

1 **Transferring Atlantic maritime pine improved material to a region with marked**
2 **Mediterranean influence in inland NW Spain. A likelihood-based approach on spatially**
3 **adjusted field data**

4
5 Raúl de la Mata^{1*}, Rafael Zas²

6
7 ¹ Centro de Investigación Forestal de Lourizán. Apdo. 127, 36080 Pontevedra, Spain; E-mail:
8 rmata.cifal@siam-cma.org.

9 ² Misión Biológica de Galicia. CSIC. Apdo. 28, 36080. Pontevedra, Spain. E-mail:
10 rzas@mbg.cesga.es.

11

12 * to whom correspondence should be addressed. Current address: Misión Biológica de
13 Galicia. CSIC. Apdo. 28, 36080. Pontevedra, Spain; phone: +34 986 854800.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **Abstract**

2 The inland region of Galicia (NW Spain), marks the boundary between the Atlantic climate of
3 the coastal area and the typical Mediterranean climate of central Spain. Compared to the
4 Atlantic coast, climate in this area has a pronounced summer drought, lower annual
5 precipitation, and higher annual thermal oscillation. Despite the high productivity and
6 ecological importance of maritime pine in inland Galicia, local forest reproductive material
7 (FRM) of high genetic quality is not available for this area. Seed sources originating
8 elsewhere and of unknown adaptation to this area are commonly used for reforestation. With
9 the aim of finding new sources of FRM for this region and exploiting the genetic gains of
10 existing breeding programmes, we analyzed the performance in field conditions of improved
11 families of the Coastal Galicia (CG) and Western Australia (WA) breeding programmes.
12 Growth, stem characteristics and branch habit were evaluated in 5 progeny trials established
13 following a coastal-to-inland gradient. Likelihood-based analyses were used to estimate
14 genetic correlations between environments and to test statistically for causes and patterns of
15 genotype \times environment interaction. Because of the strong non-random spatial structures and
16 heterogeneity of residual variances, the analyses were carried out using heterogeneous
17 residual variance mixed models on spatially adjusted data. The results indicated that there is
18 not sufficient evidence to subdivide Galicia into the two current deployment areas. Interaction
19 patterns do not reveal significant differences between zones, and crossover interactions for
20 height growth are present both between and within areas. On the inland sites, the Atlantic
21 improved materials clearly outperformed unimproved seedlots tested in adjacent provenance
22 trials, suggesting the feasibility of using both the CG and WA breeding materials as sources
23 of FRM for reforestation in inland Galicia. Of the two, the WA material showed excellent
24 results for all traits. The inclusion of this material into the Galician maritime pine breeding
25 population should be strongly considered.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Keywords: *Pinus pinaster*, progeny trial, iterative spatial analysis, genotype × environment interaction, spatial autocorrelation, REML estimation, genetic correlation, variance-covariance matrix, heterogeneous variance models

1. Introduction

Maritime pine (*Pinus pinaster* Ait.) is one of the most important forestry species in Galicia (NW Spain) where nearly 400.000 ha of pure and mixed stands are present (27% of the wooded area in Galicia), producing up to $2 \cdot 10^6$ m³ of round-wood per year (Sanz et al. 2006). Galicia is located in the extreme North West of Spain and is typically characterized by an Atlantic climate, although two main climatic regions can be distinguished. The coastal region (up to 600 m above sea level) has high annual rainfall (1500-2500 mm) and short annual thermal oscillation (10-11 °C), corresponding with Regions of Identification and Utilization (RIUs) of forest reproductive material number one and three (Figure 1) (García et al. 2001). The inland region of Galicia (corresponding with RIU number two, Figure 1) is a boundary area where the Atlantic climate of the coastal area meets with the typical Mediterranean climate of Central Spain. Climate in this area has a pronounced summer drought (summer precipitation of 60-100 mm), lower annual precipitation (600-1200 mm), and higher annual thermal oscillation (13-14 °C) owing to the greater continental influence. Maritime pine is abundant and has large productive relevance in both areas. Previous studies have identified important differences in terms of growth patterns and genetic structure between both regions (Alía et al. 1996; Álvarez-Gonzalez et al. 2005).

A genetic improvement programme of *P. pinaster* in the coastal area of Galicia was initiated in 1985. It has included phenotypic mass selection in wild stands and use of this material for seed production in clonal seed orchards. The breeding objectives were focused

1 mainly on improving growth traits, stem form, and branch quality (Zas and Merlo 2008). By
2 contrast, in the inland area, although the annual rate of plantation is also high, local
3 reproductive material of good quality is not available. Foresters need to introduce material
4 from other Spanish provenances, often with questionable adaptation to this area, and typically
5 showing low growth rates and being of poor quality stem form. Looking for alternative
6 material that performs well in the inland region has become a primary objective in order to
7 provide immediate seed sources suitable for planting in this area.

8 The coastal region breeding programme has been progressing in recent years, based on
9 the results of a series of progeny trials established in the coastal area. Using the information
10 obtained in these trials a new depurate clonal seed orchard has been recently installed, and the
11 selection of a second breeding generation has been started (Zas and Merlo 2008). The
12 important gains and good results achieved in the Coastal area encourage us to explore the
13 possibility of using the coastal breeding material in the inland region, combining the breeding
14 efforts and minimizing the overall costs. Galicia would constitute a single breeding area, and
15 new material for the inland region would be available in a short space of time. However, the
16 coastal seed orchard's families have only been tested in the coastal zone, and no information
17 is available regarding their performance within the inland region. Previous results revealed a
18 large genotype \times environment (G \times E) interaction in the breeding population both in field
19 conditions within the coastal area (Zas et al. 2004; Martíns et al. 2009), and in a drought
20 experiment under controlled conditions (Zas and Fernández-López 2005). However, G \times E
21 interaction was found to be originated by a small number of families especially sensitive to
22 environmental variation, whereas most of the families tested showed a stable behaviour.
23 Selecting for stability has been thus suggested as an option for obtaining material suitable for
24 both climatic regions (Zas and Fernández-López 2005).

1 A breeding programme in Western Australia (WA) started in the 1950s using a plus
2 tree selection from within the Leiria (Portugal) provenance, and has now completed several
3 breeding selection cycles, achieving important genetic gains in growth, stem form and
4 branching habit (Butcher 2007; Butcher and Hopkins 1993; Perry and Hopkins 1967). The
5 Leiria provenance is a clear Atlantic provenance, whereas the current areas reforested with *P.*
6 *pinaster* in WA are medium-low rainfall (400-600 mm) ex-agricultural sites with a marked
7 Mediterranean influence (Butcher 2007). Drought tolerance is therefore an important trait for
8 selection in this breeding programme (Butcher 2007; Butcher and Chandler 2007). The WA
9 example therefore supports the feasibility of achieving successful results through recurrent
10 selection upon Atlantic material for use in more Mediterranean conditions with strong
11 summer droughts (Butcher 2007; Butcher and Chandler 2007).

12 The present study aims to assess the field performance of improved materials with
13 different levels of selection (Coastal Galician (CG) and Western Australia (WA) breeding
14 programmes) in the inland region of Galicia. We also analyzed in detail the magnitude [and](#)
15 relevance of the G×E interaction within and between the two current deployments areas
16 (Coastal and Inland Galicia) in order to assess the suitability of this zonification. To this end
17 we evaluated the performance of 111 half-sib CG *P. pinaster* families and six WA families in
18 five sites, two located in the coastal and three in the inland region of Galicia, three and seven
19 years after planting. The feasibility of the Atlantic breeding materials in the inland sites was
20 assessed through comparisons with unimproved seed sources planted in adjacent provenance
21 trials.

