



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

General plant strategies and functions in wetlands: global trait-based analyses

Pan, Y.

Citation

Pan, Y. (2020, September 15). *General plant strategies and functions in wetlands: global trait-based analyses*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/136753>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/136753>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/136753> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Pan, Y.

Title: General plant strategies and functions in wetlands: global trait-based analyses

Issue Date: 2020-09-15

Chapter 2

Drivers of plant traits that allow survival in wetlands

Yingji Pan, Ellen Cieraad, Beverley R. Clarkson,
Timothy D. Colmer, Ole Pedersen, Eric J. W. Visser,
Laurentius A.C.J. Voesenek, Peter M. van Bodegom

Accepted by *Functional Ecology*
doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13541

Abstract

- Plants have developed a suite of traits to survive the anaerobic and anoxic soil conditions in wetlands. Previous studies on wetland plant adaptive traits have focused mainly on physiological aspects under experimental conditions, or compared the trait expression of the local species pool. Thus, a comprehensive analysis of potential factors driving wetland plant adaptive traits under natural environmental conditions is still missing.
- In this study, we analysed three important wetland adaptive traits, i.e. root porosity, root/shoot ratio and underwater photosynthetic rate, to explore driving factors using a newly compiled dataset of wetland plants. Based on 21 studies at 38 sites across different biomes, we found that root porosity was affected by an interaction of temperature and hydrological regime; root/shoot ratio was affected by temperature, precipitation and habitat type; and underwater photosynthetic rate was affected by precipitation and life form. This suggests that a variety of driving mechanisms affect the expression of different adaptive traits.
- The quantitative relationships we observed between the adaptive traits and their driving factors will be a useful reference for future global methane and denitrification modelling studies. Our results also stress that besides the traditionally emphasized hydrological driving factors, other factors at several spatial scales should also be taken into consideration in the context of future functional wetland ecology.

2.1 Introduction

Wetland ecosystems are of global importance for their provisioning of ecosystem services such as flood abatement, habitat provision, water purification and carbon sequestration at the regional and global scale (Zedler & Kercher, 2005). Among the variety of global wetland ecosystems (Ramsar Convention Secretariat, 2013), peat-forming wetlands (including bogs, fens and swamps) alone are considered to store more than half the amount of carbon present in the atmosphere (Page & Baird, 2016). At the same time, wetlands are the dominant single global methane emission source, contributing some 20% to 40% of global methane emissions (Ringeval *et al.*, 2010). To help understand these wetland functions, plant functional traits can be used to link the environmental conditions and species composition to the ecosystem processes (Moor *et al.*, 2017). Unravelling these interlinkages at a global scale is essential to

inform ecological modelling, such as dynamic global vegetation models, to improve our predictions on important processes such as global wetland methane emissions (Wania *et al.*, 2013; Miller *et al.*, 2016).

Wetland ecosystems are distinguished from other (non-wetland) terrestrial ecosystems by their unique hydrological and anoxic soil conditions and associated biogeochemical processes. To survive in wetlands, plants need to deal with the lack of oxygen in the rooting substrate to avoid cellular energy-deficits, and the potential accumulation of phytotoxic compounds. Oxygen-depletion in tissues can also lead to an accumulation of reactive oxygen species (ROS) upon return to aerobic conditions after flooding, causing damage of cellular macromolecules and membranes (Yordanova *et al.*, 2004; Bailey-Serres & Voeselek, 2008; Colmer & Voeselek, 2009). In the rhizosphere, the lack of oxygen as an electron acceptor results in the production of toxic chemical matter such as ferrous iron and sulphide (Singer & Havill, 1993) and low-weight monocarboxylic acids (e.g. acetic, propionic, butyric and hexanoic acids) which impair plant root function (Armstrong & Armstrong, 2001; Pezeshki, 2001). There are also environmental stressors that are specific to a certain wetland type, such as salinity in saline wetlands (Flowers & Colmer, 2008). In this study, we focus on generalities that apply to all wetlands.

To cope with these adverse conditions, wetland plants have developed a suite of adaptive traits (Voeselek *et al.*, 2006; Winkel *et al.*, 2016; Pan *et al.*, 2019). Examples include: enhanced shoot and root porosity (aerenchyma formation) to facilitate internal oxygen transportation, ameliorate oxygen concentration in the root zone and aid (root) respiration and oxidation (Visser *et al.*, 2000b; McDonald *et al.*, 2001; Colmer, 2003b); shoot elongation to allow leaves to access atmospheric oxygen; decreased root/shoot ratios to create a better balance between gas transport capacity (oxygen source) and root oxygen consumption (oxygen sink) (van Bodegom *et al.*, 2005; Jung *et al.*, 2009); and a root radial oxygen loss (ROL) barrier to reduce diffusion of precious oxygen to the rhizosphere (Armstrong *et al.*, 2000; Colmer, 2003a). Underwater photosynthesis is an important process for growth and long-term persistence of wetland plants under submerged conditions, which create low $\text{HCO}_3^-/\text{CO}_2$ concentrations and low light intensity (Mommer & Visser, 2005; Pedersen *et al.*, 2006, 2016; Colmer *et al.*, 2011). Adaptive traits involved in maintaining an optimal underwater photosynthetic rate include gas film formation (Colmer & Pedersen, 2008), changed leaf morphological structure to become thinner, narrower, with reduced cuticles, and rearranged chloroplasts closer to the epidermis (Voeselek *et al.*, 2006; Konnerup & Pedersen, 2017).

