

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Small understorey trees have greater capacity than canopy trees to adjust hydraulic traits following prolonged experimental drought in a tropical forest

Citation for published version:

Giles, AL, Rowland, L, Bittencourt, PRL, Bartholomew, DC, Coughlin, I, Costa, PB, Domingues, T, Miatto, RC, Barros, FV, Ferreira, LV, Groenendijk, P, Oliveira, AAR, Da Costa, ACL, Meir, P, Mencuccini, M, Oliveira, RS & Oren, R (ed.) 2021, 'Small understorey trees have greater capacity than canopy trees to adjust hydraulic traits following prolonged experimental drought in a tropical forest', *Tree physiology*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 537-556. https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/tpab121

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

10.1093/treephys/tpab121

Link:

Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version: Peer reviewed version

Published In: Tree physiology

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Édinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





Tree Physiology

Small understorey trees have greater capacity than canopy trees to adjust hydraulic traits following prolonged experimental drought in a tropical forest

Journal:	Tree Physiology
Manuscript ID	TP-2021-150.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Giles, André; UNICAMP, Plant biology Rowland, Lucy; University of Exeter Bittencourt, Paulo Bartholomew, David Coughlin, Sarah Costa, Patricia Domingues, Tomas; Universidade de São Paulo, Departamento de Biologia; University of São Paulo Miatto, Raquel Barros, Fernanda Ferreira, Leandro Groenendijk, Peter; Plant Biology Oliveira, Alex da Costa, Antonio; Universidade Federal do Para Meir, Patrick; Australian National University Research School of Biology, Biology; University of Edinburgh School of GeoSciences, School of Geosciences Mencuccini, Maurizio; CREAF; ICREA Oliveira, Rafael; Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Departamento de Biologia Vegetal
Keywords:	Tropical Rainforest, Forest Ecophysiology, Drought, hydraulic safety, Global Climate Change, Hydraulic
	•

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

2		
3 ⊿	1	Small understorey trees have greater capacity than canopy trees to adjust hydraulic
5	2	traits following prolonged experimental drought in a tropical forest
6 7	3	Running title: Tree size strongly controls plant hydraulic responses in a droughted tropical
8	4	forest
9 10	5	Giles, A. L. ^{1*} , Rowland L. ² , Bittencourt P. R. L. ² , Bartholomew, D. C ² , Coughlin I. ^{4,5} , Costa
11 12	6	P. B. ^{1,7} , Domingues T. ⁴ , Miatto, R.C ⁴ , Barros, F. V ² , Ferreira L. V. ⁶ , Groenendijk, P ¹ , Oliveira
13 14	7	A. A. R. ⁶ , da Costa A. C. L. ^{6,7} , Meir P. ^{5,9} , Mencuccini M. ^{10,11} , Oliveira R. S. ¹
15 16 17	8	
18 19 20	9	*Corresponding Author: andregiles.bio@gmail.com, ¹ Instituto de Biologia, University of
20 21	10	Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, SP 13083-970, Brasil.
22 23	11	
24		
25 26	12	Instituto de Biologia, University of Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, SP 13083-970, Brasil.
27	13	² College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4RJ, UK
28 29	14	³ Biological Sciences, UWA, Perth, WA, Crawley 6009, Australia
30 31	15	⁴ Departamento de Biologia, FFCLRP, Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, SP 14040-
32 33	16	900, Brasil
34 25	17	⁵ Research School of Biology, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2601 Australia
35 36	18	⁶ Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, Belém, PA 66040-170, Brasil
37 38	19	⁷ Biological Sciences, UWA, Perth, WA, Australia
39 40	20	⁸ Instituto de Geosciências, Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, PA 66075-110, Brasil
41 42	21	⁹ School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH9 3FF, UK
43 44	22	¹⁰ CREAF, Campus UAB, Cerdanyola del Vallés, 08193 Spain
45	23	¹¹ ICREA, Barcelona, 08010, Spain
46 47	24	
48		
49 50		
51		
52		
53 54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59 60		

25 Abstract

Future climate change predictions for tropical forests highlight increased frequency and intensity of extreme drought events. However, it remains unclear whether large and small trees have differential strategies to tolerate drought due to the different niches they occupy. The future of tropical forests is ultimately dependent on the capacity of small trees (<10 cm in diameter) to adjust their hydraulic system to tolerate drought. To address this question, we evaluated whether the drought tolerance of neotropical small trees can adjust to experimental water stress and was different from tall trees. We measured multiple drought resistance-related hydraulic traits across nine common neotropical genera at the world's longest-running tropical forest throughfall-exclusion experiment and compared their responses with surviving large canopy trees. Small understorey trees in both the Control and the throughfall exclusion treatment (TFE) had lower minimum stomatal conductance and maximum hydraulic leaf-specific conductivity relative to large trees of the same genera, as well as greater hydraulic safety margin (HSM), percentage loss of conductivity (PLC) and embolism resistance, demonstrating they occupy a distinct hydraulic niche. Surprisingly, in response to the drought treatment, small trees increased specific hydraulic conductivity by 56.3% and leaf:sapwood area ratio by 45.6%. The greater HSM of small understorey trees relative to large canopy trees likely enabled them to adjust other aspects of their hydraulic systems to increase hydraulic conductivity and take advantage of increases in light availability in the understorey resulting from the drought-induced mortality of canopy trees. Our results demonstrate that differences in hydraulic strategies between small understorey and large canopy trees drive hydraulic niche segregation. Small understorey trees can adjust their hydraulic systems in response to changes in water and light availability indicating natural regeneration of tropical forests following long-term drought may be possible.

52 Key-words: Long-term drought; Understorey trees; Hydraulic Safety margin; P50;
53 Maximum conductivity; Acclimation; Amazon forest.

59 Introduction

Climate change predictions for tropical forests comprise increased frequency and intensity of extreme drought events (Aragão et al., 2018; Brodribb, Powers, Cochard, & Choat, 2020) and long-term reductions in soil moisture availability (Corlett 2016, Christensen et al. 2017). Most studies relating to drought focus on the impacts on large trees that comprise the highest proportion of forest biomass (Meir et al. 2015, Rowland, da Costa, et al. 2015), often finding the effect of drought stress on a plant's hydraulic system is a key driver of tree mortality (Bittencourt et al., 2020; Brodribb et al., 2020; Rowland et al., 2015). However, small understorey trees not only are responsible for up to 20% of the forest carbon sink (Hubau et al. 2019) but have a fundamental role in recruitment and the maintenance of tree populations, as they will effectively compose the future pool of large tree in the forest. Thus, small trees may be critical in determining long-term drought responses if there is extensive loss of large canopy trees (Rowland, da Costa, et al. 2015, Esquivel-Muelbert et al. 2017).

Large trees occupy canopy positions (hereafter, large trees) with high light levels and high vapor pressure deficit. In contrast, small trees from the same genus occupy understory positions (hereafter small trees), grow slowly, generally in shaded conditions and experience a lower atmospheric vapor pressure deficit (Sterck et al. 2011). The distinct resource partitioning between small and large trees, (Brum et al., 2019; Poorter, Bongers, Sterck, & Wöll, 2005) could cause strong differences in their water supply and demand relative to large trees. Reduced water supply from the roots, alongside lower capacitance, is likely to cause more negative water potentials in small trees relative to larger ones, during periods of low soil moisture (Salomón et al. 2017). Large trees are more likely to

 buffer periods of water deficit with greater water access by deep roots (Brum et al. 2019),
higher capacitance (Mcculloh et al. 2014), and elevated carbohydrate storage that allow
to maintain either prolonged stomatal opening (deep roots) or prolonged stomatal closure
(greater storage) (McDowell et al., 2008). These potential size-dependent variations in
structural and physiological traits suggest tree size potentially influences a tree's capacity
to acclimate in response to severe drought stress.

Several key traits of the hydraulic system of a plant are essential in determining the capacity of a tree to survive prolonged drought stress. These traits are often related to preventing hydraulic failure, via emboli formation, in the xylem vessels (Sperry and Tyree 1988), which can lead to severe decreases in leaf water supply, photosynthesis and other physiological functions (Sperry et al. 2002, McDowell et al. 2008, Martinez-Vilalta et al. 2019). These key traits include the water potentials at which the xylem lose 50% or 88% of their conductance (P50 or P88, respectively) and the hydraulic safety margin (HSM) (Meinzer et al. 2009), i.e., the difference between the minimum leaf water potential that is naturally experienced and P50, effectively a metric of the risk of a plant crossing a critical hydraulic threshold. Following sustained periods of drought stress, a tree's capacity to survive is likely to be related to its capacity to acclimate certain key drought tolerance traits or to limit its demand for water, via traits such as minimum stomatal conductance, thus reducing stress on its hydraulic system (Sala et al. 2010, Meir et al. 2018). Existing studies on large trees show limited capacity for tropical trees to adjust plant hydraulic traits in response to drought stress (Binks et al., 2016; Bittencourt et al., 2020; Powell et al., 2017; Schuldt et al., 2011). Some studies have shown that the risk of embolism can be reduced by increasing HSMs under drought conditions (Awad et al. 2010, Tomasella et al. 2018, Prendin et al. 2018). However, in a tropical forest drought experiment, large trees

Page 5 of 114

were found to have limited plasticity in leaf level anatomy (Binks et al., 2016) and no capacity to acclimate their hydraulic systems, especially in traits relating to embolism resistance (Bittencourt et al., 2020; Powell et al., 2017; Rowland et al., 2015). Yet, to our knowledge, no studies have evaluated whether small trees (<10 cm diameter at breast height, DBH), contrary to adult trees, have the capacity to adjust their hydraulic system to prolonged drought stress. Following high mortality losses in large, more drought-intolerant, trees, small trees can increase photosynthetic capacity (Bartholomew et al., 2020;) and lower canopy trees can increase growth rates, even following drought (Brando et al., 2008; Rowland et al., 2015). This suggests that small trees can increase performance in response to elevated light, despite drier conditions. Increased light availability would also require these small trees to the increased atmospheric water demand, implying the need to increase water supply from their hydraulic system and/or to sustain a lower xylem water potential. However, these adjustments to conditions of severe drought only seem to be possible if small trees have a greater drought tolerance, functioning with higher levels of embolism resistance and hydraulic safety margin (HSM). Consequently, consideration of ecosystem changes, such as canopy loss and shifting light availability, is likely to be as important as the consideration of the direct impact of soil moisture stress following long-term drought, as both factors may influence hydraulic acclimation within small trees. Here we take advantage of a unique drought experiment located in northeast Amazonia

Here we take advantage of a unique drought experiment located in northeast Amazonia (Meir et al. 2015, 2018) to evaluate the response of small trees to combined changes in water and light availability. Previous research at this site has shown that large trees (>40 cm DBH) had significantly higher mortality rates, when compared to small trees and to trees in adjacent control forest, leading to a 40% reduction in biomass following 14 years

 of experimentally-imposed soil drought (da Costa et al., 2010; Rowland et al., 2015, Meir et al. 2018). This biomass loss was almost entirely from trees reaching the upper canopy, which led to increased levels of light in the understory and increased growth rates of small understory trees in the wet season (da Costa et al., 2014; Metcalfe, et al., 2010; Rowland et al., 2015, Meir et al. 2018). Furthermore elevated radiation loads are likely to have increased leaf vapour pressure deficit and temperature, increasing the atmospheric drought effect these small trees experience (Mulkey & Pearcy 1992a; Kamaluddin & Grace 1992; Krause, Virgo & Winter 1995). Using new data from this soil drought experiment (henceforth throughfall-exclusion experiment – TFE), we explore how small trees adjust hydraulic traits in response to increases in light availability coupled with increased drought stress, specifically, if small trees are able to adjust traits to novel light conditions whilst under drought stress. Thus, we test whether small trees (1-10 cm DBH) alter their plant hydraulic system in response to prolonged soil moisture stress and increased canopy openness, and determine how these responses vary relative to those of large trees (>20 cm DBH). We address the following hypotheses:

1) Considering the same genus we hope that the hydraulic systems of small trees adjust to the combined soil-drought and radiation-load conditions imposed in the TFE relative to the Control. We expect small trees in TFE treatment to take advantage of the increased canopy openness by increasing their water transport efficiency (greater hydraulic specific conductivity and leaf-sapwood ratios). At the same time, we predict that small trees will have more negative water potentials resulting from drought conditions and the capacity to compensate this by adjusting hydraulic traits to maintain higher hydraulic safety margins to meet the elevated canopy water demands in support of photosynthesis.

1 2

-	
3	
4	
5	
6	
ю	
7	
8	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
10	
16	
17	
18	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
22	
52	
33	
34	
35	
22	
36	
37	
38	
20	
39	
40	
41	
12	
42	
43	
44	
45	
4J	
46	
47	
48	
40	
49	
50	
51	
50	
52	
53	
54	
55	
55	
56	
57	
58	

59 60 2) Small trees have different hydraulic strategies from large trees. Specifically, we predict
that, independent of the drought and radiation responses in the TFE, small trees have
greater drought tolerance, higher xylem embolism resistance and larger hydraulic safety
margins, relative to large trees. We therefore predict that, as a consequence of those trait

differences, small trees occupy a different hydraulic trait space from large trees.

for per peries

Methods

160 Site and plant material

Our study site is a lowland tropical rainforest located in the Caxiuana National Forest, state of Pará, north-east Brazil (1°43'S, 51°27 W). It has an annual rainfall of 2000-2500mm, with a dry season (< 120 mm monthly rainfall) from July to December. A throughfall exclusion (TFE) experiment was established in 2002, where 50% of canopy throughfall is excluded by a plastic panel structure installed at 1-2m height over a 1 ha area (Meir et al. 2018). The TFE plot was studied alongside a 1 ha Control plot, where no throughfall exclusion took place. The plots have been monitored continuously since 2001 and further information on the experimental set-up can be found in earlier papers (da Costa et al., 2010; Fisher et al., 2007; Meir et al., 2015 and Rowland et al., 2015b).

From August-September 2017, during the peak of the dry season, we sampled 74 small trees with diameters ranging from 1 to 10 cm at breast height (1.3 m). We measured 41 small trees on the Control plot and 33 on the TFE, all taken from nine genera (20 species), replicated in each plot (two to five individuals per genera per plot). While we tried to maintain the same range of tree heights within each genus between plots, small trees had more variable height in the TFE, with light-exposed individuals reaching over 15 meters height, whilst no individuals in the Control reached 15 metres height (See Fig. S1). It was not possible to know the age of each sampled individual, because (destructive) sampling for age determination (tree-ring analyses; e.g., Brienen et al., 2016) was not possible. Consequently, we must assume that our sampled trees may have strongly varying ages (Groenendijk et al. 2014). We thus test the influence of tree stature and

position within the forest strata (van der Sleen et al. 2015), while assuming that most of
our sampled trees are likely to be young.

For each individual, we collected two branches from the top of the crown, representing the point maximally exposed to light. The branches were third to fourth order (30-55 mm of diameter), counting from the tip. We collected one set of branches before sunrise (0400 to 0600 hours) and used these to measure embolism resistance and predawn leaf water potential. We collected a second set of branches at midday (1130 to 1330 hours) and used these to measure midday leaf water potential, native embolism, leaf-to-sapwood area, xylem and leaf specific conductivity, minimum leaf conductance and wood density measurements. Immediately after collection, branches were bagged in thick black plastic sacks with moist paper to humidify internal air and minimise leaf transpiration. Branches were transported 100m from the plots to measure leaf water potential, and for the remaining measurements the branches were transported to a laboratory ~1km walk away.

We measured predawn leaf water potential (Ψ pd), taken to represent the time-point when transpiration is at its minimum and the water potential of the plant is closest to equilibrium with that of the soil. Wpd can be considered an integrated metric of soil water availability across the rooting depth (Bartlett et al. 2016). We also determined midday water potential (Ψ md), to capture the minimum Ψ of the plant in the dry season. This measure is affected by any cuticular or stomatal transpiration and, thus, broadly captures the integrated effects of plant traits and the environment water demand on the minimum water potential a plant reaches in natural conditions. We also measured the native dry-season percentage loss of conductivity (PLC). We used the difference between

the minimum leaf water potential (Ψ_{md}) and P_{50} , to calculate the branch hydraulic safety margin (HSM). These two values (native PLC and HSM) were used as indicators of the cumulative damage from embolism.

Predawn and midday water potential

Predawn and midday leaf water potentials were measured in the field immediately after collection, using a pressure chamber (Model 1505, PMS). Branches collected for predawn water potential measures were sampled before sunrise, and for midday water potential, the sampling took place between 1130 to 1330 hours. For each tree we measured water potential of two leaves, or three leaves if the first two measures differed substantially (>0.5 MPa difference) from one another. Measurements from multiple leaves were averaged to create a single value per tree. All water potential measurements were taken on the same day for small trees and across three days for large trees.

216 Wood density, leaf to sapwood area ratio and minimum stomatal conductance

We measured wood density (W_D) on woody sections 40 to 80 mm long with a diameter of 4 to 7 mm. We debarked samples, immersed them in water for 24 hours to rehydrate and measured the saturated volume using the water displacement method (Pérez-Harguindeguy *et al.*, 2013). We then oven dried the samples at 60°C until they were a constant mass and measured their dry weight with a precision balance to 3 decimal places.

We determined the leaf to sapwood area ratio (A_L:A_{SW}), on all branches by measuring leaf area and calculating sapwood area from two diameter measurements of the debarked basal part of the branch using precision callipers at a standardised distance from the tip. To avoid overestimation we checked the absence of pith area in all branches

per species before the measurement. We measured leaf area by scanning all leaves on the branch and quantifying their area using Image J software (version 1.6.0_20; Schneider et al., 2012). We calculated the leaf area to sapwood area ratio as total branch leaf area divided by its basal sapwood area. All branches had a similar size and were standardised by distance to the tip (~40-70 cm). The A_L:A_{SW} is a key indicator of the balance between transpirative demand and water supply capacity (Mencuccini et al. 2019).

For minimum leaf conductance (G_{min}), we used the leaf conductance to water vapour measured on the abaxial surface of leaves kept 30 minutes in the dark, using an infrared gas analyser (Li-COR 6400, US). All measured leaves were fully formed and undamaged leaves. G_{min} is a measure key indicator of residual leaf water loss and likely a due to a combination of leakage stomatal conductance from partially from leakage of partially closed stomata and cuticular conductance (Duursma et al. 2019, Binks et al. 2020, Márquez et al. 2021)., see Rowland et al. (2020) and Bartholomew et al. (2020), provide further details on gas exchange measurement.

241 Hydraulic efficiency and native embolism

We used maximum hydraulic specific conductivity (K_s) as a measure of xylem hydraulic efficiency and maximum leaf specific conductivity (K_{sl}) as a measure of leaf water supply capacity. We used the native percentage loss of conductivity of the collected branches (PLC) as a measure of native embolism. To PLC, we measured branch xylem hydraulic conductivity before (K_{snat} – native conductivity) and after flushing to remove emboli (Ks). We quantified the leaf area distal to each sample to obtain K_{sl} from K_l (leaf conductance). Using samples from the branches collected at midday, we put the entire branch underwater and discarded a 10 cm long segment from the base. After this, we cut

another 10-15 cm long segment from the base of each branch underwater, standard distance from the tip of the branch and let them rehydrate for 15 min to release tension and avoid artefacts (Venturas et al. 2015). Subsequently, to relax the tension in the branch we cut 1-1.5 cm of branch from base to leaves underwater, in steps of ~15 cm, and used the distal end of the branch for hydraulic measurements to ensure no artificially embolised vessels were present in the measured sample. All samples used for hydraulic measurements were second or third order branches, between 30-55 mm in length and 3-5 mm diameter and were recut underwater with a sharp razor blade before connecting to the apparatus, to ensure all vessels were open at both ends. We then measured flow in the sample using the Ventury tube method (Tyree et al. 2002, Pereira and Mazzafera 2013), where known resistance (PEEK capillary) is connected in series with the sample and the pressure drop in the capillary is proportional to flow in the sample. K_{snat} is then calculated from the pressure head applied and water flow. The samples are then flushed to remove emboli and estimate Ks (Martin-StPaul et al., 2014). We used pressure transducers (26PCCFA6G, Honeywell; read with a <u>OM-CP-VOLT101A</u> data logger, Omega Engineering) to measure pressure drop in the capillary and measured the capillary resistance prior to measurements using precision scales. The samples remained underwater throughout the entire procedure. We calculated PLC as the ratio of K_{snat} to K_s multiplied by 100. We calculated K_{sl} as the sample hydraulic conductivity (i.e., sample conductance times sample length) after flushing divided by the leaf area distal to the measured sample.

Embolism resistance and hydraulic safety

Page 13 of 114

As an index of xylem embolism resistance, we used P₅₀ and P₈₈, the xylem water potentials where, respectively, 50% and 88% of hydraulic conductivity is lost. We also used P_{50} to calculate the hydraulic safety margin - the difference between P_{50} and Ψ_{md} , an index of tree hydraulic safety. Branches collected before sunrise were rehydrated for 24 hours and from each branch we cut two or three smaller branches of approximately 40-70 cm. We measured the xylem embolism resistance of each branch using the pneumatic method (Pereira et al. 2016, Zhang et al. 2018). With this method, the loss of hydraulic conductance is estimated from the increase in air volume inside the wood caused by embolism formation as the branch dehydrates. Air volume is estimated from the air discharge from the cut end of the branch into a vacuum reservoir (~50 kPa absolute pressure) of known volume during a given amount of time (2.5 minutes). We measured initial and final pressure inside the vacuum reservoir with a pressure transducer (163PC01D75, Honeywell) and calculated the volume of air discharged using the ideal gas law. A detailed protocol is presented in (Pereira et al. 2016, Bittencourt et al. 2018) and revised by Pereira et al. (2021). Percentage loss of conductance for each branch is estimated from percentage air discharged (PAD) during its dehydration. PAD is calculated by standardising air discharge for each branch by its minimum (fully hydrated) and maximum (most dehydrated) air discharge state. We dehydrated branches using the bench dehydration method (Sperry et al. 1988). Before each air discharge measurement, branches were sealed in thick black plastic bags for one hour for leaf and wood xylem water potential to equilibrate. Directly after the air discharge was measured, we estimated wood xylem water potential by measuring the leaf water potential of one to two leaves. Drought embolism resistance is then given by the increase in PAD with decreasing xylem water potential for each tree. To calculate P₅₀, we pooled data from the

two-to-three branch replicates from the same tree and fitted a sigmoid curve to the data (Pammenter and Van der Willigen 1998) where P_{50} and slope (a) are the fitted parameters and P_{88} is predicted from the fit (Eqn 1):

$$PAD = 100/(1 + \exp(a(\Psi - P50)))$$

Eqn1. Percentage air discharge equation (PAD). Ψ Water potential. P₅₀ (xylem embolism 301 resistance (MPa)

302 Data analysis

(1)

By comparing trees found on the Control and TFE experimental plots, we measure the effect of the experimental drought on our drought stress indicators (Ψ_{pd} , Ψ_{md} - midday water potential; HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P₅₀; PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity) and plant traits (W_D – wood density; $A_L:A_{SW}$ - leaf to sapwood area; P₅₀ - xylem embolism resistance; P₈₈ - xylem embolism resistance; G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance; K_s – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; K_{sl} -maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity) in small trees. We used linear mixed effects models to test for plot (TFE vs Control) and taxonomic effects (genus and species) on hydraulics traits in small trees (n = 66) using the R package lme4 (Bates et al. 2015). We tested the significance of the random effect by removing it and evaluating if the model significantly worsened using log likelihood tests using the ranova function for ImerTest objects (Zuur et al. 2009). We tested sequentially for the random effect of genus on: (a) the model intercept; (b) the fixed Plot effect (drought effect, difference between plots) on slope without intercept; and (c) both intercept and plot. When either the genus effect on plot, slope or both did not show the significance, we kept the multilevel approach using

genus as a random effect on the intercept (1 genus), as it controls for experimental design (Burnham and Anderson 2004). After testing the random effects, we tested the fixed TFE effect on variables. When taxonomy was included as a random effect in our models, we tested for both genus-only and species-nested-within-genus effects. We tested the complete model (genus and species as a random effect) against a General Linear Model (GLM) containing only the fixed effects. In all variables genus was significant as random effect. Therefore, linear models with genus as a random effect were used to test the significance of the fixed effects. To quantify model goodness of fit, we considered the marginal and conditional R² (Mulkey and Pearcy 1992b). The marginal R² indicates how much of the model variance is explained by the fixed effects only, whereas the conditional R² indicates how much of the model variance is explained by the complete model with fixed and random effects. All the analyses were done in R (version 3.3.0; R Core Team, 2016) Small and large tree comparisons We tested for differences in individual tree-level responses to the TFE treatment for large (n = 72) and small trees (n = 39). We use the large trees data from Bittencourt et al. (2020) conducted in the same experimental plots and collected during 2017 with the same methodological procedures. For this comparison we restrict the samples to those trees whose genera are replicated on both plots and replicated between the large and small trees, with a minimum sample size of 2 individuals per size group per plot and genus. Consequently, the number of genera and individuals employed in this comparison is lower than the available number of individual small trees and the full dataset published in

340 Bittencourt et al., (2020). In total we use five genera (Eschweilera, Inga, Licania, Protium,

Swartzia), with 15 small trees on the Control and 24 small trees on the TFE, and 35 large trees on the Control and 37 large trees on the TFE. We used linear mixed-effect models to test the effects of the tree size with two classes (large and small), and tree size on drought stress indicators and hydraulic traits. Taxonomic effects were included by using genus as random effects, following the same protocol used for the small tree analyses, presented above. Within this paper, all data presented represent the mean and standard errors of the mean. A summary of available trait data by genus is presented in Table 1.