22

23 **2. Material and methods**

24 **2.1. Genetic material and test sites**

1 The study material consists of half sib families obtained from 111 selected plus trees
2 represented in a first generation clonal seed orchard (Sergude, 42.82° N, 8.45° W) which
3 provide high genetic quality seed for reforestation in the coastal area of Galicia (Figure 1). All
4 these plus trees were individually selected from natural stands or from plantations within the
5 Atlantic region of Galicia, for their superior growth, stem form, and branch characteristics.

6 In addition, six improved families from the WA breeding programme were also
7 included in all the trials (WA1-WA6). The six families were open pollinated in the second
8 generation clonal seed orchard at Manjimup (34.24° S, 116.14° E, Western Australia). Parents
9 were selected for vigour, stem form, small branching and resistance to drought within family
10 trials established in WA upon open or cross pollinations between the original plus trees
11 selected in Leiría and plus trees selected within the WA land race. Seedlot WA6 was a
12 mixture of different families and can be considered to be representative of the average
13 performance for the Manjimup clonal seed orchard (T. Butcher, personal communication).

14 One and a half year old containerized seedlings of the 111 half-sib families and of the
15 WA material were planted in five sites in 2001. Site characteristics are presented in Table 1.
16 Daneiro and Laracha sites were within the RIU number 1 which constitutes, a priori, the
17 deployment area for the selected material of the coastal seed orchards (Figure 1). These sites
18 have a typical Atlantic climate characterized by high annual precipitation, low summer
19 drought, and low temperature oscillation (Table 1). The other three sites, Becerreá, Guntín
20 and Laza, were located within the RIU number 2 which includes most of the inland area of
21 Galicia, and constitutes a transitional region towards the more continental and Mediterranean
22 climate characteristics of the central areas of the Iberian Peninsula, with prolonged summer
23 drought and wide thermal oscillation (Table 1). Becerreá is the coldest site while Guntín and
24 Laza show low annual and summer precipitation, with Laza being the drier of the two.

1 All five plantations follow a randomized complete block design with 25 replications
2 (except Daneiro, with 23 replications) of one tree-plots with 3x2 m spacing (except Laza, with
3 2.5x2 m spacing), which is the typical spacing for *P. pinaster* plantations in this region.

4 In the three inland sites, a provenance trial was simultaneously planted adjacent to the
5 progeny trials. Six Spanish provenances (Bajo Tiétar, Sierra de Gredos, Montaña de Soria-
6 Burgos, Serranía de Cuenca, Albarracín and Sierra Segura-Alcaraz) of the Mediterranean area
7 were tested in each site. These provenances were selected on the basis of their quality for
8 timber production within their natural stands and of their performance in previous provenance
9 trials (Alía et al. 2001; Molina 1965). All three trials follow a randomized complete block
10 design with 10 replications and 5 tree-row-plots. Seedlings of these provenance trials were
11 cultivated together with the progenies following the same nursery protocols. Both the progeny
12 and the provenance trials were planted at the same time, with the same spacing and soil
13 preparation, and were measured at the same dates. Data from these trials were used to predict
14 the performance of unimproved seed sources, to with compare the Atlantic materials (see
15 below). A specific analysis of these provenance trials are presented in a companion paper (de
16 la Mata and Zas 2009).

18 **2.2. Assessments**

19 All trees from each site were assessed for growth, stem form and branch characteristics at age
20 3 and 7, except those dead or badly suppressed. Growth traits included total height (H)
21 measured with a pole in centimetres and diameter at breast height (D) measured with a
22 calliper in millimetres (only assessed at age 7). Stem form and branch traits were assessed
23 following Galera et al. (1997). Stem form of each tree was evaluated by a straightness score
24 (STR: 1 = straight to 6 = very crooked) and a stem leaning score (LEN: 1 = vertical to 4 =
25 severe lean). The number of whorls (WH) was also recorded as a measure of the branch

1 abundance. The spatial position of each tree was determined using a total station (Pentax R-
2 315).

3 The two coastal sites, Daneiro and Laracha, were significantly affected by pests and
4 diseases, so were only assessed at age 3. Trees in Daneiro were attacked by the large pine
5 weevil, *Hylobius abietis* L., which kills trees by girdling the stem of the young seedlings. In
6 Laracha, the root rot fungus *Armillaria ostoyae* (Romagn.) Herink caused the death of up to
7 65% of the plants three years after planting (see Zas et al. 2007). In addition the Becerreá
8 provenance trial was affected by the construction of a forest access track in 2005, affecting
9 several of the trial trees. Data on provenance performance in this site is only available for the
10 three year-old assessment.

11

12 **2.3. Statistical analyses**

13 ***Correcting the spatial dependence***

14 We examined the spatial structure of the dependent variable in each site by constructing the
15 empirical semivariogram for the residuals adjusted for family effects with the SAS VARIOGRAM
16 procedure (SAS-Institute 1999). Those variables that were spatially dependent were corrected
17 using the Iterative Spatial Analysis (ISA) method (Zas 2006). Briefly, this method first fits a
18 theoretical semivariogram model to the observed residual semivariogram using the SAS NLIN
19 procedure (SAS-Institute 1999). Using the theoretical semivariogram model, the spatial
20 variation of the dependent variable is then modelled by the kriging method using the KRIG2D
21 procedure of SAS (SAS-Institute 1999). The original variable is then adjusted for its spatial
22 autocorrelation, subtracting the kriging estimate in each position. Finally, the new corrected
23 variable is reanalyzed and a new estimate of the family effects is obtained, and used to
24 generate new residuals. The process is repeated iteratively, until convergence of the BLUPs
25 estimates of family effects. A detailed description of the method can be consulted in Zas

1 (2006). The spatial adjustment was carried out for each site independently, including both the
2 trees of the progeny and the adjacent provenance trials, and considering a single genetic effect
3 (family or provenance) to obtain the original residuals. **Once the dependent variable was**
4 **spatially corrected, the progeny and provenance trials were analyzed independently as shown**
5 **in the following sections.**

6

7 ***Likelihood-based analyses of the site by family interaction***

8 Spatially adjusted data (**for traits with non random spatial structures**), or original
9 **unadjusted data (for spatially independent traits)**, were analyzed by fitting mixed models with
10 site as a fixed factor, and block within site, family and family \times site interaction as random
11 factors (Crossa et al. 2004; Yang 2002). The mixed models were fitted using the MIXED
12 procedure of SAS (Littell et al., 2006), accommodating the SAS Programmes of Yang (2002)
13 to our experimental design. Variance components were estimated using the REML method.
14 The estimation of the family covariance structure (variances and covariance across sites) was
15 achieved by including the SUBJECT and TYPE option in the RANDOM statement. Heterogeneity
16 of residual variances across sites was implemented with the GROUP option of the REPEATED
17 statement. Initial values (derived from single site analyses) were specified in the PARMS
18 statement to facilitate convergence and speed calculations.

19 In order to explore and interpret the G \times E interaction, different reduced models constraining
20 different elements of the family covariance structure were fitted. Constraints to the family
21 covariance structures were specified by choosing appropriate predefined covariance models
22 for the TYPE option in the RANDOM statement, and/or by fixing specific covariance parameters
23 to certain values using the HOLD option of the PARMS statement (Crossa et al. 2004; Fry 2004;
24 Yang 2002). **Out-of-bond family correlations (> 1 , or < -1) were avoided by including the**
25 **UPPERB and LOWERB option in the PARMS statement.** A detailed list of the different models and

1 the corresponding hypothesis analyzed is listed in Table 2. Hypothesis testing regarding the
2 constraints imposed on the family-covariance structure was done by comparing the restricted
3 log-likelihoods (RLL) of the constrained model and the unconstrained model (usually the full
4 model with an unstructured family covariance structure, see later). Under the null hypothesis
5 that the full covariance model is not different from the reduced covariance model, the log-
6 likelihood ratio $LLR = -2(RLL_{\text{reduced model}} - RLL_{\text{full model}})$ is distributed approximately as χ^2
7 with degrees of freedom given by the difference between the number of covariance parameter
8 specifying the full model and the reduced model (Fry 2004).