Chapter 2

The expression of wetland adaptive traits is likely determined by bioclimatic variables, hydrological regime, habitat type and plant life form. Bioclimatic variables (e.g. precipitation, temperature) may affect fundamental eco-physiological processes such as enzymatic activities and transpiration rates (Moles *et al.*, 2014) that may also be important in wetlands. However, these driving forces may be different than that in terrestrial systems, for example in relation to the general lack of water-limitation in wetlands compared with terrestrial plants. The hydrological regime, i.e. both the duration and depth of the water table (e.g. waterlogged or submerged), has a direct impact on wetland conditions and plant performance, and is recognized as an important factor. However, its importance in comparison to other drivers, such as habitat type or bioclimatic variables is unknown. Habitat type (e.g. marsh or floodplain) may drive the adaptive traits, for example through specific soil biochemistry, flooding depth (Voesenek *et al.*, 2004) or competition/facilitation of the local plant community (Maestre *et al.*, 2009; Luo *et al.*, 2010). Plant life form (such as sedge, grass, floating-leaved) in turn reflects plant morphological characteristics and life history strategies, and therefore might constrain the upper and lower range of adaptive traits. Our understanding of driving factors is further hampered by the often complex interactions among driving forces of plant functional traits in wetlands (Moor *et al.*, 2017). For instance, while the temperature in shallow waterbodies can fluctuate markedly, affecting the rate of underwater photosynthesis of tropical seagrass (Pedersen *et al.*, 2016), that of deeper waterbodies is much more stable even with strong changes in the surrounding air temperature (Colmer *et al.*, 2011). Likewise, the impact of a low redox potential on the need for aerenchyma tissues may reduce at low temperatures when respiration and thus oxygen demand is low.

The mechanisms through which such adaptive traits help plants adapt to wetland habitats, especially under flooded conditions, have been carefully studied in eco-physiological experiments (as reviewed in Colmer & Voesenek, 2009; Voesenek & Bailey-Serres, 2015). However, there is no analysis on the potentially generic driving factors of these plant traits in wetlands under natural environmental conditions. Despite their dominant ecological role in enhancing wetland plants' survival, those wetland adaptive traits are not yet included in the global plant functional trait databases, such as the TRY database (Kattge *et al.*, 2011), while we consider this essential for comprehensive analyses within the functional ecology context. Most studies so far have focused on the molecular and physiological regulation of specific traits in a limited comparison of species or genotypes (e.g. Winkel *et al.*, 2013; Konnerup & Pedersen, 2017). Comparative experiments or field studies have concentrated on comparisons of trait expression within the local species pool (Pedersen *et al.*, 2011; Colmer *et al.*, 2013). To our knowledge, no study exists relating the expression of these traits

to driving factors or to different wetland types on regional to global scales. Such understanding on the potential drivers of wetland adaptive traits comprises a fundamental step in applying trait-based approaches to wetland ecology.

In this research, we hypothesize that a) bioclimatic variables, hydrological regime, habitat type and plant life form, including their interactions, are potential key driving factors for wetland adaptive traits; b) since wetland adaptive traits all respond and adapt to the adverse wetland conditions, we expect that the driving factors for different wetland adaptive traits are similar. We aim to assess and evaluate the importance of these driving factors in determining wetland adaptive traits. Using a newly compiled wetland plant adaptive trait dataset, our paper is the first exploration of various potential driving factors for three key wetland plant adaptive traits (root porosity, root/shoot ratio and underwater photosynthetic rate) that represent key plant strategies in response to adverse wetland conditions (including anoxia, flooding and submergence). As a fundamental step towards understanding the wetland plants' adaptive strategies, our results should reveal a new perspective on the driving factors for wetland adaptive traits in the broad context of functional ecology, and provide a benchmark for modelling and predicting wetland plant species distributions and their impacts on ecosystem functioning.

2.2 Materials and Methods

2.2.1 Data compilation

We compiled a dataset of wetland plant adaptive traits, defining wetlands and wetland plants according to the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar Convention Secretariat, 2013), which includes plant species inhabiting aquatic systems (e.g. rivers and lakes) as well as those non-wetland terrestrial plants that inhabit temporarily/permanently flooded areas. The wetland plant adaptive trait dataset was compiled from a systematic search in Web of Science and Google Scholar (last updated on the 5th June 2018). The literature search included permutations of the following keywords: wetland plants, marsh plant, bog plant, isoetid, aquatic plants, macrophytes, submerged plants, floating-leaved plants, emergent plants, root porosity, root/shoot ratio and underwater photosynthesis. We also drew on references presented in several important reviews that focused on the eco-physiological studies of how wetland plants adapt to flooding conditions published in the past 15 years (e.g. Voeselek *et al.*, 2006; Bailey-Serres & Voeselek, 2008; Voeselek & Bailey-Serres, 2015). Finally, we added several of our own unpublished data sources, along with others within our network.

Chapter 2

For the current analysis, we selected those studies that i) measured plants occurring in wetlands with sufficient information for us to consistently classify the habitat types and the hydrological regime(s) (drained, waterlogged or submerged); ii) were measured using field-collected specimens, thus we did not include data on plants from greenhouse experiments; and iii) provided accurate location information (with coordinates). We then compiled data from the selected studies that included quantitative measurements of three intensively studied wetland plant adaptive traits (root porosity (%), root/shoot ratio and the rate of underwater photosynthesis ($\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)). We are aware that there are many other important wetland adaptive traits, such as root radial oxygen loss (ROL), ethanol metabolism, and tolerance of reduced metal ions. However, the data available for these traits either were measurements in greenhouse/laboratory settings or were available only in a qualitative form, which was not suitable for this quantitative analysis. In total, 598 trait records from 21 studies at 38 different study sites were analysed. For root porosity, the data comprised 198 measurements of 103 unique species in 13 studies at 25 different sites; root/shoot ratio data contained 321 measurements on 12 unique species, described in 6 studies at 7 different sites; the 79 underwater photosynthetic rate measurements on 27 unique species were contained in 3 studies at 8 different sites. Location of the sampling sites in a global map were shown in Appendix 2A Fig. 2S1.