To test for an overall difference in the hydraulic strategy between small and large trees, we used the multivariate approach conducting non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) using an individual-traits matrix (McCune & Grace 2002). We construct a matrix of data consisting of rows of individuals of each species and columns of traits values. We standardized the individual trait values for each genus and built the similarity matrix using Gower distance. NMDS searches for the best position of individuals variables on k dimensions (axes) to minimize the "stress" of the resulting k-dimensional configuration. We use k axes = 2 from that ordination as the initial configuration. The "stress" is obtained by comparison among the pair-wise distances (differences) of each individual's variables in reduced ordination space (expressed in terms of axes) and the original distance matrix (Gower distance). The regression is fitted using least-squares regressions and the goodness of fit is measured as the sum of squared differences between ordination-based distances and the distances predicted by the regression. A goodness of fit, or stress value, between 0.1 to 0.2 represent a good fit within the specified number of dimensions analysed to enable points to be interpreted relative to the NMDS axes. Therefore, the axis represents the data in a way that best represents their dissimilarity, points on the graph that are closer together are more similar. In addition, we use MANOVA to test the

 difference in multidimensional space filled by tree size (small and large groups) and by plot effect (TFE and Control groups) separately (Anderson 2001). We use a MANOVA to compare Gower distance among observations in the same group versus those in different groups. We conducted a MANOVA first using small and large tree groups and then using TFE and Control groups using both tree sizes together. The size and plot effects were tested separately. Finally, we use permutations of the observations to obtain a probability associated with the null hypothesis of no differences between groups.

372 Results

The reduced soil moisture availability and increased canopy openness caused by 15 years of the TFE (Fig. S2) caused significant changes in the hydraulic traits of the small trees (Fig. 1). Maximum specific conductivity (K_s) increased significantly, by 56.3±41.5%, in the TFE small trees relative to the Control (Fig. 1f, p<0.01), similarly there was a significant (45.6±38.2%) increase in the leaf: sapwood area ratio (AL:Asw, Fig 1b.; p<0.001). The TFE also had significant effects on key physiological indicators of drought stress in small trees (Fig. 1) with Ψ_{pd} 0.24 MPa lower on the TFE relative to the Control (p <0.001) and Ψ_{md} 0.67 MPa lower (p < 0.001, Table S2). In contrast, other key hydraulic traits including xylem embolism resistance (P₅₀ and P₈₈), leaf specific conductivity (K_{sl}), minimum stomatal conductance (G_{min}) and wood density (WD) showed no significant difference between the TFE and the Control plots for small trees (Fig. 1; Table 2; Table S3).

Taxonomic effects on hydraulic traits and their interactions with drought

Using mixed-effect modelling analysis we found that the variance explained by taxonomy had only a limited role in affecting the overall drought responses. When genus by genus responses to the drought effect were examined separately, it was clear that there were highly variable responses to the treatment among genera and sometimes these were inconsistent in terms of direction, as well as magnitude. We cannot separate the taxonomic effect from the residual variance because genus-specific influences on the plot effect were highly variable (Fig. 2 and 3). Given the low replication (between 2 and 5 for each genus on each plot treatment) and high variation within each genus, it was not always statistically viable to test the plot effect within each genus (Fig. 2 and 3), however where this was possible, clear statistical differences were seen for some genera but not for others (Table 2 Fig. 2). For example, Licania showed consistent responses in P₅₀ and HSM while Ocotea did not show differences between plots (Fig. 2 and 3). The patterns described here were also maintained when we analysed the data at a species level (data ien not shown).

401 Large versus small trees

We compared the responses of hydraulic traits between large (>20 cm DBH) and small trees (1-10 cm DBH). Except for Ψ_{pd} , the results we obtain considering only the five genera that overlap between the small and large size classes, were similar to when considering all nine genera of trees present in Control plot and TFE experiment (see Fig. S3 supplementary material and Table S3 for n values for the small to large tree comparisons). Using all of the trait data for five overlapping genera, we applied NMDS ordination which demonstrated that the niche space occupied by the small trees was significantly different from the trait space of large trees. The traits space separated on to a clear 2-dimensional axis with a stress score of 0.18, indicating a good fit between the data and an analysis consisting of two axes (Fig. 4). Different associations amongst the nine hydraulic traits separated the individuals in the small and large tree groups. This result was driven predominantly by the first axis, which was positively related to PLC, P₅₀ and P₈₈ that influenced small tree grouping (Fig. 4). While the first axis was negatively related to K_s, K_{sl}, G_{min} influencing large trees grouping (Fig 4, Table S4). Using the complete set of hydraulic traits, we show that the hydraulic niche of small trees was significantly different from that of large trees (MANOVA_(1,66); F=7.96; p<0.001; Table 1). However, there was no difference in hydraulic niche space occupied by the Control and TFE groups (MANOVA(1.64); F=1.22; p=0.30), except for K_s that showed plot and tree size effects (MANOVA_(1,64); F=3.5; p=0.05). In contrast to the large increase in K_s observed between small trees in Control and TFE trees (Figs 1 & S2), the plot level average values of K_s were similar among large trees in both Control and droughted conditions (4.82±3.93 TFE and 4.86±2.79 Control plot). Similar to Ψ_{md} , notable plot level differences were present in small trees, but these were absent

 in the large trees (-1.72 ± 0.48 MPa TFE and -1.70±0.48 MPa Control treatment). However, small trees had values of Ψ_{md} which were 17.12±0.03% higher (values closer to 0) than the large trees. Furthermore, for the variables which had no treatment effect amongst the small trees, we find on average, across both the TFE and Control plots, the small trees had a 38.20±32.10% (p<0.01) more negative P₅₀ and a 68.40±58.80% and 20.70±30.40% lower G_{min} and K_{sl}, respectively, than the large trees (Fig. 5b, 5d, 5f; p<0.001). Also across the plot we found that HSM increased by 72.97±36.34% and PLC increased by 44.41±14.62% in the small trees relative to large trees (Fig. 5g, 5i, 5j; p<0.01). We analysed the influence of genus on the combined effect of treatment and tree size effect (i.e., large and small trees on the Control and TFE plot) for the five genera we could replicate across plots and tree size classes. We found that the effects of tree size varied substantially among genera and between traits and stress indicators (Fig. 6 and 7, table S5 and S6). For example, the difference in P_{50} between large trees and the small trees was 61.48±52.51% for Licania and 38.96±3.7% for Inga (Fig. 6). In contrast, G_{min} was significantly lower in the small trees relative to large trees across almost all genera (Fig. 6b). The drought-response pattern also changes when doing within-genus comparisons between large and small trees, for example the mean P₅₀ response for Inga was different

between small and large trees (Fig. 6). A difference in trait values between the Control and TFE plots that was present either for small tree or large trees, but not for both size classes simultaneously, occurred multiple times (Fig. 6 and 7), especially for the genus Inga. Mixed effect modelling results identify a strong influence of genus on trait variation between our two size classes (Table 3), yet there are limited cases where we find significant models demonstrating trait differences between the Control and the TFE plot with a significant tree size and genus effect (Table 3).

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
14	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2/	
24	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
10	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
20	

456

To test for size (small vs. large) and genus effects in each treatment (Control and TFE), we 448 created a model with both size and genus as fixed effects. In the Control plot the full 449 450 model (trait ~ genus*size) was a better predictor of variation across almost all traits, except for K_s , where there was a genus only effect and G_{min} , P_{50} and P_{88} where there was a 451 size only effect. An interaction between size and genus was only significant for PLC (Table 452 453 S7). The full model was also the best predictor of trait variation in the TFE plot, although only HSM, W_D and G_{min} showed a significant size effect. Significant interactions between 454 r r P₅₀ ano genus and size were found for P_{50} and P_{88} (Table S7). 455

- 59
- 60

457 Discussion

Our results provide the evidence that small trees can adjust their functioning in response to drought, allowing them to maximize carbon gain in the higher-light levels following mortality of large trees in the TFE. We find that small trees (1-10 cm DBH) have the capacity to increase maximum specific hydraulic conductivity and leaf-sapwood area ratio in response to prolonged (15 year) soil moisture deficit. Despite having significantly lower pre-dawn and midday leaf water potentials, small trees had the capacity to adjust key hydraulic traits to allow a positive response to a higher light environment. This suggests that despite soil drought stress, small trees can still increase water transport efficiency and canopy water use in response to increases in light availability, following drought-induced mortality of large trees, potentially allowing them to maximise productivity in periods of the year when water is available. We also show the different components of a hydraulic strategy that provides niche segregation between small and large trees, with small trees being more drought tolerant than large canopy trees.

471 Studying the effects of multiple factors (here, imposed drought and size) on the 472 physiology of hyper-diverse tropical forests is challenging. Here, we successfully addressed 473 this problem by using genus and species nested in genus as random factors in linear mixed 474 models and show that variability of species within genera is generally small. We 475 nonetheless acknowledge our sample size limitations and the possibility that greater 476 sampling depth may discover significant species-by-species variability in these traits.

479 The impact of drought on the hydraulic system of small trees

The substantial drought-related mortality of large trees (da Costa et al., 2010; Rowland et al., 2015) in the 15 years preceding this study led to an increase in the light availability in the lower canopy of the TFE, driving increases in the maximum photosynthetic capacity (71.1% and 29.2% increase in J_{max} and Vc_{max} respectively) and a 15.1% increase in the LMA of the same small trees we study here (Bartholomew et al. 2020). These differences in response to the prevailing light environment have also been observed elsewhere in tropical tree canopies (Ruggiero et al. 2002, Domingues et al. 2010, Cavaleri et al. 2010) and are indicative of plants changing their allocation strategy in response to increased light availability (Poorter et al., 2009; Wright et al., 2004). Critically, these allocation shifts are likely to result in a net increase in photosynthesis and growth (Metcalfe, Meir, Aragão, et al. 2010, Rowland, da Costa, et al. 2015, Meir et al. 2018), which require higher water supply to the canopy of each individual. The elevated soil moisture stress in the TFE relative to the Control trees manifested itself as significantly more negative pre-dawn and midday leaf water potential values (Figs 1h-1i), key indicators of plant water stress (Bhaskar & Ackerly, 2006; Kramer, 1988; Martínez-vilalta & Garcia-Forner, 2017). Interestingly however, these more negative water potentials did not translate into a significant change in HSM between plots, which would imply that the small trees converge to have the same vulnerability to drought (Choat et al. 2012). This could occur because of a trend, albeit not statistically detectable, towards more negative P50 values in the TFE plot for small trees, relative to the Control trees (Fig. 1), making a significant difference in HSM less likely. When examined at the genus level, five of the nine genera have consistently more negative P₅₀ values on the TFE relative to the Control, with two remaining roughly equal and two less negative on the TFE (Fig. 2). These data

suggest that, despite operating at more negative water potentials, it is still possible for
small trees to adjust their hydraulic system to support the increased growth in response to
greater light availability.

Consistent with increases in photosynthetic capacity (Bartholomew et al., 2020), we observe an increase in leaf area to sapwood area ratio (AL:ASW) in the small trees on the TFE, relative to the Control. Combined with greater hydraulic specific conductivity, small trees in the TFE are therefore able to supply water to more photosynthetic tissue without increasing the volume of sapwood. A global study, including multiple sites from the tropics showed plant hydraulic systems are highly sensitive to changes in this ratio (AL:ASW) and may be one of the main factors controlling trade-offs in other plant hydraulic traits (Mencuccini et al. 2019). Increasing leaf area increases the total water demand of the tree; however, the observed increases in photosynthetic capacity (high values of Vc_{max} and J_{max}, Bartholomew et al. 2020), may allow slightly lower stomatal conductance for any given CO₂ concentration (Bartholomew et al., 2020; Sperry et al., 2017). This may, in part, compensate for the increase in demand for water that increased leaf areas could cause. However, even with the observed increases in photosynthetic capacity, these small trees probably still experience increased total water demand due to increased exposure to higher temperatures and VPD, suggesting that small trees must increase maximum hydraulic conductivity and/or tolerate reductions in water potential and therefore greater embolism risk (Sperry et al., 2017). In our study, small trees sampled in the TFE were slightly taller than the small trees in the Control plot (Fig. S1). This difference may in partcontribute to the slightly elevated conductance in the branches, as taller trees can have larger vessels at the base and greater vessel tapering from the trunk to branch tip (Olson

and Rosell 2013, Olson et al. 2020). It is, however, unlikely that these differences had a

large influence on our K_s results, overall, the difference in height were small and the genera with the greatest height differences between the TFE and Control (Protium, Octea, *Voucoupoa*, Fig. S1) showed no changes in Ks (Fig. 2). Differential hydraulic strategy between small and large trees The comparison between small trees and large trees multidimensional hydraulic trait space, using NMDS and MANOVA, indicate they occupy different hydraulic niche spaces, despite some overlap. This revealed that smaller trees do indeed have a different water use strategy to larger canopy trees (Fig 3). The differences in the traits we observed were far greater, and in most cases significantly so, between the large and the small trees than for trees of the same size class between treatments (Fig 4). In addition, we show that smaller trees across both the Control and the TFE plot have significantly more negative P₅₀ values and lower G_{min} values and significantly greater hydraulic safety margins (HSM), midday leaf water potentials and PLC (Fig. 4). This may imply that the small trees converge to the same vulnerability to drought, consistent with the results from large scale studies (e.g. Choat et al., 2012). However, the HSM is 1.94 MPa more positive in the small trees relative to large trees, indicative of a lack of convergence of the vulnerability of large and small trees (i.e. Fig 4i), potentially suggesting vulnerability to drought is driven by the ontogenetic stage of a tree. In addition, our results are consistent with the hypothesis that the smaller trees are shallow rooted and compensate for the lack of access to deep water through developing greater xylem embolism resistance and greater stomatal control (Brum et al., 2019; Tardieu, 1996, Sperry et al. 2017). It is possible that the greater hydraulic safety margin in small trees enables them to adjust more effectively to increased

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tp

549 light availability, despite the lower water availability in the TFE, as it enables these trees to
550 tolerate greater drought stress without passing critical thresholds.

The carbon gain associated with greater photosynthesis under higher light environments may be translated into new xylem growth in smaller trees. This growth could rapidly replace damaged tissues and is likely to be a more viable strategy for smaller trees, relative to large trees (Damián et al. 2018, Trugman et al. 2018), which would reduce the risk associated with higher PLC levels. Furthermore, small trees maintained significantly lower G_{min} and higher midday leaf water potentials (Fig. 5d, 5g), relative to the large trees, despite having similar pre-dawn leaf water potentials, suggesting that small trees are able to more tightly regulate water loss, during both the day and night. Probably, the high regulate water loss in small tree is associate a lower water storage capacity to buffer short-term variation of water availability (Goldstein et al. 1998, Meinzer et al. 2003). The greater degree of control further reduces the risk of runaway embolism when photosynthesising during periods with low water potential, particularly if these trees can repair cavitated vessels (Nardini et al., 2011; Salleo et al., 2004; Salleo et al., 1995) or grow new vessels between consecutive dry seasons (Eller et al. 2018). Also, small trees also have fewer structural constraints than large trees, so small changes in hydraulic traits in a small tree could have bigger effects on overall performance during drought, because the marginal effect of each unit change is larger relative to the size of the tree (Mencuccini 2002). Combined, these factors are likely to allow small trees to have greater flexibility in terms of the strategy they use to adjust to combined changes in water and light availability. However, as we highlight in our results, there is considerable variability both within and between taxonomic groups with respect to how small trees may alter their traits and their resulting drought tolerance strategy.

Page 27 of 114

This study highlights the importance of forest structural changes in controlling the traits of what are likely to be the next generation of trees growing up during prolonged drought stress. We show that, relative to large trees, small trees have a larger capacity to acclimate their hydraulic systems to increases in light availability following drought-induced mortality of large canopy-dominant trees. Our results suggest that small trees are able to acclimate the hydraulic conductance and leaf area to sapwood area ratio despite experiencing prolonged soil moisture stress, which resulted here in lower leaf water potentials and greater PLC. Also, our results demonstrate that there is a consistent and larger shift in the plant hydraulic strategy of saplings relative to large trees across most of Amazonia's hyper-abundant taxonomic groups. Whilst we find adjustment of traits in response to the drought treatment, it remains unknown whether all small trees community can respond in the same way or only the long-term drought surviving trees. In this way, a key uncertainty that remains to be answered are relates to the long-term development of these trees. Assuming these small trees continue to develop under the experimental drought stressed conditions, it would be of interest to know if the trajectory of change in hydraulic traits we observe can be sufficient to increase the hydraulic resistance to drought of these trees as they approach full size.

Ultimately, continued acclimation of hydraulic systems throughout a the lifespan of a tree may allow a more drought-resilient ecosystem to develop following the negative impacts of drought on pre-existing larger trees. Therefore, even the current generation of trees showing huge mortality rates, the next generation might be followed by a new stable community composed of those small trees that can adapt to drought. This implies that for prediction of the future of tropical ecosystems function we needs to consider trait adjustment in the future forest instead currently forest.

2 3 4 5	597	Data and Materials Availability
6 7	598	We are in the process of making this data publically available through the main funding
8 9 10	599	bodies data centre, NERC EIDC (https://eidc.ac.uk/), if accepted the data will be fully
10 11 12	600	publically available on a link we will provide.
13 14 15 16	601	Supplementary Data
17 18 19	602	Supplementary tables
20 21	603	Table S1. Linear mixed effect model analysis of stress indicator variables from small tress.
22 23	604	Table S2. Linear mixed effect model analysis of hydraulic traits from small tress.
24 25 26 27 28	605 606	Table S3 Numbers of individuals for small and large tree in each treatment (TFE an Control) and mean and standard deviation of all variables measured.
	607	Table S4. Statistics from the NMDS modelling shown in Figure 3.
29 30 31	608 609	Table S5 Results of linear effect models of size (Size vs TFE) on the stress indicator variables on Control plot.
32 33 34	610 611	Table S6 Results of linear effect models of size (Size vs TFE) on the hydraulic traits variables on TFE plot.
35 36	612	Table S7 Results of linear effect models of size (Size vs TEE) and genus on the stress indicator and
37 38	613	hydraulic variables on TFE plot.
 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 	614	
51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60		

1 ว		
2 3 4	615	
5	616	Supplementary figures
7 8 9	617 618	Figure S1 . Height and diameter in each treatment (TFE vs. Control) and by genus for the most common small tree genera in this study (9 genera)
10 11 12	619 620	Figure S2. Soil water content during 2016 in the Throughfall Exclusion Experiment plot and in the Control plot at 10 cm and at 100 cm.
13 14 15 16 17	621 622 623	Figure S3. Comparison between the small trees and large trees from the throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plots from grouping all 9 genera available within the large and small tree groupings.
18 19	624	
20 21 22 23	625	Conflict of interest
24 25 26	626	The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.
27 28 29	627	Funding
30 31 32	628	Funding for this work was provided by Brazilian Higher Education Co-ordination Agency
33 34	629	(CAPES- Finance Code 001 to ALG); Natural Environment Research Council (NE/N014022/1
35 36 37	630	to LR, NE/J011002/1 to PM and MM, and NE/L002434/1 to DCB); European Union
38 39	631	FP7(Amazalert to PM and MM);National Council for Scientific and Technological
40 41 42	632	Development (457914/2013-0/MCTI/CNPq/FNDCT/LBA/ESECAFLOR to ACLdC); Australian
43 44	633	Research Council (DP170104091 to PM). The São Paulo Research Foundation FAPESP
45 46	634	(grant 11/52072-0 to RSO, 2018/01847-0 to RSO and LR); Royal Society's Newton
47 48 49	635	International for its Fellowship to PRLB (NF170370).
50 51 52 53	636	Acknowledgements
54 55	637	We thank the UNICAMP postgraduate program in Ecology and the Brazilian Higher
56 57 58	638	Education Co-ordination Agency (CAPES). We would like to thank the entire community
59 60	639	surrounding the study area (Caxiuanã-PA northern Brazil), the climbers Joca and their

children, the workers at the scientific base "Bigode"; "Bené"; "Benézinho" and the dear cook chef "Morena". We also thank "Kaká" and "Moska" for the field campaign help. **Authors' Contributions** ALG collected and compiled the data alongside LR, PRLB, IC, PBC, PG, LVF, DDV, JASJ, DCB and ACLdC. LR designed the study with MM, ACLdC, PM, ALG and RO. ALG, MM, PRLB and LR performed the statistical analysis and ALG, LR and RO wrote the paper, all authors substantially contributed to revisions. References Anderson MJ (2001) A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. Austral Ecol 26:32-46. Aragão LEOC, Anderson LO, Fonseca MG, Rosan TM, Vedovato LB, Wagner FH, Silva CVJ, Silva Junior CHL, Arai E, Aguiar AP, Barlow J, Berenguer E, Deeter MN, Domingues LG, Gatti L, Gloor M, Malhi Y, Marengo JA, Miller JB, Phillips OL, Saatchi S (2018) 21st Century drought-related fires counteract the decline of Amazon deforestation carbon emissions. Nat Commun 9:536. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02771-y Awad H, Barigah T, Badel E, Cochard H, Herbette S (2010) Poplar vulnerability to xylem cavitation acclimates to drier soil conditions. Physiol Plant 139:280–288. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1399-3054.2010.01367.x

B. Eller C, de V. Barros F, R.L. Bittencourt P, Rowland L, Mencuccini M, S. Oliveira R (2018)
 Xylem hydraulic safety and construction costs determine tropical tree growth. Plant
 Cell Environ 41:548–562. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/pce.13106

- Bartholomew DC, Bittencourt PRL, Costa ACL, Banin LF, Britto Costa P, Coughlin SI,
 Domingues TF, Ferreira L V., Giles A, Mencuccini M, Mercado L, Miatto RC, Oliveira A,
 Oliveira R, Meir P, Rowland L (2020) Small tropical forest trees have a greater
 capacity to adjust carbon metabolism to long-term drought than large canopy trees.
 Plant Cell Environ 43:2380–2393.
- 667 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/pce.13838
- 668 Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker BM, Walker SC (2015) Fitting linear mixed-effects models 4 669 using Ime4. J Stat Softw 67
- 56670Bhaskar R, Ackerly DD (2006) Ecological relevance of minimum seasonal water potentials.57671Physiol Plant 127:353–359. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1399-3054.2006.00718.x
- ⁶⁰
 ⁶⁷² Binks O, Coughlin I, Mencuccini M, Meir P (2020) Equivalence of foliar water uptake and
 ⁶⁰
 ⁶⁷³ stomatal conductance? Plant Cell Environ 43:524–528.

2		
3	674	https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.13663
4 5	675	Binks O. Mair D. Bowland L. Costa ACL. Vasconsolas SS. Olivaira AAD. Formina L
6	675	Christofferson R. Nardini A. Monguesini M (2016) Plasticity in loaf lovel water
7	670	consciences of transical rainforest treas in response to experimental drought. New Deutel
8	677	211:477, 488, https://oplinglik.gov.uilou.com/doi/obc/10.1111/pph.12027
9	678	211:477–488. https://oninelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/hph.13927
10 11	679	Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC,
12	680	Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir
13	681	P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant
14	682	hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569–
15	683	3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040
16 17		
18	684	Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem
19	685	Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059
20	686	Brando PM Nenstad DC Davidson EA Trumbore SE Ray D Camargo P (2008) Drought
21	697	offects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon
22	600	forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Dhiles Trans P. Sec. P. Diel Sci
23 24	680	262:1820 1848 https://rovalcociatypubliching.org/doi/10.1008/rcth.2007.0021
25	089	505.1659–1646. https://loyaisocietypublishing.org/uoi/10.1096/15tb.2007.0051
26	690	Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS
27	691	(eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-
28 20	692	3-319-27422-5
29 30		
31	693	Brodribb IJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and
32	694	drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266.
33	695	https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631
34 35	696	Brum M. Vadeboncoeur MA. Ivanov V. Saleska S. Alves LF. Penha D. Asbiornsen H. Dias JD.
36	697	Aragão LEOC. Barros F. Bittencourt P. Pereira L. Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche
37	698	segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal
38	699	Amazon forest. I Ecol:318–333.
39		
40 41	700	Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304.
42	701	http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644
43	702	Cavaleri MA Oberbauer SE Clark DB Clark DA Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important
44	702	than light in determining leaf mornhology in a tronical forest. Ecology 01:1730–1730
45	703	http://doi.wilov.com/10.1800/00.1226.1
46 47	704	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/05-1520.1
48	705	Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently
49	706	projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181.
50	707	http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805
51 52	700	Chest D. Jansen C. Dradrikk TJ. Cashard JJ. Dalaan C. Dhaalyan D. Dyssi CJ. Faild TC. Classes
52 53	708	Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Deizon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Felid TS, Gleason
54	709	SIM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Manerali H, Martinez-Vilaita J, Mayr S,
55	/10	Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M,
56	/11	wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to
57 50	712	arought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688
50 59	713	Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI. Cavalcanti. I.F.A. de C. M., Dong W.
60	714	Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick J. Stephenson DB.