9 Because we are dealing with multiple environments (3 or 5 sites depending on the
10 trait) the following strategy was employed (Yang 2002). Firstly, we analyzed our data with
11 the conventional mixed model typically used in tree breeding, which assumes a constant
12 family variance and covariance across sites (i.e. a compound symmetry (CS) covariance
13 structure), and homogeneity of residual variance. This model was compared with a less
14 restrictive model in which residual variances were allowed to vary between sites.
15 Homogeneity of residual variance is a main assumption of conventional statistical analyses
16 and the non-fulfilment of this requisite is known to be a possible cause of spurious
17 interactions (Yang 2002). Significance of family and family \times site interaction was analyzed
18 comparing the RLL of each factor included versus excluded from this model. This test of G \times E
19 interaction, although commonly used, may be not appropriate in cases of heterogeneous
20 family variance and/or covariances across sites. A more precise analysis of the significance of
21 the G \times E interaction in a broad sense was implemented comparing the CS model without the
22 term G \times E (Model H1 in Table 2) with the unstructured covariance model (the full model H0),
23 in which all possible causes of G \times E (i.e. family heterogeneity across sites and deviations from
24 perfect family correlations between environments) are allowed (Yang 2002). Secondly, we
25 specifically tested for the contribution of each of the different possible causes of G \times E.

1 Heterogeneity of family variance was analyzed by comparing the CS family covariance
2 structure model (model H2 in Table 2) with the heterogeneous compound symmetry
3 covariance structure model (CSH, model H4 in Table 2). Deviations from perfect correlations,
4 which can be interpreted as a test of cross-over interactions (Yang 2007), were analyzed by
5 comparing a model in which all family correlations are fixed to 1 (model H3 in Table 2) with
6 the full model H0. Finally, if significant deviations from perfect correlations were detected,
7 we examined whether family correlations between sites were constant across all pairs of
8 environments (model H4 in Table 2) or whether they differed depending on the site pairs (full
9 model H0). Additionally, for traits assessed both in Coastal and Inland sites (i.e., traits
10 assessed at age 3), we also investigated whether the crossover interactions were due to
11 deviations from perfect correlations between sites of different areas. This hypothesis was
12 analyzed comparing the full model with a model in which all family correlations between
13 sites of the same area were fixed to 1, whereas family correlations between sites of different
14 areas were unconstrained (model H5 in Table 2).

15 SAS codes for performing all these analyses are available from the second author upon
16 request.

17

18 *Comparisons between WA and CG materials*

19 In order to analyze the statistical differences between the families of the WA and CG breeding
20 programmes, we reanalyzed the data including the Breeding Programme and the Programme
21 \times Site interaction as fixed effects in the mixed models, and nesting families within breeding
22 programmes. Additionally, the best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP) of each WA family was
23 statistically compared with the BLUP of the average of all the 111 CG families using the
24 ESTIMATE statement of the MIXED procedure (Littell et al. 2006, chap. 6).

25

1 *Superiority of the improved materials*

2 Because no control seedlots were included in the trial series, we used the adjacent
3 provenances tests to obtain predictors of unimproved seed sources with which to compare the
4 selected materials. Despite the provenance and the progeny trials being two independent
5 trials, with independent experimental designs, statistical comparisons between them were
6 reliable due to the fact that common spatial adjustments accounted for the eventual
7 microenvironmental differences between both trials. We estimated the confidence intervals at
8 95% for BLUPs of each family and provenance across the three inland sites using the
9 ESTIMATE statement of the MIXED procedure (Littell et al. 2006). Non overlapping confidence
10 intervals were interpreted as significance differences between the improved families and the
11 unimproved provenances. Becerreá was not considered for traits assessed at age 7 because
12 data for the provenance trial from this site at age 7 was lacking.

13

14 **3. Results**

15 Mean heights (H) were notably different over the different sites, indicating different site
16 indexes. Height means varied from 78.6 cm in Daneiro to 133.9 cm in Laracha at age 3, and
17 from 295.1 cm in Becerreá to 350.3 cm in Guntín at age 7 (Table 1). The dispersion of the
18 individual tree heights within each site was very high, with coefficients of variation up to
19 40%. For instance, individual tree heights at age 7 varied in Laza from 52 cm to 683 cm, i.e.
20 more than 5 m between the lowest and the highest tree. For each trait, the corrected data
21 adjusted for spatial autocorrelation showed the same site mean as the uncorrected data, but a
22 clearly smaller dispersion, with coefficients of variation of just 15-20% (data not shown).

23 The survival in the coastal sites was abnormally low (39 and 35 % in Daneiro and
24 Laracha at age 3, respectively) because of the sanitary problems explained before. Of the

1 inland sites, survival rates were acceptable in Guntín and Laza with values of around 93 % at
2 age 7, whereas it was notably lower in Becerreá (58 % at age 7).

3

4 **3.1. Spatial dependence and homocedasticity**

5 Residuals after subtracting family effects revealed pronounced non-random spatial structures
6 for the growth traits and the number of whorls in all sites (Table 3). The spherical theoretical
7 semivariogram fitted well to the observed semivariogram for most of these traits ($r^2 > 0.85$,
8 $p < 0.001$). The variation explained by the spatial pattern varied from 10.6% for WH in
9 Becerreá at age 3 to 73.2% for H in Laza at age 7 (Table 3, [see also Figure S1 supplied as](#)
10 [supplementary online material](#)). Height at age 7 showed the largest intensities of the spatial
11 dependence, with values of the patch variance to sill variance ratio varying from 41.4 to
12 73.2%. The range (a_0) or patch size of the theoretical semivariograms was greatly variable,
13 ranging from 29.3 m for H in Daneiro at age 3 to 103.9 m for H in Laza at age 3 (Table 3).
14 Stem form traits revealed random spatial structures with the exception of Becerreá and
15 Daneiro sites, where STR and LEN revealed a slight spatial autocorrelation.

16 Heterogeneity of residual variances was observed for all traits and ages ([see Table S1](#)
17 [as supplementary online material](#)). Log-likelihood ratios for the heterogeneous variance
18 models were much lower than those for the respective equal variance models, and the
19 differences were highly significant ($p < 0.001$) in all cases.

20 Because of heterogeneity of residual variances in all cases, all further analyses
21 presented in the following sections were based on heterogeneous error variance models, [and](#)
22 [in those cases where non random spatial structures were found \(Table 3\), spatially adjusted](#)
23 [data were employed.](#)

24

25 **3.2. Family variation and family \times site interaction**

1 Results of the conventional mixed model including family and family \times site interaction as
2 random effects (i.e., assuming a compound symmetry family covariance structure with
3 constant variance and constant covariance) are shown in Table 4. Using this model, family
4 variation was highly significant for all traits and ages, and the family \times site interaction was
5 significant ($p < 0.05$) or marginally significant ($p < 0.10$) for seven out of the 9 traits. The
6 number of whorls at age 3 and the leaning score at age 7 were the traits with no significant
7 family \times site interaction. The ratio of interaction to family variance component (σ_{fs}^2/σ_f^2) was
8 relatively low in all cases, and varied between 0.10 for leaning at age 7 to 0.54 for height at
9 age 3.