We included bioclimatic variables, hydrological regime, habitat type and the plant life form (see Table 2.1) as potential drivers for the above selected wetland plant adaptive traits. We could not include other abiotic variables, such as redox potential, due to a limited data availability and inconsistent measurement methods. Nevertheless, we believe that the variables we included, such as the hydrological regime, act as a good proxy for redox potential and oxygen depletion. We did not include soil variables in our analysis either. Local soil conditions in wetlands strongly deviate from those in nearby non-wetland terrestrial systems (organic matter content as an example) that is represented in available global soil databases. Also, the soil information provided in the original publications was inconsistent and insufficiently detailed to be included in our analyses.

For our analyses, we classified hydrological regime as drained, waterlogged or submerged (as defined by Sasidharan *et al.*, 2017), as provided in the original study. While this provides baseline information on local (hydrological and fertility) wetland conditions, additional insights can be obtained from a classification into specific wetland habitat types. Based on the guidance of the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar Convention Secretariat, 2013) and the definitions by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, <https://www.epa.gov/wetlands/classification-and-types-wetlands#marshes>), we grouped

wetland habitats into eleven categories (Appendix 2B). Studies selected for the current paper encompassed eight habitat types (Table 2.1). We grouped the life form of plants into seven categories (Table 2.1). We acquired bioclimatic variables at the global scale with an accuracy of 2.5 minutes (WorldClim Version 2.0, <http://www.worldclim.org/>) (Fick & Hijmans, 2017). These bioclimatic variables represent 19 climate attributes of ecological importance, in terms of annual means, seasonality and extreme or limiting climate factors. To determine the major axes of variation in all bioclimatic variables and to minimize the effect of inter-correlations, we ran a principal component analysis (PCA), and took the scores of the first two axes of the PCA to represent the climatic conditions. The PCA surface and axis scores reveal that the first and second axes (explained 51.8% and 25.8% of total variance, respectively) are mainly related to temperature and precipitation, respectively (Appendix 2A Fig. 2S2). Therefore, below we will refer these axes as *temperature* and *precipitation*, respectively. Our data points represent most of the global bioclimatic space, illustrated by an overlay of the sampling points onto the PCA surface (Appendix 2A Fig. 2S3).

Table 2.1 The explanatory variables in the model as driving factors for wetland adaptation traits.

Explanatory variables	Continuous/Categories
Bioclimatic variables	<i>temperature; precipitation</i>
Hydrological regime	<i>drained; waterlogged; submerged</i>
Habitat type	<i>fens; permanent forested wetlands; mangrove swamps; marshes; permanent brackish/saline non-forested wetlands; rivers and lakes; temporary brackish/saline non-forested wetlands; temporary non-forested wetlands</i>
Plant life form	<i>emergent; floating-leaved; grass; isoetid; sedge; shrub/tree; submerged</i>

2.2.2 Data analysis

We constructed single-trait linear regression models to elucidate the role of variables in driving the three wetland plant adaptive traits. We used trait values recorded at the individual plant level. In some papers, measurements were summarised as a species mean \pm standard deviation, in which case we simulated the original number of data points (recorded sample size) based on a normal distribution around the recorded mean and standard deviation. The

Chapter 2

response variables were \log_{10} -transformed to approximate normality, and logit transformed in the case of root porosity (Warton & Hui, 2011).

For the root porosity trait, we included all four sets of explanatory variables: bioclimatic variables, hydrological regime, habitat type and plant life form. Due to the limited data available for some of the combinations of categorical variables, we could add only the two-way interaction terms between the (continuous) bioclimatic variables and each of the three categorical variables. The full model for root porosity was therefore structured as:

$\log_{10}(\text{Root porosity}/(1-\text{Root porosity})) \sim \text{Temperature} + \text{Precipitation} + \text{Hydrology} + \text{Habitat} + \text{Life form} + \text{Temperature: Hydrology} + \text{Precipitation: Hydrology} + \text{Temperature: Habitat} + \text{Precipitation: Habitat} + \text{Temperature: Life form} + \text{Precipitation: Life form} + \text{Temperature: Precipitation}$

Some of the study sites were geographically clustered, which might significantly affect the results. Given that we aimed to provide estimates of impacts of each driving factor, we were not interested in solving this clustering by including study sites as a random factor. Instead, after checking the amount of data available for each location, we randomly selected up to 5 measurements at each pixel (one pixel=0.01 PCA score *0.01 PCA score square cell) on the bioclimatic PCA surface (if there were fewer than 5 measurements, we included all the measurements) to maintain a balanced data structure for linear model construction.

We constructed the full model with the data set as generated by the above-mentioned resampling process. For each resampled dataset, we ran a model selection on the full model based on the Akaike Information Criterion weight (AIC weight). For some resampled datasets, some coefficients could not be estimated because a combination of variables was coincidentally- not sampled. We excluded candidate models with such undefined coefficients, and rescaled the AIC weight for the remaining candidate models to sum to 1. This resampling and model selection was repeated 1000 times.

Then we calculated the averaged AIC weight for each candidate model across all 1000 iterations, and the best model was selected as being the candidate model with the highest averaged AIC weight (Burnham & Anderson, 1998). To gain a robust parameter estimation for the best model, we calculated the average adjusted R^2 , average coefficient values of the intercept and each variable, and the average relative importance of each main effect based on the model parameters generated in all 1000 iterations.