2		
3	715	Xie SP, Zhou T (2017) Climate Phenomena and their Relevance for Future Regional
4	716	Climate Change. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of
5 6	717	Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on
7	718	Climate Change.
8		U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U U
9	719	Corlett RT (2016) The Impacts of Droughts in Tropical Forests. Trends Plant Sci 21:584–
10	720	593. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2016.02.003
11	701	da Casta ACL Galbraith D. Almaida S. Dortala PTT, da Casta M. da Athavdas Silva Junior J
12	721	Drage AD de Concelves DHL de Oliveire AA Fisher B Dhilling OL Metcelfe DB Low D
14	722	Blaga AP, de Goliçaives PHL, de Olivella AA, Fisher R, Philips OL, Metcalle DB, Levy P,
15	723	historia stars as a far asstars Assessing rainforest New Plate 197570, 501
16	/24	biomass storage of an eastern Amazonian rainforest. New Phytol 187:579–591.
17	725	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03309.x
18	726	da Costa ACL. Metcalfe DB. Doughty CF. de Oliveira AAR. Neto GFC. da Costa MC. Silva
19 20	727	Junior I de A. Aragão JEOC. Almeida S. Galbraith DR. Rowland I M. Meir P. Malhi Y
21	728	(2014) Ecosystem respiration and net primary productivity after 8–10 years of
22	720	experimental through-fall reduction in an eastern Amazon forest. Plant Ecol Divers
23	720	7.7–24. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17550874.2013.708366
24	730	7.7-24. http://www.tandionnine.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17550874.2015.758500
25 26	731	Damián X, Fornoni J, Domínguez CA, Boege K (2018) Ontogenetic changes in the
20	732	phenotypic integration and modularity of leaf functional traits. Funct Ecol:234–246.
28		
29	733	Domingues TF, Meir P, Feldpausch TR, Saiz G, Veenendaal EM, Schrödt F, Bird M,
30	734	Djagbletey G, Hien F, Compaore H, Diallo A, Grace J, Lloyd J (2010) Co-limitation of
31	735	photosynthetic capacity by nitrogen and phosphorus in West Africa woodlands. Plant,
32 33	736	Cell Environ 33:959–980.
34	737	Duffy PB_Brando P_Asner GP_Field CB (2015) Projections of future meteorological
35	738	drought and wet periods in the Amazon, Proc Natl Acad Sci 112:13172–13177
36	739	http://www.ppas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/ppas.1421010112
37	755	http://www.phus.org/lookup/uol/10.10/3/phus.1421010112
38 20	740	Duursma RA, Blackman CJ, Lopéz R, Martin-StPaul NK, Cochard H, Medlyn BE (2019) On
39 40	741	the minimum leaf conductance: its role in models of plant water use, and ecological
41	742	and environmental controls. New Phytol 221:693–705.
42		
43	743	Esquivel-Muelbert A, Baker TR, Dexter KG, Lewis SL, ter Steege H, Lopez-Gonzalez G,
44 45	744	Monteagudo Mendoza A, Brienen R, Feldpausch TR, Pitman N, Alonso A, van der
45 46	745	Heijden G, Peña-Claros M, Ahuite M, Alexiaides M, Alvarez Dávila E, Murakami AA,
47	746	Arroyo L, Aulestia M, Balslev H, Barroso J, Boot R, Cano A, Chama Moscoso V,
48	747	Comiskey JA, Cornejo F, Dallmeier F, Daly DC, Dávila N, Duivenvoorden JF, Duque
49	748	Montoya AJ, Erwin T, Di Fiore A, Fredericksen T, Fuentes A, García-Villacorta R,
50	749	Gonzales T, Guevara Andino JE, Honorio Coronado EN, Huamantupa-Chuquimaco I,
51	750	Killeen TJ, Malhi Y, Mendoza C, Mogollón H, Jørgensen PM, Montero JC, Mostacedo
52 53	751	B, Nauray W, Neill D, Vargas PN, Palacios S, Palacios Cuenca W, Pallqui Camacho NC,
54	752	Peacock J, Phillips JF, Pickavance G, Quesada CA, Ramírez-Angulo H, Restrepo Z,
55	753	Reynel Rodriguez C, Paredes MR, Sierra R, Silveira M, Stevenson P, Stropp J, Terborgh
56	754	J, Tirado M, Toledo M, Torres-Lezama A, Umaña MN, Urrego LE, Vasquez Martinez R,
57	755	Gamarra LV, Vela CIA, Vilanova Torre E, Vos V, von Hildebrand P, Vriesendorp C,
58 50	756	Wang O, Young KR, Zartman CE, Phillips OL (2017) Seasonal drought limits tree
60	757	species across the Neotropics. Ecography (Cop) 40:618–629.

2		
3	758	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ecog.01904
4 5	750	Fu R. Vin I. Li W. Arias PA. Dickinson RF. Huang I. Chakraborty S. Fernandes K. Liebmann R
6	755	Fisher R Myneni RB (2013) Increased dry-season length over southern Amazonia in
7	760	recent decades and its implication for future climate projection. Proc Natl Acad Sci
8	701	110:19110 19115 http://www.ppg.org/cgi/doi/10.1072/ppg.1202594110
9 10	702	110.10110-10113. http://www.phas.org/cg/u0//10.10/3/phas.1502364110
10	763	Goldstein G, Andrade JL, Meinzer FC, Holbrook NM, Cavelier J, Jackson P, Celis A (1998)
12	764	Stem water storage and diurnal patterns of water use in tropical forest canopy trees.
13	765	Plant, Cell Environ 21:397–406.
14 15	700	Creanandiik D. Cass Klaasson II. Dangars F. Zuidama DA (2014) Datantial of trea ring
15 16	700	Groenenuijk P, Sass-Kladssen O, Bongers F, Zuidelina PA (2014) Potential of tree-ring
17	707	Control Africa, For Fool Manage 222:65, 78
18	768	Central Africa. For Econ Manage 323:05–78.
19	769	nttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2014.03.037
20	770	Hubau W, De Mil T, Van den Bulcke J, Phillips OL, Angoboy Ilondea B, Van Acker J, Sullivan
21	771	MJP, Nsenga L, Toirambe B, Couralet C, Banin LF, Begne SK, Baker TR, Bourland N,
23	772	Chezeaux E, Clark CJ, Collins M, Comiskey JA, Cuni-Sanchez A, Deklerck V, Dierickx S,
24	773	Doucet J-L, Ewango CEN, Feldpausch TR, Gilpin M, Gonmadie C, Hall JS, Harris DJ,
25	774	Hardy OJ. Kamdem M-ND. Kasongo Yakusu E. Lopez-Gonzalez G. Makana J-R. Malhi Y.
26 27	775	Mbayu FM. Moore S. Mukinzi J. Pickayance G. Poulsen JR. Reitsma J. Rousseau M.
27 28	776	Sonké B. Sunderland T. Taedoumg H. Talbot J. Tshibamba Mukendi J. Umunay PM.
29	777	Vleminckx J. White LIT. Zemagho L. Lewis SL. Beeckman H (2019) The persistence of
30	778	carbon in the African forest understory. Nat Plants 5:133–140.
31	779	http://www.nature.com/articles/s41477-018-0316-5
32 33		
34	780	KAMALUDDIN M, GRACE J (1992) Acclimation in Seedlings of a Tropical Tree, Bischofia
35	781	javanica, Following a Stepwise Reduction in Light. Ann Bot 69:557–562.
36	782	https://academic.oup.com/aob/article-
37	783	lookup/doi/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aob.a088386
30 39	784	KRAMER PI (1988) Changing concepts regarding plant water relations. Plant, Cell Environ
40	785	11:565–568, http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/i.1365-3040.1988.tb01796.x
41		,,,,,,,,,,
42	786	Krause GH, Virgo A, Winter K (1995) High susceptibility to photoinhibition of young leaves
45 44	787	of tropical forest trees. Planta 197:583–591.
45	788	Marengo IA Souza CM Thonicke K Burton C Halladay K Betts RA Alves IM Soares WR
46	789	(2018) Changes in Climate and Land Use Over the Amazon Region: Current and
47	790	Future Variability and Trends Front Farth Sci 6:1–21
48	791	https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/feart 2018.00228/full
49 50	751	
51	792	Márquez DA, Stuart-Williams H, Farquhar GD (2021) An improved theory for calculating
52	793	leaf gas exchange more precisely accounting for small fluxes. Nat Plants 7.
53	794	http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41477-021-00861-w
54 55	705	Martin StRaul NK Longonierre D. Huc P. Delzen S. Burlett P. Joffre P. Pambal S. Cochard H.
56	795	(2014) How reliable are methods to access when where hilts to constant (2014) How reliable are methods to access when where hilts to constant (2014) How reliable are methods to access when
57	790	(2014) NOW TEHADIE ALE THELHOUS TO ASSESS XYTELL VUITELADILLY TO CAVILATION? THE issue of 'open vessel' artifact in eaks. Tree Device 24:204, 005
58	191	1550E 01 Upen vesser artifact in Oaks. Thee Physiol 54.694-905.
59 60	798	Martinez-Vilalta J, Anderegg WRL, Sapes G, Sala A (2019) Greater focus on water pools
00		

2		
3 4 5	799 800	may improve our ability to understand and anticipate drought-induced mortality in plants. New Phytol 223:22–32.
6	901	Martínez Vilalta I. Carcia Forner N (2017) Water notential regulation, stematal hebaviour
7	001	and hydraulia transport under draught, deconstructing the ice (anicohydric concent
8	802	
9	803	Plant Cell Environ 40:962–976.
10	804	Mcculloh KA, Johnson DM, Meinzer FC, Woodruff DR (2014) The dynamic pipeline [.]
 10	805	Hydraulic canacitance and vylem hydraulic safety in four tall conifer species. Plant
12 13 14	806	Cell Environ 37:1171–1183.
15	807	McDowell N. Pockman WT. Allen CD. Breshears DD. Cobh N. Kolh T. Plaut I. Sperry I. West
16	808	A Williams DG Venez EA (2008) Mechanisms of plant survival and mortality during
17	808	drought: why do some plants survive while others sussume to drought? New Phytol
18	809	179-710, 720, http://doi.ucilou.com/10.1111/j.1400.0127.2009.02420.v
19	810	178:719–739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2008.02436.x
20	811	Meinzer FC. James SA. Goldstein G. Woodruff D (2003) Whole-tree water transport scales
21	812	with sanwood canacitance in tropical forest canopy trees. Plant Cell Environ
22	813	26·11/7–1155
24	015	20.1147 1155.
25	814	Meinzer FC, Johnson DM, Lachenbruch B, McCulloh KA, Woodruff DR (2009) Xylem
26	815	hydraulic safety margins in woody plants: Coordination of stomatal control of xylem
27	816	tension with hydraulic capacitance. Funct Ecol 23:922–930.
28	817	http://doi.wilev.com/10.1111/i.1365-2435.2009.01577.x
29	017	
30 31	818	Meir P, Mencuccini M, Binks O, Da Costa AL, Ferreira L, Rowland L (2018) Short-term
32	819	effects of drought on tropical forest do not fully predict impacts of repeated or long-
33	820	term drought: Gas exchange versus growth. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 373
34	071	Mair D. Wood TE. Calbraith DP. Brando DM. Da Costa ACL. Bowland L. Eorraira I. V. (2015)
35	821	Threshold Degramans to Coll Maisture Deficit by Trees and Coll in Treesied Dein
30 37	822	Forester Insights from Eight Functionants, Disseigner CE, 202, 202
38	823	Forests: insights from Field Experiments. Bioscience 65:882–892.
39	824	Mencuccini M (2002) Hydraulic constraints in the functional scaling of trees. Tree Physiol
40	825	22:553–565.
41	010	
42	826	Mencuccini M, Rosas T, Rowland L, Choat B, Cornelissen H, Jansen S, Kramer K, Lapenis A,
43	827	Manzoni S, Niinemets Ü, Reich PB, Schrodt F, Soudzilovskaia N, Wright IJ,
44 45	828	Martínez-Vilalta J (2019) Leaf economics and plant hydraulics drive leaf : wood area
46	829	ratios. New Phytol 224:1544–1556.
47	830	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.15998
48		
49	831	Metcalfe DB, Meir P, Aragao LEOC, Lobo-do-vale R, Galbraith D, Fisher RA, Chaves MM,
50	832	Maroco JP, Costa ACL, Almeida SS De, Braga AP, Gonc PHL (2010) Shifts in plant
51	833	respiration and carbon use efficiency at a large-scale drought experiment in the
52 53	834	eastern Amazon. New Phytol:608–621.
54		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
55	835	Metcalte DB, Meir P, Aragão LEOC, Lobo-do-Vale R, Galbraith D, Fisher RA, Chaves MM,
56	836	Maroco JP, da Costa ACL, de Almeida SS, Braga AP, Gonçalves PHL, de Athaydes J, da
57	837	Costa M, Portela TTB, de Oliveira AAR, Malhi Y, Williams M (2010) Shifts in plant
58	838	respiration and carbon use efficiency at a large-scale drought experiment in the
59 60	839	eastern Amazon. New Phytol 187:608–621. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1469-
00		
1		
----------	------------	---
2		
3 4	840	8137.2010.03319.x
5	841	Mulkey SS, Pearcy RW (1992a) Interactions between Acclimation and Photoinhibition of
6	842	Photosynthesis of a Tropical Forest Understorey Herb, Alocasia macrorrhiza, during
7 8	843	Simulated Canopy Gap Formation. Funct Ecol 6:719.
9	844	Mulkey SS, Pearcy RW (1992b) Interactions between Acclimation and Photoinhibition of
10 11	845	Photosynthesis of a Tropical Forest Understorey Herb, Alocasia macrorrhiza, during
12	846	Simulated Canopy Gap Formation. Funct Ecol 6:719.
13	847	https://www.jstor.org/stable/2389969?origin=crossref
14 15	040	Nardini A. La MA. Sallag S. (2011) Plant Science Pafilling ambalized valom conduits : Is it a
16	040 040	matter of phloom unloading 2 Plant Science Remining embolized xylem conduits . Is it a
17	049 0E0	http://dv.doi.org/10.1016/i.plantsci.2010.12.011
18	830	http://ux.uoi.org/10.1010/j.plantsci.2010.12.011
19 20	851	Olson ME, Anfodillo T, Gleason SM, McCulloh KA (2020) Tip-to-base xylem conduit
20	852	widening as an adaptation: causes, consequences, and empirical priorities. New
22	853	Phytol:nph.16961. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.16961
23	854	Olson MF. Rosell JA (2013) Vessel diameter-stem diameter scaling across woody
24 25	855	angiosperms and the ecological causes of xylem vessel diameter variation. New
26	856	Phytol 197:1204–1213.
27		
28	857	Pammenter NW, Van der Willigen C (1998) A mathematical and statistical analysis of the
30	858	curves illustrating vulnerability of xylem to cavitation. Tree Physiol 18:589–593.
31	859	nttps://academic.oup.com/treephys/article-lookup/dol/10.1093/treephys/18.8-
32	860	9.589
33 34	861	Pereira L, Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Junior MBM, Barros F V, Ribeiro R V, Mazzafera P
35	862	(2016) Plant pneumatics: stem air flow is related to embolism – new perspectives on
36	863	methods in plant hydraulics. New Phytol 211:357–370.
37 38	864	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13905
39	865	Pereira L, Bittencourt PRL, Rowland L, Brum M, Miranda MT, Pacheco VS, Oliveira RS,
40	866	Machado EC, Jansen S, Ribeiro R V. (2021) Using the Pneumatic method to estimate
41	867	embolism resistance in species with long vessels: A commentary on the article "A
42	868	comparison of five methods to assess embolism resistance in trees". For Ecol Manage
44	869	479:2019–2021.
45	070	Poroira L. Mazzafora P. (2012) A low cost apparatus for moasuring the vylem hydraulic
46 47	870 871	conductance in plants. Bragantia 71:583-587
48	071 972	http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0006-
49	872	87052012000400017&lng=en&tlng=en
50	075	07052012000400017 amg-enating-en
51	874	Poorter L, Bongers F, Sterck FJ, Wöll H (2005) Beyond the regeneration phase:
53	875	Differentiation of height-light trajectories among tropical tree species. J Ecol 93:256–
54	876	267. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2004.00956.x
55 56	877	Poorter H. Nijnemets Ü. Poorter L. Wright IJ. Villar R (2009) Causes and consequences of
50 57	878	variation in leaf mass per area (LMA): a meta-analysis. New Phytol 182:565–588.
58	879	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.02830.x
59	-	
60	880	Powell IL, Wheeler JK, de Oliveira AAR, da Costa ACL, Saleska SR, Meir P, Moorcroft PR

2		
3	881	(2017) Differences in xylem and leaf hydraulic traits explain differences in drought
4	887	tolerance among mature Amazon rainforest trees. Glob Chang Biol 23:4280–4293
5	002	http://doi.wilov.com/10.1111/gch.12721
6	005	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.15/51
/	884	Prendin AL, Mayr S, Beikircher B, von Arx G, Petit G (2018) Xylem anatomical adjustments
9	885	prioritize hydraulic efficiency over safety as Norway spruce trees grow taller
10	886	Martinez-Vilalta I (ed) Tree Physiol 38:1088–1097
11	997	https://academic.oup.com/treenbys/article/38/8/1088/5038075
12	007	
13	888	Rowland L, da Costa ACL, Galbraith DR, Oliveira RS, Binks OJ, Oliveira AAR, Pullen AM,
14	889	Doughty CE, Metcalfe DB, Vasconcelos SS, Ferreira LV, Malhi Y, Grace J, Mencuccini
15	890	M. Meir P (2015) Death from drought in tropical forests is triggered by hydraulics not
16	891	carbon starvation Nature 528:119–122 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature15539
17	001	
19	892	Rowland L, da Costa ACL, Oliveira RS, Bittencourt PRL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, de Britto Costa
20	893	P, Bartholomew D, Domingues TF, Miatto RC, Ferreira LV, Vasconcelos SS, Junior JAS,
21	894	Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir P (2020) The response of carbon assimilation and
22	895	storage to long-term drought in tropical trees is dependent on light availability. Funct
23	896	Ecol:1365-2435 13689 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-
24	897	2435 13689
25 26	0.57	2455.15005
20	898	Rowland L, Lobo-do-Vale RL, Christoffersen BO, Melém EA, Kruijt B, Vasconcelos SS,
28	899	Domingues T, Binks OJ, Oliveira AAR, Metcalfe D, da Costa ACL, Mencuccini M, Meir P
29	900	(2015) After more than a decade of soil moisture deficit, tropical rainforest trees
30	901	maintain photosynthetic capacity, despite increased leaf respiration. Glob Chang Biol
31	902	21:4662–4672. http://doi.wilev.com/10.1111/gcb.13035
32	502	
33 34	903	Ruggiero PGC, Batalha MA, Pivello VR, Meirelles ST (2002) Soil vegetation relationships in
35	904	cerrado (Brazilian savanna) and semideciduous forest, Southeastern Brazil. Plant Ecol
36	905	160:1–16.
37		
38	906	Sala A, Piper F, Hoch G (2010) Physiological mechanisms of drought-induced tree mortality
39	907	are far from being resolved. New Phytol 186:274–281.
40	908	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.03167.x
41 42	000	Sallas S. La Culla MA. Da Daali D. Zinna M (1006) Yulam recovery from cavitation induced
43	909	saled 5, Lo Guilo IVIA, De Paoli D, Zippo IVI (1996) Aylen Tecovery from cavitation-induced
44	910	emponsm in young plants of Laurus hobilis: A possible mechanism, New Phytol
45	911	132:47–56. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/J.1469-8137.1996.tb04507.x
46	912	Salleo S. Lo Gullo MA. Trifilò P. Nardini A (2004) New evidence for a role of vessel-
47	913	associated cells and phoem in the rapid xylem refilling of cavitated stems of Laurus
48	01/	nobilis L. Plant, Cell Environ 27:1065–1076, http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/i.1365-
49 50	914 015	2040 2004 01211 v
51	912	5040.2004.01211.X
52	916	Salomón RL, Limousin JM, Ourcival JM, Rodríguez-Calcerrada J, Steppe K (2017) Stem
53	917	hydraulic capacitance decreases with drought stress: implications for modelling tree
54	918	hydraulics in the Mediterranean oak Ouercus ilex. Plant Cell Environ 40:1379–1391
55	510	
56	919	Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW (2012) NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image
57 58	920	analysis. Nat Methods 9:671–675.
59	024	
60	921	Schulut B, Leuschner C, Horna V, Woser G, Kohler M, Van Straaten D, Barus H (2011)

1		57
2 3 4 5 6	922 923 924	Change in hydraulic properties and leaf traits in a tall rainforest tree species subjected to long-term throughfall exclusion in the perhumid tropics. Biogeosciences 8:2179–2194.
7 8 9 10 11 12	925 926 927 928	van der Sleen P, Groenendijk P, Vlam M, Anten NPR, Boom A, Bongers F, Pons TL, Terburg G, Zuidema PA (2015) No growth stimulation of tropical trees by 150 years of CO2 fertilization but water-use efficiency increased. Nat Geosci 8:24–28. http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo2313
13 14 15	929 930	Sperry JS, Donelly JR, Tyree MT (1988) A method for measuring hydraulic conductivity and embolism in xylem. Plant Cell Environ 11:35–40.
16 17 18	931 932	Sperry JS, Hacke UG, Oren R, Comstock JP (2002) Water deficits and hydraulic limits to leaf water supply. Plant, Cell Environ:251–263.
19 20 21	933 934	Sperry JS, Tyree MT (1988) Mechanism of Water Stress-Induced Xylem Embolism1. Plant Physiol 88:581–587.
22 23 24 25 26 27	935 936 937 938	Sperry JS, Venturas MD, Anderegg WRL, Mencuccini M, Mackay DS, Wang Y, Love DM (2017) Predicting stomatal responses to the environment from the optimization of photosynthetic gain and hydraulic cost. Plant Cell Environ 40:816–830. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/pce.12852
27 28 29 30 31	939 940 941	Sterck F, Markesteijn L, Schieving F, Poorter L (2011) Functional traits determine trade-offs and niches in a tropical forest community. Proc Natl Acad Sci 108:20627–20632. http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1106950108
32 33 34	942 943	Tardieu F (1996) Drought perception by plants: Do cells of draughted plants experience water stress? Plant Growth Regul 20:93–104.
35 36 37 38	944 945 946	Tng DYP, Apgaua DMG, Ishida YF, Mencuccini M, Lloyd J, Laurance WF, Laurance SGW (2018) Rainforest trees respond to drought by modifying their hydraulic architecture. Ecol Evol 8:12479–12491.
39 40 41 42 42	947 948 949	Tomasella M, Beikircher B, Häberle KH, Hesse B, Kallenbach C, Matyssek R, Mayr S (2018) Acclimation of branch and leaf hydraulics in adult Fagus sylvatica and Picea abies in a forest through-fall exclusion experiment. Tree Physiol 38:198–211.
44 45 46 47	950 951 952	Trugman AT, Detto M, Bartlett MK, Medvigy D, Anderegg WRL, Schwalm C, Schaffer B, Pacala SW (2018) Tree carbon allocation explains forest drought-kill and recovery patterns. Ecol Lett:1552–1560.
48 49 50 51	953 954 955	Tyree MT, Vargas G, Engelbrecht BMJ, Kursar TA (2002) Drought until death do us part: A case study of the desiccation-tolerance of a tropical moist forest seedling-tree, Licania platypus (Hemsl.) Fritsch. J Exp Bot 53:2239–2247.
52 53 54 55	956 957 958	Venturas MD, Mackinnon ED, Jacobsen AL, Pratt RB (2015) Excising stem samples underwater at native tension does not induce xylem cavitation. Plant, Cell Environ 38:1060–1068.
57 58 59 60	959 960 961	Wright IJ, Reich PB, Westoby M, Ackerly DD, Baruch Z, Bongers F, Cavender-bares J, Chapin T, Cornelissen JHC, Diemer M, Flexas J, Garnier E, Groom PK, Gulias J (2004) The worldwide leaf economics spectrum. Nature 12:821–827.