10 A comprehensive likelihood-based analysis regarding the relevance and interpretation
11 of the family \times site interaction for three selected traits is shown in Table 5. When all possible
12 causes of interaction are considered, the family \times site interaction was highly significant in all
13 cases. These results disagree with those presented in Table 4 for the number of whorls at age
14 3 and straightness at age 7. These discrepancies arise because results presented in Table 4 are
15 based on a model that assumes homogeneity of family variance and covariance across sites,
16 which are clearly inappropriate assumptions in these cases. Indeed, the large heterogeneity of
17 family variance across sites for these traits (Table 5) is responsible for the significant family \times
18 site interaction. On the other hand, the lack of perfect family correlation between sites
19 contributed significantly to the family \times site interaction in the cases of height growth at both
20 ages, and straightness at age 3, suggesting family rank changes across sites for these traits.
21 Moreover, the results of the H4 hypothesis indicate that the family covariance across sites for
22 height growth was fairly constant for all pairs of sites (Table 5). Thus, family rank changes
23 are likely to be equally distributed among all pairs of sites and no single site or group of sites
24 is responsible for the cross-over interaction (see the low variation in family correlations
25 between sites in Table 6). This is not the case with straightness at age 3, where the common-

1 covariance model (H4) fitted significantly less well than the unstructured covariance model
2 (Table 5). The family correlations between sites (Table 6) indicate that Becerreá, which shows
3 no significant family correlations with any other site, has a clearly anomalous behaviour for
4 this trait. Furthermore, in the case of height and straightness age 3, deviations from perfect
5 correlations appeared both within and among the two deployment areas (coastal and inland
6 Galicia). Assuming perfect correlation between sites of the same area and allowing family
7 rank changes between sites of different areas (H5 hypothesis) resulted in clearly and
8 significantly less well-fitting models (Table 5).

9

10 **3.3. Performance of the CG and WA material**

11 Grouping the families into the two breeding programmes which they originated (WA and
12 CG), and including this origin and its interaction with sites as fixed effects in the mixed
13 models, resulted in highly significant differences between programmes for all traits (Table 7).
14 Families from WA performed, on average, significantly better than those from CG (Figure 2).
15 In the case of growth traits, the programme \times site interaction was significant (Table 7)
16 indicating that the superiority of the WA material was not uniform across sites. The
17 superiority in height growth of the WA material was more evident in Laza and Guntín (Table
18 8). Among the different WA families tested, WA4 always ranked highly for all traits in each
19 of the three inland sites (Table 8), whereas WA1 showed reduced growth and worse stem
20 form. Other WA sources showed intermediate results.

21 Both the CG and WA materials grew significantly more than the average performance
22 of the unimproved seed sources tested in the adjacent provenance trials, and none of the single
23 provenances performed better than the average of the improved material (Figure 2). However,
24 although the mean performance in stem form traits of the 6 provenances was worse than the

1 average of the improved materials, there were some single origins that stand out with very
2 straight stems and low number of whorls (Figure 2).

3

4 **4. Discussion**

5 This paper provides new information about the performance of Atlantic improved material in
6 the inland region of Galicia, where the Atlantic character is clearly modified by continental
7 and Mediterranean influences. Growth patterns of maritime pine in Galicia are known to
8 differ between the inland and the coastal area, as a consequence of both environmental and
9 genetic factors (Álvarez-Gonzalez et al. 2005; Barrio-Anta et al. 2006). Our results are in
10 agreement with this, and the height growth of the studied material in the inland sites was
11 lower than that observed in the coastal region in an earlier trial series at similar ages (Zas et
12 al. 2004). However, mean height growth in the three inland sites was similar to intermediate
13 to high site index *P. pinaster* plantations in this area (Álvarez-Gonzalez et al. 2005),
14 suggesting that the coastal material also performed relatively well in the drier and colder
15 environmental conditions of the inland region.

16 Results from the likelihood-based analyses of the G×E interaction also indicate that
17 there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the subdivision of the region into the two
18 independent deployment areas of Coastal and Inland Galicia. This subdivision would be only
19 justified if the relevance of the G×E interaction were much lower within than between areas.
20 The G×E interaction is of consequence only when it involves rank changes across sites (i.e.
21 crossover interactions) and so, deployment areas should cluster sites into groups with
22 statistically negligible crossover interactions (e.g. Crossa et al. 2004). In this study, family ×
23 site interaction was highly significant for most of the studied traits, however this interaction
24 was due to departures from perfect family correlations between sites only in the case of height
25 growth and straightness at age 3. Imperfect genetic correlations between environments

1 suggest crossover interactions (Yang, 2007; Crossa et al. 2004). Thus, for these traits, there
2 could be major disadvantages to merging both areas into a single deployment zone. However,
3 the analysis of additional hypotheses regarding the genetic correlations between sites revealed
4 that, in the case of height growth, crossover interactions are as important within areas as
5 between areas. Constraining genetic correlations between sites of the same deployment area to
6 1 (i.e. avoiding family rank changes within areas) significantly reduced the log likelihood of
7 the model, and thus resulted in an inappropriate model compared with the unconstrained full
8 model. Moreover, genetic correlations between sites were similar for pairs of sites of the same
9 or different areas, and the mixed models that assumed a constant family correlation between
10 sites fitted as well as the unstructured full model. Thus, the pattern of the crossover
11 interactions for height growth seemed to be similar between all possible pairs of sites,
12 irrespective of the sites belonging to the same or different deployment areas.

13 The interpretation of the crossover interactions for straightness at age 3 was different.
14 Assuming a constant family correlation between sites was not appropriate for this trait, and
15 Becerreá seemed to be a site showing clearly anomalous behaviour. Family correlations
16 between this site and the other four sites were not significant and even negative in some cases,
17 whereas the remaining family correlations were significant and positive. The anomalous
18 results for straightness in Becerreá, a site near the upper limit of the distribution of the
19 species, are likely to be caused by the strong and irregular slope and the presence of snow
20 during the winter. Additionally, straightness was assessed as an ordinal trait (1-6 scale), and
21 residuals of the mixed models significantly ($p < 0.05$; Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) departed
22 from normal distributions, although residual histograms were unimodal and relatively
23 unskewed. Normality of residuals is a main assumption of mixed models (Littell et al. 2006),
24 so results regarding this trait should be managed with care here. Generalized linear mixed
25 models would have provided a more appropriate way of analyzing an ordinal trait such as this

1 (Bolker et al. 2009), but fitting generalized linear mixed models to our large data set and
2 imposing constraints to the family covariance structure resulted in a failure to converge.

3 The pest and disease problems that occurred in the coastal sites may be also distorting
4 the results regarding the comparison of inland and coastal performance. Both the fungus and
5 the pest significantly reduced the survival and growth of the pine seedlings (Zas et al. 2007),
6 and may have also favoured severe deformities in the stems (Sampedro et al. 2009). In
7 addition, pine growth and stem straightness in the five studied sites could be also heavily
8 influenced by rooting problems induced by the relatively long time nursery period (up to 19
9 months) and the small containers used (Superleach 125 cm³) (Climent et al. 2008).

10 Both across and within site variation in the studied traits was very high. The results
11 indicated a strong spatial autocorrelation for all the growth variables, reflecting the strong
12 within site heterogeneity, whereas no spatial pattern was found for the stem form variables,
13 except in Becerreá and Daneiro. Spatial dependence in stem form traits in these sites may be
14 caused by the strong and irregular slope and the presence of snow during the winter in
15 Becerreá, and by the existence of patchy waterlogged areas in Daneiro, that caused severe
16 deformities in the stem. Non random spatial patterns in traits assessed in forest genetic trials
17 are very common (Dutkowski et al. 2006; Fu et al. 1999). Augmenting standard analytical
18 models with spatial components have shown to increase the accuracy of genetic parameter
19 estimates and to increase the treatment correlation between tests (Dutkowski et al 2006; Qiao
20 et al. 2000; Zas 2006). The impact of the spatial autocorrelation on the analyses of forest
21 genetic trials can be so dramatic that several authors stated that leaving data unadjusted in the
22 presence of spatial autocorrelation is clearly unacceptable (Costa-Silva et al. 2001; Dutkowski
23 et al. 2006; Zas 2006). PROC MIXED in SAS allows to fit spatial correlation models in which
24 residuals are allowed to be autocorrelated among themselves, with autocorrelation being a
25 function of the distance that separate them (Littell et al. 2006, chap. 11; Saenz-Romero et al.