The root/shoot ratio had similar and even stronger data limitations in the categorical variables. Hence, we included only the main effects of the four set of variables: bioclimatic variables,

hydrological regime, habitat type and plant life form without interaction terms. The full model for root/shoot ratio was therefore:

$\log_{10}(\text{Root/shoot ratio}) \sim \text{Temperature} + \text{Precipitation} + \text{Hydrology} + \text{Habitat} + \text{Life form}$

For this response variable, there was only one record in the habitat type ‘mangrove swamp’, which we excluded from further analysis. Following the same resampling approach as described above, we selected the best model and obtained its parameter estimates.

For the underwater photosynthetic rate, data were limited to three studies (see Appendix 2A Fig. 2S1 & Fig. 2S3). Since these data were reasonably balanced across geographical space, we ran this linear model on the original data (without resampling). All data records were from within one habitat type (rivers and lakes) and one hydrological regime (submerged). We therefore used only bioclimatic variables, plant life form and the interactions between them to construct the linear model. Thus, the full model for underwater photosynthetic rate was:

$\log_{10}(\text{Underwater photosynthetic rate}) \sim \text{Temperature} * \text{Precipitation} * \text{Life form}$

The analyses were performed in the R language (R Core Team, 2018). We used the dredge() function in the MuMIn package (Barton, 2018) to simplify the full model and obtain the AIC weight based on AICs values. We visually assessed whether the most assumptions were met. We then calculated the relative importance of the main effects in the best models by using the calc.relimp() function in the relimp package (Grömping, 2006). To compare the trait variances between different functional group and habitat conditions, we ran Tukey's honest significant difference test (TukeyHSD) using glht() function in the multcomp package (Hothorn *et al.*, 2008).

2.3 Results

2.3.1 Quantifying the driving factors for root porosity

The best model for root porosity included hydrological regime, temperature and the interaction term between them (Table 2.2; averaged adjusted $R^2=0.42$). Root porosity was overall positively correlated with temperature. Higher temperature conditions corresponded with a higher root porosity under drained and waterlogged conditions. Under submerged conditions, however, the impacts of temperature were rather weak (Fig. 2.1). In our best model, the interaction term had the highest variance explained (17%) in comparison to hydrological regime (13%) and temperature (11%) (Fig. 2.4). Post-hoc comparisons suggested that the root porosity in submerged conditions was significantly higher than in waterlogged and drained conditions, while no significant difference was detected between

Chapter 2

waterlogged and drained conditions. Without the interaction term between temperature and hydrological regime, the best model would have included only habitat as the explanatory variable (see Table 2.2). This suggests that habitat type contains part of the underlying information as related to the hydrological conditions and temperature.

Table 2.2 Summary of the top five models fit to explain root porosity, root/shoot ratio and underwater photosynthetic rate, respectively. The models were ranked based on the averaged Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) weight, which was calculated for each candidate model as the average AIC weight across 1000 iterations. Proportion variance explained (average adjusted R^2) for the top models are also displayed

Wetland adaptive trait	Top models	Averaged AIC weight	Rank	Adjusted R^2
Root porosity	~Temperature * Hydrology	0.219	1	0.42
	~Temperature * Hydrology + Precipitation	0.097	2	
	~Temperature + Precipitation + Habitat	0.059	3	
	~Precipitation + Habitat + Life form	0.054	4	
	~Habitat	0.052	5	
Root/shoot ratio	~Temperature + Precipitation + Habitat	0.346	1	0.57
	~Temperature + Precipitation + Habitat + Life form	0.136	2	
	~Hydrology + Habitat	0.131	3	
	~Hydrology	0.064	4	
	~Life form	0.040	5	
Underwater photosynthetic rate	~Precipitation + Life form	0.245	1	0.41
	~Temperature * Precipitation + Life form	0.196	2	
	~Temperature + Precipitation + Life form	0.128	3	
	~Precipitation * Life form	0.112	4	
	~Temperature * Life form + Precipitation * Life form	0.080	5	




Figure 2.1 The relationship between logit transformed root porosity and temperature grouped by different hydrological regime. The regression line and the 95% confidence interval are obtained by taking the mean of the bootstrapped parameters of the best model for 1000 iterations, taking into account the biased spatial spread of the original data points. The bubble size indicates the sampling probability of each point in order to maintain a balanced spatial data structure (see details in method).

2.3.2 Quantifying the driving factors for root/shoot ratio trait

The best model for root/shoot ratio included temperature, precipitation and habitat type (Table 2.2; averaged adjusted $R^2=0.57$). Habitat type played the most important role in determining the root/shoot ratio (explaining 26% of the variance; Fig. 2.4). At higher temperatures, the root/shoot ratio was lower (Fig. 2.2), which indicates that in a warmer environment relatively more biomass is allocated to shoots (explaining 16% of the variance). The root/shoot ratio was also positively correlated with precipitation (explaining 15% of the variance). This suggests that at higher precipitation, more biomass is allocated to roots. Hydrological regime was potentially important driving factors, which could partially replace the explanatory power of bioclimatic variables. The second best model suggests that the root/shoot ratio varied across different plant life forms (Table 2.2).




Figure 2.2 The relationship between \log_{10} -transformed root/shoot ratio and the bioclimatic variables (temperature left, precipitation right) grouped by different habitat types. The regression line and the 95% confidence interval were obtained by taking the mean parameters of the best model across 1000 resampled dataset, taking into account spatial bias in the original data points (see methods). Regression lines represent marginal estimates and include the mean value of the other variable(s) in the model. Points indicate observed values. We note the lack of an environmental gradient in the data from temporary brackish/saline non-forested wetlands, and the overall interaction effects may therefore have been underestimated. The bubble size indicates the sampling probability of each point in order to maintain a balanced spatial data structure (see details in method).

