red) and precipitation (bottom, mean displayed in blue) at each site are shown between April of the year prior to ring development (pApr) and the current September. Nodes are arranged according to (a) temperature, (b) precipitation and (c) mixed sensitivity as classified in the SOM array (Fig. 3a). Map area: 30°–70° N, 10° W–40° E.
evaluate the accuracy of spatiotemporal variability in NPP simulation from DGVMs. However, it is important to note that this tree-ring compilation consists of data that were collected by a variety of researchers, for numerous investigations with differing sampling designs. While the sampled space, sites and species cannot be considered to be fully representative of European forests, we were nevertheless able to identify broad geographic, climatic and species-specific controls on tree growth across the continent.

Analyses of annual growth response to summer temperature largely reflect the ‘common knowledge’ of distinct temperature signals at high elevations and latitudes (Fritts, 1976). However, even in characteristically cold regions where temperature would be expected to be the single dominant factor, correlation coefficients decrease with reduced water availability. In the Alps, this is the case in dry valleys (e.g. Affolter et al., 2010), whereas in Scandinavia, temperature responses decrease with the moisture gradient from the maritime west to the more continental east, reinforcing the findings of Helama et al. (2005) who assessed the climate response of forests across Finland. The spatial distribution of sites that respond to summer precipitation and scPDSI is more diffuse and strongly related to topography. Signals from the scPDSI, a measure of soil moisture and thus a better estimate of the water available for trees (Cook et al., 2010), are considerably stronger than those from precipitation. Yet, monthly climate responses (Appendix S2, Fig. S2) suggest that European forest growth is not driven by climate during a single time-window. Instead we observed a diverse seasonality that can be explained by differing growing season lengths (Moser et al., 2010), emergent manifestations of complex tree physiological processes (Cook & Pederson, 2011), lag effects from the previous year (Frank & Esper, 2005), as well as site properties. This finding is likely to have important implications for tree-ring based spatial climate reconstructions (e.g. Briffa et al., 2002) which usually focus on one specific season (St George et al., 2010).

We found SOM models to be an ideal tool for assessing patterns of common variances in extensive tree-ring networks, because the corners of the 3 × 3 node array can be interpreted as the most unequal climate response types whereas neighbouring nodes react to similar drivers. Assigning sites to climate signal categories in this way may occasionally result in a classification differing from a single-monthly or seasonal classification. For instance, in northern Great Britain, PISY sites often show a moderate summer temperature signal (Wilson et al., 2012; Fig. 2) whereas their overall response is assigned to a mixed signal node (Fig. 4c).

An essential result of our SOM analysis is the grouping of species from diverse geographic regions and the separation of confined regions by species solely based on their climate response functions (e.g. PISY and PCAB in Fennoscandia; Fig. 4a). Such a separation underlines the importance of species-specific growth responses compared to common environmental drivers. This has implications for the use of generic plant functional types (e.g. Jung et al., 2007) in DGVMs to compute forest productivity. Refinement of the species types by including their characteristic climate responses could potentially improve regional estimates of the response of NPP to climate variability and change, as well as estimates of competitive success and thus future biodiversity.

Growth at temperature- or precipitation-sensitive sites generally responds to current summer climate. Thus, the separation of nodes is largely based on conditions in the period prior to the main growing season and the interpretation of node differences is closely related to geographic location and topography. For instance, Alpine tree line species in N3 respond negatively to high previous winter temperatures which are associated with increased respiratory carbon costs (Piao et al., 2009). Other sites are positively influenced by previous summer (N2 and N8) and autumn (N6) climate. Such lag effects are possibly introduced by enhanced nutrient storage and a variety of climate and biological processes such as a delayed end of the growing season (Moser et al., 2010).

