LIVERPOOL
JOHN MOORES
UNIVERSITY

LJMU Research Online

Jaganathan, G, Boenisch, G, Kattge, J and Dalrymple, SE

 Physically, physiologically and conceptually hidden: improving the description and communication of seed persistence

http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/10789/

Article

Physically, physiologically and conceptually hidden: improving the description and communication of seed persistence

Ganesh K. Jaganathan[1]∗, Gerhard Boenisch[2], Jens Kattge[2,3], Sarah E. Dalrymple[4]

[1] Institute of Biothermal Technology, University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Shanghai 20009

[2] Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Hans Knöll Str. 10, 07745 Jena, Germany

[3] German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

[4] Liverpool John Moores University, James Parsons Building, School of Natural Sciences and Psychology, Byrom Street, Liverpool, L3 3AF.

Running title: Seed persistence and niche theory

∗ Corresponding author. Tel: +86 21 55271200; fax: +86 21 55270695
Email: jganeshcbe@gmail.com

Abstract

Seed persistence is a trait that is difficult to observe or measure and, consequently has remained conceptually obscure for 40 years since Grubb's influential description of the regeneration niche. Seed persistence is the ability of seeds to persist in a viable state post-dispersal and is relevant to current research in plant community dynamics and conservation. However, categorisations of seed persistence as transient, short-term or long-term persistent do not acknowledge the variation in persistence times as a result of deterministic processes and are difficult to apply in a predictive capacity. Consequently, a more robust understanding of seed persistence is needed in niche descriptions that are temporally explicit and in predicting the distributional changes of species in the current and future climate. We surmise an alternative to the categorizations of seed persistence on the basis of seed bank type and argue that it is best expressed as a continuous variable. We review the methods available for estimating seed persistence in situ and provide a number of testable hypotheses to contribute to the development of this important research topic. We maintain that seed persistence has not been incorporated adequately into niche theory and highlight that it can make several contributions including properly defining metapopulation niche, population growth definition. This holistic approach by integrating seed persistence into niche theory would allow us to better predict the survival of plants in a changing environment.

Key words: climate change; dormancy; ecological niche; soil seed banks; longevity index.

Introduction

Seed persistence is a trait that is extremely difficult to quantify: the physiological processes controlling persistence are contained within the external layers of the seed, the seeds themselves are physically hidden once they are buried beneath the soil surface, and as a consequence, seed persistence has remained conceptually obscure for 40 years since Grubb's (1977) influential description of the regeneration niche. Significant attention has been given to conditions promoting germination and seedling establishment, two important components of this niche, and these are proving to have enduring relevance, most recently with respect to understanding vegetation response to climate change and other drivers of range loss (e.g. Cochrane et al., 2015; Holt, 1990; Walck et al., 2011). However, one aspect of the regeneration niche, the ability of seeds to persist in the soil, continues to be largely overlooked by a significant part of the plant ecology community. Seeds of most plant species persist for varying time periods after dispersal and before they germinate (Chambers and MacMahon, 1994; Roberts, 1981), and as Grubb (1977) noted, this ability is "probably extremely important" for maintaining the rarest species within a community. However, whilst Grubb (1977) made contributions that are now several decades old, and more authors before and since have recognized the ecological relevance of seed persistence (e.g. Gremer and Venable, 2014; Venable and Brown, 1988), existing definitions of seed persistence have failed to resonate with the wider ecological research community meaning that seed persistence is an overlooked and misunderstood property of populations and species. While efforts to determine persistence ability should continue, two recent attempts (Long et al., 2015; Saatkamp et al., 2018) have called for a more rigorous treatment to define seed persistence, implying that more robust approaches are imperative in linking seed persistence with niche theory.

Many detailed studies conducted in various ecosystems have identified numerous seed- and soil-related factors that impact upon seed persistence in soil and previous reviews highlight our lack of understanding of the interactions of these factors (Baskin and Baskin, 2006; Benech-Arnold et

3

77   al., 2000; Chambers and MacMahon, 1994; Long et al., 2015; Thompson, 2000). Despite growing

78   evidence that multiple factors together drive persistence and germination, and that seed

79   persistence at species- and individual-level is extremely variable (supplementary data provides

80   an overview of factors known to influence the entry and exit of seeds in the soil), seed persistence

81   is categorized as soil seed bank longevity at species-level based on estimates of time from

82   dispersal until germination or death. This review aims to improve on the current systems of seed

83   bank classification by bringing together several areas of research (physiology, community ecology

84   and theoretical ecology) to i) demonstrate that existing seed bank classifications have served a

85   useful purpose, but are now inadequate for current research questions pertaining to the wide

86   range of seed bank research, ii) to reconcile definitions of persistence with ecological niche theory

87   and iii) make recommendations for reporting seed persistence that can be more effectively applied

88   to predicting population survival and species viability.

89   **Current seed bank classifications**

90   The formation of a seed bank commences when seeds reach the soil surface and ends with the

91   germination or death of seeds (Chambers and MacMahon, 1994; Jaganathan et al., 2015). In

92   most cases, seeds are dispersed from a parent plant at the end of the growing season which is

93   followed by harsh climatic conditions e.g. the dry seasons in the Tropics or cold winters in alpine

94   ecosystems (Baskin and Baskin, 2014). To avoid seedling death, the seeds must therefore

95   possess mechanisms to promote persistence at least until the next favourable germination period

96   followed by a growing season (see supplementary data). Germination is typically concentrated

97   in the first post-dispersal growing season, but may continue for many years, albeit in seasonal

98   cycles (Baskin and Baskin, 2014; Thompson, 2000). Thompson and Grime (1979) classified soil

99   seed banks as transient and persistent . Transient seed banks persist in the soil for < 1 year, i.e.

100 at least until the first opportunity for germination occurs, but species forming persistent seed

101 banks maintain viable seeds in the soil for > 1 year. Seed banks are a component of a population

102   that generally persist over consecutive years maintained by a turnover of seeds entering and

103   leaving the soil.