2.3.3 Quantifying the driving factors for underwater photosynthetic rate

The best model for underwater photosynthetic rate included precipitation and the plant life form (Table 2.2; adjusted $R^2=0.41$). The precipitation-related bioclimatic variables positively affected underwater photosynthetic rate (Fig. 2.3), explaining 22% of the variance (Fig. 2.4). Plant life form explained 19% of the variance. The TukeyHSD test suggested that the submerged leaves of floating-leaved plants had a significantly higher underwater photosynthetic rate compared to the submerged leaves of emergent and grass life forms. This indicates a major advantage of floating-leaved plants over emergent plants and grasses in deep water.




Figure 2.3 The relationship between \log_{10} -transformed underwater photosynthetic rate and precipitation grouped by different plant life forms, as estimated by the top-ranked model.

2.4 Discussion

The eco-physiology of wetland adaptive traits has been relatively well-studied, but the majority of this research has been limited to a small set of species under experimental conditions. A global analysis of the driving factors for wetland adaptive traits under natural environmental conditions is still missing. Using our newly compiled comprehensive wetland plant adaptive trait dataset, we explored the potential driving factors of three important wetland plant adaptive traits (root porosity, root/shoot ratio and underwater photosynthetic rate). Our models explained a substantial amount of the variation in the data, and revealed the importance of bioclimatic variables for all three traits – but for each trait in combination with different other driving factors, suggesting the existence of a myriad of wetland plant adaptive strategies. While based on a relatively small dataset, our study is a pilot exploration of available data of these wetland traits and attempts to bring wetland adaptive traits to the functional ecology context.

Chapter 2

Among the four driving factors tested, bioclimatic variables were selected for all three wetland plant adaptive traits. Previous studies in terrestrial systems have shown that climatic variables not only drive the habitat conditions, but also various functional traits including the leaf economics spectrum (LES) (Wright *et al.*, 2005; van Ommen Kloeke *et al.*, 2012; Maire *et al.*, 2015), size-related traits (Wright *et al.*, 2017b), plant life form (Ordoñez *et al.*, 2009), and fine-root traits (Freschet *et al.*, 2017). Our results extend this consistent theme of climate impacts to a broader context; from plants in drier terrestrial ecosystems to wetlands. The importance of bioclimatic variables additionally implies that the functional structure of wetland plants can be further impacted in the context of global climate change. Besides the bioclimatic variables, we demonstrated that hydrological regime, habitat type and plant life form affected root porosity, root/shoot ratio and underwater photosynthetic rate, respectively (Fig. 2.4).




Figure 2.4 The contribution of each driving factor to the three wetland adaptive traits under study, as determined from the top-ranked models of each wetland adaptive trait.

When assessing the driving factors of the three wetland plant adaptive traits, we found that simple combinations of bioclimatic variables (expressed in PCA multivariate space), hydrological regime, habitat type and plant life form explained a substantial proportion of the trait expression (adjusted R^2 values range from 0.41 to 0.57). This proportion is similar to the filtering of non-wetland terrestrial traits by environmental conditions (Reich & Oleksyn,

2004; Wright *et al.*, 2005, 2017b; Maire *et al.*, 2015; Atkin *et al.*, 2015). The different drivers identified for different traits (Fig. 2.4) imply that the filtering mechanisms for wetland plant adaptive traits seem trait-specific, rather than related to a single driving factor selecting for all adaptive traits.

2.4.1 Ecological interpretation of the patterns in individual traits

Root porosity was driven by the temperature-related axis of bioclimatic variables. A positive response was detected under drained and waterlogged conditions. In warm areas, a higher temperature corresponds to a higher metabolic activity of plants resulting in a higher oxygen demand for transpiration and evapotranspiration. In those conditions, wetland plants need to develop a higher root porosity to ensure sufficient oxygen supply. Moreover, the oxygen solubility is reduced with increasing water temperature, amplifying the need for more porous tissues within roots for oxygen transport at higher temperature. In extremely cold habitats such as tundra areas where the soil water is frequently frozen, high root porosity might not be favourable since it results in reduced mechanical support (Striker *et al.*, 2007). In our model, the effect of air temperature on root porosity was much reduced under submerged conditions. This can be explained by the high specific heat capacity of water. When growing in submerged conditions, the atmospheric temperature has a limited impact on roots, whose temperature will be determined by relatively stable water temperatures. This suggests that future ecological modelling studies should include water temperature as a predictor variable for especially those submerged wetland plant species, for example, using global database of lake surface temperatures (Sharma *et al.*, 2015). The different impact of temperature in different hydrological regimes (as represented by the interaction term between temperature and hydrological regime) was the most important selected driving factor in the model, indicating the importance of these stabilising effects of water on the impact of air temperature. Without the inclusion of the interaction term in the model, the next-best model was represented by the single explanatory variable of habitat type. Habitat type (e.g. fens, forested/shrub wetlands, marshes) convey combined information regarding hydrological regime and climatic variables at each site. Previous greenhouse studies indicated a significant difference in root porosity between drained and waterlogged conditions (Justin & Armstrong, 1987). In our study, we did not detect such differences mainly because most variation in root porosity in our database occurred between species. Hence, impacts of hydrological regime on intraspecific variation were not picked up in our analysis.