Figure 5 Distribution of temperature and precipitation signals in altitudinal and latitudinal space across Europe. The black polygons represent the total sampled area. The top figure (a) shows the distribution based on a self-organizing map (SOM) classification, the bottom figures (b) display responsive sites (r > 0.3) for six different seasons (letters correspond to sequential months, pYear is the year prior to ring development). Symbol sizes correspond to signal strength.
or water availability after snow melt. Trees at moisture-limited sites generally show less seasonality in their climate response than thermally limited stands. A weak but continuously positive precipitation signal peaking in current and previous summer is commonly observed. This response pattern explains the diffuse spatial distribution of sites that respond to summer drought. Of all moisture sensitive nodes, conifers in N7 exhibit the most pronounced seasonality and have often been used for drought reconstructions in the past (e.g. Nicault et al., 2008). In latitudinal and altitudinal space, we find a surprisingly
distinct threshold between temperature- and moisture-sensitive areas. Such a distribution was postulated by Fritts (1976) but has not been empirically defined on a continental scale. Our network thus enables us for the first time to estimate the climate response of European forests as a function of elevation and latitude.

Our analyses of NPP climate response revealed clear differences between the two DGVMs, probably contributing to differences in model estimates of carbon-cycle climate feedbacks (Frank et al., 2010). Comparisons with a continental-scale tree-ring network opens possibilities for a novel concept to validate and improve DGVM estimates, and should encourage further use of tree rings for model evaluation. ORC and LPJ in their current configurations are variably successful in reproducing the empirical tree-ring based climate response in different parts of Europe. Observed differences between the two models may be introduced by varying treatment of water-stressed conductance, autotrophic respiration and phenology (Sitch et al., 2008). ORC is highly sensitive to summer precipitation, yet captures the general spatial variability in summer climate sensitivity of European forests. LPJ simulations exhibit an even stronger drought response, particularly in Scandinavia and the Mediterranean area, which introduces differences in NPP estimates compared to ORC and even stronger differences compared to TRW. The drought response of simulated NPP is possibly enhanced by model assumptions that do not capture the full autocorrelation effects which are often found in tree rings as a result of local water and nutrient storage or recovery after disturbance (Fritts, 1976). Our results emphasize the importance of climate conditions during the previous year for current growth performance, an issue that ought to be included in vegetation models (McDowell et al., 2011). Except for possible soil moisture deficit legacies from the previous year, the models contain insufficient reserves from the prior growing season affecting allocation to wood in the following year. Additionally, none of the models include a parameterization of wood growth during a well-defined interval of the year, so that NPP is seasonally very similar to GPP.

Analyses of observed and simulated climate sensitivities revealed regional differences and identified potential for future improvement of model structures. Yet multiple factors may complicate the joint assessment of empirical TRW and simulated NPP. For instance, model simulations are forced by the same gridded historical climate data that are used for the climate response analysis. NPP correlations with climate data could thus be stronger due to such dependence on the model input. Additionally, our results suggest that the success of the models in reproducing observed climate sensitivities varies regionally while the average climate response over the entire continent is similar to TRW (Fig. S5, Appendix S2), thus emphasizing the need to carefully assess regional productivity. Climate on the other hand, is a principal but not the only driver of tree growth with site- and species-specific properties (e.g. Frank & Esper, 2005), disturbances (e.g. Babst et al., 2010) and human management (Fritts, 1976) co-determining forest productivity. These additional drivers may reduce the strength of the climate signal in tree-ring data and until such factors are routinely implemented in model simulations we will have to settle for less than optimal comparisons of modelled versus observational output. Despite the above challenges that may tend to enhance the climate response of the models in comparison to the empirical data, in our study we were still able to provide concrete evidence on model biases. For example, in Scandinavia we find a higher temperature sensitivity of TRW in comparison with NPP from both models, despite the noise contained in tree-ring data (Frank et al., 2007) and the strength of the temperature signal in the model simulations. This result suggests that the above caveats do not invalidate the use of tree-rings for model evaluation and calibration and we believe that more work in this direction will prove to be quite fruitful.

This study identifies the principal climatic drivers of European forest growth, but an absolute quantification of annual biomass increment based on the currently existing tree-ring data is impractical due to lack of site control, limited meta-data availability and diverse sampling strategies. Empirical forest productivity measurements nevertheless carry a great potential to quantify the impacts of climate change on the terrestrial carbon cycle and tree-ring based DGVM validation. An adapted sampling scheme (Babst et al., 2012) consistently applied on a large scale is thus required to enable absolute and annually resolved measurements of tree growth. Related assessments of coherent growth patterns, extremes and long-term trends will further contribute to improved understanding of forest carbon sink dynamics. Such work is time- and cost-intensive, but crucial for different research communities, forest management practices and for determining and implementing effective environmental policies.
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