104   This classification scheme has subsequently been revised by numerous researchers, mostly

105   when studied species failed to fit into the original categories (Csontos and Tamás, 2003; Grime,

106   1981; Hawkins et al., 2007). Several authors noted that treating all seed banks persisting for >1

107   year as functionally the same (i.e. classing them all as 'persistent'), could not convey the huge

108   potential for variation in persistence times (Bekker et al., 1998; Poschlod and Jackel, 1993;

109   Thompson et al., 1997). This led to further distinctions between transient, short-term persistent

110   and long-term persistent (Bakker et al., 1996; Bakker, 1989), although the length of time

111   suggested as defining each of these sub-categories varied from 1-4 or 5 years to a decade

112   (Csontos and Tamás, 2003; Walck et al., 2005).

113   Despite the successive refinements, existing soil seed bank classifications may be inaccurate

114   because they do not acknowledge that i) different methods produce varying estimates of seed

115   persistence leading to misclassification, and ii) many seed- and soil- related factors contribute in

116   varying magnitudes and sometimes with additive or synergistic impacts on persistence times at

117   different locations (Long et al 2015; supplementary data). These problems mean that community

118   ecology has often overlooked seed persistence. The review of community ecology studies

119   undertaken by Jiménez-Alfaro et al. (2016) supports this observation; of 226 studies only 3.2%

120   included seed longevity as a trait to describe and understand community-level processes. Given

121   that soil seed bank classifications appear to be underutilised and authors circumvent the

122   persistence issue rather than deal with the current systems, we recommend that alternative

123   approaches to describing seed persistence are adopted.

124   **Methods for measuring seed persistence**

The ability of seeds to persist in soil is long-established (Darwin, 1859), but only since the 1970's have methods been developed to estimate the duration of persistence. According to Saatkamp et al. (2009) these methods can be classified into: (a) radio-carbon dating of seeds present in soil (McGraw et al., 1991); (b) artificial burial of seeds in soil and retrieval at regular intervals to test germinability or viability (see below); (c) determination of the depth distribution of germinable seeds in the soil (Bekker et al., 1998); (d) determination of soil seed banks along successional series (Poschlod et al., 1998) and (e) comparative analysis of seasonal dynamics of seed rain and seed bank (Thompson and Grime, 1979, Poschlod and Jackel, 1993). We also add to these the use of autogenous recovery of vegetation after anthropogenic vegetation clearance.

Each method has advantages and disadvantages (Thompson et al., 1997, Saatkamp et al., 2009). For example, recent seed input from standing vegetation at unknown distances from the sample can 'contaminate' the data, and germination under controlled conditions incorrectly assume a uniform response thereby interpreting lack of germination as seed death. Radio carbon dating is the most reliable and has well-defined confidence limits but is extremely time-intensive especially given the seed-to-seed variation in persistence, meaning that large samples are necessary to represent variation. Another drawback is the destructive nature of radio-carbon dating meaning that the viability of seeds used for analysis cannot be determined.

Artificial burial is generally regarded as the most accurate and frequently used method of describing in-soil seed persistence (e.g. Schwienbacher et al., 2010) but is not without limitations. Firstly, burial depths are often limited to 5cm (Baskin & Baskin, 2014) because seeds buried in the top soil layer are assumed to experience 'optimal' conditions for both dormancy break and germination, but seeds buried at lower or shallow layers may germinate, die or remain viable for many years (Hu et al., 2009, Campbell and Nicol, 2002). However, this may not necessarily be true for all the species, e.g. for *Avena ludoviciana*, which remained dormant at the soil surface, dormancy was broken in a higher proportion of seeds found at a depth between 5 and 15 cm than

150   seeds buried below 15 cm where the seeds remained dormant (Salimi and Angadji, 1997).

151   Likewise, in a two year artificial burial experiment, Wijayratne & Pyke (2012) showed that seeds

152   of *Artemisia tridentata* Nutt. subsp. *tridentata* and *Artemisia tridentata* subsp. *wyomingensis*

153   buried at 3 cm below the soil surface retained 30-40% viability when exhumed at the end of 2

154   year period compared to 0 and < 11% of seeds survived on soil surface from each species

155   respectively. Harrison et al. (2007), working with *Ambrosia trifida*, revealed that seeds buried in

156   the top soil layer had no viable seeds at the end of fourth year, whereas 19% of the seeds

157   remained viable at the 20 cm burial depth and some seeds at this depth remained viable even

158   after 9 years. If burial experiments were conducted only at top soil layer, then this species might

159   be classified as short-term persistent, because no viable seeds remained after four years.

160   Consequently, burial experiments conducted at one particular depth are likely to result in

161   misclassifications of seed bank type. Furthermore, it is important to note that seeds can be buried

162   by various routes including wind-deposited soil particles, root growth loosening the soil, rainfall

163   making top soil layers muddy and therefore, fluid, trees uprooting, and landslides (Long et al.,

164   2015), all of which effectively alter the depth of burial even as the trial is underway.

165   Secondly, seeds of the same species buried at multiple sites show variance in persistence as

166   multiple sites represent more variation in key explanatory variables and therefore viability over

167   time varies with site (Quinlivan, 1967, Robocker et al., 1969). One case described by Robocker

168   et al. (1969) is pertinent to this: during a 10 year burial trial of *Halogeton* seeds comparing two

169   different colours of seeds, those authors found that none of the black seeds buried in Nevada,

170   Utah and Washington persisted after one year in the soil (persistence ended through germination

171   or seed death). However, 67% of the brown seeds retrieved from Washington germinated

172   successfully.

173   Thirdly, the duration of burial in experiments described in the literature varied from a few months

174   to 11 years which may place an artificial endpoint on persistence estimations [see chapter 7 of

175   Baskin and Baskin (2014)]. It is often not known if burial experiments were planned for a set time

176   period and if the species investigated had some viable seeds beyond the experimental period. To

177   quote one example, seeds of *Chrysocephalum apiculatum* sown on the surface and buried at 5

178   cm depth had 36% and 61% viable seeds after 12 months respectively, but the experiments were

179   terminated and it remains unknown if this species can be included in short-term persistent or

180   persistent category (Lunt, 1995).