Root/shoot ratio was driven by both temperature-related and precipitation-related axes of bioclimatic variables. At high temperature, plants need more oxygen to support the higher

Chapter 2

metabolic rates (Pedersen *et al.*, 2016). In this situation, it is advantageous for plants to maintain a lower root/shoot ratio, since this reduces the relative oxygen consumption in the root tissues, and at the same time, increases the gas transport from the atmosphere to the root system (van Bodegom *et al.*, 2005). Moreover, higher metabolic rates will ensure a faster biomass production, i.e., the capability to produce more shoot tissues when required by dynamic wetland conditions, which in turn, further reduces the root/shoot ratio. When it comes to forests, it has been found that low temperature induces a higher proportion of root biomass in adaptation to low available nutrient supply and limited soil solution movement (Poorter *et al.*, 2012; Reich *et al.*, 2014). While a matching case study in wetland is still lacking, our results indicate a similar pattern may exist here, albeit associated with a different mechanism.

In terrestrial conditions, more precipitation usually leads to a decrease in root/shoot ratio with increasing precipitation (Schenk & Jackson, 2002; Poorter *et al.*, 2012). In contrast, our model suggested an increase in root/shoot ratio with increasing precipitation. These contrasting patterns for non-wetland terrestrial and wetland environments are presumably related to the extent of water limitation - much less severe in the latter, and suggest potentially varying mechanisms driving biomass allocation between belowground and aboveground tissues. In wetland systems, water excess through precipitation and associated changes to submergence leads to limitations in oxygen availability. In contrast, in non-wetland terrestrial ecosystems, precipitation alleviates the water limitation and allows plants to invest less in root tissues to acquire water.

The rate of underwater photosynthesis was also positively related to precipitation. This result agrees with a meta-analysis on the response of global terrestrial ecosystems to precipitation (Wu *et al.*, 2011), although here the mechanism involved may be different. In our study, the impact of precipitation was stronger for underwater leaves of some life forms (floating-leaved and grass) than those of others (emergent and submerged plants), as indicated by the confidence interval of each life form in Fig. 2.3. We speculate that wetland plants in areas with more precipitation generally are more adapted to frequent flooding events, and therefore have a higher underwater photosynthetic rate. Another potential explanation for this pattern is that temporal wetlands generally differentiate from non-temporal wetlands by maximum water depth and sediment materials. The strategy of plants in coping with seasonal floods is anaerobic dormancy (a reduction of metabolic rates), and therefore do not need to maintain an optimum photosynthetic rate when fully submerged (Voisenek *et al.*, 2004). This reasoning should be confirmed by further studies, as it is currently based on relatively few observations.

Interestingly, for underwater photosynthetic rate, temperature was not selected in the top model. This contrasts with studies of terrestrial plants, where temperature is an important driver for photosynthesis (Wu *et al.*, 2011; Yamori *et al.*, 2014). Again, the high specific heat capacity of water compared to air, and resulting dampened temperature fluctuations in inundated conditions may explain the limited impact of air temperature on underwater photosynthetic rate. Inclusion of observations in tropical regions (the underwater photosynthesis studies included in our analysis were all from temperate regions) may reveal other trends, since warm atmospheric temperatures (e.g. as high as 38°C) can diminish the underwater photosynthetic rates of plants in shallow pools when the small volume of water heats up owing to solar radiation (Pedersen *et al.*, 2016). We also found that underwater leaves of floating-leaved and submerged plants had on average a higher underwater photosynthetic rate than the underwater leaves of emergent and grass life forms. Floating-leaved and submerged plants have evolved many traits (e.g. leaves with thinner cuticle, enhanced utility of HCO_3^-) in adapting to submerged conditions, which may help maintain underwater photosynthesis (Rascio *et al.*, 1999; Colmer *et al.*, 2011; Iversen *et al.*, 2019). Many floating-leaved and submerged plants are also able to use the CO_2 from sediment to facilitate underwater photosynthesis (Singer *et al.*, 1994; Colmer, 2003b; Winkel & Borum, 2009).

2.4.2 Ecological implications

While bioclimatic drivers were important for all three adaptive traits, different combinations of drivers were identified for each wetland adaptive trait. We hypothesize that a variety of driving mechanisms affect the expression of different wetland adaptive traits on a global scale. We therefore expect to see a decoupled pattern between some of the wetland adaptive traits. Along with the evidence that some wetland adaptive traits tend to be orthogonal to leaf economics spectrum traits (Pan *et al.*, 2019), our current results support the idea that these three (and potentially others as well) wetland adaptive traits are relatively cheap to develop, and therefore are not to a large extent constrained by other adaptive traits or by leaf economics spectrum traits.

Wetland adaptive traits are the premise of survival under the adverse conditions present in wetlands (Voesenek & Bailey-Serres, 2015; Moor *et al.*, 2017; Pan *et al.*, 2019). The identified environmental filters in wetlands select plants with suitable adaptive traits, along with other factors including soil fertility, light radiation, competition/facilitation in communities (Luo *et al.*, 2016). Disentangling the driving factors for wetland adaptive traits not only provides a theoretical basis for understanding the overall wetland plant functioning

Chapter 2

and strategy, but also creates new perspectives on modelling global wetland plant distributions and community structure (Lenssen *et al.*, 2000; Visser *et al.*, 2000a; Willby *et al.*, 2001). These results can be included in dynamic global vegetation models (DGVMs) (van Bodegom *et al.*, 2012, 2014), which can in turn contribute to a better prediction of ecosystem processes such as those related to carbon, nitrogen and water cycles. For example, current global methane models, such as CLM4Me and LPJ-WHyMe, have considered the effect of plants only to constant plant functional types (PFTs) parameters (Wania *et al.*, 2010; Riley *et al.*, 2011). The results of this study may improve global methane model accuracy by quantifying the continuous trait expression on the varying environmental gradients.

Our study has shown that bioclimatic variables explain a great deal of variation in wetland plant functional traits on a global scale, however, our analysis was limited by the number of species, sites, variables and traits studied. Future studies should seek to expand the dataset that we have developed, which is freely available (see Data Accessibility Statement) and curated by the correspondence author. Many of the traits are relatively cheap to measure. Therefore, contributions of only a few days of work by a global network of wetland scientists would easily and greatly expand the database as a common resource for all.