1 2001). The mixed models used in the present paper could thus have been augmented allowing
2 for an autocorrelation structure of the residual variation within each site. However, both
3 fitting spatial autocorrelation models and fitting heterogeneous residual variation models with
4 unstructured family covariance structure across sites are computationally very demanding.
5 Integrating all these family and residual covariance structures into a single mixed model
6 would be **very difficult** with a conventional personal computer. Thus, the procedure used here,
7 in which we first adjusted data for spatial autocorrelation (Zas 2006) and then fitted these
8 complex mixed models, seems to be an operative way to circumvent this problem.

9 The studied trial series lacks control seedlots of local origin with which to compare the
10 improved materials. Indeed, finding a representative seedlot of the many different origins
11 commonly used in the maritime pine plantations in the inland region of Galicia would be a
12 difficult task. We took advantage of the adjacent provenance tests to get estimates of
13 unimproved seed sources in the area. Comparisons between materials from these adjacent
14 trials with independent experimental designs were possible thanks to the common spatial
15 adjustment, which accounted for the microenvironmental variation between the two trials
16 within each site. The results indicate that both the CG and WA improved materials grew
17 significantly more than all the provenances tested. On average, stem form and branching habit
18 of the improved materials were also better, but some individual provenances from Central
19 Spain performed clearly better regarding these traits. Atlantic origins are known to present
20 poor forms, and are clearly surpassed in provenance tests by other mountain origins such
21 Morocco, Corsica, and Sierra de Gredos (Alía et al. 1995). In fact, the French maritime pine
22 breeding programme, developed upon the basis of the Atlantic Landes provenance, has
23 exploited interprovenance crosses with Corsican origins to improve stem straightness of the
24 local population (Alazard 1988; Harfouche and Kremer 2000). Our results also suggest that
25 the superiority of the Atlantic improved materials in inland Galicia could be complemented

1 by introducing favourable genes for straightness and branching habit through introgression.
2 Interprovenance crosses with Albarracín (good stem straightness) and Sierra de Segura-
3 Alcaraz (low number of whorls), or with other mountain origins of known stem straightness
4 (e.g. Morocco, Corsica or Sierra de Gredos; Alía et al. 1995; Harfouche and Kremer 2000;
5 Sierra de Grado et al. 2008) should therefore be considered.

6 The Western Australia breeding programme has achieved, using an Atlantic
7 provenance, very good results and ample gains for use in areas of severe drought within that
8 region (Butcher 2007). The wide genotypic variation within provenances (Mariette et al.
9 2001; Petit et al. 1995) and the characteristic phenotypic plasticity of the species (Alía et al.
10 1997; Chambel 2006) offer a plausible explanation for this large flexibility. The performance
11 of the WA material in inland Galicia was also very good, always above the overall average at
12 each site. The superiority of the WA families was evident for the three main studied traits:
13 growth, stem form and branch habits (Figure 2, Table 7, Table 8). However the performance
14 of the WA families was fairly variable across the three inland sites (Table 8). As expected, the
15 best development of this material occurred on the driest sites (Guntín and Laza), while the
16 worst performance was on the coldest one (Becerreá). Among the different WA families,
17 WA4, a full cross between “sexy” clones characterized by a high resistance to drought, good
18 growth and strong apical dominance, was one of the most stable and stands out as one of the
19 best families for the three main traits in the three inland sites. The remaining WA families,
20 except WA1, also show superior growth in Laza and Guntín, but only intermediate
21 performance in terms of stem form. Results from the WA6 seedlot, which is a mixture of
22 different open pollinated families from the 2nd generation clonal seed orchard at Manjimup
23 (WA), indicated that, on average, the material from this seed orchard performed better than
24 that from the Galician coastal seed orchard, although the differences were only significant in
25 the case of growth on the two warmest and driest sites. Because the tree breeding programme

1 for maritime pine in WA has continued to progress in recent years (Butcher 2007), we could
2 expect even greater gains with new WA materials with higher levels of selection. Testing new
3 seedlots from WA is, therefore, highly recommended.

4 As a practical conclusion, the results of this paper suggest the feasibility of using both
5 the CG and the WA breeding materials as possible sources of forest reproductive material for
6 the inland region of Galicia. Specifically, based on the excellent results of the WA material,
7 importing seed for reforestation in inland Galicia and/or including specific selected WA
8 genotypes into the local breeding population should be strongly considered. Furthermore,
9 judging from the results of the G×E interaction analyses, there is not sufficient evidence to
10 subdivide Galicia into the two current deployment areas, coastal and inland Galicia.
11 Interaction patterns do not reveal significant differences between zones, and crossover
12 interactions for height growth are present both between and within areas. Although a strategy
13 is undoubtedly needed to deal with the overall crossover interactions, based on the results of
14 the present paper, both zones could be merged into a single breeding and deployment area.

15

16 **5. Acknowledgements**

17 This study was supported by the Instituto Nacional de Tecnología Agraria y Alimentaria
18 (INIA) projects RTA05-173 and RTA07-100. The series of trials were established under
19 supervision of Guillermo Vega and Josefa Fernández-López, within the development of the
20 Forest Genetic Improvement Programme of Galicia, funded by the European Union and
21 Xunta de Galicia. We thank Ana Hernández for her helpful participation in data processing
22 and field assessments, Dr. Esther Merlo for stimulating discussion on the results, Pablo
23 Xesteira for helping in trial maintenance, and Ricardo Ferradás, Raquel Jares, Manuel
24 Cerviño, Emilio Pérez, Xoaquín Moreira and Patricia Martins for field assessments. We also
25 gratefully acknowledge Trevor Butcher (Department of Conservation and Land Management,

1 WA) for providing the Western Australia improved seedlots and providing valuable
2 suggestions on earlier versions of the manuscript. Valuable comments by Dr. Luis Sampedro
3 and two anonymous reviewers also helped to improve the quality of the manuscript.

4

5 **References**

- 6 Alazard, P. 1988. Intérêt de la race Corse dans le programme d'amélioration génétique du pin
7 maritime. Ann Rech Sylv. AFOCEL.
- 8 Alía R, Gil L, Pardos JA (1995) Performance of 43 *Pinus pinaster* Ait. provenances on 5
9 locations in central Spain. Silvae Genet 44: 75-81
- 10 Alía R, Martin S, De Miguel J, Galera R, Agúndez D, Gordo J, Catalán G, Gil L (1996) Las
11 regiones de procedencia de *Pinus pinaster* Ait. OA de Parques Nacionales. DGCONA,
12 Madrid
- 13 Alía R, Moro J, Denis JB (1997) Performance of *Pinus pinaster* provenances in Spain:
14 interpretation of the genotype by environment interaction. Can J For Res 27: 1548-1559
- 15 Alía R, Moro J, Denis J-B (2001) Ensayos de procedencias de *Pinus pinaster* Ait. en el centro
16 de España: resultados a la edad de 32 años. Inv. Agraria: Sist Rec For 10: 333-354
- 17 Álvarez-Gonzalez JG, Ruiz-Gonzalez AD, Rodriguez-Soalleiro R, Barrio-Anta M (2005)
18 Ecoregional site index models for *Pinus pinaster* in Galicia (NW Spain). Ann For Sci 62:
19 115-127
- 20 Barrio-Anta M, Balboa-Murias Mn, Castedo-Dorado F, Diéguez-Aranda U, Alvarez-
21 González JG (2006) An ecoregional model for estimating volume, biomass and carbon pools
22 in maritime pine stands in Galicia (NW Spain). Forest Ecol Manage 223: 24-34
- 23 Bolker BM, Brooks ME, Clark CJ, Geange SW, Poulsen RP, Stevens MH, White JS (2009)
24 Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. Trends Ecol
25 Evol 24: 127-135

1 Butcher TB (2007) Achievements in forest tree genetic improvement in Australia and New
2 Zealand 7: Maritime pine and Brutian pine tree improvement programs in Western Australia.
3 Aust For 70: 141-151