181   Besides the traditional estimation methods, several novel techniques show promise in

182   determining the seed persistence in soil. We searched the literature to identify new methods of

183   estimating seed persistence in soil and found 13 techniques that have been frequently used to

184   track seed movement in soil after dispersal, most of which are reviewed in Forget and Wenny

185   (2005). Some of these methods might also be used to estimate seed persistence, e.g. radio

186   tracking for larger seeds (Pons and Pausas, 2007). Given its ease and precision in identifying the

187   exact location of seeds, post-dispersal seeds can be recovered routinely after some time and

188   tested for viability. Dyeing seeds for consecutive years at the natural maturation time with different

189   colors each year before performing soil core analysis annually can also determine persistence

190   times although not all seeds can be recovered. The isotope method proposed by Carlo et al.

191   (2009), involves spraying 15N-urea during seed maturation and identifying the isotopically

192   enriched seedlings, but this technique could only determine the persistence time of germinated

193   seeds and information about seed death cannot be determined. However, it is of interest to note

194   that these methods have been used rarely for persistence estimation and incorporating them in

195   new attempts would go long way.

196   **Attempts to improve the description of seed persistence in the soil**

197   The problems with seed bank classifications have been acknowledged by previous researchers

198   and has resulted in attempts to coalesce the varying seed persistence estimates produced by

199   different methods, e.g. artificial burial, radiocarbon analysis, and removal of soil cores to identify

200   seeds. Thompson et al. (1998) developed a longevity index (LI) from the various persistence

201   classifications (i.e. transient, persistent) reported for a given species. The LI is the proportion of

202   the total number of published seed bank classifications (i.e. the sum of transient, short and long-

203   term persistent records) that are persistent and is expressed as a value between 0 (fully transient,

204   i.e. all the records reported transient seed bank type) and 1 (fully persistent, i.e. all the records

205   reported long-term persistent seed bank type). Although this technique reports seed persistence

206   on a continuous scale and has been widely used, Saatkamp et al. (2009) questioned the

207   approach, as the seed bank types suggested by their burial experiment did not agree with the LI

208   classification. This problem is likely to occur in many situations, as the new data generated for

209   persistence of a particular species would continue to alter the LI and there may be a bias, as

210   species of a certain type of habitat or with a certain type of seed persistence may be

211   overrepresented. Thus, we note that not only is the LI prone to errors based on how the estimates

212   of persistence were generated, it actually obscures important variation in seed traits that could

213   improve the application of seed persistence data to the predictive requirements of current

214   ecological research.

215   Various theoretical and/or mathematical models have been developed to predict the fate of seeds

216   after dispersal and until germination (Gardarin et al., 2012; Holzapfel et al., 2006). Whilst these

217   models are highly useful, their application to community ecology is still challenging, either due to

218   the limitations imposed by climatic regime, e.g. models developed for arid systems with seasonal

219   temperature extremes cannot be used for rainforests (Lampei et al., 2017), or restricted to specific

220   sets of species, e.g. weeds or annuals (Petrů et al., 2006). Furthermore, most models ignore the

221   fact that seeds can be dispersed to different environments or micro-sites, e.g. they might be

222   deeply buried, where persistence may be favored or seeds might die quickly (Saatkamp et al.,

223   2011; Vázquez-Yanes and Orozco-Segovia, 1982; Venable and Brown, 1993). In their recent

224   comprehensive review, Long et al. (2015) propose a theoretical framework for describing seed

225 persistence on a continuous scale that attempts to encompass all scenarios by identifying a wide

226 range of explanatory variables affecting persistence times. They conceptualize this as a three-

227 dimensional space in which seed persistence is determined by the interacting dimensions of

228 exposure to persistence-limiting variables and traits conferring resistance to seed death or

229 germination. This paper has made a significant contribution to our understanding of seed

230 persistence and certainly provides a more robust approach to predicting seed persistence, but we

231 argue that the resistance-exposure model has some limitations. The first is that it does not

232 explicitly state that seed persistence estimates are specific to one set of conditions and cannot

233 be automatically extrapolated to other situations. Seeds are known to persist longer in certain

234 micro-sites compared to others, but this has not been given any consideration by Long et al.

235 (2015) and other models available. Secondly, Long et al. (2015) suggest that hypothetically, a

236 given trait promoting persistence might offset an environmental parameter that limits seed

237 persistence; consequently, the model might be erroneously interpreted as a simple trade-off

238 between two opposing processes. In reality, persistence-limiting variables rarely work in isolation:

239 the response of seeds to changes in these conditions is rarely linear, and these variables may

240 become irrelevant above or below key thresholds and/or change in severity depending on the

241 levels of exposure to other persistence-limiting conditions. Thirdly, Long et al.'s (2015) model

242 assumes that conditions identified as 'exposure' parameters will always limit persistence thereby

243 reducing seed survival relative to the maximum seed longevity identified under controlled

244 conditions. However, it is possible that persistence may be promoted by certain variables or traits

245 that in other circumstances might also curtail survival e.g. they provide the example of seed coat

246 toughness, which can promote longevity by protecting the internal tissues of the seed, but can

247 also be a barrier to successful germination when soil moisture is too low to allow the seed coat to

248 split and the cotyledons to emerge.

249 **Defining seed persistence as a continuum**

250   In advocating the description of seed persistence as a continuous variable, we support the use of

251   the unit recommended by Long et al (2015) - the time period over which 50% of a population of

252   seeds have persisted since maturation on the parent plant. This type of metric is typical for any

253   process which has the potential to last for time periods which are practically impossible to

254   measure e.g. the decay of radioactive substances is expressed as the 'radioactive half-life'. This

255   measure has also been used previously, e.g. mortality over time in seeds stored in gene-banks

256   (Pritchard and Dickie, 2003), and whilst representing an arbitrary threshold of 50% survival,

257   avoids the complications presented by the 'long tail' of seed persistence estimates resulting from

258   the extremely long persistence of a small proportion of a population. Although this might be

259   perceived as obscuring some of the variation that this review emphasizes as being important, this

260   is the only feasible way of conveying seed persistence times. Where persistence times are

261   reported, they should be linked to the conditions under which the persistence estimate was made

262   in order to determine whether variation in persistence exists and whether this can be linked to

263   particular explanatory variables.

264

265

266   Figure 1. Scenarios of seed viability as a percentage of initial viability of a sample of seeds over

267   time (year) from point of maturation (t_0). Horizontal dashed line refers to 50% mortality or

268   germination; vertical dashed lines denote time at which 50% mortality or germination occurs for

269   three samples of seeds.