962	Zhang Y, Lamarque LJ, Torres-Ruiz JM, Schuldt B, Karimi Z, Li S, Qin DW, Bittencourt P,
963	Burlett R, Cao KF, Delzon S, Oliveira R, Pereira L, Jansen S (2018) Testing the plant
964	pneumatic method to estimate xylem embolism resistance in stems of temperate
965	trees. Tree Physiol 38:1016–1025.

to per peries

1		
2 3 4	967	List of Figures
5 6 7 8	968 969	Figure 1 Stress indicators and hydraulic traits for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) measured in dry season oct/2017 on the Control plot and through-fall exclusion (TFE).
9 10 11	970 971	Figure 2 Hydraulic traits considered by genus for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) surviving after 15 years of throughfall exclusion (TFE) and the Control plot.
12 13 14	972 973	Figure 3 Drought stress indicators and considered by genus for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) surviving after 15 years of throughfall exclusion (TFE) and the Control plot.
15 16 17	974 975	Figure 4 Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of drought stress indicators and hydraulic traits.
18 19 20 21	976 977	Figure 5 Hydraulic traits comparison between small trees and large trees from the throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot.
22 23 24	978 979	Figure 6 Stress indicators comparison between small trees and large trees from throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot.
25 26 27	980 981	Figure 7 Hydraulic traits comparison between small trees and large trees from throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot.
28 29 30	982	Tables
31 32	983	Table 1 – Mean and standard deviation from small trees: P_{50} - xylem embolism resistance (MPa);
33 34 35	984	P_{88} - xylem embolism resistance (MPa); G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹); K _s –
36 37	985	maximum hydraulic specific conductivity (kg m ⁻² s ⁻¹ MPa ⁻¹); K_{sl} - maximum hydraulic leaf-specific
38 39	986	conductivity (kg m ⁻² s ⁻¹ MPa ⁻¹); $A_L:A_{sw}$ – leaf to sapwood area ratio (m ² m ⁻²); W_D - Woody density;
40 41	987	Ψ_{pd} - predawn water potential (MPa); Ψ_{md} - midday water potential (MPa); HSM – branch hydraulic
42 43	988	safety margin to P ₅₀ (MPa); PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity (%), separated
44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54	989	by genus and treatment.
55 56 57		
58		

						Hydraulic traits	;					
Genus (n individuals)	Treatme nt	P ₅₀	P ₈₈	G _{min}	Ks	K _{sl}	AL:ASW	WD	Ψ_{pd}	Ψ_{md}	HSM	PLC
Eschweilera (3)	Control	-2.91±0.07	-5.08±0.31	0.028±0.023	1.12±0.19	0.57±0.30	112.07±32.41	0.73±0.12	-0.32±0.23	-1.68±0.24	1.13±0.32	49.14±4.
Eschweilera (3)	TFE	-3.66±2.01	-6.32±3.80	0.026±0.019	2.80±2.62	4.71±6.12	92.12±65.44	0.59±0.09	-0.52±0.24	-1.87±0.26	1.89±2.28	9.22±4.3
Inga (4)	Control	-4.60±1.63	-7.84±3.10	0.02±0.014	2.3±1.43	1.56±0.85	84.59±47.51	0.64±0.18	-0.37±0.26	-1.51±0.57	3.09±2.07	11.33±10
Inga (3)	TFE	-3.48±0.58	-6.22±1.62	0.02±0.006	4.56±1.68	1.93±0.73	160.81±58.68	0.63±0.08	-0.39±0.22	-1.35±0.78	2.13±0.4	19.28±13
Licania (4)	Control	-5.28±1.98	-9.62±4.40	0.025±0.014	0.15±0.04	0.12±0.07	66.15±24.41	0.76±0.062	-0.25±0.07	-1.65±0.85	3.62±2.75	38.29±28
Licania(4)	TFE	-6.18±1.59	-9.07±1.77	0.024±0.02	2.17±2.19	0.37±0.40	104.90±45.99	0.761±0.014	-0.85±0.81	-1.388±0.78	5.183±1.70	68.667±28
Mouriri (3)	Control	-4.77±0.54	-7.69±1.31	0.025±0.017	0.62±0.05	0.22±0.20	154.33±59.51	0.867±0.003	-0.24±0.09	-0.943±0.08	3.829±0.48	58.031±27
Mouriri (3)	TFE	-5.55±0.74	-7.35±2.18	0.077±0.022	3.63±3.03	1.32±0.88	143.30±92.13	0.751±0.17	-1.07±1.32	-2.583±0.95	2.972±0.77	60.769±15
Ocotea (3)	Control	-3.59±1.49	-8.72±2.63	0.007±0.003	1.63±0.81	0.84±0.17	125.38±54.22	0.638±0.05	-0.36±0.4	-0.6±0.364	2.994±1.26	36.718±18
Ocotea (3)	TFE	-5.04±2.08	-8.61±4.88	0.03±0.024	1.58±0.66	0.60±0.46	84.83±32.64	0.68±0.13	-1.44±1.17	-2.41±0.81	2.62±2.45	65.27±24
Protium (5)	Control	-2.30±0.71	-4.16±2.40	0.017±0.01	1.68±0.94	0.75±0.41	78.60±6.37	0.74±0.07	-0.31±0.3	-1.23±0.31	1.07±0.78	54.73±17
Protium (3)	TFE	-3.64±1.47	-5.65±0.73	0.013±0.01	1.10±0.07	0.44±0.07	90.57±17.71	0.72±0.049	-0.48±0.16	-1.00±0.24	2.55±1.73	49.74±11
Swartzia (3)	Control	-3.17±1.28	-5.98±1.89	0.06±0.04	1.67±0.26	0.78±0.55	72.45±18.20	0.73±0.02	-0.23±0.12	-1.57±0.16	1.60±1.36	59.73±9.
Swartzia (3)	TFE	-4.34±0.57	-6.94±0.06	0.06±0.02	2.78±0.51	0.89±0.54	210.45±67.51	0.72±0.005	-0.79±0.48	-2.36±0.09	1.98±0.66	49.13±8.
Tetragastris (5)	Control	-2.31±1.48	-4.34±1.81	0.03±0.01	2.22±1.66	2.29±3.12	83.86±59.38	0.64±0.05	-0.28±0.13	-1.06±0.58	1.25±1.31	22.12±15
Tetragastris (3)	TFE	-4.36±1.19	-6.52±2.90	0.016±0.01	1.33±0.62	1.04±0.45	88.10±34.28	0.58±0.04	-1.43±0.40	-2.44±0.13	1.92±1.06	43.24±6.
Vouacapoa (3)	Control	-3.57±0.13	-5.37±1.45	0.015±0.003	1.00±0.16	0.95±0.64	56.71±22.69	0.69±0.13	-0.39±0.18	-1.59±0.19	1.97±0.31	43.78±11
Vouacapoa (3)	TFE	-2.22±0.79	-3.54±1.63	0.012±0.004	0.83±0.51	0.67±0.78	229.76±101.26	0.70±0.01	-0.77±0.35	-2.07±0.24	0.15±0.72	33.24±19

Table 2 Results of linear mixed effect models of plot (Control versus TFE) on the stress indicators and hydraulic traits for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) measured in dry season (Oct/2017) on the Control plot and through-fall exclusion TFE. WD - wood density; AL:ASW - leaf to sapwood area ratio; P50 - xylem embolism resistance; P88 - xylem embolism resistance; Gmin - minimum stomatal conductance; Ks - maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; Ksl - maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; Upd - predawn water potential; Umd - midday water potential. HSM -branch hydraulic safety margin to P50; PLC - native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The table shows the least square means for the Control and TFE, and the random genus effects (see analysis section in Methods for details). The first row of each trait gives the mean and second row gives one standard error for the fixed effects and the 95% confidence interval for genus-level random effects. Traits for which plot had a significant effect, and species for which the random effects were different from zero, are marked with * (p < 0.05), ** (p < 0.01) and *** (p < 0.001) er Revi and ns (non-significant).

Plot-level Coefficients				Genus-level Coefficients							
Variabl e	Control	TFE	Eschweilera	Inga	Licania	Mouriri	Ocotea	Protium	Swartzia	Tetragastris	Vouacapoa
P ₅₀	3.56 (-4.12/-2.99)	-4.26 (-5.761/-2.79) ns	-3.29 (-4.67/-1.91) ***	0.83 (-2.56/0.90)	2.38 (-4.11/-0.65) **	1.87 (-3.65/-0.09) *	-1.03 (-2.81/0.75)	0.60 (-1.13/2.33)	-0.35 (-2.20/1.50)	0.21 (-1.48/1.90)	0.39 (-1.39/2.17)
P ₈₈	6.49 (-7.45/-5.42)	-6.58 (-9.34/-4.00) ns	-5.71 (-8.18/-3.24) ***	1.44 (-4.54/1.65)	3.69 (-6.78/-0.59) *	-1.82 (-5.01/1.37)	-2.96 (-6.15/0.22)	1.11 (-1.98/4.21)	-0.66 (-3.97/2.65)	0.54 (-2.48/3.57)	1.25 (-1.94/4.43)
\mathbf{G}_{\min}	0.027 (0.02/0.03)	0.030 (0.008/0.053) ps	0.03 (0.01/0.04) ***	0.01 (-0.03/0.01)	0.00 (-0.02/0.02)	0.03 (0.01/0.05) **	-0.01 (-0.03/0.01)	-0.01 (-0.03/0.01)	0.04 (0.02/0.06) ***	0.00 (-0.02/0.02)	-0.01 (-0.03/0.01)

Manuscripts submitted to Tree Physiology

2
Z
_

Ks	1.46 (0.95/2.00)	2.32 (0.98/3.64) *	1.79 (0.46/3.13) **	1.48 (-0.28/3.23)	-0.49 (-2.24/1.26)	0.34 (-1.47/2.15)	-0.19 (-2.00/1.63)	-0.33 (-2.03/1.38)	0.33 (-1.56/2.22)	0.17 (-1.58/1.92)	-0.88 (-2.69/0.93)
K _{sl}	1.00 (0.45/1.55)	1.22 (0.21/2.58) ns	2.23 (0.86/3.61) **	0.51 (-2.31/1.29)	-1.96 (-3.76/-0.17)	-1.45 (-3.31/0.40)	-1.51 (-3.37/0.35)	-1.59 (-3.34/0.16)	-1.41 (-3.35/0.54)	-0.29 (-2.09/1.50)	-1.42 (-3.28/0.44)
A _L :A _{SW}	90.77 (69.76/110.74)	131.70 (81.14/183.50) **	104.09 (48.95/159.23) ***	13.17 (-59.03/85.37)	-18.57 (-88.86/51.73)	44.73 (-29.93/119.39)	1.02 (-73.64/75.68)	-21.00 (-91.29/49.29)	23.56 (-54.42/101.54)	-18.64 (-88.93/51.65)	39.15 (-35.52/113.81)
WD	0.71 (0.68/0.75)	0.68 (0.59/0.78) ns	0.68 (0.60/0.75) ***	0.03 (-0.14/0.07)	0.09 (-0.01/0.19)	0.13 (0.03/0.24) **	-0.01 (-0.12/0.10)	0.06 (-0.04/0.16)	0.05 (-0.06/0.16)	-0.05 (-0.15/0.06)	0.03 (-0.08/0.13)
Ψ_{pd}	0.31 (0.14/0.48)	0.86 (0.63/1.52) ***	-0.42 (-0.05/0.90)	0.04 (-0.69/0.61)	0.13 (-0.50/0.76)	0.24 (-0.44/0.91)	0.48 (-0.19/1.15)	-0.03 (-0.66/0.60)	0.03 (-0.67/0.74)	0.29 (-0.34/0.92)	0.17 (-0.51/0.84)
Ψ_{md}	1.29 (1.09/1.54)	1.93 (1.50/2.19) **	-1.78 (1.19/2.37) ***	0.34 (-1.14/0.46)	-0.26 (-1.03/0.52)	-0.02 (-0.85/0.81)	-0.27 (-1.10/0.56)	-0.63 (-1.41/0.14)	0.11 (-0.76/0.98)	-0.20 (-0.98/0.57)	0.05 (-0.78/0.88)
HSM	2.25 (1.64/2.86)	2.35 (0.74/3.96) ns	1.52 (0.05/2.99) *	1.16 (-0.69/3.01)	2.77 (0.93/4.62) **	1.88 (-0.02/3.78)	1.29 (-0.61/3.19)	-0.02 (-1.87/1.83)	0.24 (-1.74/2.21)	-0.02 (-1.82/1.79)	-0.46 (-2.36/1.45)
PLC	41.315 (32.38/49.21)	45.82 (24.14/67.78) ns	33.18 (15.62/50.74) ***	18.44 (-41.43/4.56)	22.47 (-0.52/45.47)	26.22 (2.44/50.00) *	17.82 (-5.96/41.60)	19.68 (-2.70/42.07)	22.31 (-2.52/47.15)	-4.01 (-27.79/19.77)	5.33 (-18.45/29.11)

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tp

Table 3. Results of linear mixed effect models of size (Large versus Small) on the stress indicators and hydraulic traits for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) and large trees (>20 cm DBH) measured in dry season (Oct/2017) on the Control plot and through-fall exclusion TFE. WD - wood density; AL:ASW - leaf to sapwood area ratio; P50 - xylem embolism resistance; P88 - xylem embolism resistance; Gmin - minimum stomatal conductance; Ks - maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; Ksl maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; Ψpd - predawn water potential; Ψmd - midday water potential. HSM - branch hydraulic safety margin to P50; PLC - native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The table shows the least square means for the Control and TFE, and the random genus effects (see analysis section in Methods for details). The first row of each trait gives the mean and second row gives one standard error for the fixed effects and the 95% confidence interval for genus-level random effects. Traits for which plot had a significant effect, and species for which the random effects were different from zero, are marked with * (p < 0.05), ** (p < 0.01) and *** (p < 0.001) and ns (non-significant).

Plot-level	Coefficients			c	Genus-level Coefficients	1	
Variable	Large	Small	Eschweilera	Inga	Licania	Protium	Swartzia
P	-2.66	-4.06	-2.654	-0.824	-1.526	0.014	-0.593
• 50	(-3.24/-2.08)	(-5.20/-2.93) ***	(-3.382/-1.926)***	(-1.798/0.150) ns	(-2.540/-0.513) **	(-0.985/1.013) ns	(-1.592/0.406) ns
в	-4.83	-7.08	-4.83	-1.35	-2.53	0.21	-1.02
P ₈₈	(-5.87/-3.80)	(-9.18/-5.02))***	(-6.16/ -3.49) ***	(-3.13/0.44) ns	(-4.39/ -0.67) **	(-1.62 /2.04) ns	(-2.85 /0.81) ns
~	0.08 (0.06/0.09)	0.02	0.07482	-0.01930	-0.02935	-0.03583	0.01851
G _{min}		(0.007/0.06) ***	(0.053/0.09) ***	(-0.049/0.010)ns	(-0.05941/0.00071)*	(-0.066/-0.005) *	(-0.011/0.048) ns
v	4.60 (2.20/5.58)	2.10 (1.09/4.33))***	3.88	1.98	-2.81	-0.90	-0.30
Ks			(2.59/5.16) ***	(0.28/3.68) *	(-4.69/ -0.94) **	(-2.64/0.83) ns	(-2.11/1.52) ns
	6.13	5.00	4.35	0.90	1.55	1.56	2.98
K _{sl}	(5.06/7.19)	(3.09/6.89) *	(3.42/5.28) ***	(-0.41/2.21)	(0.24/2.86) **	(0.29/2.83) **	(1.69/4.28)***
	0.70	0.60	0.63	0.01	0.05	-0.05	0.05
vv _D	(0.61/0.70)	(0.52/0.67) ***	(0.59/0.67) ***	(-0.04/0.06) ns	(0.00/0.11)*	(-0.11/0.00)*	(-0.01/0.10) ns
	-0.44	-0.44	-0.48	0.04	0.09	-0.05	0.08
Ψ_{pd}	(-0.50/-0.38)	(-0.61/-0.28)ns	(-0.59/-0.36) ***	(-0.12/0.20) ns	(-0.07/0.25) ns	(-0.21/0.11) ns	(-0.08/0.24) ns
	-1.75	-1.50	-1.85	0.17	0.54	0.41	-0.23
Ψ_{md}	(-2.04/-1.46)	(-1.98/-1.02)**	(-2.07/-1.63) ***	(-0.12 to 0.47) ns	(0.24/0.84) ***	(0.11/0.71) ***	(-0.54/0.08) ns
HSM	0.90	2.70	0.92	0.97	1.96	0.21	0.27

	(1.09/2.32)	(1.32/3.91)***	(0.10/1.74) **	(-0.13/2.08) ns	(0.82/3.11) ***	(-0.92/1.34) ns	(-0.85/1.40) ns
PLC	19.50 (8.91/30.75)	42.03 (23.13/60.94)***	19.19 (8.87/29.50) ***	-4.71 (-18.36/8.93) ns	12.90(-2.14/27.94) ns	20.93 (7.02/34.84) **	16.15 (1.56/ 30.74) *

For peer Review



Figure 1 Stress indicators and hydraulic traits for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) measured in dry season oct/2017 on the Control plot (blue) and through-fall exclusion (TFE, red). a) W_D – wood density b) $A_L:A_{sw}$ - leaf to sapwood area ratio c) P_{50} - xylem embolism resistance; d) P_{88} - xylem embolism resistance; e) G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance; f) K_s – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; g) K_{sl} - maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; h) Ψ_{pd} - predawn water potential; i) Ψ_{md} - midday water potential. j) HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P₅₀; l) PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The boxes represent quartiles 1 and 3, the central line indicates the median and the black points the mean of each treatment. Whiskers are either maximum value or 1.5 interquartile range above quartile 3, if outliers are present and notches represents a confidence interval around the median represented by central line. Traits for which plot had a significant effect are marked with * (p < 0.05), ** (p < 0.01) and *** (p < 0.001). P-values are from mixed effects analysis (see Table 2 for models and analysis section in Methods



1043 G_{min} - minimum stomatal conductance; f) K_s - maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; g) K_{sl} 1044 maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity. The vertical dashed coloured lines represent the
 1045 marginal fixed effects for plot. The points represent random effects plus fixed effect mean by
 1046 genus and the horizontal lines represents standard error for each genus (see Table 2 for models
 1047 and analysis section in Methods).







Figure 4 Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of drought stress indicators and hydraulic
 traits. Ordination showing multidimensional space filled by small (yellow) and large (green) trees
 indicating distinct hydraulic ecological strategies (MANOVA; P < 0.05) between trees from the TFE
 and Control. Hydraulic traits represented by arrows (Arrow length represent predictor "strength").
 Dots represent individuals in Control and triangles individuals in TFE treatment. The green colour
 represents large trees and yellow represents small trees.

1en



Figure 5 Comparison between small trees and large trees from the throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plots. a) W_D – wood density; b) P_{50} - xylem embolism resistance; c) P_{88} - xylem embolism resistance; d) G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance; e) K_s – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; f) K_{sl} - maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; g) Ψ_{pd} - predawn water potential; h) Ψ_{md} midday water potential; i) HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P₅₀; j) PLC –

1070 native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The boxes represent quartiles 1 and 3, the
1071 central line indicates the median and the black points the mean of each treatment. Whiskers are
1072 either maximum value or 1.5 interquartile range above the quartile 3, when outliers are present.
1073 Different letters indicate significant differences within each graph, p<0.05.



58
59Figure 6 Hydraulic traits comparison between small trees and large trees from throughfall
exclusion (TFE) and Control plot. a) W_D – wood density; b) P_{50} - xylem embolism resistance; c) P_{88} -
xylem embolism resistance; d) G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance; e) K_s – maximum hydraulic

1078 specific conductivity; f) K_{sl} - maximum hydraulic leaf-specific conductivity. The vertical dashed lines
 1079 represents marginal fixed effect mean, green vertical lines represents large trees and yellow
 1080 vertical lines, the points represents random plus fixed effect mean by each level (by genus) and
 1081 the horizontal lines represents standard error by each random effects level. The blue and red in
 1082 horizontal lines represents Control and TFE plot, respectively and are show when a significant plot
 1083 effect was found. All points and lines represent genus in each treatment (see Table 3 for models
 1084 and analysis section in Methods).



Figure 7 Drought stress indicators comparison between small trees and large trees from throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot. a) Ψ pd - predawn water potential; b) Ψ md - midday water potential. c) HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P50; d) PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The vertical dashed lines represents marginal fixed effect mean, the points represents random effects plus fixed effect mean by each level (by genus) and the

horizontal lines represents standard error by each random effects level. All points and lines
represent genus in each treatment. P-values are from mixed effects analysis (see Table 3 for
models and analysis section in Methods).

to per per period

2		
3 4	1	Small understorey trees have greater capacity than canopy trees to adjust hydraulic
5	2	traits following prolonged experimental drought in a tropical forest
6 7	3	Running title: Tree size strongly controls plant hydraulic responses in a droughted tropical
8	4	forest
9 10	5	Giles, A. L. ^{1*} , Rowland L. ² , Bittencourt P. R. L. ² , Bartholomew, D. C ² , Coughlin I. ^{4,5} , Costa
11 12	6	P. B. ^{1,7} , Domingues T. ⁴ , Miatto, R.C ⁴ , Barros, F. V ² , Ferreira L. V. ⁶ , Groenendijk, P ¹ , Oliveira
13 14	7	A. A. R. ⁶ , da Costa A. C. L. ^{6,7} , Meir P. ^{5,9} , Mencuccini M. ^{10,11} , Oliveira R. S. ¹
15 16 17	8	
18 19	9	*Corresponding Author: andregiles.bio@gmail.com, ¹ Instituto de Biologia, University of
20 21	10	Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, SP 13083-970, Brasil.
22 23 24	11	
25	12	¹ Instituto de Biologia, University of Campinas (UNICAMP), Campinas, SP 13083-970, Brasil.
26 27	13	² College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4RJ, UK
28 29	14	³ Biological Sciences, UWA, Perth, WA, Crawley 6009, Australia
30 31	15	⁴ Departamento de Biologia, FFCLRP, Universidade de São Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, SP 14040-
32	16	900, Brasil
34 25	17	⁵ Research School of Biology, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2601 Australia
36	18	⁶ Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi, Belém, PA 66040-170, Brasil
37 38	19	⁷ Biological Sciences, UWA, Perth, WA, Australia
39 40	20	⁸ Instituto de Geosciências, Universidade Federal do Pará, Belém, PA 66075-110, Brasil
41 42	21	⁹ School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, EH9 3FF, UK
43 44	22	¹⁰ CREAF, Campus UAB, Cerdanyola del Vallés, 08193 Spain
45	23	¹¹ ICREA, Barcelona, 08010, Spain
40 47	24	
48 49		
50		
51 52		
52 53		
54		
55 56		
50 57		
58		
59		

25 Abstract

Future climate change predictions for tropical forests highlight increased frequency and intensity of extreme drought events. However, it remains unclear whether large and small trees have differential strategies to tolerate drought due to the different niches they occupy. The future of tropical forests is ultimately dependent on the capacity of small trees (<10 cm in diameter) to adjust their hydraulic system to tolerate drought. To address this question, we evaluated whether the drought tolerance of neotropical small trees can adjust to experimental water stress and was different from tall trees. We measured multiple drought resistance-related hydraulic traits across nine common neotropical genera at the world's longest-running tropical forest throughfall-exclusion experiment and compared their responses with surviving large canopy trees. Small understorey trees in both the Control and the throughfall exclusion treatment (TFE) had lower minimum stomatal conductance and maximum hydraulic leaf-specific conductivity relative to large trees of the same genera, as well as greater hydraulic safety margin (HSM), percentage loss of conductivity (PLC) and embolism resistance, demonstrating they occupy a distinct hydraulic niche. Surprisingly, in response to the drought treatment, small trees increased specific hydraulic conductivity by 56.3% and leaf:sapwood area ratio by 45.6%. The greater HSM of small understorey trees relative to large canopy trees likely enabled them to adjust other aspects of their hydraulic systems to increase hydraulic conductivity and take advantage of increases in light availability in the understorey resulting from the drought-induced mortality of canopy trees. Our results demonstrate that differences in hydraulic strategies between small understorey and large canopy trees drive hydraulic niche segregation. Small understorey trees can adjust their hydraulic systems in response to changes in water and light availability indicating natural regeneration of tropical forests following long-term drought may be possible.

52 Key-words: Long-term drought; Understorey trees; Hydraulic Safety margin; P50;
53 Maximum conductivity; Acclimation; Amazon forest.

59 Introduction

Climate change predictions for tropical forests comprise increased frequency and intensity of extreme drought events (Aragão et al., 2018; Brodribb, Powers, Cochard, & Choat, 2020) and long-term reductions in soil moisture availability (Corlett 2016, Christensen et al. 2017). Most studies relating to drought focus on the impacts on large trees that comprise the highest proportion of forest biomass (Meir et al. 2015, Rowland, da Costa, et al. 2015), often finding the effect of drought stress on a plant's hydraulic system is a key driver of tree mortality (Bittencourt et al., 2020; Brodribb et al., 2020; Rowland et al., 2015). However, small understorey trees not only are responsible for up to 20% of the forest carbon sink (Hubau et al. 2019) but have a fundamental role in recruitment and the maintenance of tree populations, as they will effectively compose the future pool of large tree in the forest. Thus, small trees may be critical in determining long-term drought responses if there is extensive loss of large canopy trees (Rowland, da Costa, et al. 2015, Esquivel-Muelbert et al. 2017).

Large trees occupy canopy positions (hereafter, large trees) with high light levels and high vapor pressure deficit. In contrast, small trees from the same genus occupy understory positions (hereafter small trees), grow slowly, generally in shaded conditions and experience a lower atmospheric vapor pressure deficit (Sterck et al. 2011). The distinct resource partitioning between small and large trees, (Brum et al., 2019; Poorter, Bongers, Sterck, & Wöll, 2005) could cause strong differences in their water supply and demand relative to large trees. Reduced water supply from the roots, alongside lower capacitance, is likely to cause more negative water potentials in small trees relative to larger ones, during periods of low soil moisture (Salomón et al. 2017). Large trees are more likely to

buffer periods of water deficit with greater water access by deep roots (Brum et al. 2019),
higher capacitance (Mcculloh et al. 2014), and elevated carbohydrate storage that allow
to maintain either prolonged stomatal opening (deep roots) or prolonged stomatal closure
(greater storage) (McDowell et al., 2008). These potential size-dependent variations in
structural and physiological traits suggest tree size potentially influences a tree's capacity
to acclimate in response to severe drought stress.