2.5 Conclusions

Understanding the potential drivers of wetland adaptive traits is a fundamental step towards future studies on wetland adaptive strategies and provides a reference for ecological modelling of wetland plants' distributions. Among the drivers we tested, bioclimatic variables are important driving factors for all three wetland plant adaptive traits. This finding extends the climatic variables as universal drivers of trait expression from non-wetland terrestrial ecosystems to wetlands. Perhaps more importantly, we show different drivers for different adaptive traits, which implies that each adaptive trait is most appropriate for a specific set of wetland conditions, and that there is not one common set of traits that best succeed in wetland conditions. This also suggests that there are a multitude of wetland plant strategies with potentially varied ecological mechanisms involved. Therefore, future wetland plant studies should consider a more complete set of driving factors to effectively bring wetland adaptive traits into the broad context of functional ecology.

2.6 Acknowledgements

The establishment of the wetland trait database was first discussed and started in 2008 at the Vegfunction WG39 which was funded by ARC-NZ Research Network for Vegetation

Function. We would like to thank all additional contributors to this original workshop, including Paul Adam (U New South Wales, Sydney, AU), William Armstrong (U Hull, Kingston upon Hull, UK), Jean Armstrong (U Hull, Kingston upon Hull, UK), Margaret Brock (U New England, Armidale, USA), George Ganf (U Adelaide, Adelaide, AU), Irving A. Mendelsohn (Louisiana State U, Baton Rouge, USA), Eliska Rejmánková (U California, Davis, USA), Brian Sorrell (Aarhus U, Aarhus, DK), and Evan Weiher (U Wisconsin, Eau Claire, USA). We especially thank William Armstrong for his many insightful comments. Yingji Pan is grateful for support from the China Scholarship Council (Grant No. 201606140037).

2.7 Authors' Contributions

PvB initialized this research; YP, PvB and EC designed and planned the research. YP and PvB compiled the data with inputs from all co-authors. YP ran all analyses with inputs from all co-authors. YP, PvB and EC wrote the first drafts of the manuscript that was further improved by inputs from all co-authors, and finalized by YP. All authors contributed critically to the drafts and gave final approval for publication.

2.8 Data Accessibility Statement

Data deposited in the Dryad Digital Repository: <https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.7h44j0zqx>, (Pan *et al.*, 2020)

Chapter 2

2.9 Supporting Information

Appendix 2A




Figure 2S1 The location of the sampling sites. The root porosity, root/shoot ratio and underwater photosynthetic rate are presented in red, blue and green dots, respectively.




Figure 2S2 The PCA1 and PCA2 axes (explained 51.8% and 25.8% of total variance, respectively) of the 19 bio-climatic variables. (Bio1 = Annual Mean Temperature; Bio2 = Mean Diurnal Range (Mean of monthly (max temp - min temp)); Bio3 = Isothermality (Bio2/Bio7) (*100); Bio4 = Temperature Seasonality (standard deviation *100); Bio5 = Max Temperature of Warmest Month; Bio6 = Min Temperature of Coldest Month; Bio7 = Temperature Annual Range (Bio5-Bio6); Bio8 = Mean Temperature of Wettest Quarter; Bio9 = Mean Temperature of Driest Quarter; Bio10 = Mean Temperature of Warmest Quarter; Bio11 = Mean Temperature of Coldest Quarter; Bio12 = Annual Precipitation; Bio13 = Precipitation of Wettest Month; Bio14 = Precipitation of Driest Month; Bio15 = Precipitation Seasonality (Coefficient of Variation); Bio16 = Precipitation of Wettest Quarter; Bio17 = Precipitation of Driest Quarter; Bio18 = Precipitation of Warmest Quarter; Bio19 = Precipitation of Coldest Quarter).




Figure 2S3 The layout of the sampling points on the global 19 bio-climatic variables PCA1 (temperature) & PCA2 (precipitation) surface. Grey circles indicate the bioclimatic environment of the global terrestrial surface at 2.5 minutes. The coloured circles indicate the locations in this same climate space of the measurements of root porosity (red circles), root/shoot ratio (green triangles) and underwater photosynthetic rate (blue squares) contained within the newly developed wetlands trait database.

Appendix 2B

Ramsar wetland type classification

Under the Ramsar Convention, wetland types have been defined to provide a very broad framework to aid rapid identification of the main wetland habitats represented at each Ramsar site. Wetland type is identified for each site on the relevant Ramsar Information Sheet.

The codes used to define wetland types for Ramsar sites are based upon the Ramsar Classification System for Wetland Type as approved by Recommendation 4.7 and amended by Resolutions VI.5 and VII.11 of the Conference of the Contracting Parties.

Marine/Coastal Wetlands

A — Permanent shallow marine waters in most cases less than six metres deep at low tide; includes sea bays and straits.

B — Marine subtidal aquatic beds; includes kelp beds, sea-grass beds, tropical marine meadows.

C — Coral reefs.

D — Rocky marine shores; includes rocky offshore islands, sea cliffs.

E — Sand, shingle or pebble shores; includes sand bars, spits and sandy islets; includes dune systems and humid dune slacks.

F — Estuarine waters; permanent water of estuaries and estuarine systems of deltas.

G — Intertidal mud, sand or salt flats.

H — Intertidal marshes; includes salt marshes, salt meadows, saltings, raised salt marshes; includes tidal brackish and freshwater marshes.

I — Intertidal forested wetlands; includes mangrove swamps, nipah swamps and tidal freshwater swamp forests.