270   Figure 1 demonstrates how the persistence time (time taken since maturation for 50% of the

271   population to die) can be assigned to three samples of seeds. This hypothetical scenario borrows

272   the sigmoidal curve identified in seed decay in storage conditions (Mead and Gray 1999). The

273   three samples might represent different species or populations of the same species, or might

274   represent samples from plants of the same species and population but in different microsites.

275   Mean persistence time to 50% mortality or germination may be expressed with an appropriate

276   measure of variance around the mean. Thus, a proportion of seeds belonging to a particular

277   species might persist only until the growing season commences and the seeds are exposed to

278   the correct conditions for dormancy-break and germination. A small proportion of seeds could end

279   up in different micro-sites (where conditions for dormancy-break and germination did not occur)

280   and persist for longer time periods.   A relatively large variance around the mean of these

281   persistence times might indicate that persistence varied due to deterministic impacts of external

282   conditions or seed traits, or could be interpreted as evidence of stochastic variation in persistence

283   (see later sections of this article). Regardless of the magnitude of variance of persistence, and

284   the causal mechanisms underlying these patterns in seed survival, we intend to make it clear that

285   without such measures of seed persistence, we cannot hope to properly incorporate this crucial

286   plant trait alongside other indicators of plant response to their environment.

287   Many seed- and soil-related factors are variable both within sites and between years, and

288   therefore we concur with Long et al (2015) that there is a continuum of response with respect to

289   seed persistence. We also add that this response is variable both amongst and within species,

290   and that this requires the expression of seed persistence as a mean with associated variance,

291   but also that seed persistence is explicitly communicated as a response to a defined set of

292   conditions. We suggest that multivariate regression techniques are used to determine the relative

293   importance of different factors in explaining seed persistence such as (but not limited to) those

294   factors reviewed by Long et al (2015). The explicit link between seed persistence and the

295   surrounding environment allows extrapolation to other situations and can be incorporated into a

296   larger trait-level database. This would enable ecologists to confidently identify known persistence

297   times for species of interest, or failing this, identify species with similar traits and judge whether

298   estimates of seed persistence can be transferred and used in lieu of empirical data.

299   **The limited utility of seed persistence definitions in ecological research**

300   Whilst ecological research has failed to adequately incorporate seed persistence into theoretical

301   or empirical studies, ecologists are not entirely at fault because the existing literature on seed

302   persistence is surprisingly indiscriminate with regards to the endpoint of persistence – seed

303   persistence is defined as seed survival "from the time they reach maturity on the parent plant until

304   they germinate, are eaten or decayed, or age and die" (Long et al 2015). However, the distinction

305   between the two outcomes of germination *versus* seed death is critical to whether persistence is

306   contributing to population growth in the case of germination, or population decline if seeds die. If

307   certain conditions reliably cause death, seed banks could not contribute to maintaining or

308   increasing population growth rate and therefore fall outside of the species' niche. Conversely, a

309   germinated seed indicates that the individual plant has made it through the constraints of post-

310   dispersal survival to enter the regeneration phase, and has a chance to reproduce assuming that

311   the conditions characterising the niche at various subsequent life stages continues to be met. So

312   the current definition of persistence that ends with germination or seed death are of limited use

313   for ecological research because they allow persistence to be classified regardless of the outcome;

314   for example, the entirely opposing scenarios of 100% germination or 100% seed death within a

315   few years would both be classed as short-term persistent. Given that the relative proportion of

316   death or germination over the long-term defines whether the environment supports a source or

317   sink population, the conflation of seed death and germination is a major barrier to understanding

318   the niche of plants and consequently prevents the design of effective conservation management

319   programmes (Sutherland et al., 2006).

320 Determining whether seed persistence ends in death or germination also has implications for the

321 accuracy of estimations of persistence times. If a seed's existence in the soil ends with

322 germination, then the seed *may* have persisted for longer had suitable germination conditions not

323 arrived, and in this case, potential seed persistence until death will be underestimated. To

324 illustrate this point further, we highlight the seedbank duration data originally presented in the

325 LEDA Traitbase (Kleyer et al., 2008) and made available through the TRY Plant Trait Database

326 version 4.1 as Trait ID 2809 (Kattge et al., 2011). The complete dataset reported contains 38929

327 observations of seedbank duration (in months) for 1549 species (n varies from 1 to 439

328 observations per species; Figure 2). Each observation actually reports the time period after

329 dispersal or deliberate burial, to the point when seeds were sampled from the soil and successfully

330 germinated. The reporting of seedbank duration is potentially problematic because each reported

331 observation is the time at which the seeds were sampled and germinated, and not the potential

332 longevity of the seeds. There is no capacity to report sampling that did not result in germination,

333 i.e. the point at which seeds may all be dead. Whilst the LEDA and TRY databases provide

334 accompanying materials to explain this, it appears that errors of analysis and interpretation may

335 occur if researchers conflate this data with the accepted definition of seed persistence as ending

336 in germination or death. Figure 3 provides a visualisation of how these data might be

337 communicated – mean seedbank duration is the arithmetic mean of all observations per species

338 and maximum duration of the seedbank is the longest time period since seed burial reported for

339 each species. Mean seedbank duration is flawed because it implies an average survival when it

340 is actually the average time period for which seeds were buried and then dug up and germinated.

341 Maximum seedbank duration is more useful because it gives an indication of the potential seed

342 persistence, but cannot be linked to the many factors affecting seed survival detailed in this and

343 previous contributions (e.g. Long et al 2015). The reporting of seedbank duration as the point at

344 which seeds were deliberately germinated can confirm that the seedbank is still viable but cannot

345 convey for how much longer the seedbank might last.

346

Figure 2. Seedbank duration data (months) for all data as reported in the TRY Trait Database
(Kattge et al. 2011)

349

350

Figure 3. Seedbank duration reported in the LEDA traitbase (and available through TRY
database, see text for details) expressed as mean duration (months) per species against

15

353   maximum reported duration (months) for the same species. Replication varies considerably (n =

354   1 - 439 observations) per species.