Several key traits of the hydraulic system of a plant are essential in determining the capacity of a tree to survive prolonged drought stress. These traits are often related to preventing hydraulic failure, via emboli formation, in the xylem vessels (Sperry and Tyree 1988), which can lead to severe decreases in leaf water supply, photosynthesis and other physiological functions (Sperry et al. 2002, McDowell et al. 2008, Martinez-Vilalta et al. 2019). These key traits include the water potentials at which the xylem lose 50% or 88% of their conductance (P50 or P88, respectively) and the hydraulic safety margin (HSM) (Meinzer et al. 2009), i.e., the difference between the minimum leaf water potential that is naturally experienced and P50, effectively a metric of the risk of a plant crossing a critical hydraulic threshold. Following sustained periods of drought stress, a tree's capacity to survive is likely to be related to its capacity to acclimate certain key drought tolerance traits or to limit its demand for water, via traits such as minimum stomatal conductance, thus reducing stress on its hydraulic system (Sala et al. 2010, Meir et al. 2018). Existing studies on large trees show limited capacity for tropical trees to adjust plant hydraulic traits in response to drought stress (Binks et al., 2016; Bittencourt et al., 2020; Powell et al., 2017; Schuldt et al., 2011). Some studies have shown that the risk of embolism can be reduced by increasing HSMs under drought conditions (Awad et al. 2010, Tomasella et al. 2018, Prendin et al. 2018). However, in a tropical forest drought experiment, large trees

Page 57 of 114

were found to have limited plasticity in leaf level anatomy (Binks et al., 2016) and no capacity to acclimate their hydraulic systems, especially in traits relating to embolism resistance (Bittencourt et al., 2020; Powell et al., 2017; Rowland et al., 2015). Yet, to our knowledge, no studies have evaluated whether small trees (<10 cm diameter at breast height, DBH), contrary to adult trees, have the capacity to adjust their hydraulic system to prolonged drought stress. Following high mortality losses in large, more drought-intolerant, trees, small trees can increase photosynthetic capacity (Bartholomew et al., 2020;) and lower canopy trees can increase growth rates, even following drought (Brando et al., 2008; Rowland et al., 2015). This suggests that small trees can increase performance in response to elevated light, despite drier conditions. Increased light availability would also require these small trees to the increased atmospheric water demand, implying the need to increase water supply from their hydraulic system and/or to sustain a lower xylem water potential. However, these adjustments to conditions of severe drought only seem to be possible if small trees have a greater drought tolerance, functioning with higher levels of embolism resistance and hydraulic safety margin (HSM). Consequently, consideration of ecosystem changes, such as canopy loss and shifting light availability, is likely to be as important as the consideration of the direct impact of soil moisture stress following long-term drought, as both factors may influence hydraulic acclimation within small trees. Here we take advantage of a unique drought experiment located in northeast Amazonia

Here we take advantage of a unique drought experiment located in northeast Amazonia (Meir et al. 2015, 2018) to evaluate the response of small trees to combined changes in water and light availability. Previous research at this site has shown that large trees (>40 cm DBH) had significantly higher mortality rates, when compared to small trees and to trees in adjacent control forest, leading to a 40% reduction in biomass following 14 years

 of experimentally-imposed soil drought (da Costa et al., 2010; Rowland et al., 2015, Meir et al. 2018). This biomass loss was almost entirely from trees reaching the upper canopy, which led to increased levels of light in the understory and increased growth rates of small understory trees in the wet season (da Costa et al., 2014; Metcalfe, et al., 2010; Rowland et al., 2015, Meir et al. 2018). Furthermore elevated radiation loads are likely to have increased leaf vapour pressure deficit and temperature, increasing the atmospheric drought effect these small trees experience (Mulkey & Pearcy 1992a; Kamaluddin & Grace 1992; Krause, Virgo & Winter 1995). Using new data from this soil drought experiment (henceforth throughfall-exclusion experiment – TFE), we explore how small trees adjust hydraulic traits in response to increases in light availability coupled with increased drought stress, specifically, if small trees are able to adjust traits to novel light conditions whilst under drought stress. Thus, we test whether small trees (1-10 cm DBH) alter their plant hydraulic system in response to prolonged soil moisture stress and increased canopy openness, and determine how these responses vary relative to those of large trees (>20 cm DBH). We address the following hypotheses:

1) Considering the same genus we hope that the hydraulic systems of small trees adjust to the combined soil-drought and radiation-load conditions imposed in the TFE relative to the Control. We expect small trees in TFE treatment to take advantage of the increased canopy openness by increasing their water transport efficiency (greater hydraulic specific conductivity and leaf-sapwood ratios). At the same time, we predict that small trees will have more negative water potentials resulting from drought conditions and the capacity to compensate this by adjusting hydraulic traits to maintain higher hydraulic safety margins to meet the elevated canopy water demands in support of photosynthesis.

2	
ر ۸	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
10	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20 21	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
20	
3/	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
15	
45	
40	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
52	
55	
54	
55	
56	
57	

58 59 60 2) Small trees have different hydraulic strategies from large trees. Specifically, we predict
that, independent of the drought and radiation responses in the TFE, small trees have
greater drought tolerance, higher xylem embolism resistance and larger hydraulic safety
margins, relative to large trees. We therefore predict that, as a consequence of those trait
differences, small trees occupy a different hydraulic trait space from large trees.

for per peries

Methods

160 Site and plant material

Our study site is a lowland tropical rainforest located in the Caxiuana National Forest, state of Pará, north-east Brazil (1°43'S, 51°27 W). It has an annual rainfall of 2000-2500mm, with a dry season (< 120 mm monthly rainfall) from July to December. A throughfall exclusion (TFE) experiment was established in 2002, where 50% of canopy throughfall is excluded by a plastic panel structure installed at 1-2m height over a 1 ha area (Meir et al. 2018). The TFE plot was studied alongside a 1 ha Control plot, where no throughfall exclusion took place. The plots have been monitored continuously since 2001 and further information on the experimental set-up can be found in earlier papers (da Costa et al., 2010; Fisher et al., 2007; Meir et al., 2015 and Rowland et al., 2015b).

From August-September 2017, during the peak of the dry season, we sampled 74 small trees with diameters ranging from 1 to 10 cm at breast height (1.3 m). We measured 41 small trees on the Control plot and 33 on the TFE, all taken from nine genera (20 species), replicated in each plot (two to five individuals per genera per plot). While we tried to maintain the same range of tree heights within each genus between plots, small trees had more variable height in the TFE, with light-exposed individuals reaching over 15 meters height, whilst no individuals in the Control reached 15 metres height (See Fig. S1). It was not possible to know the age of each sampled individual, because (destructive) sampling for age determination (tree-ring analyses; e.g., Brienen et al., 2016) was not possible. Consequently, we must assume that our sampled trees may have strongly varying ages (Groenendijk et al. 2014). We thus test the influence of tree stature and

position within the forest strata (van der Sleen et al. 2015), while assuming that most of
our sampled trees are likely to be young.

For each individual, we collected two branches from the top of the crown, representing the point maximally exposed to light. The branches were third to fourth order (30-55 mm of diameter), counting from the tip. We collected one set of branches before sunrise (0400 to 0600 hours) and used these to measure embolism resistance and predawn leaf water potential. We collected a second set of branches at midday (1130 to 1330 hours) and used these to measure midday leaf water potential, native embolism, leaf-to-sapwood area, xylem and leaf specific conductivity, minimum leaf conductance and wood density measurements. Immediately after collection, branches were bagged in thick black plastic sacks with moist paper to humidify internal air and minimise leaf transpiration. Branches were transported 100m from the plots to measure leaf water potential, and for the remaining measurements the branches were transported to a laboratory ~1km walk away.

We measured predawn leaf water potential (Ψ pd), taken to represent the time-point when transpiration is at its minimum and the water potential of the plant is closest to equilibrium with that of the soil. Wpd can be considered an integrated metric of soil water availability across the rooting depth (Bartlett et al. 2016). We also determined midday water potential (Ψ md), to capture the minimum Ψ of the plant in the dry season. This measure is affected by any cuticular or stomatal transpiration and, thus, broadly captures the integrated effects of plant traits and the environment water demand on the minimum water potential a plant reaches in natural conditions. We also measured the native dry-season percentage loss of conductivity (PLC). We used the difference between

the minimum leaf water potential (Ψ_{md}) and P_{50} , to calculate the branch hydraulic safety margin (HSM). These two values (native PLC and HSM) were used as indicators of the cumulative damage from embolism.

Predawn and midday water potential

Predawn and midday leaf water potentials were measured in the field immediately after collection, using a pressure chamber (Model 1505, PMS). Branches collected for predawn water potential measures were sampled before sunrise, and for midday water potential, the sampling took place between 1130 to 1330 hours. For each tree we measured water potential of two leaves, or three leaves if the first two measures differed substantially (>0.5 MPa difference) from one another. Measurements from multiple leaves were averaged to create a single value per tree. All water potential measurements were taken on the same day for small trees and across three days for large trees.

Wood density, leaf to sapwood area ratio and minimum stomatal conductance

We measured wood density (W_D) on woody sections 40 to 80 mm long with a diameter of 4 to 7 mm. We debarked samples, immersed them in water for 24 hours to rehydrate and measured the saturated volume using the water displacement method (Pérez-Harguindeguy et al., 2013). We then oven dried the samples at 60°C until they were a constant mass and measured their dry weight with a precision balance to 3 decimal places.

We determined the leaf to sapwood area ratio $(A_L:A_{SW})$, on all branches by measuring leaf area and calculating sapwood area from two diameter measurements of the debarked basal part of the branch using precision callipers at a standardised distance from the tip. To avoid overestimation we checked the absence of pith area in all branches

per species before the measurement. We measured leaf area by scanning all leaves on the branch and quantifying their area using Image J software (version 1.6.0_20; Schneider et al., 2012). We calculated the leaf area to sapwood area ratio as total branch leaf area divided by its basal sapwood area. All branches had a similar size and were standardised by distance to the tip (~40-70 cm). The $A_L:A_{SW}$ is a key indicator of the balance between transpirative demand and water supply capacity (Mencuccini et al. 2019).

For minimum leaf conductance (G_{min}), we used the leaf conductance to water vapour measured on the abaxial surface of leaves kept 30 minutes in the dark, using an infrared gas analyser (Li-COR 6400, US). All measured leaves were fully formed and undamaged leaves. G_{min} is a measure key indicator of residual leaf water loss and likely a due to a combination of leakage stomatal conductance from partially from leakage of partially closed stomata and cuticular conductance (Duursma et al. 2019, Binks et al. 2020, Márquez et al. 2021)., see Rowland et al. (2020) and Bartholomew et al. (2020), provide further details on gas exchange measurement.

241 Hydraulic efficiency and native embolism

We used maximum hydraulic specific conductivity (K_s) as a measure of xylem hydraulic efficiency and maximum leaf specific conductivity (K_{sl}) as a measure of leaf water supply capacity. We used the native percentage loss of conductivity of the collected branches (PLC) as a measure of native embolism. To PLC, we measured branch xylem hydraulic conductivity before (K_{snat} – native conductivity) and after flushing to remove emboli (Ks). We quantified the leaf area distal to each sample to obtain K_{sl} from K_l (leaf conductance). Using samples from the branches collected at midday, we put the entire branch underwater and discarded a 10 cm long segment from the base. After this, we cut

another 10-15 cm long segment from the base of each branch underwater, standard distance from the tip of the branch and let them rehydrate for 15 min to release tension and avoid artefacts (Venturas et al. 2015). Subsequently, to relax the tension in the branch we cut 1-1.5 cm of branch from base to leaves underwater, in steps of ~15 cm, and used the distal end of the branch for hydraulic measurements to ensure no artificially embolised vessels were present in the measured sample. All samples used for hydraulic measurements were second or third order branches, between 30-55 mm in length and 3-5 mm diameter and were recut underwater with a sharp razor blade before connecting to the apparatus, to ensure all vessels were open at both ends. We then measured flow in the sample using the Ventury tube method (Tyree et al. 2002, Pereira and Mazzafera 2013), where known resistance (PEEK capillary) is connected in series with the sample and the pressure drop in the capillary is proportional to flow in the sample. K_{snat} is then calculated from the pressure head applied and water flow. The samples are then flushed to remove emboli and estimate Ks (Martin-StPaul et al., 2014). We used pressure transducers (26PCCFA6G, Honeywell; read with a OM-CP-VOLT101A data logger, Omega Engineering) to measure pressure drop in the capillary and measured the capillary resistance prior to measurements using precision scales. The samples remained underwater throughout the entire procedure. We calculated PLC as the ratio of K_{snat} to K_s multiplied by 100. We calculated K_{sl} as the sample hydraulic conductivity (i.e., sample conductance times sample length) after flushing divided by the leaf area distal to the measured sample.

271 Embolism resistance and hydraulic safety

Page 65 of 114

As an index of xylem embolism resistance, we used P₅₀ and P₈₈, the xylem water potentials where, respectively, 50% and 88% of hydraulic conductivity is lost. We also used P_{50} to calculate the hydraulic safety margin - the difference between P_{50} and Ψ_{md} , an index of tree hydraulic safety. Branches collected before sunrise were rehydrated for 24 hours and from each branch we cut two or three smaller branches of approximately 40-70 cm. We measured the xylem embolism resistance of each branch using the pneumatic method (Pereira et al. 2016, Zhang et al. 2018). With this method, the loss of hydraulic conductance is estimated from the increase in air volume inside the wood caused by embolism formation as the branch dehydrates. Air volume is estimated from the air discharge from the cut end of the branch into a vacuum reservoir (~50 kPa absolute pressure) of known volume during a given amount of time (2.5 minutes). We measured initial and final pressure inside the vacuum reservoir with a pressure transducer (163PC01D75, Honeywell) and calculated the volume of air discharged using the ideal gas law. A detailed protocol is presented in (Pereira et al. 2016, Bittencourt et al. 2018) and revised by Pereira et al. (2021). Percentage loss of conductance for each branch is estimated from percentage air discharged (PAD) during its dehydration. PAD is calculated by standardising air discharge for each branch by its minimum (fully hydrated) and maximum (most dehydrated) air discharge state. We dehydrated branches using the bench dehydration method (Sperry et al. 1988). Before each air discharge measurement, branches were sealed in thick black plastic bags for one hour for leaf and wood xylem water potential to equilibrate. Directly after the air discharge was measured, we estimated wood xylem water potential by measuring the leaf water potential of one to two leaves. Drought embolism resistance is then given by the increase in PAD with decreasing xylem water potential for each tree. To calculate P₅₀, we pooled data from the

two-to-three branch replicates from the same tree and fitted a sigmoid curve to the data (Pammenter and Van der Willigen 1998) where P_{50} and slope (a) are the fitted parameters and P_{88} is predicted from the fit (Eqn 1):

$$PAD = 100/(1 + \exp(a(\Psi - P50)))$$

Eqn1. Percentage air discharge equation (PAD). Ψ Water potential. P₅₀ (xylem embolism 301 resistance (MPa)

302 Data analysis

(1)

By comparing trees found on the Control and TFE experimental plots, we measure the effect of the experimental drought on our drought stress indicators (Ψ_{pd} , Ψ_{md} - midday water potential; HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P₅₀; PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity) and plant traits (W_D – wood density; A_L:A_{SW} - leaf to sapwood area; P₅₀ - xylem embolism resistance; P₈₈ - xylem embolism resistance; G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance; K_s – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; K_{sl} -maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity) in small trees. We used linear mixed effects models to test for plot (TFE vs Control) and taxonomic effects (genus and species) on hydraulics traits in small trees (n = 66) using the R package lme4 (Bates et al. 2015). We tested the significance of the random effect by removing it and evaluating if the model significantly worsened using log likelihood tests using the ranova function for ImerTest objects (Zuur et al. 2009). We tested sequentially for the random effect of genus on: (a) the model intercept; (b) the fixed Plot effect (drought effect, difference between plots) on slope without intercept; and (c) both intercept and plot. When either the genus effect on plot, slope or both did not show the significance, we kept the multilevel approach using

genus as a random effect on the intercept (1|genus), as it controls for experimental design (Burnham and Anderson 2004). After testing the random effects, we tested the fixed TFE effect on variables. When taxonomy was included as a random effect in our models, we tested for both genus-only and species-nested-within-genus effects. We tested the complete model (genus and species as a random effect) against a General Linear Model (GLM) containing only the fixed effects. In all variables genus was significant as random effect. Therefore, linear models with genus as a random effect were used to test the significance of the fixed effects. To quantify model goodness of fit, we considered the marginal and conditional R² (Mulkey and Pearcy 1992b). The marginal R² indicates how much of the model variance is explained by the fixed effects only, whereas the conditional R² indicates how much of the model variance is explained by the complete model with fixed and random effects. All the analyses were done in R (version 3.3.0; R Core Team, 2016)

Small and large tree comparisons

We tested for differences in individual tree-level responses to the TFE treatment for large (n = 72) and small trees (n = 39). We use the large trees data from Bittencourt et al. (2020) conducted in the same experimental plots and collected during 2017 with the same methodological procedures. For this comparison we restrict the samples to those trees whose genera are replicated on both plots and replicated between the large and small trees, with a minimum sample size of 2 individuals per size group per plot and genus. Consequently, the number of genera and individuals employed in this comparison is lower than the available number of individual small trees and the full dataset published in Bittencourt et al., (2020). In total we use five genera (Eschweilera, Inga, Licania, Protium,

Swartzia), with 15 small trees on the Control and 24 small trees on the TFE, and 35 large trees on the Control and 37 large trees on the TFE. We used linear mixed-effect models to test the effects of the tree size with two classes (large and small), and tree size on drought stress indicators and hydraulic traits. Taxonomic effects were included by using genus as random effects, following the same protocol used for the small tree analyses, presented above. Within this paper, all data presented represent the mean and standard errors of the mean. A summary of available trait data by genus is presented in Table 1.

To test for an overall difference in the hydraulic strategy between small and large trees, we used the multivariate approach conducting non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) using an individual-traits matrix (McCune & Grace 2002). We construct a matrix of data consisting of rows of individuals of each species and columns of traits values. We standardized the individual trait values for each genus and built the similarity matrix using Gower distance. NMDS searches for the best position of individuals variables on k dimensions (axes) to minimize the "stress" of the resulting k-dimensional configuration. We use k axes = 2 from that ordination as the initial configuration. The "stress" is obtained by comparison among the pair-wise distances (differences) of each individual's variables in reduced ordination space (expressed in terms of axes) and the original distance matrix (Gower distance). The regression is fitted using least-squares regressions and the goodness of fit is measured as the sum of squared differences between ordination-based distances and the distances predicted by the regression. A goodness of fit, or stress value, between 0.1 to 0.2 represent a good fit within the specified number of dimensions analysed to enable points to be interpreted relative to the NMDS axes. Therefore, the axis represents the data in a way that best represents their dissimilarity, points on the graph that are closer together are more similar. In addition, we use MANOVA to test the

difference in multidimensional space filled by tree size (small and large groups) and by plot effect (TFE and Control groups) separately (Anderson 2001). We use a MANOVA to compare Gower distance among observations in the same group versus those in different groups. We conducted a MANOVA first using small and large tree groups and then using TFE and Control groups using both tree sizes together. The size and plot effects were tested separately. Finally, we use permutations of the observations to obtain a probability associated with the null hypothesis of no differences between groups.

372 Results

The reduced soil moisture availability and increased canopy openness caused by 15 years of the TFE (Fig. S2) caused significant changes in the hydraulic traits of the small trees (Fig. 1). Maximum specific conductivity (K_s) increased significantly, by 56.3±41.5%, in the TFE small trees relative to the Control (Fig. 1f, p<0.01), similarly there was a significant (45.6±38.2%) increase in the leaf: sapwood area ratio (AL:Asw, Fig 1b.; p<0.001). The TFE also had significant effects on key physiological indicators of drought stress in small trees (Fig. 1) with Ψ_{pd} 0.24 MPa lower on the TFE relative to the Control (p <0.001) and Ψ_{md} 0.67 MPa lower (p < 0.001, Table S2). In contrast, other key hydraulic traits including xylem embolism resistance (P₅₀ and P₈₈), leaf specific conductivity (K_{sl}), minimum stomatal conductance (G_{min}) and wood density (WD) showed no significant difference between the TFE and the Control plots for small trees (Fig. 1; Table 2; Table S3).

Taxonomic effects on hydraulic traits and their interactions with drought

Using mixed-effect modelling analysis we found that the variance explained by taxonomy had only a limited role in affecting the overall drought responses. When genus by genus responses to the drought effect were examined separately, it was clear that there were highly variable responses to the treatment among genera and sometimes these were inconsistent in terms of direction, as well as magnitude. We cannot separate the taxonomic effect from the residual variance because genus-specific influences on the plot effect were highly variable (Fig. 2 and 3). Given the low replication (between 2 and 5 for each genus on each plot treatment) and high variation within each genus, it was not always statistically viable to test the plot effect within each genus (Fig. 2 and 3), however where this was possible, clear statistical differences were seen for some genera but not for others (Table 2 Fig. 2). For example, Licania showed consistent responses in P₅₀ and HSM while Ocotea did not show differences between plots (Fig. 2 and 3). The patterns described here were also maintained when we analysed the data at a species level (data ien not shown).
401 Large versus small trees

We compared the responses of hydraulic traits between large (>20 cm DBH) and small trees (1-10 cm DBH). Except for Ψ_{pd} , the results we obtain considering only the five genera that overlap between the small and large size classes, were similar to when considering all nine genera of trees present in Control plot and TFE experiment (see Fig. S3 supplementary material and Table S3 for n values for the small to large tree comparisons). Using all of the trait data for five overlapping genera, we applied NMDS ordination which demonstrated that the niche space occupied by the small trees was significantly different from the trait space of large trees. The traits space separated on to a clear 2-dimensional axis with a stress score of 0.18, indicating a good fit between the data and an analysis consisting of two axes (Fig. 4). Different associations amongst the nine hydraulic traits separated the individuals in the small and large tree groups. This result was driven predominantly by the first axis, which was positively related to PLC, P₅₀ and P₈₈ that influenced small tree grouping (Fig. 4). While the first axis was negatively related to K_s, K_{sl}, G_{min} influencing large trees grouping (Fig 4, Table S4). Using the complete set of hydraulic traits, we show that the hydraulic niche of small trees was significantly different from that of large trees (MANOVA_(1,66); F=7.96; p<0.001; Table 1). However, there was no difference in hydraulic niche space occupied by the Control and TFE groups (MANOVA(1.64); F=1.22; p=0.30), except for K_s that showed plot and tree size effects (MANOVA_(1,64); F=3.5; p=0.05). In contrast to the large increase in K_s observed between small trees in Control and TFE trees (Figs 1 & S2), the plot level average values of K_s were similar among large trees in both Control and droughted conditions (4.82±3.93 TFE and 4.86±2.79 Control plot). Similar to Ψ_{md} , notable plot level differences were present in small trees, but these were absent

in the large trees (-1.72 ± 0.48 MPa TFE and -1.70±0.48 MPa Control treatment). However, small trees had values of Ψ_{md} which were 17.12±0.03% higher (values closer to 0) than the large trees. Furthermore, for the variables which had no treatment effect amongst the small trees, we find on average, across both the TFE and Control plots, the small trees had a 38.20±32.10% (p<0.01) more negative P₅₀ and a 68.40±58.80% and 20.70±30.40% lower G_{min} and K_{sl}, respectively, than the large trees (Fig. 5b, 5d, 5f; p<0.001). Also across the plot we found that HSM increased by 72.97±36.34% and PLC increased by 44.41±14.62% in the small trees relative to large trees (Fig. 5g, 5i, 5j; p<0.01).

We analysed the influence of genus on the combined effect of treatment and tree size effect (i.e., large and small trees on the Control and TFE plot) for the five genera we could replicate across plots and tree size classes. We found that the effects of tree size varied substantially among genera and between traits and stress indicators (Fig. 6 and 7, table S5 and S6). For example, the difference in P_{50} between large trees and the small trees was 61.48±52.51% for Licania and 38.96±3.7% for Inga (Fig. 6). In contrast, G_{min} was significantly lower in the small trees relative to large trees across almost all genera (Fig. 6b). The drought-response pattern also changes when doing within-genus comparisons between large and small trees, for example the mean P₅₀ response for Inga was different between small and large trees (Fig. 6). A difference in trait values between the Control and TFE plots that was present either for small tree or large trees, but not for both size classes simultaneously, occurred multiple times (Fig. 6 and 7), especially for the genus Inga. Mixed effect modelling results identify a strong influence of genus on trait variation between our two size classes (Table 3), yet there are limited cases where we find significant models demonstrating trait differences between the Control and the TFE plot with a significant tree size and genus effect (Table 3).

To test for size (small vs. large) and genus effects in each treatment (Control and TFE), we created a model with both size and genus as fixed effects. In the Control plot the full model (trait ~ genus*size) was a better predictor of variation across almost all traits, except for K_s , where there was a genus only effect and G_{min} , P_{50} and P_{88} where there was a size only effect. An interaction between size and genus was only significant for PLC (Table S7). The full model was also the best predictor of trait variation in the TFE plot, although only HSM, W_D and G_{min} showed a significant size effect. Significant interactions between genus and size were found for P_{50} and P_{88} (Table S7).

O' PER PERio

457 Discussion

Our results provide the evidence that small trees can adjust their functioning in response to drought, allowing them to maximize carbon gain in the higher-light levels following mortality of large trees in the TFE. We find that small trees (1-10 cm DBH) have the capacity to increase maximum specific hydraulic conductivity and leaf-sapwood area ratio in response to prolonged (15 year) soil moisture deficit. Despite having significantly lower pre-dawn and midday leaf water potentials, small trees had the capacity to adjust key hydraulic traits to allow a positive response to a higher light environment. This suggests that despite soil drought stress, small trees can still increase water transport efficiency and canopy water use in response to increases in light availability, following drought-induced mortality of large trees, potentially allowing them to maximise productivity in periods of the year when water is available. We also show the different components of a hydraulic strategy that provides niche segregation between small and large trees, with small trees being more drought tolerant than large canopy trees.

Studying the effects of multiple factors (here, imposed drought and size) on the physiology of hyper-diverse tropical forests is challenging. Here, we successfully addressed this problem by using genus and species nested in genus as random factors in linear mixed models and show that variability of species within genera is generally small. We nonetheless acknowledge our sample size limitations and the possibility that greater sampling depth may discover significant species-by-species variability in these traits.