4 Butcher TB, Chandler AL (2007) Maritime pine for dry-land Western Australia. Joint
5 Australian Forest Genetics and IUFRO Southern Pines Working Group (2.02.20) Conference.
6 11-14 April 2007, Hobart Australia. (Proceedings in press as CD and at
7 <http://www.crcforestry.com.au/>)

8 Butcher TB, Hopkins ER (1993) Realised gains from breeding *Pinus pinaster*. For Ecol
9 Manage 58: 211-231

10 Climent J, Alonso J, Gil L (2008) Root restriction hindered early allometric differentiation
11 between seedlings of two provenances of Canary Island Pine. *Silvae Genet* 57: 187-193

12 Costa-Silva J, Dutkowski GW, Gilmour AR (2001) Analysis of early tree height in forest
13 genetic trials is enhanced by including a spatially correlated residual. *Can J For Res* 31: 1887-
14 1893

15 Chambel MR (2006) Variabilidad adaptativa y plasticidad fenotípica en procedencias de
16 pinos ibéricos. Thesis. Departamento de Silvopascicultura. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid

17 de la Mata R, Zas R (2009) Performance of maritime pine Spanish Mediterranean
18 provenances at young ages in a transitional region between Atlantic and Mediterranean
19 climates in NW Spain. *Silvae Genet* In press

20 Crossa J, Yang R-C, Cornelius PL (2004) Studying crossover genotype x environment
21 interaction using linear-bilinear models and mixed models. *J Agric Biol Environ Stat* 9: 362-
22 380

23 Dutkowski GW, Costa-e-Silva J, Gilmour AR, Wallendorf H, Aguiar A (2006) Spatial
24 analysis enhances modelling of a wide variety of traits in forest genetic trials. *Can J Forest*
25 *Res* 36: 1851-1870

1 Fry JD (2004) Estimation of genetic variances and covariances by restricted maximum
2 likelihood using PROC MIXED. A.M. Saxton (ed) Genetic analysis of complex traits using
3 SAS. SAS Institute, Cary, NC.

4 Fu YB, Yanchuk AD, Namkoong G (1999) Spatial patterns of tree height variations in a
5 series of Douglas-fir progeny trials: implications for genetic testing. Can J For Res 29: 714-
6 723

7 Galera R, Martin S, Alía R, Gordo J, Aguado AM, Notivol E (1997) Manual de selección de
8 masas productoras de semillas. Evaluación de caracteres. Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y
9 Alimentación. INIA, Madrid

10 García JM, De-Miguel J, Alía R, Iglesias S (2001) Regiones de Identificación y Utilización de
11 material forestal de reproducción. Ministerio de Medio Ambiente. Serie Cartográfica, Madrid

12 Harfouche A, Kremer A (2000) Provenance hybridization in a diallel mating scheme of
13 maritime pine (*Pinus pinaster*). I. Means and variance components. Can J Forest Res 30: 1-9

14 Kremer A, Lascoux DM (1988) Genetic architecture of height growth in maritime pine (*Pinus*
15 *pinaster* Ait.). Silvae Genet 37: 1-8

16 Littell RC, Milliken GA, Stroup WW, Wolfinger RD, Schabenberger O (2006) SAS System
17 for mixed models, second edition. SAS Institute, Cary, NC

18 Mariette S, Chagne D, Lezier C, Pastuszka P, Raffin A, Plomion C, Kremer A (2001) Genetic
19 diversity within and among *Pinus pinaster* populations: comparison between AFLP and
20 microsatellite markers. Heredity 86: 469-479

21 Martíns P, Sampedro L, Moreira X, Zas R (2009) Nutritional status and genetic variation in
22 the response to nutrient availability in *Pinus pinaster*. A multisite field study in Northwest
23 Spain. For Ecol Manage 258: 1429-1436

24 Molina F (1965) Comportamiento racial del *Pinus pinaster* en el noroeste de España. An IFIE
25 2: 221-238

1 Perry DH, Hopkins ER (1967) Importation of Breeding Material of *Pinus pinaster* Ait. from
2 Portugal. Bulletin 75, Forests Department, Western Australia

3 Petit RJ, Bahrman N, Baradat P (1995) Comparison of genetic differentiation in Maritime
4 Pine (*Pinus pinaster* Ait.) estimated using isozyme, total protein and terpenic loci. Heredity
5 75: 382-389

6 Qiao CG, Basford KE, DeLacy IH, Cooper M (2000) Evaluation of experimental designs and
7 spatial analyses in wheat breeding trials. Theor Appl Genet 100: 9-16

8 Saenz-Romero C, Nordheim EV, Guries RP, Crump PM (2001) A case study of a
9 provenance/progeny test using Trend Analysis with correlated errors and SAS PROC
10 MIXED. Silvae Genet 50: 127-135

11 Sampedro L, Moreira X, Martins P, Zas R (2009) Growth and nutritional response of *Pinus*
12 *pinaster* after a large pine weevil (*Hylobius abietis*) attack. Trees Struct Funct 23: 1189-1197

13 Sanz F, Latour S, Neves M, Bastet E, Pischedda D, Piñeiro G, Gauthier T, Lesbats J, Plantier
14 C, Marques A, Lanvin JD, Santos JA, Touza M, Pedras F, Parrot J, Reuling D, Faria C (2006)
15 Aplicacions industriais da madeira de piñeiro pinaster. Rodi Artes Gráficas S.L., Ourense

16 SAS-Institute (1999) SAS/STAT User's guide, Version 8. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC

17 Sierra de Grado R, Pando V, Martinez-Xurimendi P, Penalvo A, Bascones E, Moulia B
18 (2008) Biomechanical differences in the stem straightening process among *Pinus pinaster*
19 provenances. A new approach for early selection of stem straightness. Tree Physiol 28: 835-
20 846

21 Webster R, Oliver MA (1990) Statistical methods in soil and land resource survey. Oxford
22 University Press, Oxford

23 Yang R-C (2002) Likelihood-based analysis of Genotype-Environment interactions. Crop Sci
24 42: 1434-1440

- 1 Yang R-C (2007) Mixed-model analysis of crossover genotype-environment interactions.
2 Crop Sci 47: 1051-1062
- 3 Zas R (2006) Iterative kriging for removing spatial autocorrelation in analysis of forest
4 genetic trials. Tree Genet Genom 2: 177-186
- 5 Zas R, Fernández-López J (2005) Juvenile genetic parameters and genotypic stability of *Pinus*
6 *pinaster* Ait. open pollinated families under different water and nutrient regimes. Forest Sci
7 51: 165-174
- 8 Zas R, Merlo E (2008) El programa de mejora de *Pinus pinaster* en Galicia. Boletín CIDEU.
9 URL: <http://www.uhu.es/cideu/Boletin/TemasBoletines.htm>
- 10 Zas R, Merlo E, Fernández-López J (2004) Genotype x environment interaction in Maritime
11 pine families in Galicia, Northwest Spain. Silvae Genet 53: 175-182
- 12 Zas R, Solla A, Sampedro L (2007) Variography and kriging allow screening *Pinus pinaster*
13 resistant to *Armillaria ostoyae* in field conditions. Forestry 80: 201-209
- 14
- 15

Figure Captions

Fig. 1 Location of the *Pinus pinaster* plus trees (black dots), the five progeny trials (grey squares), the three provenance trials (black squares), and the clonal seed orchard (black star) from which CG families were obtained. Encircled numbers indicate the number of the ‘Identification and Utilization Regions’ (RIUs) of forest reproductive material (García et al. 2001).

Fig. 2 Best linear unbiased predictors (BLUPs) for the 111 half sib families of the CG seed orchard (white bars) and the 6 families of the WA breeding programme (black bars, WA1-WA6), for a) height, b) straightness, and c) number of whorls at age 7 in two sites (Guntín and Laza) located in the inland region of Galicia. The **best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP)** of the best provenance and the overall mean of all the provenances tested in the adjacent provenance trials (grey bars) are also shown. X-axis intersects the y-axis at the overall mean of the progeny trials.