355   The seedbank duration data presented in LEDA and TRY trait databases are an affirmation that

356   the seeds are still present and viable, but cannot convey actual persistence. This is akin to

357   measuring plant height regularly in the first few months-years of a plants life and expressing that

358   as the final plant height when actually the plant survives for many more years and attains heights

359   of 30 or 40 m. The difference of course is that we can see how tall a seedling might be by visual

360   comparison with mature examples surrounding it, but we can't see the seed bank or trace the age

361   without complicated methods (see above). Whilst seed researchers may recognise this problem

362   to be a property of the data necessitated by the methods available to us, the wider plant ecology

363   community might not, and would erroneously use these data with other traits to look at broader

364   ecological questions.

365   What is important is seed persistence until death, and what conditions cause death, because

366   these data allow us to build persistence decay curves that are tied to particular conditions. Whilst

367   monitoring seeds in their post-dispersal phase is extremely complicated, this does not mean that

368   measuring seed persistence is an impossible task. Although it is unfeasible to determine the

369   persistence ability of each seed dispersed from a plant, efforts should be channeled to understand

370   seed persistence at community level and comparisons on relevant ecosystems and co-existing

371   ability with other species.

372   **Niche theory and the importance of seed persistence**

373   Niche theory is around a century old (Wake et al., 2009) but producing accurate niche descriptions

374   has taken on renewed relevance with applications in niche modelling, evolutionary biology,

375   functional and community ecology, climate change science and paleoecology (Blonder, 2017). In

376   the following sections we aim to highlight different roles that seed persistence contributes in

377 improving niche descriptions of plants and moving ecological science further towards being a

378 predictive discipline.

Seed persistence is necessary to define the metapopulation niche

380 Where niche descriptions omit the role of seed banks in population persistence, the logical

381 outcome of temporary habitat unsuitability is population extinction, at least until immigration can

382 restore the population to that site. Whilst for animals this accurately explains metapopulation

383 dynamics, the description is inadequate for plants with a seed bank that can persist through

384 unsuitable growing conditions. Therefore, to describe the requirements of the entire

385 metapopulation, it is necessary to know the time periods over which seeds can typically persist in

386 different microhabitats in order to accurately define the species' or metapopulation niche.

387 Determining what is the appropriate time scale over which to describe the conditions required to

388 meet the species' niche draws parallels with Pulliam's (2000) theoretical treatment of spatial

389 dispersal: seed dispersal through space needs to be properly defined relative to the scale of

390 habitat patchiness to understand the difference between the realized and fundamental niches –

391 unoccupied suitable patches may be falsely assumed to be unsuitable unless dispersal limitation

392 is well-defined. Similarly, seeds may disperse through time by persisting in the soil but unless

393 the persistence time is long enough to coincide with suitable conditions for germination or growth,

394 the seeds will die. In other words, metapopulation niches have to be temporally- as well as

395 spatially-explicit to allow for proper predictions of metapopulation survival.

Seed persistence has not been adequately integrated into population growth definitions

397 Seed persistence has been incorporated in population growth models such as those by Chesson

398 (1994) which defined population growth of annual plant species as a function of environmental

399 suitability, and incorporated seed survival rate as the survival of seeds that do not germinate

400 during a defined time period over which the population growth rate was calculated. By

401 incorporating a temporal component, allowing for the existence of a seed bank and distinguishing

402 between seed death and germination Chesson's (1994) seed bank model presents our most

403 complete treatment of plant population dynamics. However, a number of refinements need to be

404 made to accurately represent the known properties of post-dispersal seed 'behaviour'.

405 Firstly, seed survival rate is assumed to be constant but this is likely to change depending on the

406 age of the seeds (Valleriani and Tielbörger, 2006), and will also change depending on

407 environmental conditions experienced by the seeds in the soil or other pressures impacting upon

408 seeds (see supplementary data). As long as the aboveground population's niche requirements

409 are met, the age of the seeds is apparently not important for understanding population survival,

410 but has significant implications where the vegetation fails to regenerate or recruit as seed

411 persistence will become the mechanism by which the population might recover. However, the

412 relative contribution of seeds from different cohorts is impossible to discern based purely on in-

413 soil abundance which is a measure often relied upon to describe the seed bank of a species, and

414 regular inputs will mask the relative contribution of seeds that are of older cohorts. Therefore, to

415 properly describe population growth, the survival of seeds of differing ages needs to be better

416 understood.

417 In situations where the aboveground vegetation has entirely died out, the shape of the survival

418 decay curve following the last input of seeds not only defines how long there might be a viable

419 seed bank, it also dictates whether it is likely that viable seeds will be present in enough numbers

420 to enable population recovery should suitable conditions return. Seed survival in *ex situ* storage

421 (i.e. in cool, dry conditions) generally follows a normally distributed sigmoid curve if all the seeds

422 in a sample are viable at the point of being stored (Mead and Gray, 1999). But *in situ* persistence

423 may vary and consequently, seed survival rates used in population projections must account for

424 a variability depending on the shape of the mortality curves and the abundance of seeds in the

425 soil relative to the last input of seeds from the parent plant community.

Seed persistence contributes to both stochastic and deterministic components of the niche

We can safely assume that there are several, and possibly very many, parameters that determine seed persistence. However, seed survival in the soil is not an entirely deterministic phenomenon and drawing further on the parallels between temporal seed persistence and spatial propagule dispersal suggests that there will be a strong stochastic component to seed persistence. As a consequence of this stochasticity, it is tempting to disregard seed persistence as a critical part of the species' niche especially given that seed persistence may be a weaker filter of population survival compared to other life stages where deterministic niche requirements are narrower. However, separating the proportion of seed persistence variability that is simply stochastic, from that which is deterministic, is key to not only predict expected seed persistence, but also, the typical *variation* in persistence times under specified conditions. The stochastic element of seed survival in the soil has the potential to contribute to niche theory by forming a mechanism that might acknowledge the roles of both deterministic niche theory and neutral theory in explaining patterns of occurrence.

Another implication of the existence of stochasticity in seed persistence is the survival of the metapopulation. Where several populations in a locality, a metapopulation, respond deterministically to the same conditions, we might expect that these populations have a high level of synchrony within scales that those deterministic variables operate (Liebhold et al., 2004). Population synchrony is associated with higher extinction risk because events causing mortality at landscape or regional scales are likely to affect all populations equally severely and leads to loss of the metapopulation as a whole. Consequently, metapopulation survival is promoted by an optimal level of asynchrony between subpopulations (Heino et al., 1997; Lande et al., 2003) and given that seed persistence is potentially an important source of demographic stochasticity, it is likely to contribute to avoiding local extinctions by reducing population synchrony.