The impact of drought on the hydraulic system of small trees

The substantial drought-related mortality of large trees (da Costa et al., 2010; Rowland et al., 2015) in the 15 years preceding this study led to an increase in the light availability in the lower canopy of the TFE, driving increases in the maximum photosynthetic capacity (71.1% and 29.2% increase in J_{max} and Vc_{max} respectively) and a 15.1% increase in the LMA of the same small trees we study here (Bartholomew et al. 2020). These differences in response to the prevailing light environment have also been observed elsewhere in tropical tree canopies (Ruggiero et al. 2002, Domingues et al. 2010, Cavaleri et al. 2010) and are indicative of plants changing their allocation strategy in response to increased light availability (Poorter et al., 2009; Wright et al., 2004). Critically, these allocation shifts are likely to result in a net increase in photosynthesis and growth (Metcalfe, Meir, Aragão, et al. 2010, Rowland, da Costa, et al. 2015, Meir et al. 2018), which require higher water supply to the canopy of each individual. The elevated soil moisture stress in the TFE relative to the Control trees manifested itself as significantly more negative pre-dawn and midday leaf water potential values (Figs 1h-1i), key indicators of plant water stress (Bhaskar & Ackerly, 2006; Kramer, 1988; Martínez-vilalta & Garcia-Forner, 2017). Interestingly however, these more negative water potentials did not translate into a significant change in HSM between plots, which would imply that the small trees converge to have the same vulnerability to drought (Choat et al. 2012). This could occur because of a trend, albeit not statistically detectable, towards more negative P50 values in the TFE plot for small trees, relative to the Control trees (Fig. 1), making a significant difference in HSM less likely. When examined at the genus level, five of the nine genera have consistently more negative P₅₀ values on the TFE relative to the Control, with two remaining roughly equal and two less negative on the TFE (Fig. 2). These data

suggest that, despite operating at more negative water potentials, it is still possible for
small trees to adjust their hydraulic system to support the increased growth in response to
greater light availability.

Consistent with increases in photosynthetic capacity (Bartholomew et al., 2020), we observe an increase in leaf area to sapwood area ratio (AL:ASW) in the small trees on the TFE, relative to the Control. Combined with greater hydraulic specific conductivity, small trees in the TFE are therefore able to supply water to more photosynthetic tissue without increasing the volume of sapwood. A global study, including multiple sites from the tropics showed plant hydraulic systems are highly sensitive to changes in this ratio (AL:ASW) and may be one of the main factors controlling trade-offs in other plant hydraulic traits (Mencuccini et al. 2019). Increasing leaf area increases the total water demand of the tree; however, the observed increases in photosynthetic capacity (high values of Vc_{max} and J_{max}, Bartholomew et al. 2020), may allow slightly lower stomatal conductance for any given CO₂ concentration (Bartholomew et al., 2020; Sperry et al., 2017). This may, in part, compensate for the increase in demand for water that increased leaf areas could cause. However, even with the observed increases in photosynthetic capacity, these small trees probably still experience increased total water demand due to increased exposure to higher temperatures and VPD, suggesting that small trees must increase maximum hydraulic conductivity and/or tolerate reductions in water potential and therefore greater embolism risk (Sperry et al., 2017). In our study, small trees sampled in the TFE were slightly taller than the small trees in the Control plot (Fig. S1). This difference may in partcontribute to the slightly elevated conductance in the branches, as taller trees can have larger vessels at the base and greater vessel tapering from the trunk to branch tip (Olson

and Rosell 2013, Olson et al. 2020). It is, however, unlikely that these differences had a

large influence on our K_s results, overall, the difference in height were small and the genera with the greatest height differences between the TFE and Control (Protium, Octea, *Voucoupoa*, Fig. S1) showed no changes in Ks (Fig. 2). Differential hydraulic strategy between small and large trees The comparison between small trees and large trees multidimensional hydraulic trait space, using NMDS and MANOVA, indicate they occupy different hydraulic niche spaces, despite some overlap. This revealed that smaller trees do indeed have a different water use strategy to larger canopy trees (Fig 3). The differences in the traits we observed were far greater, and in most cases significantly so, between the large and the small trees than for trees of the same size class between treatments (Fig 4). In addition, we show that smaller trees across both the Control and the TFE plot have significantly more negative P₅₀ values and lower G_{min} values and significantly greater hydraulic safety margins (HSM), midday leaf water potentials and PLC (Fig. 4). This may imply that the small trees converge to the same vulnerability to drought, consistent with the results from large scale studies (e.g. Choat et al., 2012). However, the HSM is 1.94 MPa more positive in the small trees relative to large trees, indicative of a lack of convergence of the vulnerability of large and small trees (i.e. Fig 4i), potentially suggesting vulnerability to drought is driven by the ontogenetic stage of a tree. In addition, our results are consistent with the hypothesis that the smaller trees are shallow rooted and compensate for the lack of access to deep water through developing greater xylem embolism resistance and greater stomatal control (Brum et al., 2019; Tardieu, 1996, Sperry et al. 2017). It is possible that the greater hydraulic safety margin in small trees enables them to adjust more effectively to increased

549 light availability, despite the lower water availability in the TFE, as it enables these trees to
550 tolerate greater drought stress without passing critical thresholds.

The carbon gain associated with greater photosynthesis under higher light environments may be translated into new xylem growth in smaller trees. This growth could rapidly replace damaged tissues and is likely to be a more viable strategy for smaller trees, relative to large trees (Damián et al. 2018, Trugman et al. 2018), which would reduce the risk associated with higher PLC levels. Furthermore, small trees maintained significantly lower G_{min} and higher midday leaf water potentials (Fig. 5d, 5g), relative to the large trees, despite having similar pre-dawn leaf water potentials, suggesting that small trees are able to more tightly regulate water loss, during both the day and night. Probably, the high regulate water loss in small tree is associate a lower water storage capacity to buffer short-term variation of water availability (Goldstein et al. 1998, Meinzer et al. 2003). The greater degree of control further reduces the risk of runaway embolism when photosynthesising during periods with low water potential, particularly if these trees can repair cavitated vessels (Nardini et al., 2011; Salleo et al., 2004; Salleo et al., 1995) or grow new vessels between consecutive dry seasons (Eller et al. 2018). Also, small trees also have fewer structural constraints than large trees, so small changes in hydraulic traits in a small tree could have bigger effects on overall performance during drought, because the marginal effect of each unit change is larger relative to the size of the tree (Mencuccini 2002). Combined, these factors are likely to allow small trees to have greater flexibility in terms of the strategy they use to adjust to combined changes in water and light availability. However, as we highlight in our results, there is considerable variability both within and between taxonomic groups with respect to how small trees may alter their traits and their resulting drought tolerance strategy.

Page 79 of 114

This study highlights the importance of forest structural changes in controlling the traits of what are likely to be the next generation of trees growing up during prolonged drought stress. We show that, relative to large trees, small trees have a larger capacity to acclimate their hydraulic systems to increases in light availability following drought-induced mortality of large canopy-dominant trees. Our results suggest that small trees are able to acclimate the hydraulic conductance and leaf area to sapwood area ratio despite experiencing prolonged soil moisture stress, which resulted here in lower leaf water potentials and greater PLC. Also, our results demonstrate that there is a consistent and larger shift in the plant hydraulic strategy of saplings relative to large trees across most of Amazonia's hyper-abundant taxonomic groups. Whilst we find adjustment of traits in response to the drought treatment, it remains unknown whether all small trees community can respond in the same way or only the long-term drought surviving trees. In this way, a key uncertainty that remains to be answered are relates to the long-term development of these trees. Assuming these small trees continue to develop under the experimental drought stressed conditions, it would be of interest to know if the trajectory of change in hydraulic traits we observe can be sufficient to increase the hydraulic resistance to drought of these trees as they approach full size.

Ultimately, continued acclimation of hydraulic systems throughout a the lifespan of a tree may allow a more drought-resilient ecosystem to develop following the negative impacts of drought on pre-existing larger trees. Therefore, even the current generation of trees showing huge mortality rates, the next generation might be followed by a new stable community composed of those small trees that can adapt to drought. This implies that for prediction of the future of tropical ecosystems function we needs to consider trait adjustment in the future forest instead currently forest.

2 3 4	597	Data and Materials Availability
5 6 7	598	We are in the process of making this data publically available through the main funding
8 9 10	599	bodies data centre, NERC EIDC (https://eidc.ac.uk/), if accepted the data will be fully
11 12	600	publically available on a link we will provide.
13 14 15	601	Supplementary Data
17 18 19	602	Supplementary tables
20 21	603	Table S1. Linear mixed effect model analysis of stress indicator variables from small tress.
22 23	604	Table S2. Linear mixed effect model analysis of hydraulic traits from small tress.
24	605	Table S3 Numbers of individuals for small and large tree in each treatment (TFE an Control) and
25 26	606	mean and standard deviation of all variables measured.
27 28	607	Table S4. Statistics from the NMDS modelling shown in Figure 3.
29	608	Table S5 Results of linear effect models of size (Size vs TFE) on the stress indicator variables on
30 31	609	Control plot.
32	610	Table S6 Results of linear effect models of size (Size vs TEE) on the hydraulic traits variables on TEE
33 34 35	611	plot.
36	612	Table S7 Results of linear effect models of size (Size vs TFE) and genus on the stress indicator and
37 38	613	hydraulic variables on TFE plot.
39 40	614	
40 41		
42		
43		
44 45		
46		
47		
48		
49 50		
51		
52		
53		
54 55		
56		
57		
58		
59		

1		
2		
3 4	615	
5 6	616	Supplementary figures
7 8	617 618	Figure S1 . Height and diameter in each treatment (TFE vs. Control) and by genus for the most common small tree genera in this study (9 genera)
9 10	640	5 62 Soil water content during 2016 in the Throughfell Evolution Function and plat and
11 12	619 620	in the Control plot at 10 cm and at 100 cm.
13 14	621	Figure S3. Comparison between the small trees and large trees from the throughfall exclusion
15	622	(TFE) and Control plots from grouping all 9 genera available within the large and small tree
16 17	623	groupings.
18 19	624	
20		
21	625	Conflict of interest
23		
24 25	626	The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.
25 26	020	
27		
28	627	Funding
29 30		
31	628	Funding for this work was provided by Brazilian Higher Education Co-ordination Agency
32		
33 34	629	(CAPES- Finance Code 001 to ALG); Natural Environment Research Council (NE/N014022/1
35		
36	630	to LR, NE/J011002/1 to PM and MM, and NE/L002434/1 to DCB); European Union
37	624	EDZ(Amerelant to DNA and NANA) National Council for Scientific and Tacky alorized
39	631	FP7(Amazalert to PIVI and MIVI);National Council for Scientific and Technological
40	632	Development (457914/2013-0/MCTI/CNPg/ENDCT/LBA/ESECAELOB to ACLdC): Australian
41 42	052	
43	633	Research Council (DP170104091 to PM).The São Paulo Research Foundation FAPESP
44		······································
45 46	634	(grant 11/52072-0 to RSO, 2018/01847-0 to RSO and LR); Royal Society's Newton
47		
48	635	International for its Fellowship to PRLB (NF170370).
49 50		
50	636	Acknowledgements
52	000	
53 54		
55	637	We thank the UNICAMP postgraduate program in Ecology and the Brazilian Higher
56	620	Education Co. ordination Agonou (CARES) We would like to thank the entire community
57	520	Education Co-ordination Agency (CAPES). We would like to thank the entire community
58 59	620	surrounding the study area (Caxiuanã-PA northern Brazil) the climbers loca and their
60	035	surrounding the study area (caxiadila i A northern Brazil), the climbers soca and then

children, the workers at the scientific base "Bigode"; "Bené"; "Benézinho" and the dear cook chef "Morena". We also thank "Kaká" and "Moska" for the field campaign help. **Authors' Contributions** ALG collected and compiled the data alongside LR, PRLB, IC, PBC, PG, LVF, DDV, JASJ, DCB and ACLdC. LR designed the study with MM, ACLdC, PM, ALG and RO. ALG, MM, PRLB and LR performed the statistical analysis and ALG, LR and RO wrote the paper, all authors substantially contributed to revisions. References Anderson MJ (2001) A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. Austral Ecol 26:32-46. Aragão LEOC, Anderson LO, Fonseca MG, Rosan TM, Vedovato LB, Wagner FH, Silva CVJ, Silva Junior CHL, Arai E, Aguiar AP, Barlow J, Berenguer E, Deeter MN, Domingues LG, Gatti L, Gloor M, Malhi Y, Marengo JA, Miller JB, Phillips OL, Saatchi S (2018) 21st Century drought-related fires counteract the decline of Amazon deforestation carbon emissions. Nat Commun 9:536. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02771-y Awad H, Barigah T, Badel E, Cochard H, Herbette S (2010) Poplar vulnerability to xylem cavitation acclimates to drier soil conditions. Physiol Plant 139:280–288. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1399-3054.2010.01367.x B. Eller C, de V. Barros F, R.L. Bittencourt P, Rowland L, Mencuccini M, S. Oliveira R (2018) Xylem hydraulic safety and construction costs determine tropical tree growth. Plant Cell Environ 41:548–562. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/pce.13106

- Bartholomew DC, Bittencourt PRL, Costa ACL, Banin LF, Britto Costa P, Coughlin SI, Domingues TF, Ferreira L V., Giles A, Mencuccini M, Mercado L, Miatto RC, Oliveira A, Oliveira R, Meir P, Rowland L (2020) Small tropical forest trees have a greater capacity to adjust carbon metabolism to long-term drought than large canopy trees. Plant Cell Environ 43:2380–2393. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/pce.13838
- Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker BM, Walker SC (2015) Fitting linear mixed-effects models using Ime4. J Stat Softw 67
- Bhaskar R, Ackerly DD (2006) Ecological relevance of minimum seasonal water potentials. Physiol Plant 127:353–359. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1399-3054.2006.00718.x
- Binks O, Coughlin I, Mencuccini M, Meir P (2020) Equivalence of foliar water uptake and stomatal conductance? Plant Cell Environ 43:524-528.

 674 https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.13663 675 Binks O, Meir P, Rowland L, Costa ACL, Vasconcelos SS, Oliveira AAR, Ferreira L, 676 Christoffersen B, Nardini A, Mencuccini M (2016) Plasticity in leaf-level water 677 relations of tropical rainforest trees in response to experimental drought. New Phytol 678 211477–488. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13927 679 Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC, 679 Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir 680 P, Rowland L (2020) Manazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569– 683 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 81:1-14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 686 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 687 ferest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 688 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 690 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS 691 (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-312-27422-5 693 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261-266. 694 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought toler	1		
 674 https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.13663 675 Binks O, Meir P, Rowland L, Costa ACL, Vasconcelos SS, Oliveira AAR, Ferreira L, Christoffersen B, Nardini A, Mencuccini M (2016) Plasticity in leaf-level water relations of tropical rainforest trees in response to experimental drought. New Phytol 211:477–488. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13227 679 Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC, Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569– 3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gch.15040 684 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 685 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought effects on litterfail. wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 36:1839–1848. https://orajascietrypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsb.2007.0031 690 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 693 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 695 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. 700 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:	2		
 Binks O, Meir P, Rowland L, Costa ACL, Vasconcelos SS, Oliveira AAR, Ferreira L, Christoffersen B, Nardini A, Mencuccini M (2016) Plasticity in leaf-level water relations of tropical rainforest trees in response to experimental drought. New Phytol 211:477–488. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13927 Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC, Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir P, Rowland L (2020) Manzonia trees have limited capacity to accilmate plant hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569– 3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gch.15040 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem Embolism. BIO-PROTOCIO. 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc Biol Sci 363:1839–1848. https://rovalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1089/rstb.2007.0031 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 363:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 Brum M, Vadeboncour MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjormen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journa	5 4	674	https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.13663
 676 Christoffersen B, Nardini A, Mencuccini M (2016) Plasticity in leaf-level water 777 relations of tropical rainforest trees in response to experimental drought. New Phytol 788 211:477–488. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13927 799 Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC, 797 Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir 79 P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant 701 hydroxin P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem 802 Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 803 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought 804 effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 805 forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 809 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 801 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS 803 (eds). Springer International Publishing. Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 807 dribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261-266. 805 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 807 807 807 808 807 808 809 809 809 809 809 809 800 800 8	5	675	Binks O, Meir P, Rowland L, Costa ACL, Vasconcelos SS, Oliveira AAR, Ferreira L,
 relations of tropical rainforest trees in response to experimental drought. New Phytol 211:477–488. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ph.13927 Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC, Ferreira LV, Vasconcelos SS, Barros FV, Junior JAS, Oliveira ARA, Mencuccini M, Meir P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569–3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-27422-5 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical Ind. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Chavaleri MA, Ober	6	676	Christoffersen B, Nardini A, Mencuccini M (2016) Plasticity in leaf-level water
 678 211:477–488. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13927 79 Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC, 79 Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir 79 P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant 70 hypothesis in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569– 71 S84. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040 72 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem 73 Embolism. BiO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 74 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem 75 Embolism. BiO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 76 Birando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought 76 effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 76 forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 76 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 77 Biriner N, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS 78 (eds). Springer International Publishing. Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 78 3-319-27422-5 79 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and 70 drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 71 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 70 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Social Methods Res 33:261–304. 70 http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/01.1177/0049124104268644 70 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height Is more important<td>7</td><td>677</td><td>relations of tropical rainforest trees in response to experimental drought. New Phytol</td>	7	677	relations of tropical rainforest trees in response to experimental drought. New Phytol
 Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC, Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569– 3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 Brum M, Vadeboncour MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Social Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) L	8 9	678	211:477–488. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13927
11 679 Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC, 12 Ferreira L, V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencucchi M, Meir 13 681 P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant 14 682 hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569– 16 3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040 17 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem 18 Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 19 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought 19 effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 10 forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans Ros C B Biol Sci 10 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 11 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS 16 Gedribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and 16 drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 111 Science (80-) 368:261–266. 112 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF,	10		
12 680 Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir 14 681 P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant 14 hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569– 15 683 3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040 16 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem 17 686 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought 18 effects on litterfail, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 16 forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 17 681 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS 18 (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 19 3-319-27422-5 10 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and 11 drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 11 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 12 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, 13 G97	11	679	Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Costa ACL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, Costa PB, Bartholomew DC,
 P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia frees have limited capacity to acclimate plant hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569– 3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Goo	12	680	Ferreira L V, Vasconcelos SS, Barros F V, Junior JAS, Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir
682hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569–6833584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040684Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem685Embolism. BiO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059686Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought687effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon688forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci689363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031690Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS691(eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-7893-319-27422-5780Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and781drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266.783https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631786Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD,783Arragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche783segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal784Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333.785Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304.786http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644787Cavaleri MA, Oberba	13 14	681	P, Rowland L (2020) Amazonia trees have limited capacity to acclimate plant
683 3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040 77 684 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem 78 Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 79 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought 70 effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 71 687 72 688 73 688 74 effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 76 689 76 689 76 761 761 (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 78 3-319-27422-5 78 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and 79 drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 716 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 79 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, 70 Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche 708 segregation defines forest structure and drought t	15	682	hydraulic properties in response to long-term drought. Glob Chang Biol 26:3569–
17 684 Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem 19 685 Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059 20 686 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought 21 687 effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 22 688 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 23 691 gets: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 24 693 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 25 691 gets: production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 26 91 schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS 26 91 (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 27 691 (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 28 3-319-27422-5 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and 26 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 26 Burum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, D	16	683	3584. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/gcb.15040
18685Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e305919686Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought19687effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon10688forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci11363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.003112Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS12691(eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-133-319-27422-514Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat76311569616Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333.16Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/004912410426864417Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/atticles/nclimate2805178Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chan	17	684	Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira R (2018) Pneumatic Method to Measure Plant Xylem
 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martinez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini	18 19	685	Embolism. BIO-PROTOCOL 8:1–14. https://bio-protocol.org/e3059
 686 Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choad B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Pelzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuc	20		
 687 effects on litterfail, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 688 for the second production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon 689 for the second production experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 690 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS 691 (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 693 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and 694 drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 695 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 696 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, 697 Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche 698 segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal 699 Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. 700 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Social Methods Res 33:261–304. 701 http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 702 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important 703 thttp://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 704 http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 705 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason 709 SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, 710 Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, 711 Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to 712 drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.	21	686	Brando PM, Nepstad DC, Davidson EA, Trumbore SE, Ray D, Camargo P (2008) Drought
123 688 Forest: results of a throughtall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 124 689 363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 125 690 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS 126 691 (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 126 692 3-319-27422-5 126 693 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and 126 694 drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 127 695 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 128 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, 126 697 Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche 127 segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal 128 699 Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. 129 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Social Methods Res 33:261–304. 121 http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 127 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important <td>22</td> <td>687</td> <td>effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon</td>	22	687	effects on litterfall, wood production and belowground carbon cycling in an Amazon
 689 365:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031 690 Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 693 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 696 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. 700 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Social Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 702 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 704 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 708 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 713 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SJ, Cavalcanti, I, F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin Lau NC. Renwick L Stenhenson DB 	23	688	forest: results of a throughfall reduction experiment. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci
26690Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS27691(eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-286923-319-27422-530693Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and31694drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266.33695https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat763134896Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD,36697Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche37698segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal38699Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333.40700Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304.41701http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/004912410426864442702Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important44703than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739.45704http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.146705Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently47706projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181.48709SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínz-Vilalta J, Mayr S,49706Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A,	25	689	363:1839–1848. https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rstb.2007.0031
 691 (eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978- 3-319-27422-5 693 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 695 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 696 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. 700 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 702 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 703 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 708 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 713 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SJ, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanvanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin Lau NC. Renwick L. Stenhenson DB 	26	690	Brienen R, Schongart J, Zuidema P (2016) Tropical Tree Physiology Goldstein G, Santiago LS
 692 3-319-27422-5 693 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. 695 https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 696 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. 700 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 702 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 705 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 708 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 713 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SJ, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK. Kitoh A, Kossin Lau NC. Renwick L Stenhenson DB 	27	691	(eds). Springer International Publishing, Cham. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-
 Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Social Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SJ, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanvanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin Lau NC. Renwick I, Stenhenson DB 	28 20	692	3-319-27422-5
 Broaribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266. https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat7631 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bitencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitch A, Kossin, Lau NC. Renwick L, Stephenson DB 	30	600	
32694drought. Science (80-') 363:261-266.33695https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat76314445696Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318-333.40700Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261-304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/004912410426864441701http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/004912410426864442702Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730-1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.144705Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177-181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate280555708Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752-755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature1168858713Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SJ, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitch A, Kossin Lau NC. Renwick L Stephenson DB	31	693	Brodribb TJ, Powers J, Cochard H, Choat B (2020) Hanging by a thread? Forests and
 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin Lau NC, Renwick L, Stenberson DB 	32	694	drought. Science (80-) 368:261–266.
 Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD, Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin Lau NC, Renwick L, Stephenson DB 	33 34	695	https://www.sciencemag.org/lookup/doi/10.1126/science.aat/631
 Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SJ, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin Lau NC, Renwirk L Stenbenson DB 	35	696	Brum M, Vadeboncoeur MA, Ivanov V, Saleska S, Alves LF, Penha D, Asbjornsen H, Dias JD,
 segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Benwick I, Stenbenson DB 	36	697	Aragão LEOC, Barros F, Bittencourt P, Pereira L, Oliveira RS (2019) Hydrological niche
 Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333. Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stenbenson DB 	37	698	segregation defines forest structure and drought tolerance strategies in a seasonal
 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference. Sociol Methods Res 33:261–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stephenson DB 	38 39	699	Amazon forest. J Ecol:318–333.
 burnham Kr, Anderson DK (2004) Midtimoder inference. Sociol Methods Res 33.201–304. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0049124104268644 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stenbenson DB 	40	700	Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2004) Multimodel Inference, Social Methods Res 33:261-304
 Ali antip,//journals.sagepub.com/add/10.1177/00043124104200044 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SJ, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick L, Stenbenson DB 	41	700	http://journals.sagenub.com/doi/10.1177/00/912/10/2686//
 Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stenhenson DB 	42	701	http://journals.sagepub.com/ub/10.11///0049124104200044
 than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick L, Stenbenson DB 	43 44	702	Cavaleri MA, Oberbauer SF, Clark DB, Clark DA, Ryan MG (2010) Height is more important
 46 704 http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1 47 48 705 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently 49 706 projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. 50 707 http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 51 52 708 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason 53 709 SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, 54 710 Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, 55 712 Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to 57 712 drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 59 713 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, 60 714 Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stephenson DB 	45	703	than light in determining leaf morphology in a tropical forest. Ecology 91:1730–1739.
 Chadwick R, Good P, Martin G, Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stephenson DB 	46	704	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1890/09-1326.1
 Prosecond Consistently and the consistently projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. projected over substantial areas of tropical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181. http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stephenson DB 	47	705	Chadwick B. Good P. Martin G. Rowell DP (2016) Large rainfall changes consistently
 707 http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805 708 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason 709 SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, 710 Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, 711 Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to 712 drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 713 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, 714 Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stephenson DB 	48 49	706	projected over substantial areas of tronical land. Nat Clim Chang 6:177–181
 ⁵¹ Tos an integrit with interference of the integrit of the construction of	50	707	http://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2805
 Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S, Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick L, Stephenson DB 	51	, 0,	
53709SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S,54710Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M,55710Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to56711Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to57712drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature116885859713Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W,60714Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stephenson DB	52	708	Choat B, Jansen S, Brodribb TJ, Cochard H, Delzon S, Bhaskar R, Bucci SJ, Feild TS, Gleason
 Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M, Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stephenson DB 	53 54	709	SM, Hacke UG, Jacobsen AL, Lens F, Maherali H, Martínez-Vilalta J, Mayr S,
 Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick I, Stephenson DB 	55	710	Mencuccini M, Mitchell PJ, Nardini A, Pittermann J, Pratt RB, Sperry JS, Westoby M,
 drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick L, Stephenson DB 	56	711	Wright IJ, Zanne AE (2012) Global convergence in the vulnerability of forests to
 58 59 713 Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian E, An SI, Cavalcanti, I.F.A. de C, M., Dong W, 60 714 Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK, Kitoh A, Kossin, Lau NC, Renwick L, Stephenson DB 	57	712	drought. Nature 491:752–755. http://www.nature.com/articles/nature11688
60 714 Goswami P. Hall A. Kanvanga JK. Kitoh A. Kossin, Lau NC. Renwick I. Stephenson DR	58 59	713	Christensen JH, Krishna Kumar K, Aldrian F, An SL Cavalcanti J F A, de C, M, Dong W
	60	714	Goswami P, Hall A, Kanyanga JK. Kitoh A. Kossin. Lau NC. Renwick J. Stephenson DB.