Table 1 Location, main climatic features and overall means for height at age 3 and 7, of the *Pinus pinaster* progeny trials

	COAST		INLAND		
	Daneiro	Laracha	Becerreá	Guntín	Laza
Longitude (W)	8° 55' 06"	8° 31' 47"	7° 10' 32"	7° 40' 42"	7° 29' 32"
Latitude (N)	43° 9' 35"	43° 12' 09"	42° 50' 16"	42° 54' 02"	42° 02' 24"
Altitude (m)	210	252	900	550	770
Aspect	SEE	SW	S	W	NE
Slope (%)	0	2	30	3	18
Annual precipitation (mm)	1528	1505	1047	1000	783
Summer precipitation (mm) ¹	144	140	132	99	76
Gausсен Index ²	1	0	0	17	37
Annual mean Temperature (°C)	13.2	12.4	10.4	11.6	11.1
Annual Temperature oscillation (°C) ³	10.1	10.8	13.1	13.3	13.7
No. of frost days (Tmin <0 °C) per year	10	23	58	38	29
Absolute minimum temperature (°C)	-2.8	-4.3	-7.8	-7.1	-4.8
Overall height mean 3 years (cm) ⁴	78.6 ± 24.0	133.9 ± 30.9	109.1 ± 23.0	106.1 ± 20.4	88.0 ± 22.2
Overall height mean 7 years (cm) ⁴			295.1 ± 60.1	350.3 ± 77.1	300.1 ± 120.8

¹ Rain fallen during the months of June, July and August

² Gausсен = $\Sigma(2T-P)$ for each month where $2T > P$ (P: monthly precipitation (mm), T: monthly mean temperature (°C))

³ Difference between the mean of daily maximum of the warmest month and the mean of daily minimum of the coldest month.

⁴ Overall mean and standard deviation of height at age 3 and 7 without spatial correction.

Table 2 Description of the full model and reduced models for testing different hypotheses on the relevance and interpretation of the genotype by environment interaction. The reduced models constrain different elements of the family variance-covariance structure⁽¹⁾ by specifying in the RANDOM statement of PROC MIXED different types of covariance structures (CovStruc), and/or constraining different covariance parameters with the HOLD option of the PARMs statement⁽²⁾. The parameters to be estimated in each model are shown for analyses involving 5 sites (traits assessed at age 3). The total number of parameters to be estimated (# parms) for analyses involving 5 and 3 sites is also given. All models assume heterogeneity of residual variances across sites. All hypotheses are tested by comparing the reduced models with the full model, except the H2 hypothesis which is tested by comparing the H2 model *versus* the H4 model.

Model and hypothesis tested	Constraints	CovStruc ⁽²⁾	Parameters to be estimated	# parms	
				5 sites	3 sites
H0 Full model. All causes of genotype x environment interaction are allowed	None	UNR	$\sigma_{G1}^2, \sigma_{G2}^2, \sigma_{G3}^2, \sigma_{G4}^2, \sigma_{G5}^2$ $\rho_{12}, \rho_{13}, \rho_{14}, \rho_{15}, \rho_{23}, \rho_{24}, \rho_{25}, \rho_{34}, \rho_{35}, \rho_{45}$ $\sigma_{e1}^2, \sigma_{e2}^2, \sigma_{e3}^2, \sigma_{e4}^2, \sigma_{e5}^2$	20	9
H1 No family by environment interaction	$\sigma_{Gi}^2 = \sigma_{Gj}^2 = \sigma_G^2 \forall i, j; \sigma_{GxE}^2 = 0$	CS*	σ_G^2 $\sigma_{e1}^2, \sigma_{e2}^2, \sigma_{e3}^2, \sigma_{e4}^2, \sigma_{e5}^2$	6	4
H2 Homogeneity of family variance across sites	$\sigma_{Gi}^2 = \sigma_{Gj}^2 = \sigma_G^2 \forall i, j$	CS	$\sigma_G^2, \sigma_{GxE}^2$ $\sigma_{e1}^2, \sigma_{e2}^2, \sigma_{e3}^2, \sigma_{e4}^2, \sigma_{e5}^2$	7	5
H3 Perfect family correlation between all site pairs	$\rho_{Gij} = 1 \forall i \neq j$	CSH*	$\sigma_{G1}^2, \sigma_{G2}^2, \sigma_{G3}^2, \sigma_{G4}^2, \sigma_{G5}^2$ $\sigma_{e1}^2, \sigma_{e2}^2, \sigma_{e3}^2, \sigma_{e4}^2, \sigma_{e5}^2$	10	6
H4 Homogeneity of family covariance across all site pairs	$\rho_{Gij} = \rho_{G'i'j'} = \rho_G \forall i \neq j, i' \neq j'$	CSH	$\sigma_{G1}^2, \sigma_{G2}^2, \sigma_{G3}^2, \sigma_{G4}^2, \sigma_{G5}^2$ ρ $\sigma_{e1}^2, \sigma_{e2}^2, \sigma_{e3}^2, \sigma_{e4}^2, \sigma_{e5}^2$	11	7
H5 Perfect family correlation between sites within areas	$\rho_{Gij} = 1 \forall i, j \in \text{same area}$	UNR*	$\sigma_{G1}^2, \sigma_{G2}^2, \sigma_{G3}^2, \sigma_{G4}^2, \sigma_{G5}^2$ $\rho_{14}, \rho_{15}, \rho_{24}, \rho_{25}, \rho_{34}, \rho_{35}$ $\sigma_{e1}^2, \sigma_{e2}^2, \sigma_{e3}^2, \sigma_{e4}^2, \sigma_{e5}^2$	16	-

⁽¹⁾ Under the full model, the matrices for the family (Σ_G) and error (Σ_e) covariance structures are as follow:

$$\Sigma_G = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cc} \text{Inner sites} & \text{Coastal sites} \end{array} \\ \left[\begin{array}{ccccc} \sigma_{G1}^2 & \rho_{12} & \rho_{13} & \rho_{14} & \rho_{15} \\ \rho_{12} & \sigma_{G2}^2 & \rho_{23} & \rho_{24} & \rho_{25} \\ \rho_{13} & \rho_{23} & \sigma_{G3}^2 & \rho_{34} & \rho_{35} \\ \rho_{14} & \rho_{24} & \rho_{34} & \sigma_{G4}^2 & \rho_{45} \\ \rho_{15} & \rho_{25} & \rho_{35} & \rho_{45} & \sigma_{G5}^2 \end{array} \right] \end{array}$$

$$\Sigma_e = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cc} \text{Inner sites} & \text{Coastal sites} \end{array} \\ \left[\begin{array}{ccccc} \sigma_{e1}^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{e2}^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_{e3}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{e4}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{e5}^2 \end{array} \right] \end{array} \left. \begin{array}{l} \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Inner sites} \\ \text{Coastal sites} \end{array} \right\} \right\}$$

where σ_{Gi}^2 and σ_{ei}^2 are the family and residual variances in site i , and ρ_{ij} is the family correlation between site i and j .

⁽²⁾ Further constrains in specific elements of the variance-covariance matrix are denoted by an * in the CovStruc type.