451 Careful experimentation can uncover some of the explanatory variables of persistence but cannot

452 represent the many different influential conditions that seeds are subjected to. Additionally, study

453 duration is generally too short to encompass long persistence times. To address this constraint,

454 distinguishing deterministic from stochastic processes can be achieved by understanding if

455 species' distributions respond to environmental gradients, or if neutral models of stochastic

456 processes can be assumed to explain distribution patterns (Chase and Myers, 2011). Whilst

457 deterministic responses are either already described, or relatively easy to describe, for

458 aboveground vegetation, the response in terms of seed persistence relies on advances in

459 describing the seed persistence niche to discern where environmental tolerances lie and how they

460 might impact upon species response to environmental change.

461 **Applications and further research**

462 Understanding seed persistence in soil has many ecological applications, and thus, failure to

463 predict which species might persist in different microenvironments hampers our ability to model

464 population dynamics and manage focal species and communities. For example, inaccurate seed

465 persistence predictions may lead to i) misapplied and costly weed management, ii) the failure of

466 threatened species reintroductions in environments with high interannual variation where a seed

467 bank is key to survival, iii) the unanticipated release of an invasive species from regeneration

468 constraints, iv) the restoration of vegetation that is less diverse and functionally inferior than the

469 original community, and v) erroneous predictions of plant community response as climate change

470 progresses. Below we outline some practical suggestions that we hope to further the study of

471 seed persistence and integration of this important trait with other aspects of plant biology.

472   (1) Focus on species that are declining

473 Whilst it is impossible to describe the persistence ability of 350,000 angiosperm species, it is

474 pragmatic to prioritise which species should form the basis of study. Previous investigations have

475 estimated persistence ability of seeds for various purposes, not limited to, but including ecological

476 restoration, community ecology, threatened plant conservation, species distribution and

477 community co-existence, weed management, seed pathogens effect, seed loss via soil erosion,

478 responses to changes in flooding and the impacts of subterranean animals on soil seed banks.

479 These studies are essential, but we propose that estimating persistence of declining species

480 should be prioritized, especially those showing negative responses to recent climate change. A

481 decline in abundance indicates that the species no longer occupies its niche space, either for

482 germination or growth and/or the space of the realised niche has become smaller. This may have

483 resulted from changing climate, species competition, change in soil properties or seasonal

484 change. Targeting these species might inform the critical role of seed persistence in species that

485 are demonstrably vulnerable to environmental changes.

486   (2) Determine persistence using more than one method

487 Given that the methods available to estimate soil seed persistence carry limitations, a combined

488 approach tailored to the species in question is recommended. For example, if soil-core extraction

489 had shown that seeds of a particular species can be found at various depths, then artificially

490 burying the seeds to all the possible depths and estimating the viability is an appropriate method

491 for exploring persistence variation. The critical question of how long the artificial burial

492 experiments must be conducted requires careful thought. Current categorization of seed-banks

493 limits the duration of studies to 5 years, and experimental work typically reports this at one depth.

494 Our alternative suggestion of using various depths based on soil-core exhumation, informs the

495 longevity of seeds in the soil at different micro-climates occurring at different depths. Thus, efforts

496 should be channeled to bury the seeds for longer than 5 years to determine longevity with seed

497 extraction every 3 months during first two years and annually after that until 5 years and biannually

498 after that until 90% of the seeds have died or germinated. In addition to germination experiments,

499 methods such as tetrazolium test could be incorporated to distinguish whether the seeds have

500   died or remain viable. Also, we suggest burying seeds at several locations, as seeds can disperse

501   and consequently be exposed to different, and maybe even novel, micro-conditions.

502   (3) Distinguishing persistence and longevity of seeds in the soil

503   Although we acknowledge that proportions of germinating seed are often reported as affirmation

504   of survival to a specified time point, and in the best examples, viability testing is used to discern

505   mortality of seeds in the ungerminated proportion, there is still confusion with regards to the end

506   point of persistence that has the potential to make definitions unworkable. For example, in Long

507   et al (2015), seed persistence is defined as "The survival of seeds from the time they reach

508   maturity on the parent plant until they germinate, are eaten or decayed, or age and die." (see

509   Table 1, p.35 of Long et al. 2015). So whilst we know that seed ecologists do indeed know the

510   difference between seed death and germination, for seed traits to be incorporated into other

511   analyses, particularly large trait-based studies, we think that definitions need to be made more

512   specific. To this end, we recommend that seed persistence is reported with respect to a defined

513   end point, and this may be germination, predation or other destruction, whilst seed longevity is

514   reserved for persistence until death (whether this is in situ or ex situ).

515   (4) Incorporate seed traits into persistence estimation

516   Saatkamp et al. (2018) lists the following traits that contribute to persistence: seed size, seed

517   mass, germination speed, seed metabolic rate, serotiny, seed coat thickness, dispersal potential,

518   response to chemical cues, seed nutrient content, seasonality of seed release, seed coat

519   permeability, seed shape, seed defense, seed defenses, longevity. In addition to this, we note

520   that dispersal structures, ability to remain attached to covering structures, e.g. pods, ability to

521   withstand drying, i.e. orthodox or recalcitrant, germination requirement, e.g. light/dark or

522   appropriate temperature might also play crucial role in determining the entry and exit of seeds in

523   the soil. Incorporating these traits into persistence estimation could likely inform what species

524 might become extinct and appropriate conservation plans to be developed. To this end, the

525 literature on seed persistence contains some generalizable theories on what traits confer

526 persistence. For example, seeds with impermeable coats show higher ability to persist in soil,

527 whereas seeds that are desiccation-sensitive, i.e. recalcitrant germinate or die immediately after

528 dispersal and therefore persist in soil for a maximum of few months (Baskin and Baskin, 2014).

529 However, relationships between persistence and other seed traits are not so straightforward.

530 Thus, much information is required at community level and our knowledge gap raises further

531 questions that can be only answered with further studies:

532 (a) What are the additional seed traits that drive seed persistence?

533 (b) Do plants in different life-forms differ in seed persistence?

534 (c) Is there a relationship between ecosystem functioning and seed persistence

535 ability?