2		
3	715	Xie SP, Zhou T (2017) Climate Phenomena and their Relevance for Future Regional
4 5	716	Climate Change. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of
5	717	Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on
7	718	Climate Change.
8		5
9	719	Corlett RT (2016) The Impacts of Droughts in Tropical Forests. Trends Plant Sci 21:584–
10	720	593. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2016.02.003
11	701	da Casta ACL. Calbraith D. Almaida S. Dartala PTT. da Casta M. da Athaudas Silva Juniar J.
12	721	ua costa ACL, Galbraitti D, Alfileida S, Politeia BTT, da costa IVI, de Atflaydes Silva Juliot J,
14	722	Braga AP, de Gonçaives PHL, de Onvena AA, Fisher R, Phillips OL, Metcane DB, Levy P,
15	723	Weir P (2010) Effect of 7 yr of experimental drought on vegetation dynamics and
16	/24	biomass storage of an eastern Amazonian rainforest. New Phytol 187:579–591.
17	725	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03309.x
18	726	da Costa ACL. Metcalfe DB. Doughty CE. de Oliveira AAR. Neto GFC. da Costa MC. Silva
19 20	727	Junior J de A. Aragão LEOC. Almeida S. Galbraith DR. Rowland LM. Meir P. Malhi Y
21	728	(2014) Ecosystem respiration and net primary productivity after 8–10 years of
22	729	experimental through-fall reduction in an eastern Amazon forest. Plant Ecol Divers
23	720	7:7-24 http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17550874.2013.798366
24	/30	7.7 24. http://www.tanatonnine.com/doi/abs/10.1000/17550074.2015.750500
25 26	731	Damián X, Fornoni J, Domínguez CA, Boege K (2018) Ontogenetic changes in the
20	732	phenotypic integration and modularity of leaf functional traits. Funct Ecol:234–246.
28		Device of TE MaileD Folder and TD Seil C Margaretader EM Colorado E Distan
29	/33	Domingues TF, Meir P, Feldpausch TR, Saiz G, Veenendaal EM, Schrödt F, Bird M,
30	734	Djagbletey G, Hien F, Compaore H, Diallo A, Grace J, Lloyd J (2010) Co-limitation of
31	735	photosynthetic capacity by nitrogen and phosphorus in West Africa woodlands. Plant,
32	736	Cell Environ 33:959–980.
34	737	Duffy PB, Brando P, Asner GP, Field CB (2015) Projections of future meteorological
35	738	drought and wet periods in the Amazon. Proc Natl Acad Sci 112:13172–13177.
36	739	http://www.pnas.org/lookup/doi/10.1073/pnas.1421010112
37	755	
38 30	740	Duursma RA, Blackman CJ, Lopéz R, Martin-StPaul NK, Cochard H, Medlyn BE (2019) On
40	741	the minimum leaf conductance: its role in models of plant water use, and ecological
41	742	and environmental controls. New Phytol 221:693–705.
42	740	Familial Muelhert A. Beller TD. Deuter KC. Lewis Cl. ter Steare H. Lerez Conseler C.
43	743	Esquivel-Muelbert A, Baker TR, Dexter KG, Lewis SL, ter Steege H, Lopez-Gonzalez G,
44 45	/44	Monteagudo Mendoza A, Brienen R, Feidpausch TR, Pitman N, Alonso A, van der
45 46	745	Heijden G, Pena-Claros M, Ahuite M, Alexiaides M, Alvarez Davila E, Murakami AA,
47	746	Arroyo L, Aulestia M, Balslev H, Barroso J, Boot R, Cano A, Chama Moscoso V,
48	747	Comiskey JA, Cornejo F, Dallmeier F, Daly DC, Dávila N, Duivenvoorden JF, Duque
49	748	Montoya AJ, Erwin T, Di Fiore A, Fredericksen T, Fuentes A, García-Villacorta R,
50	749	Gonzales T, Guevara Andino JE, Honorio Coronado EN, Huamantupa-Chuquimaco I,
51	750	Killeen TJ, Malhi Y, Mendoza C, Mogollón H, Jørgensen PM, Montero JC, Mostacedo
53	751	B, Nauray W, Neill D, Vargas PN, Palacios S, Palacios Cuenca W, Pallqui Camacho NC,
54	752	Peacock J, Phillips JF, Pickavance G, Quesada CA, Ramírez-Angulo H, Restrepo Z,
55	753	Reynel Rodriguez C, Paredes MR, Sierra R, Silveira M, Stevenson P, Stropp J, Terborgh
56	754	J, Tirado M, Toledo M, Torres-Lezama A, Umaña MN, Urrego LE, Vasquez Martinez R,
57	755	Gamarra LV, Vela CIA, Vilanova Torre E, Vos V, von Hildebrand P, Vriesendorp C,
50 59	756	Wang O, Young KR, Zartman CE, Phillips OL (2017) Seasonal drought limits tree
60	757	species across the Neotropics. Ecography (Cop) 40:618–629.

2		
3	758	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ecog.01904
4 5	759	Fu R. Vin I. Li W. Arias PA. Dickinson RF. Huang I. Chakraborty S. Fernandes K. Liebmann B.
6	760	Fisher R Myneni RB (2013) Increased dry-season length over southern Amazonia in
7	761	recent decades and its implication for future climate projection. Proc Natl Acad Sci
8	762	110.18110–18115, http://www.ppas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/ppas.130258/110
9 10	702	110.10110-10115. http://www.phas.org/cg/doi/10.10/5/phas.1502504110
11	763	Goldstein G, Andrade JL, Meinzer FC, Holbrook NM, Cavelier J, Jackson P, Celis A (1998)
12	764	Stem water storage and diurnal patterns of water use in tropical forest canopy trees.
13	765	Plant, Cell Environ 21:397–406.
14 15	766	Creanandiik D. Sacs Klaasson II. Bangars F. Zuidama DA (2014) Batantial of trop ring
15	700	Groenenuijk P, Sass-Klaassell O, Boligers P, Zuidellia PA (2014) Potential of tree-filig
17	707	Control Africa For Ecol Manage 222:6E 78
18	708	bttp://dy.doi.org/10.1016/i.forece.2014.02.027
19	769	http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2014.03.037
20	770	Hubau W, De Mil T, Van den Bulcke J, Phillips OL, Angoboy Ilondea B, Van Acker J, Sullivan
21	771	MJP, Nsenga L, Toirambe B, Couralet C, Banin LF, Begne SK, Baker TR, Bourland N,
23	772	Chezeaux E, Clark CJ, Collins M, Comiskey JA, Cuni-Sanchez A, Deklerck V, Dierickx S,
24	773	Doucet J-L, Ewango CEN, Feldpausch TR, Gilpin M, Gonmadje C, Hall JS, Harris DJ,
25	774	Hardy OJ, Kamdem M-ND, Kasongo Yakusu E, Lopez-Gonzalez G, Makana J-R, Malhi Y,
26 27	775	Mbayu FM. Moore S. Mukinzi J. Pickavance G. Poulsen JR. Reitsma J. Rousseau M.
27	776	Sonké B. Sunderland T. Taedoumg H. Talbot J. Tshibamba Mukendi J. Umunav PM.
29	777	Vleminckx J. White LIT. Zemagho L. Lewis SL. Beeckman H (2019) The persistence of
30	778	carbon in the African forest understory. Nat Plants 5:133–140.
31	779	http://www.nature.com/articles/s41477-018-0316-5
32		
34	780	KAMALUDDIN M, GRACE J (1992) Acclimation in Seedlings of a Tropical Tree, Bischofia
35	781	javanica, Following a Stepwise Reduction in Light. Ann Bot 69:557–562.
36	782	https://academic.oup.com/aob/article-
37	783	lookup/doi/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aob.a088386
38 30	78/	KRAMER PL (1988) Changing concepts regarding plant water relations. Plant, Cell Environ
40	785	11.565-568 http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-3040.1988.tb01796.x
41	705	11.505 500. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1505 5040.1500.tb01/50.x
42	786	Krause GH, Virgo A, Winter K (1995) High susceptibility to photoinhibition of young leaves
43	787	of tropical forest trees. Planta 197:583–591.
44	700	Marongo IA Souza CM Thonicko K Burton C Halladay K Botts BA Alvos IM Soaros W/B
46	700	(2018) Changes in Climate and Land Use Over the Amazon Region: Current and
47	789	(2016) Changes in Chinate and Land Use Over the Amazon Region. Current and
48	790	https://www.frontiorgin.org/orticle/10.2280/foort.2018.00228/full
49 50	791	11(1ps.//www.iron(iersin.org/article/10.5589/1eart.2018.00228/10)
50	792	Márquez DA, Stuart-Williams H, Farquhar GD (2021) An improved theory for calculating
52	793	leaf gas exchange more precisely accounting for small fluxes. Nat Plants 7.
53	794	http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41477-021-00861-w
54		
55 56	795	Wiartin-StPaul NK, Longepierre D, Huc K, Deizon S, Burlett K, Joffre K, Kambal S, Cochard H
57	796	(2014) How reliable are methods to assess xylem vulnerability to cavitation? The
58	/9/	issue of open vessel artifact in oaks. Tree Physiol 34:894–905.
59	798	Martinez-Vilalta J, Anderegg WRL, Sapes G, Sala A (2019) Greater focus on water pools
60		

2		
3	799	may improve our ability to understand and anticipate drought-induced mortality in
4 5	800	plants. New Phytol 223:22–32.
6	801	Martínez-Vilalta J, Garcia-Forner N (2017) Water potential regulation, stomatal behaviour
7	802	and hydraulic transport under drought: deconstructing the iso/anisohydric concept.
8 9	803	Plant Cell Environ 40:962–976.
10 11	804	Mcculloh KA, Johnson DM, Meinzer FC, Woodruff DR (2014) The dynamic pipeline:
12	805	Hydraulic capacitance and xylem hydraulic safety in four tall conifer species. Plant
13 14	806	Cell Environ 37:1171–1183.
15	807	McDowell N. Pockman WT. Allen CD. Breshears DD. Cobb N. Kolb T. Plaut J. Sperry J. West
16	808	A Williams DG Yenez FA (2008) Mechanisms of plant survival and mortality during
17	808	drought: why do some plants survive while others succumb to drought? New Phytol
18 19	810	178:719–739. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2008.02436.x
20	811	Meinzer FC. James SA. Goldstein G. Woodruff D (2003) Whole-tree water transport scales
21	812	with sanwood canacitance in tronical forest canony trees. Plant Cell Environ
22	812 813	
24	015	20.1147 1155.
25	814	Meinzer FC, Johnson DM, Lachenbruch B, McCulloh KA, Woodruff DR (2009) Xylem
26	815	hydraulic safety margins in woody plants: Coordination of stomatal control of xylem
27	816	tension with hydraulic capacitance. Funct Ecol 23:922–930.
28 29	817	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2435.2009.01577.x
30	818	Meir P, Mencuccini M, Binks O, Da Costa AL, Ferreira L, Rowland L (2018) Short-term
31	819	effects of drought on tropical forest do not fully predict impacts of repeated or long-
32 33 24	820	term drought: Gas exchange versus growth. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci 373
34 35	821	Meir P. Wood TE. Galbraith DR. Brando PM. Da Costa ACL. Rowland L. Ferreira L V. (2015)
36	822	Threshold Responses to Soil Moisture Deficit by Trees and Soil in Tropical Rain
37 38	823	Forests: Insights from Field Experiments. Bioscience 65:882–892.
39	824	Mencuccini M (2002) Hydraulic constraints in the functional scaling of trees. Tree Physiol
40 41	825	22:553–565.
42	826	Mencuccini M, Rosas T, Rowland L, Choat B, Cornelissen H, Jansen S, Kramer K, Lapenis A,
43	827	Manzoni S, Niinemets Ü, Reich PB, Schrodt F, Soudzilovskaia N, Wright IJ,
44 45	828	Martínez-Vilalta J (2019) Leaf economics and plant hydraulics drive leaf : wood area
45 46	829	ratios New Phytol 224.1544–1556
47	830	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.15998
48	830	
49	831	Metcalfe DB, Meir P, Aragao LEOC, Lobo-do-vale R, Galbraith D, Fisher RA, Chaves MM,
50	832	Maroco JP, Costa ACL, Almeida SS De, Braga AP, Gonc PHL (2010) Shifts in plant
51	833	respiration and carbon use efficiency at a large-scale drought experiment in the
52 53	834	eastern Amazon. New Phytol:608–621.
54	835	Metcalfe DB, Meir P, Aragão LEOC, Lobo-do-Vale R, Galbraith D, Fisher RA, Chaves MM.
55 56	836	Maroco JP, da Costa ACL, de Almeida SS, Braga AP, Goncalves PHL, de Athavdes J, da
57	837	Costa M. Portela TTB, de Oliveira AAR, Malhi Y. Williams M (2010) Shifts in plant
58	838	respiration and carbon use efficiency at a large-scale drought experiment in the
59	000	estern Amazon, New Phytol 187:602–621, http://doi.wiloy.com/10.1111/: 1460
60	520	castern Amazon. New Fnytor 107.000-021. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/J.1409-

1		
2 3	840	8137.2010.03319.x
4		
5	841	Mulkey SS, Pearcy RW (1992a) Interactions between Acclimation and Photoinhibition of
7	842	Photosynthesis of a Tropical Forest Understorey Herb, Alocasia macrorrhiza, during
8	843	Simulated Canopy Gap Formation. Funct Ecol 6:719.
9	844	Mulkey SS, Pearcy RW (1992b) Interactions between Acclimation and Photoinhibition of
10	845	Photosynthesis of a Tropical Forest Understorey Herb, Alocasia macrorrhiza, during
12	846	Simulated Canopy Gap Formation. Funct Ecol 6:719.
13	847	https://www.jstor.org/stable/2389969?origin=crossref
14 15	Q/Q	Nardini A. Lo MA. Salleo S (2011) Plant Science Refilling embolized vylem conduits : Is it a
16	040 9/0	matter of phloem unloading 2 Plant Science Kenning embolized xylem conducts . is it a
17	849 850	http://dx doi org/10.1016/i plantsci 2010.12.011
18	850	http://ux.doi.org/10.1010/j.plantsci.2010.12.011
19 20	851	Olson ME, Anfodillo T, Gleason SM, McCulloh KA (2020) Tip-to-base xylem conduit
20	852	widening as an adaptation: causes, consequences, and empirical priorities. New
22	853	Phytol:nph.16961. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nph.16961
23	854	Olson MF. Rosell JA (2013) Vessel diameter-stem diameter scaling across woody
24 25	855	angiosperms and the ecological causes of xylem vessel diameter variation. New
26	856	Phytol 197:1204–1213.
27		
28	857	Pammenter NW, Van der Willigen C (1998) A mathematical and statistical analysis of the
30	858	curves illustrating vulnerability of xylem to cavitation. Tree Physiol 18:589–593.
31	859	https://academic.oup.com/treephys/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/treephys/18.8-
32	860	9.589
33 34	861	Pereira L, Bittencourt PRL, Oliveira RS, Junior MBM, Barros F V, Ribeiro R V, Mazzafera P
35	862	(2016) Plant pneumatics: stem air flow is related to embolism – new perspectives on
36	863	methods in plant hydraulics. New Phytol 211:357–370.
37	864	https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/nph.13905
30 39	865	Pereira L Bittencourt PRL Bowland L Brum M Miranda MT Pacheco VS Oliveira RS
40	866	Machado FC Jansen S Ribeiro R V (2021) Using the Pneumatic method to estimate
41	867	embolism resistance in species with long vessels: A commentary on the article "A
42 43	868	comparison of five methods to assess embolism resistance in trees". For Ecol Manage
43	869	479:2019–2021.
45		
46	870	Pereira L, Mazzafera P (2013) A low cost apparatus for measuring the xylem hydraulic
47 48	871	conductance in plants. Bragantia 71:583–587.
40 49	872	http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0006-
50	873	87052012000400017&Ing=en&ting=en
51	874	Poorter L, Bongers F, Sterck FJ, Wöll H (2005) Beyond the regeneration phase:
52 53	875	Differentiation of height-light trajectories among tropical tree species. J Ecol 93:256–
54	876	267. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2004.00956.x
55	077	Dearter II, Nünemete II, Dearter I, Mright II, Viller D (2000), Course and concerns of
56	8//	Poorter π , Ninemets U, Poorter L, Wright IJ, Villar K (2009) Causes and consequences of
57 58	8/8	variation in lear mass per area (LiviA): a meta-analysis. New Phytol 182:565–588.
59	8/9	https://onintenutary.wney.com/u0//abs/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.02830.X
60	880	Powell TL, Wheeler JK, de Oliveira AAR, da Costa ACL, Saleska SR, Meir P, Moorcroft PR

2		
3	881	(2017) Differences in xylem and leaf hydraulic traits explain differences in drought
4	887	tolerance among mature Amazon rainforest trees. Glob Chang Biol 23:4280–4293
5	002	http://doi.wilov.com/10.1111/gch.12721
6	883	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.15/51
/	884	Prendin AL, Mayr S, Beikircher B, von Arx G, Petit G (2018) Xylem anatomical adjustments
9	885	prioritize hydraulic efficiency over safety as Norway spruce trees grow taller
10	886	Martinez-Vilalta I (ed). Tree Physiol 38:1088–1097.
11	887	https://academic.oup.com/treenbys/article/38/8/1088/5038975
12	007	
13	888	Rowland L, da Costa ACL, Galbraith DR, Oliveira RS, Binks OJ, Oliveira AAR, Pullen AM,
14	889	Doughty CE, Metcalfe DB, Vasconcelos SS, Ferreira L V, Malhi Y, Grace J, Mencuccini
15	890	M, Meir P (2015) Death from drought in tropical forests is triggered by hydraulics not
10	891	carbon starvation. Nature 528:119–122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature15539
18		
19	892	Rowland L, da Costa ACL, Oliveira RS, Bittencourt PRL, Giles AL, Coughlin I, de Britto Costa
20	893	P, Bartholomew D, Domingues TF, Miatto RC, Ferreira LV, Vasconcelos SS, Junior JAS,
21	894	Oliveira AAR, Mencuccini M, Meir P (2020) The response of carbon assimilation and
22	895	storage to long-term drought in tropical trees is dependent on light availability. Funct
23	896	Ecol:1365-2435.13689. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1365-
24 25	897	2435.13689
25	001	
27	898	Rowland L, Lobo-do-Vale RL, Christoffersen BO, Melém EA, Kruijt B, Vasconcelos SS,
28	899	Domingues T, Binks OJ, Oliveira AAR, Metcalfe D, da Costa ACL, Mencuccini M, Meir P
29	900	(2015) After more than a decade of soil moisture deficit, tropical rainforest trees
30	901	maintain photosynthetic capacity, despite increased leaf respiration. Glob Chang Biol
31	902	21:4662–4672. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/gcb.13035
32 33		
34	903	Ruggiero PGC, Batalha MA, Pivello VR, Meirelles ST (2002) Soil vegetation relationships in
35	904	cerrado (Brazilian savanna) and semideciduous forest, Southeastern Brazil. Plant Ecol
36	905	160:1–16.
37	000	Sala A. Dinor F. Hash C (2010) Dhysiological machanisms of draught induced tree mortality
38	906	Sala A, Piper F, Hoch G (2010) Physiological mechanisms of urought-induced tree mortality
39	907	are far from being resolved. New Phytol 186:274–281.
40	908	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2009.03167.x
42	909	Salleo S. Lo Gullo MA. De Paoli D. Zippo M (1996) Xylem recovery from cavitation-induced
43	910	embolism in young plants of Laurus pobilis: A possible mechanism. New Phytol
44	911	132.47-56 http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/i 1469-8137.1996 th04507 x
45	511	152.47 50. http://doi.wiicy.com/10.1111/j.1405 0157.1550.004507.k
46	912	Salleo S, Lo Gullo MA, Trifilò P, Nardini A (2004) New evidence for a role of vessel-
47 48	913	associated cells and phloem in the rapid xylem refilling of cavitated stems of Laurus
49	914	nobilis L. Plant, Cell Environ 27:1065–1076. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1365-
50	915	3040.2004.01211.x
51		
52	916	Salomón RL, Limousin JM, Ourcival JM, Rodríguez-Calcerrada J, Steppe K (2017) Stem
53	917	hydraulic capacitance decreases with drought stress: implications for modelling tree
54 55	918	hydraulics in the Mediterranean oak Quercus ilex. Plant Cell Environ 40:1379–1391.
56	040	Cohneider CA. Dechand MC. Elizairi KM (2012) MULtime - La trace to 25 and 51
57	919	Schneider CA, Kasband WS, Elicent KW (2012) NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of Image
58	920	analysis. Nat Methods 9:6/1–6/5.
59	921	Schuldt B. Leuschner C. Horna V. Moser G. Köhler M. Van Straaten O. Barus H (2011)
60		,

1		57
2		
3 4	922	Change in hydraulic properties and leaf traits in a tall rainforest tree species
5	923	subjected to long-term throughfall exclusion in the perhumid tropics. Biogeosciences
6	924	8:2179–2194.
7	925	van der Sleen P, Groenendijk P, Vlam M, Anten NPR, Boom A, Bongers F, Pons TL, Terburg
9	926	G, Zuidema PA (2015) No growth stimulation of tropical trees by 150 years of CO2
10	927	fertilization but water-use efficiency increased. Nat Geosci 8:24–28.
11	928	http://www.nature.com/articles/ngeo2313
12		
15 14	929	Sperry JS, Donelly JR, Tyree MT (1988) A method for measuring hydraulic conductivity and
15	930	embolism in xylem. Plant Cell Environ 11:35–40.
16	931	Sperry JS, Hacke UG, Oren R, Comstock JP (2002) Water deficits and hydraulic limits to leaf
17	932	water supply. Plant, Cell Environ:251–263.
18 19		
20	933	Sperry JS, Tyree MT (1988) Mechanism of Water Stress-induced Xylem Embolism1. Plant
21	934	Physiol 88:581-587.
22	935	Sperry JS, Venturas MD, Anderegg WRL, Mencuccini M, Mackay DS, Wang Y, Love DM
23 24	936	(2017) Predicting stomatal responses to the environment from the optimization of
25	937	photosynthetic gain and hydraulic cost. Plant Cell Environ 40:816–830.
26	938	http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/pce.12852
27	020	Starek F. Markastaiin I. Schioving F. Doortor I. (2011) Eurotional traits determine trade offs
20 29	939	and nichos in a tropical forest community. Broc Natl Acad Sci 109:20627, 20622
30	940	http://www.ppps.org/cgi/doi/10.1072/ppps.1106050108
31	941	http://www.phas.org/cg/doi/10.10/3/phas.1100950108
32 33	942	Tardieu F (1996) Drought perception by plants: Do cells of draughted plants experience
34	943	water stress? Plant Growth Regul 20:93–104.
35	944	The DYP Angaua DMG Ishida YE Mencuccini M Llovd L Laurance WE Laurance SGW
36	945	(2018) Rainforest trees respond to drought by modifying their hydraulic architecture
37 38	946	Ecol Evol 8:12479–12491.
39	0.10	
40	947	Tomasella M, Beikircher B, Häberle KH, Hesse B, Kallenbach C, Matyssek R, Mayr S (2018)
41	948	Acclimation of branch and leaf hydraulics in adult Fagus sylvatica and Picea abies in a
42 43	949	forest through-fall exclusion experiment. Tree Physiol 38:198–211.
44	950	Trugman AT, Detto M, Bartlett MK, Medvigy D, Anderegg WRL, Schwalm C, Schaffer B,
45	951	Pacala SW (2018) Tree carbon allocation explains forest drought-kill and recovery
46	952	patterns. Ecol Lett:1552–1560.
47 48		·
49	953	Tyree MT, Vargas G, Engelbrecht BMJ, Kursar TA (2002) Drought until death do us part: A
50	954	case study of the desiccation-tolerance of a tropical moist forest seedling-tree,
51	955	Licania platypus (Hemsl.) Fritsch. J Exp Bot 53:2239–2247.
52 53	956	Venturas MD, Mackinnon ED, Jacobsen AL, Pratt RB (2015) Excising stem samples
53 54	957	underwater at native tension does not induce xylem cavitation. Plant, Cell Environ
55	958	38:1060–1068.
56	- -	
57 58	959	Wright IJ, Reich PB, Westoby M, Ackerly DD, Baruch Z, Bongers F, Cavender-bares J,
59	960	Chapin T, Cornelissen JHC, Diemer M, Flexas J, Garnier E, Groom PK, Gulias J (2004)
60	961	i ne worldwide leat economics spectrum. Nature 12:821–827.