Table 3 Patch size (range in meters, a_0 ¹) and intensity of the spatial pattern structure (patch variance to sill variance ratio, $I(\%) = [C_0/(C_0+C_n)] \times 100$) derived from theoretical semivariograms fitted to different traits, adjusted for genetic effects in the five test sites at age 3 and 7 after planting

	COAST				INLAND					
	Daneiro		Laracha		Becerreá		Guntín		Laza	
	a_0 (m)	I (%)	a_0 (m)	I (%)	a_0 (m)	I (%)	a_0 (m)	I (%)	a_0 (m)	I (%)
Age 3										
Height	29.3	19.3	78.9	25.8	53.6	29.5	36.8	24.1	103.9	38.1
No. Whorls	grad ²	16.5 ³	s.i. ⁴		61.8	10.6	44.1	11.4	70.0	22.5
Leaning	99.0	26.6	s.i.		77.6	12.0	s.i.		s.i.	
Straightness	grad	29.8	s.i.		77.2	15.8	s.i.		s.i.	
Age 7										
Height					42.7	41.4	94.6	47.5	47.8	73.2
Diameter					48.0	32.6	88.0	42.1	34.9	57.9
No. Whorls					112.5	60.9	grad	25.6	33.8	35.3
Leaning					113.5	17.7	s.i.		s.i.	
Straightness					grad	18.1	s.i.		s.i.	

¹ The shown patch size (a_0) is the a_0 parameter of the spherical model, but is $a_0 \times 3$ for the exponential model (Webster and Oliver 1990).

² grad = gradient (linear semivariogram).

³ For linear models, the intensity of the spatial pattern structure was calculated for a distance of 100 m as $100 \times C_0 / (100 \times C_0 + C_n)$.

⁴ s.i.= spatially independent trait.

Table 4 Summary of the mixed model analyses for different traits assessed at age 3 and 7 using a compound-symmetry structure for the family variance-covariance matrix across sites. For fixed effects (Site), F-ratio and associated significance levels are shown; for random effects (family, and family × site interaction), variance component estimates ± standard errors (VC ± s.e.) and associated significance levels of the log-likelihood ratio test⁽¹⁾ for significance of each variance component are shown.

Age	Traits	Site	Family	Family x site
		F ⁽²⁾	VC ± s.e.	VC ± s.e.
3	Height	1067.0 ***	20.316 ± 3.496***	11.053 ± 1.937***
	No. Whorls	407.0 ***	0.046 ± 0.008***	0.005 ± 0.005 ^{ns}
	Leaning	329.4 ***	0.001 ± 0.0003***	0.0005 ± 0.0004 ^{ns}
	Straightness	75.1 ***	0.018 ± 0.003***	0.009 ± 0.003***
7	Height	635.6 ***	124.850 ± 24.946***	52.487 ± 16.651***
	Diameter	261.0 ***	4.513 ± 1.143***	1.617 ± 1.052*
	No. Whorls	109.3 ***	0.075 ± 0.015***	0.022 ± 0.010**
	Leaning	101.5 ***	0.002 ± 0.001**	0.0002 ± 0.001 ^{ns}
	Straightness	86.3 ***	0.010 ± 0.003***	0.003 ± 0.002 ^{ns}

⁽¹⁾ Asterisks denote the significance level (***) = p<0.001; ** = p<0.01; * = p<0.05; ns = p > 0.05) associated to the chi-square value given by the difference in two times the log likelihood of that factor included versus excluded from the model. Because variance components are constrained to be positive, test of variance components are one-tailed (Fry, 2004).

⁽²⁾ F_{4,118} for traits at age 3 and F_{2,67} at age 7.

Table 5 Likelihood ratios for testing different hypotheses on the relevance and interpretation of the genotype by environment interaction for different traits assessed at age 3 and 7. The chi-squared values shown are the differences in two times the log-likelihood of the full model (unstructured variance-covariance matrix) and different reduced models constraining different elements of the family variance-covariance structure across sites (see Methods). Degrees of freedom (DF) associated with the chi-squared values results from the difference between the number of covariance parameters specifying the full and reduced models. P values lower than 0.05 indicate that the null hypotheses should be rejected.

Null hypotheses	DF	Height		No. Whorls		Straightness	
		χ^2	p> χ^2	χ^2	p> χ^2	χ^2	p> χ^2
<i>Age 3</i>							
H1: No family by environment interaction	14	100.7	<0.001	72.1	<0.001	912.8	<0.001
H2: Homogeneity of family variance across sites	4	15.8	0.003	60.0	<0.001	19.5	<0.001
H3: Perfect family correlation between all site pairs	10	77.3	<0.001	12.6	0.248	67.4	<0.001
H4: Homogeneity of family covariance across site pairs	9	14.6	0.102	10.6	0.304	64.2	<0.001
H5: Perfect family correlation between sites within deployment areas (coastal and inland Galicia)	4	59.5	<0.001	4.7	0.319	41.0	<0.001
<i>Age 7</i>							
H1: No family by environment interaction	5	21.3	<0.001	26.8	<0.001	256.3	<0.001
H2: Homogeneity of family variance across sites	2	4.5	0.100	19.2	<0.001	26.6	<0.001
H3: Perfect family correlation between all site pairs	3	12.3	0.006	6.3	0.098	4.2	0.241
H4: Homogeneity of family covariance across site pairs	2	1.1	0.576	1.4	0.500	4.2	0.121

Table 6 REML estimates of genetic correlations between sites using an unstructured family variance-covariance matrix across sites for different traits at age 3 (above the diagonal) and age 7 (below the diagonal). Sites are grouped into the two major climatic regions (Inland and Coastal Galicia).

Trait	Site	Inland			Coastal	
		Becerreá	Guntín	Laza	Daneiro	Laracha
Height	Becerreá		0.63***	0.62***	0.77***	0.62***
	Guntín	0.63***		0.60***	0.42**	0.74***
	Laza	0.67***	0.79***		0.84***	0.67***
	Daneiro					0.60***
	Laracha					
No. Whorls	Becerreá		0.79***	1.00***	0.24 ^{ns}	0.54**
	Guntín	0.86***		0.95***	1.00*	0.60**
	Laza	0.68***	0.82***		1.00*	0.80***
	Daneiro					1.00 ^{ns}
	Laracha					
Straightness	Becerreá		0.28 ^{ns}	0.27 ^{ns}	-0.41 ^{ns}	0.10 ^{ns}
	Guntín	1.00 ^{ns}		1.00***	1.00***	0.47**
	Laza	0.29 ^{ns}	1.00*		0.89***	0.45**
	Daneiro					0.10 ^{ns}
	Laracha					

Asterisks denote the significance level (*** = $p < 0.001$; ** = $p < 0.01$; * = $p < 0.05$; ns = $p > 0.05$) associated to the chi-square value given by the difference in two times the log likelihood of that element included versus excluded (fixed to zero) from the model.

Table 7 Effects of the Breeding Program origin from which families proceed (Coastal Galicia and Western Australia), and its interaction with sites for different traits evaluated at age 7 in the three inland sites.

Effects	DF		Height		No. Whorls		Straightness	
			F	p> F	F	p> F	F	p> F
Programme	1	115	11.4	0.001	4.6	0.034	5.1	0.026
Site	2	67	138.7	<0.001	17.1	<0.001	26.0	<0.001
Programme x site	2	230	3.2	0.043	1.5	0.217	2.0	0.132

Table 8 Ranking of the BLUPs of the Western Australia (WA) families in the three inland sites for height, straightness and number of whorls at age 7 (N= 117 genetic entries). Asterisks denote the significance level ¹ associated to the specific contrast between the BLUP of each WA family and the BLUP of the average performance of the 111 CG families for each trait.

WA Families	Height			No. Whorls			Straightness		
	Becerreá	Laza	Guntín	Becerreá	Laza	Guntín	Becerreá	Laza	Guntín
WA1	47	44	43	12	19	9*	39	23	46
WA2	16	14*	15*	83	63	70	7	15	4*
WA3	7*	9**	3***	16	22	21	35	58	31
WA4	4**	3**	1***	1**	1**	6*	3*	6	2*
WA5	61	16*	10*	70	65	74	36	27	35
WA6	15	13*	13*	32	30	59	28	26	21

¹ Significance levels: *** = p<0.001; ** = p<0.01; * = p<0.05




Figure 1. de la Mata & Zas




Figure 2. de la Mata & Zas