536 (d) What are the large-scale phylogenetic patterns of seed persistence?

537 **Concluding remarks**

538 Every aspect of climate, seed position, potential for dormancy, time since dispersal, pathogen

539 loadings, seed predation, seed morphology and soil characteristics can interact positively and

540 negatively to result in variation in seed persistence even amongst individuals of the same species.

541 For this reason, the factors influencing soil seed persistence can be conceptualized as a multi-

542 dimensional hyperspace similar to those constructed to describe a plant's niche, and the

543 awareness that different factors may shift in their relative importance depending on timing and

544 environment is similarly appropriate. When a particular species is studied by including all the seed

545 and soil related parameters that are known to affect persistence, it would become apparent that

546 a continuum of response might exist with all seeds germinating soon after dispersal in one set of

547 conditions and most seeds persisting for long time periods in another set of conditions. We

548 strongly recommend that these parameters are included in species-level niche descriptions and

549 that our insights into the importance of deterministic factors affecting persistence, and the

550 potential for demographic stochasticity to be introduced as a result of variable seed persistence,

551 are exposed to a wide spectrum of researchers of plant ecology. The inclusion of seed persistence

552 in niche descriptions will be an important step in moving ecology and niche theory from descriptive

553 to predictive (Gewin, 2006) over 100 years since niche concept emerged (Wake et al 2009), and

554 40 years since Grubb's inception of the regeneration niche (Grubb 1977). Given that our

555 environment is a dynamic and shifting system, categorizations of seed persistence cannot convey

556 the variation in response to a seed's environment and a more nuanced understanding of seed

557 persistence embracing our perception of soil seed survival as a 'continuum' is necessary to

558 understand and predict species and community response, and protect our ecological systems

559 under global environmental change.

560 **Conflict of interest**

561 None.

562 **Authors contribution**

563 GKJ and SED contributed equally to the development of ideas and writing. GB and JK maintain

564 TRY-database, provided the data for analysis presented in figures 2 and 3 and helped with

565 revision. We also sincerely thank two anonymous reviewers, especially one reviewer during

566 revision, for their constructive comments on an earlier version of the manuscript.

567 **Supplementary Data**

568 Table 1. Important factors known to affect the entry and exit of seeds in the soil.

569 **Acknowledgements**

References

579 Bakker, J., Poschlod, P., Strykstra, R., Bekker, R., Thompson, K., 1996. Seed banks and seed
580 dispersal: important topics in restoration ecology. Acta Botanica Neerlandica 45, 461-490.
581 Bakker, J.P., 1989. Nature management by grazing and cutting. Kluwer Academic Publishers,
582 Dordrecht.
583 Baskin, C.C., Baskin, J.M., 2006. The natural history of soil seed banks of arable land. Weed
584 Science 54, 549-557.
585 Baskin, C.C., Baskin, J.M., 2014. Seeds: Ecology, Biogeography and Evolution of Dormancy
586 and Germination, Second ed. Elsevier, San Diego, USA.
587 Bekker, R., Bakker, J., Grandin, U., Kalamees, R., Milberg, P., Poschlod, P., Thompson, K.,
588 Willems, J., 1998. Seed size, shape and vertical distribution in the soil: indicators of seed
589 longevity. Functional Ecology 12, 834-842.
590 Benech-Arnold, R.L., Sánchez, R.A., Forcella, F., Kruk, B.C., Ghersa, C.M., 2000.
591 Environmental control of dormancy in weed seed banks in soil. Field Crops Research 67, 105-
592 122.
593 Blonder, B., 2017. Hypervolume concepts in niche-and trait-based ecology. Ecography 26,
594 1071-1075.
595 Chambers, J.C., MacMahon, J.A., 1994. A day in the life of a seed: movements and fates of
596 seeds and their implications for natural and managed systems. Annual review of Ecology and
597 Systematics 25, 263-292.
598 Chase, J.M., Myers, J.A., 2011. Disentangling the importance of ecological niches from
599 stochastic processes across scales. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London
600 B: Biological Sciences 366, 2351-2363.
601 Chesson, P., 1994. Multispecies competition in variable environments. Theoretical Population
602 Biology 45, 227-276.
603 Cochrane, A., Yates, C.J., Hoyle, G.L., Nicotra, A.B., 2015. Will among-population variation in
604 seed traits improve the chance of species persistence under climate change? Global Ecology
605 and Biogeography 24, 12-24.
606 Csontos, P., Tamás, J., 2003. Comparisons of soil seed bank classification systems. Seed
607 Science Research 13, 101-111.
608 Gardarin, A., Dürr, C., Colbach, N., 2012. Modeling the dynamics and emergence of a
609 multispecies weed seed bank with species traits. Ecological Modelling 240, 123-138.
610 Gewin, V., 2006. Beyond neutrality—ecology finds its niche. PLoS Biology 4, e278.
611 Gremer, J.R., Venable, D.L., 2014. Bet hedging in desert winter annual plants: optimal
612 germination strategies in a variable environment. Ecology Letters 17, 380-387.
613 Grime, J., 1981. The role of seed dormancy in vegetation dynamics. Annals of Applied Biology
614 98, 555-558.
615 Grubb, P.J., 1977. The maintenance of species-richness in plant communities: the importance
616 of the regeneration niche. Biological Reviews 52, 107-145.