962	Zhang Y, Lamarque LJ, Torres-Ruiz JM, Schuldt B, Karimi Z, Li S, Qin DW, Bittencourt P,
963	Burlett R, Cao KF, Delzon S, Oliveira R, Pereira L, Jansen S (2018) Testing the plant
964	pneumatic method to estimate xylem embolism resistance in stems of temperate
965	trees. Tree Physiol 38:1016–1025.

to per perior

1		
2 3 4	967	List of Figures
5 6 7 8	968 969	Figure 1 Stress indicators and hydraulic traits for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) measured in dry season oct/2017 on the Control plot and through-fall exclusion (TFE).
9 10 11	970 971	Figure 2 Hydraulic traits considered by genus for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) surviving after 15 years of throughfall exclusion (TFE) and the Control plot.
12 13 14	972 973	Figure 3 Drought stress indicators and considered by genus for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) surviving after 15 years of throughfall exclusion (TFE) and the Control plot.
15 16 17	974 975	Figure 4 Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of drought stress indicators and hydraulic traits.
18 19 20 21	976 977	Figure 5 Hydraulic traits comparison between small trees and large trees from the throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot.
22 23 24	978 979	Figure 6 Stress indicators comparison between small trees and large trees from throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot.
25 26 27	980 981	Figure 7 Hydraulic traits comparison between small trees and large trees from throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot.
28 29 30	982	Tables
31 32	983	Table 1 – Mean and standard deviation from small trees: P_{50} - xylem embolism resistance (MPa);
33 34 25	984	P_{88} - xylem embolism resistance (MPa); G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance (mol m ⁻² s ⁻¹); K_s –
36 37	985	maximum hydraulic specific conductivity (kg m ⁻² s ⁻¹ MPa ⁻¹); K _{sl} - maximum hydraulic leaf-specific
38 39	986	conductivity (kg m ⁻² s ⁻¹ MPa ⁻¹); $A_L:A_{SW}$ – leaf to sapwood area ratio (m ² m ⁻²); W_D - Woody density;
40 41	987	Ψ_{pd} - predawn water potential (MPa); Ψ_{md} - midday water potential (MPa); HSM – branch hydraulic
42 43	988	safety margin to P ₅₀ (MPa); PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity (%), separated
44 45 46 47	989	by genus and treatment.
48 49		
50 51		
52 53		
54		
55 56		
57 58		
58 59		
60		

						Hydraulic traits	;					
Genus (n individuals)	Treatme nt	P ₅₀	P ₈₈	G _{min}	Ks	K _{sl}	AL:ASW	WD	Ψ_{pd}	Ψ_{md}	HSM	PLC
Eschweilera (3)	Control	-2.91±0.07	-5.08±0.31	0.028±0.023	1.12±0.19	0.57±0.30	112.07±32.41	0.73±0.12	-0.32±0.23	-1.68±0.24	1.13±0.32	49.14±4
Eschweilera (3)	TFE	-3.66±2.01	-6.32±3.80	0.026±0.019	2.80±2.62	4.71±6.12	92.12±65.44	0.59±0.09	-0.52±0.24	-1.87±0.26	1.89±2.28	9.22±4.
Inga (4)	Control	-4.60±1.63	-7.84±3.10	0.02±0.014	2.3±1.43	1.56±0.85	84.59±47.51	0.64±0.18	-0.37±0.26	-1.51±0.57	3.09±2.07	11.33±1
Inga (3)	TFE	-3.48±0.58	-6.22±1.62	0.02±0.006	4.56±1.68	1.93±0.73	160.81±58.68	0.63±0.08	-0.39±0.22	-1.35±0.78	2.13±0.4	19.28±13
Licania (4)	Control	-5.28±1.98	-9.62±4.40	0.025±0.014	0.15±0.04	0.12±0.07	66.15±24.41	0.76±0.062	-0.25±0.07	-1.65±0.85	3.62±2.75	38.29±28
Licania(4)	TFE	-6.18±1.59	-9.07±1.77	0.024±0.02	2.17±2.19	0.37±0.40	104.90±45.99	0.761±0.014	-0.85±0.81	-1.388±0.78	5.183±1.70	68.667±2
Mouriri (3)	Control	-4.77±0.54	-7.69±1.31	0.025±0.017	0.62±0.05	0.22±0.20	154.33±59.51	0.867±0.003	-0.24±0.09	-0.943±0.08	3.829±0.48	58.031±2
Mouriri (3)	TFE	-5.55±0.74	-7.35±2.18	0.077±0.022	3.63±3.03	1.32±0.88	143.30±92.13	0.751±0.17	-1.07±1.32	-2.583±0.95	2.972±0.77	60.769±3
Ocotea (3)	Control	-3.59±1.49	-8.72±2.63	0.007±0.003	1.63±0.81	0.84±0.17	125.38±54.22	0.638±0.05	-0.36±0.4	-0.6±0.364	2.994±1.26	36.718±2
Ocotea (3)	TFE	-5.04±2.08	-8.61±4.88	0.03±0.024	1.58±0.66	0.60±0.46	84.83±32.64	0.68±0.13	-1.44±1.17	-2.41±0.81	2.62±2.45	65.27±2
Protium (5)	Control	-2.30±0.71	-4.16±2.40	0.017±0.01	1.68±0.94	0.75±0.41	78.60±6.37	0.74±0.07	-0.31±0.3	-1.23±0.31	1.07±0.78	54.73±1
Protium (3)	TFE	-3.64±1.47	-5.65±0.73	0.013±0.01	1.10±0.07	0.44±0.07	90.57±17.71	0.72±0.049	-0.48±0.16	-1.00±0.24	2.55±1.73	49.74±1
Swartzia (3)	Control	-3.17±1.28	-5.98±1.89	0.06±0.04	1.67±0.26	0.78±0.55	72.45±18.20	0.73±0.02	-0.23±0.12	-1.57±0.16	1.60±1.36	59.73±
Swartzia (3)	TFE	-4.34±0.57	-6.94±0.06	0.06±0.02	2.78±0.51	0.89±0.54	210.45±67.51	0.72±0.005	-0.79±0.48	-2.36±0.09	1.98±0.66	49.13±8
Tetragastris (5)	Control	-2.31±1.48	-4.34±1.81	0.03±0.01	2.22±1.66	2.29±3.12	83.86±59.38	0.64±0.05	-0.28±0.13	-1.06±0.58	1.25±1.31	22.12±1
Tetragastris (3)	TFE	-4.36±1.19	-6.52±2.90	0.016±0.01	1.33±0.62	1.04±0.45	88.10±34.28	0.58±0.04	-1.43±0.40	-2.44±0.13	1.92±1.06	43.24±
Vouacapoa (3)	Control	-3.57±0.13	-5.37±1.45	0.015±0.003	1.00±0.16	0.95±0.64	56.71±22.69	0.69±0.13	-0.39±0.18	-1.59±0.19	1.97±0.31	43.78±1
Vouacapoa (3)	TFE	-2.22±0.79	-3.54±1.63	0.012±0.004	0.83±0.51	0.67±0.78	229.76±101.26	0.70±0.01	-0.77±0.35	-2.07±0.24	0.15±0.72	33.24±1

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tp

Table 2 Results of linear mixed effect models of plot (Control versus TFE) on the stress indicators and hydraulic traits for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) measured in dry season (Oct/2017) on the Control plot and through-fall exclusion TFE. WD - wood density; AL:ASW - leaf to sapwood area ratio; P50 - xylem embolism resistance; P88 - xylem embolism resistance; Gmin - minimum stomatal conductance; Ks - maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; Ksl - maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; Upd - predawn water potential; Umd - midday water potential. HSM -branch hydraulic safety margin to P50; PLC - native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The table shows the least square means for the Control and TFE, and the random genus effects (see analysis section in Methods for details). The first row of each trait gives the mean and second row gives one standard error for the fixed effects and the 95% confidence interval for genus-level random effects. Traits for which plot had a significant effect, and species for which the random effects were different from zero, are marked with * (p < 0.05), ** (p < 0.01) and *** (p < 0.001) Pr Revi and ns (non-significant).

Plot-level Coefficients				Genus-level Coefficients							
Variabl e	Control	TFE	Eschweilera	Inga	Licania	Mouriri	Ocotea	Protium	Swartzia	Tetragastris	Vouacapoa
P ₅₀	3.56 (-4.12/-2.99)	-4.26 (-5.761/-2.79) ns	-3.29 (-4.67/-1.91) ***	0.83 (-2.56/0.90)	2.38 (-4.11/-0.65) **	1.87 (-3.65/-0.09) *	-1.03 (-2.81/0.75)	0.60 (-1.13/2.33)	-0.35 (-2.20/1.50)	0.21 (-1.48/1.90)	0.39 (-1.39/2.17)
P ₈₈	6.49 (-7.45/-5.42)	-6.58 (-9.34/-4.00) ns	-5.71 (-8.18/-3.24) ***	1.44 (-4.54/1.65)	3.69 (-6.78/-0.59) *	-1.82 (-5.01/1.37)	-2.96 (-6.15/0.22)	1.11 (-1.98/4.21)	-0.66 (-3.97/2.65)	0.54 (-2.48/3.57)	1.25 (-1.94/4.43)
\mathbf{G}_{\min}	0.027 (0.02/0.03)	0.030 (0.008/0.053) ns	0.03 (0.01/0.04) ***	0.01 (-0.03/0.01)	0.00 (-0.02/0.02)	0.03 (0.01/0.05) **	-0.01 (-0.03/0.01)	-0.01 (-0.03/0.01)	0.04 (0.02/0.06) ***	0.00 (-0.02/0.02)	-0.01 (-0.03/0.01)

Manuscripts submitted to Tree Physiology

2
2
_

	Ks	1.46 (0.95/2.00)	2.32 (0.98/3.64) *	1.79 (0.46/3.13) **	1.48 (-0.28/3.23)	-0.49 (-2.24/1.26)	0.34 (-1.47/2.15)	-0.19 (-2.00/1.63)	-0.33 (-2.03/1.38)	0.33 (-1.56/2.22)	0.17 (-1.58/1.92)	-0.88 (-2.69/0.93)
	K _{sl}	1.00 (0.45/1.55)	1.22 (0.21/2.58) ns	2.23 (0.86/3.61) **	0.51 (-2.31/1.29)	-1.96 (-3.76/-0.17)	-1.45 (-3.31/0.40)	-1.51 (-3.37/0.35)	-1.59 (-3.34/0.16)	-1.41 (-3.35/0.54)	-0.29 (-2.09/1.50)	-1.42 (-3.28/0.44)
	A _L :A _{SW}	90.77 (69.76/110.74)	131.70 (81.14/183.50) **	104.09 (48.95/159.23) ***	13.17 (-59.03/85.37)	-18.57 (-88.86/51.73)	44.73 (-29.93/119.39)	1.02 (-73.64/75.68)	-21.00 (-91.29/49.29)	23.56 (-54.42/101.54)	-18.64 (-88.93/51.65)	39.15 (-35.52/113.81)
	WD	0.71 (0.68/0.75)	0.68 (0.59/0.78) ns	0.68 (0.60/0.75) ***	0.03 (-0.14/0.07)	0.09 (-0.01/0.19)	0.13 (0.03/0.24) **	-0.01 (-0.12/0.10)	0.06 (-0.04/0.16)	0.05 (-0.06/0.16)	-0.05 (-0.15/0.06)	0.03 (-0.08/0.13)
	Ψ_{pd}	0.31 (0.14/0.48)	0.86 (0.63/1.52) ***	-0.42 (-0.05/0.90)	0.04 (-0.69/0.61)	0.13 (-0.50/0.76)	0.24 (-0.44/0.91)	0.48 (-0.19/1.15)	-0.03 (-0.66/0.60)	0.03 (-0.67/0.74)	0.29 (-0.34/0.92)	0.17 (-0.51/0.84)
	Ψ_{md}	1.29 (1.09/1.54)	1.93 (1.50/2.19) **	-1.78 (1.19/2.37) ***	0.34 (-1.14/0.46)	-0.26 (-1.03/0.52)	-0.02 (-0.85/0.81)	-0.27 (-1.10/0.56)	-0.63 (-1.41/0.14)	0.11 (-0.76/0.98)	-0.20 (-0.98/0.57)	0.05 (-0.78/0.88)
	HSM	2.25 (1.64/2.86)	2.35 (0.74/3.96) ns	1.52 (0.05/2.99) *	1.16 (-0.69/3.01)	2.77 (0.93/4.62) **	1.88 (-0.02/3.78)	1.29 (-0.61/3.19)	-0.02 (-1.87/1.83)	0.24 (-1.74/2.21)	-0.02 (-1.82/1.79)	-0.46 (-2.36/1.45)
	PLC	41.315 (32.38/49.21)	45.82 (24.14/67.78) ns	33.18 (15.62/50.74) ***	18.44 (-41.43/4.56)	22.47 (-0.52/45.47)	26.22 (2.44/50.00) *	17.82 (-5.96/41.60)	19.68 (-2.70/42.07)	22.31 (-2.52/47.15)	-4.01 (-27.79/19.77)	5.33 (-18.45/29.11)
1004												
1005												

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/tp

Table 3. Results of linear mixed effect models of size (Large versus Small) on the stress indicators and hydraulic traits for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) and large trees (>20 cm DBH) measured in dry season (Oct/2017) on the Control plot and through-fall exclusion TFE. WD - wood density; AL:ASW - leaf to sapwood area ratio; P50 - xylem embolism resistance; P88 - xylem embolism resistance; Gmin - minimum stomatal conductance; Ks - maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; Ksl -maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; Ψpd - predawn water potential; Ψmd - midday water potential. HSM - branch hydraulic safety margin to P50; PLC - native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The table shows the least square means for the Control and TFE, and the random genus effects (see analysis section in Methods for details). The first row of each trait gives the mean and second row gives one standard error for the fixed effects and the 95% confidence interval for genus-level random effects. Traits for which plot had a significant effect, and species for which the random effects were different from zero, are marked with * (p < 0.05), ** (p < 0.01) and *** (p < 0.001) and ns (non-significant).

Plot-level	Coefficients		Genus-level Coefficients							
Variable	Large	Small	Eschweilera	Inga	Licania	Protium	Swartzia			
р	-2.66	-4.06	-2.654	-0.824	-1.526	0.014	-0.593			
P ₅₀	(-3.24/-2.08)	(-5.20/-2.93) ***	(-3.382/-1.926)***	(-1.798/0.150) ns	(-2.540/-0.513) **	(-0.985/1.013) ns	(-1.592/0.406) ns			
	-4.83	-7.08	-4.83	-1.35	-2.53	0.21	-1.02			
P ₈₈	(-5.87/-3.80)	(-9.18/-5.02))***	(-6.16/ -3.49) ***	(-3.13/0.44) ns	(-4.39/ -0.67) **	(-1.62 /2.04) ns	(-2.85 /0.81) ns			
~	0.08 (0.06/0.09)	0.02	0.07482	-0.01930	-0.02935	-0.03583	0.01851			
G _{min}		(0.007/0.06) ***	(0.053/0.09) ***	(-0.049/0.010)ns	(-0.05941/0.00071)*	(-0.066/-0.005) *	(-0.011/0.048) ns			
	4.60 (2.20/5.58)	2.10 (1.09/4.33))***	3.88	1.98	-2.81	-0.90	-0.30			
Ks			(2.59/5.16) ***	(0.28/3.68) *	(-4.69/ -0.94) **	(-2.64/0.83) ns	(-2.11/1.52) ns			
	6.13	5.00	4.35	0.90	1.55	1.56	2.98			
K _{sl}	(5.06/7.19)	(3.09/6.89) *	(3.42/5.28) ***	(-0.41/2.21)	(0.24/2.86) **	(0.29/2.83) **	(1.69/4.28)***			
	0.70	0.60	0.63	0.01	0.05	-0.05	0.05			
WD	(0.61/0.70)	(0.52/0.67) ***	(0.59/0.67) ***	(-0.04/0.06) ns	(0.00/0.11)*	(-0.11/0.00)*	(-0.01/0.10) ns			
	-0.44	-0.44	-0.48	0.04	0.09	-0.05	0.08			
Ψ_{pd}	(-0.50/-0.38)	(-0.61/-0.28)ns	(-0.59/-0.36) ***	(-0.12/0.20) ns	(-0.07/0.25) ns	(-0.21/0.11) ns	(-0.08/0.24) ns			
	-1.75	-1.50	-1.85	0.17	0.54	0.41	-0.23			
Ψ_{md}	(-2.04/-1.46)	(-1.98/-1.02)**	(-2.07/-1.63) ***	(-0.12 to 0.47) ns	(0.24/0.84) ***	(0.11/0.71) ***	(-0.54/0.08) ns			
HSM	0.90	2.70	0.92	0.97	1.96	0.21	0.27			

	(1.09/2.32)	(1.32/3.91)***	(0.10/1.74) **	(-0.13/2.08) ns	(0.82/3.11) ***	(-0.92/1.34) ns	(-0.85/1.40) ns
PLC	19.50 (8.91/30.75)	42.03 (23.13/60.94)***	19.19 (8.87/29.50) ***	-4.71 (-18.36/8.93) ns	12.90(-2.14/27.94) ns	20.93 (7.02/34.84) **	16.15 (1.56/ 30.74) *

For peer Review



Figure 1 Stress indicators and hydraulic traits for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) measured in dry season oct/2017 on the Control plot (blue) and through-fall exclusion (TFE, red). a) W_D – wood density b) $A_L:A_{sw}$ - leaf to sapwood area ratio c) P_{50} - xylem embolism resistance; d) P_{88} - xylem embolism resistance; e) G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance; f) K_s – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; g) K_{sl} - maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; h) Ψ_{pd} - predawn water potential; i) Ψ_{md} - midday water potential. j) HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P₅₀; l) PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The boxes represent quartiles 1 and 3, the central line indicates the median and the black points the mean of each treatment. Whiskers are either maximum value or 1.5 interquartile range above quartile 3, if outliers are present and notches represents a confidence interval around the median represented by central line. Traits for which plot had a significant effect are marked with * (p < 0.05), ** (p < 0.01) and *** (p < 0.001). P-values are from mixed effects analysis (see Table 2 for models and analysis section in Methods

- 51 1037



G_{min} - minimum stomatal conductance; f) K_s - maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; g) K_{sl} maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity. The vertical dashed coloured lines represent the
 marginal fixed effects for plot. The points represent random effects plus fixed effect mean by
 genus and the horizontal lines represents standard error for each genus (see Table 2 for models
 and analysis section in Methods).



Figure 3 Drought stress indicators considered by genus for small trees (1-10 cm DBH) surviving after 15 years of throughfall exclusion (TFE – red) and the Control plot (blue). a) Ψ_{pd} - predawn water potential; b) Ψ_{md} - midday water potential. c) HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P₅₀; d) PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The vertical dashed lines represents marginal fixed effects for plot, the points represents random effects plus fixed effect mean by genus and the horizontal lines represents standard error by genus (see Table 2 for models and analysis section in Methods).



Figure 4 Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of drought stress indicators and hydraulic
 traits. Ordination showing multidimensional space filled by small (yellow) and large (green) trees
 indicating distinct hydraulic ecological strategies (MANOVA; P < 0.05) between trees from the TFE
 and Control. Hydraulic traits represented by arrows (Arrow length represent predictor "strength").
 Dots represent individuals in Control and triangles individuals in TFE treatment. The green colour
 represents large trees and yellow represents small trees.

1en



Figure 5 Comparison between small trees and large trees from the throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plots. a) W_D – wood density; b) P_{50} - xylem embolism resistance; c) P_{88} - xylem embolism resistance; d) G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance; e) K_s – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; f) K_{sl} - maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; g) Ψ_{pd} - predawn water potential; h) Ψ_{md} midday water potential; i) HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P₅₀; j) PLC –

1070 native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The boxes represent quartiles 1 and 3, the
1071 central line indicates the median and the black points the mean of each treatment. Whiskers are
1072 either maximum value or 1.5 interquartile range above the quartile 3, when outliers are present.
1073 Different letters indicate significant differences within each graph, p<0.05.



Figure 6 Hydraulic traits comparison between small trees and large trees from throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot. a) W_D – wood density; b) P_{50} - xylem embolism resistance; c) P_{88} -xylem embolism resistance; d) G_{min} – minimum stomatal conductance; e) K_s – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; f) K_{sl} - maximum hydraulic leaf-specific conductivity. The vertical dashed lines represents marginal fixed effect mean, green vertical lines represents large trees and yellow vertical lines, the points represents random plus fixed effect mean by each level (by genus) and the horizontal lines represents standard error by each random effects level. The blue and red in horizontal lines represents Control and TFE plot, respectively and are show when a significant plot effect was found. All points and lines represent genus in each treatment (see Table 3 for models and analysis section in Methods).





water potential. c) HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P50; d) PLC – native dry season
percentage loss of conductivity. The vertical dashed lines represents marginal fixed effect mean,
the points represents random effects plus fixed effect mean by each level (by genus) and the
horizontal lines represents standard error by each random effects level. All points and lines
represent genus in each treatment. P-values are from mixed effects analysis (see Table 3 for
models and analysis section in Methods).

for per period

Contro

k)

%)0

Control

TFE

TĖE



HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P50; I) PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The boxes represent quartiles 1 and 3, the central line indicates the median and the black points the mean of each treatment. Whiskers are either maximum value or 1.5 interquartile range above quartile 3, if outliers are present and notches represents a confidence interval around the median represented by central line. Traits for which plot had a significant effect are marked with * (p < 0.05), ** (p < 0.01) and *** (p < 0.001). P-values are from mixed effects analysis (see Table 2 for models and analysis section in Methods.

338x190mm (230 x 230 DPI)





1312x1969mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 4 Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) of drought stress indicators and hydraulic traits. Ordination showing multidimensional space filled by small (yellow) and large (green) trees indicating distinct hydraulic ecological strategies (MANOVA; P < 0.05) between trees from the TFE and Control. Hydraulic traits represented by arrows (Arrow length represent predictor "strength"). Dots represent individuals in Control and triangles individuals in TFE treatment. The green colour represents large trees and yellow represents small trees.

190x125mm (96 x 96 DPI)

а

h







Figure 5 Comparison between small trees and large trees from the throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plots. a) WD - wood density; b) P50 - xylem embolism resistance; c) P88 - xylem embolism resistance; d) Gmin - minimum stomatal conductance; e) Ks - maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; f) Ksl - maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; g) Ψpd - predawn water potential; h) Ψmd midday water potential; i) HSM – branch hydraulic safety margin to P50; j) PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity. The boxes represent quartiles 1 and 3, the central line indicates the median and the black points the mean of each treatment. Whiskers are either maximum value or 1.5 interguartile range above the guartile 3, when outliers are present. Different letters indicate significant differences within each graph, p < 0.05.

321x456mm (96 x 96 DPI)



59

60



Figure 6 Hydraulic traits comparison between small trees and large trees from throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plot. a) WD – wood density; b) P50 - xylem embolism resistance; c) P88 - xylem embolism resistance; d) Gmin – minimum stomatal conductance; e) Ks – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; f) Ksl - maximum hydraulic leaf-specific conductivity. The vertical dashed lines represents marginal fixed effect mean, green vertical lines represents large trees and yellow vertical lines, the points represents random plus fixed effect mean by each level (by genus) and the horizontal lines represents standard error by each random effects level. The blue and red in horizontal lines represents Control and TFE plot, respectively and are show when a significant plot effect was found. All points and lines represent genus in each treatment (see Table 3 for models and analysis section in Methods).

1312x1969mm (96 x 96 DPI)



1467x1761mm (96 x 96 DPI)





Figure S1. Height and diameter in each treatment (TFE vs. Control) and by genus for the most common small tree genera in this study (9 genera). a)The significant relationship between diameter (DBH) and Height by treatment (F=48.61; R²=0.72; p-value<0.001), b) Height of Small trees by treatment c) Height of Small trees by genus. The box represents quartiles 1 and 3, with the central line indicating the median. Whiskers are either maximum value or 1.5 interquartile range above the quartile 3, when outliers are present.

228x341mm (96 x 96 DPI)



Figure S2. Soil water content during 2016 in the Throughfall Exclusion Experiment plot (red) and in the Control plot (blue) at 10 cm and at 100 cm depth adapted from Bittencourt et al. 2020. The TFE had a mean reduction, in relation to Control, of 48% and 56% in soil water content at 10 cm and 100 cm depth, respectively. Data are missing for periods when sensors failed.

247x201mm (96 x 96 DPI)



Figure S3- Comparison between the small trees and large trees from the throughfall exclusion (TFE) and Control plots from grouping all 9 genera available within the large and small tree groupings. Note that four of these genera were not present in both of the large and small tree groupings, and were thus excluded from Figure 3. a) WD – wood density; b) P50 - xylem embolism resistance (MPa); c) P88 - xylem embolism resistance; d) Gmin – minimum stomatal conductance; e) Ks – maximum hydraulic specific conductivity; f) Ksl - maximum hydraulic leaf -specific conductivity; g) Wpd – predawn water potential; h) Wmd midday water potential; i) PLC – native dry season percentage loss of conductivity; j) HSM – hydraulic safety margin to P50. The box represents quartiles 1 and 3, with the central line indicating the median. Whiskers are either maximum value or 1.5 interquartile range above the quartile 3, when outliers are present. Different letter indicant significant differences, p<0.001.

325x456mm (96 x 96 DPI)