J — Coastal brackish/saline lagoons; brackish to saline lagoons with at least one relatively narrow connection to the sea.

K — Coastal freshwater lagoons; includes freshwater delta lagoons.

Zk(a) - Karst and other subterranean hydrological systems, marine/coastal

Inland Wetlands

L — Permanent inland deltas.

M — Permanent rivers/streams/creeks; includes waterfalls.

N — Seasonal/intermittent/irregular rivers/streams/creeks.

O — Permanent freshwater lakes (over 8 ha); includes large oxbow lakes.

P — Seasonal/intermittent freshwater lakes (over 8 ha); includes floodplain lakes.

Q — Permanent saline/brackish/alkaline lakes.

R — Seasonal/intermittent saline/brackish/alkaline lakes and flats.

Sp - Permanent saline/brackish/alkaline marshes/pools.

Ss - Seasonal/intermittent saline/brackish/alkaline marshes/pools.

Tp - Permanent freshwater marshes/pools; ponds (below 8 ha), marshes and swamps on inorganic soils; with emergent vegetation water-logged for at least most of the growing season.

Ts - Seasonal/intermittent freshwater marshes/pools on inorganic soils; includes sloughs, potholes, seasonally flooded meadows, sedge marshes.

U — Non-forested peatlands; includes shrub or open bogs, swamps, fens.

Va - Alpine wetlands; includes alpine meadows, temporary waters from snowmelt.

Vt - Tundra wetlands; includes tundra pools, temporary waters from snowmelt.

W — Shrub-dominated wetlands; shrub swamps, shrub-dominated freshwater marshes, shrub carr, alder thicket on inorganic soils.

Xf - Freshwater, tree-dominated wetlands; includes freshwater swamp forests, seasonally flooded forests, wooded swamps on inorganic soils.

Xp - Forested peatlands; peat swamp forests.

Chapter 2

Y — Freshwater springs; oases.

Zg - Geothermal wetlands

Zk(b)- Karst and other subterranean hydrological systems, inland

Human-made wetlands

1 — Aquaculture (e.g., fish/shrimp) ponds

2 — Ponds; includes farm ponds, stock ponds, small tanks; (generally below 8 ha).

3 — Irrigated land; includes irrigation channels and rice fields.

4 — Seasonally flooded agricultural land (including intensively managed or grazed wet meadow or pasture).

5 — Salt exploitation sites; salt pans, salines, etc.

6 — Water storage areas; reservoirs/barrages/dams/impoundments (generally over 8 ha).

7 — Excavations; gravel/brick/clay pits; borrow pits, mining pools.

8 — Wastewater treatment areas; sewage farms, settling ponds, oxidation basins, etc.

9 — Canals and drainage channels, ditches.

Zk(c) - Karst and other subterranean hydrological systems, human-made

Our wetland habitat types follow the Ramsar Convention (Ramsar Convention Secretariat, 2013, see details below) as well as the guidance given by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA, <https://www.epa.gov/wetlands/classification-and-types-wetlands#marshes>). We summarized the Ramsar wetland type classification system as:

Marine/Coastal wetlands

1. Estuary: A, B, C, D, F, Zk(a)
2. Intertidal wetland: E, G, H, J, K
3. Mangrove swamps: I

Inland wetlands

4. Rivers and lakes: L, M, N, O, P, Q
5. Brackish and saline inland wetlands: R, Sp, Ss
6. Permanent non-forested wetlands: Tp, U, Y
7. Temporary non-forested wetlands: Ts, Va, Vt
8. Permanent forested wetlands: W, Xf, Xp

Human-made wetlands

9. Artificial waterbodies: 1-9, Zk(c)

We further divided the “Permanent non-forested wetlands” into “marsh”, “bog” and “fen” according to the EPA guidance. The “swamps” defined in EPA guidance should be considered as “Permanent forested wetlands”. The definition given by EPA for “marsh”, “bog” and “fen” is as:

Marsh*: Marshes are defined as wetlands frequently or continually inundated with water, characterized by emergent soft-stemmed vegetation adapted to saturated soil conditions. There are many different kinds of marshes, ranging from the prairie potholes to the Everglades, coastal to inland, freshwater to saltwater. All types receive most of their water from surface water, and many marshes are also fed by groundwater. Nutrients are plentiful and the pH is usually neutral leading to an abundance of plant and animal life.

Bog**: Bogs characterized by spongy peat deposits, acidic waters and a floor covered by a thick carpet of sphagnum moss. Bogs receive all or most of their water from precipitation rather than from runoff, groundwater or streams. As a result, bogs are low in the nutrients needed for plant growth, a condition that is enhanced by acid forming peat mosses.

Fen***: Fens, are peat-forming wetlands that receive nutrients from sources other than precipitation: usually from upslope sources through drainage from surrounding mineral soils and from groundwater

movement. Fens differ from bogs because they are less acidic and have higher nutrient levels. Therefore, they are able to support a much more diverse plant and animal community. These systems are often covered by grasses, sedges, rushes and wildflowers. Some fens are characterized by parallel ridges of vegetation separated by less productive hollows.

Table 2S1 The summary of the habitat types used in the analysis.

Habitat types in our analysis	Habitat types defined in Ramsar Convention and EPA guidance
Estuary	A, B, C, D, F, Zk(a)
Intertidal wetland	E, G, H, J, K
Mangrove swamps	I
Rivers and lakes	L, M, N, O, P, Q
Brackish and saline inland wetlands	R, Sp, Ss
Permanent non-forested wetlands	Tp, U, Y
Temporary non-forested wetlands	Ts, Va, Vt
Permanent forested wetlands	W, Xf, Xp
Artificial waterbodies	1-9, Zk(c)
Marsh	*
Bog	**
Fen	***