617 Hawkins, T.S., Baskin, J.M., Baskin, C.C., 2007. Seed morphology, germination phenology, and
618 capacity to form a seed bank in six herbaceous layer Apiaceae species of the Eastern
619 Deciduous Forest. Castanea 72, 8-14.
620 Heino, M., Kaitala, V., Ranta, E., Lindström, J., 1997. Synchronous dynamics and rates of
621 extinction in spatially structured populations. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B:
622 Biological Sciences 264, 481-486.
623 Holt, R.D., 1990. The microevolutionary consequences of climate change. Trends in Ecology
624 and Evolution 5, 311-315.
625 Holzapfel, C., Tielbörger, K., Parag, H.A., Kigel, J., Sternberg, M., 2006. Annual plant–shrub
626 interactions along an aridity gradient. Basic and Applied Ecology 7, 268-279.
627 Jaganathan, G.K., Dalrymple, S.E., Liu, B., 2015. Towards an understanding of factors
628 controlling seed bank composition and longevity in the alpine environment. The Botanical
629 Review 81, 70-103.
630 Jiménez-Alfaro, B., Silveira, F.A., Fidelis, A., Poschlod, P., Commander, L.E., 2016. Seed
631 germination traits can contribute better to plant community ecology. Journal of Vegetation
632 Science 27, 637-645.
633 Kattge, J., Diaz, S., Lavorel, S., Prentice, I.C., Leadley, P., Bönisch, G., Garnier, E., Westoby,
634 M., Reich, P.B., Wright, I.J., 2011. TRY–a global database of plant traits. Global Change
635 Biology 17, 2905-2935.
636 Kleyer, M., Bekker, R., Knevel, I., Bakker, J., Thompson, K., Sonnenschein, M., Poschlod, P.,
637 Van Groenendael, J., Klimeš, L., Klimešová, J., 2008. The LEDA Traitbase: a database of life-
638 history traits of the Northwest European flora. Journal of Ecology 96, 1266-1274.
639 Lampei, C., Metz, J., Tielbörger, K., 2017. Clinal population divergence in an adaptive parental
640 environmental effect that adjusts seed banking. New Phytologist 214, 1230-1244.
641 Lande, R., Engen, S., Saether, B.-E., 2003. Stochastic population dynamics in ecology and
642 conservation. Oxford University Press on Demand.
643 Liebhold, A., Koenig, W.D., Bjørnstad, O.N., 2004. Spatial synchrony in population dynamics.
644 Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics 35, 467-490.
645 Long, R.L., Gorecki, M.J., Renton, M., Scott, J.K., Colville, L., Goggin, D.E., Commander, L.E.,
646 Westcott, D.A., Cherry, H., Finch-Savage, W.E., 2015. The ecophysiology of seed persistence:
647 a mechanistic view of the journey to germination or demise. Biological Reviews 90, 31-59.
648 Mead, A., Gray, D., 1999. Prediction of seed longevity: a modification of the shape of the Ellis
649 and Roberts seed survival curves. Seed Science Research 9, 63-73.
650 Petrů, M., Tielbörger, K., Belkin, R., Sternberg, M., Jeltsch, F., 2006. Life history variation in an
651 annual plant under two opposing environmental constraints along an aridity gradient. Ecography
652 29, 66-74.
653 Poschlod, P., Jackel, A., 1993. The dynamics of the generative diaspore bank of calcareous
654 grassland plants. 1. Seasonal dynamics of diaspore rain and diaspore bank in 2 calcareous
655 grassland sites of the suebian-alb. Flora 188, 49-71.
656 Pritchard, H.W., Dickie, J.B., 2003. Predicting seed longevity: the use and abuse of seed
657 viability equations, in: Smith, R.D., Dickie, J.B., Linington, S.H., Pritchard, H.W., Probert, R.J.
658 (Eds.), Seed conservation: turning science into practice. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, London:
659 Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, pp. 653-722.
660 Pulliam, H.R., 2000. On the relationship between niche and distribution. Ecology letters 3, 349-
661 361.
662 Roberts, H., 1981. Seed banks in soils. Advances in Applied Biology 6, 1-55.
663 Saatkamp, A., Affre, L., Baumberger, T., Dumas, P.-J., Gasmi, A., Gachet, S., Arène, F., 2011.
664 Soil depth detection by seeds and diurnally fluctuating temperatures: different dynamics in 10
665 annual plants. Plant and Soil 349, 331-340.

666 Saatkamp, A., Affre, L., Dutoit, T., Poschlod, P., 2009. The seed bank longevity index revisited:
667 limited reliability evident from a burial experiment and database analyses. Annals of Botany 104,
668 715-724.
669 Saatkamp, A., Cochrane, A., Commander, L., Guja, L.K., Jimenez-Alfaro, B., Larson, J., Nicotra,
670 A., Poschlod, P., Silveira, F.A., Cross, A.T., 2018. A research agenda for seed-trait functional
671 ecology. New Phytologist.
672 Sutherland, W.J., ARMSTRONG-BROWN, S., Armsworth, P.R., Tom, B., Brickland, J.,
673 Campbell, C.D., Chamberlain, D.E., Cooke, A.I., Dulvy, N.K., Dusic, N.R., 2006. The
674 identification of 100 ecological questions of high policy relevance in the UK. Journal of Applied
675 Ecology 43, 617-627.
676 Thompson, K., 2000. The functional ecology of soil seed banks, in: Fenner, M. (Ed.), Seeds: the
677 ecology of regeneration in plant communities. CABI pp. 215-235.
678 Thompson, K., Bakker, J.P., Bekker, R.M., 1997. The soil seed banks of North West Europe:
679 methodology, density and longevity. Cambridge Univ Pr.
680 Thompson, K., Grime, J.P., 1979. Seasonal variation in the seed banks of herbaceous species
681 in ten contrasting habitats. The Journal of Ecology 67, 893-921.
682 Valleriani, A., Tielbörger, K., 2006. Effect of age on germination of dormant seeds. Theoretical
683 Population Biology 70, 1-9.
684 Vázquez-Yanes, C., Orozco-Segovia, A., 1982. Seed germination of a tropical rain forest
685 pioneer tree (*Heliocarpus donnell*-smithii) in response to diurnal fluctuation of temperature.
686 Physiologia Plantarum 56, 295-298.
687 Venable, D., Brown, J., 1993. The population-dynamic functions of seed dispersal. Vegetatio
688 107, 31-55.
689 Venable, D.L., Brown, J.S., 1988. The selective interactions of dispersal, dormancy, and seed
690 size as adaptations for reducing risk in variable environments. The American Naturalist 131,
691 360-384.
692 Wake, D.B., Hadly, E.A., Ackerly, D.D., 2009. Biogeography, changing climates, and niche
693 evolution. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 106, 19631-19636.
694 Walck, J.L., Baskin, J.M., Baskin, C.C., Hidayati, S.N., 2005. Defining transient and persistent
695 seed banks in species with pronounced seasonal dormancy and germination patterns. Seed
696 Science Research 15, 189-196.
697 Walck, J.L., Hidayati, S.N., Dixon, K.W., Thompson, K., Poschlod, P., 2011. Climate change
698 and plant regeneration from seed. Global Change Biology 17, 2145-2161.

699

700