<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Identifying the main drivers for the production and maturation of Scots pine tracheids along a temperature gradient

Kulmala, Liisa

2017

Kulmala , L , Read , J , Nöjd , P , Rathgeber , C B K , Cuny , H E , Hollmén , J & Mäkinen , H
2017 , ' Identifying the main drivers for the production and maturation of Scots pine tracheids
pý along a temperature gradient ' , Agricultural and Forest Meteorology ,
. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.08.012>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/178326>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.08.012>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Identifying the main drivers for the production and maturation of Scots pine tracheids along a temperature gradient

Liisa Kulmala^{c,1,2}, Jesse Read^{a,b,2}, Pekka Nöjd^d, Cyrille. B. K. Rathgeber^e, Henri E. Cuny^f, Jaakko Hollmén^a, Harri Mäkinen^d

^aDepartment of Computer Science, Aalto University and HIIT, P.O. Box 15400, FI-00076 Aalto, Helsinki, Finland

^bComputer Science and Networks Dept., Télécom ParisTech, 46 Rue de Barrault, 75013 Paris, France

^cDepartment of Forest Sciences, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 27, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

^dNatural Resources Institute Finland, Jokiniemenkuja 1, FI-01370, Vantaa, Finland

^eLERFOB, INRA, AgroParisTech, UMR 1092 LERFOB, F-54000 Nancy, France

^fSwiss Federal Research Institute WSL, Zürcherstrasse 111, CH-8903 Birmensdorf, Switzerland

Abstract

Even though studies monitoring the phenology and seasonal dynamics of the wood formation have accumulated for several conifer species across the Northern Hemisphere, the environmental control of tracheid production and differentiation is still fragmentary. With microcore and environmental data from six stands in Finland and France, we built auto-calibrated data-driven black box models for analyzing the most important factors controlling the tracheid production and maturation in Scots pine stem. In the best models, estimation was accurate to within a fraction of a tracheid per week. We compared the relative results of models built using different predictors, and found that the rate of tracheid production was partly regular but current and previous air temperature had influence on the sites in the middle of the temperature range and photosynthetic production in the coldest ones. The rate of mature cell production was more difficult to relate to the predictors but recent photosynthetic production was included in all successful models.

Keywords: micro-core measurements; xylogenesis; diameter growth; gross primary production; black box modeling; predictive models

1. Introduction

In extra-tropical areas, trees seasonally produce new wood (i.e., xylem), which serves as mechanical support, water and nutrients conduction, and storage of carbohydrates, water and defensive compounds. In conifers, the xylem mainly consists of one type of cells called tracheids. New tracheids are produced by cell division in the cambium, after which they follow a differentiation program involving enlargement, secondary wall formation, lignification, and programmed cell death. The regulation of tracheid formation is dependent on both endogenous factors, such as genotype and hormonal signalling, and exogenous factors such as the environment (Fritts, 1976; Plomion et al., 2001; Rossi et al., 2006; Vaganov et al., 2006). The phenology and intra-annual dynamics of the xylem production and maturation has already been accurately quantified for several species (Rossi et al., 2013; Cuny et al., 2014), but our knowledge of the influence of environmental factors on these processes is fragmentary (Vaganov et al., 2006; Delpierre et al., 2016b).

The importance of air temperature, especially in the onset of xylem growth, has been widely reported. Rossi et al. (2008) observed that the onset of xylogenesis occurred with daily average temperature of 8-9°C. An earlier onset and later ending of cell division cause a longer duration of xylem formation at higher temperatures (Rossi et al., 2011). Also a temperature sum approach has been used for modelling the onset of xylem formation (Seo et al., 2008; Swidrak et al., 2011; Jyske et al., 2014; de Lis et al., 2015).

In addition to air temperature, photoperiod has been reported to affect growth in many species (Partanen et al., 2001; Seo et al., 2011; Cuny et al., 2015), and the cell division rate has been found to decline after summer solstice (Rossi et al., 2006; Cuny et al., 2015). Zhai et al. (2012) found positive correlations between the minimum and mean air and soil temperature and tracheid formation in Jack pine (*Pinus banksiana* L.) stem. Oberhuber et al. (2014) found a negative relationship between vapour pres-

¹Corresponding author, +358 2941 57981, liisa.kulmala@helsinki.fi

²Equal collaboration of the first two authors

43 sure deficit (VPD) and tree ring increment indicating that high VPD and the resulting
44 high evaporative demand reduces turgor pressure in cells, as well as cell division and
45 enlargement. Also in drought-prone areas, water deficits in late spring and summer play
46 a critical role in the onset of xylogenesis and xylem cell production (Kalliokoski et al.,
47 2012; Ren et al., 2015; Oberhuber et al., 2014; Lempereur et al., 2015). The role of dif-
48 ferent environmental factors controlling intra-annual growth dynamics most likely vary
49 depending on growing environment but this is still not clearly understood.

50 Photosynthesis provides material for the growth and wood formation. A positive
51 connection between annual ring width and net ecosystem productivity (NEP) or gross
52 primary production (GPP) has been reported (Ohtsuka et al., 2009; Babst et al., 2014;
53 Gea-Izquierdo et al., 2014; Schiestl-Aalto et al., 2015). On the other hand, Delpierre et al.
54 (2016a) demonstrated that soil water and VPD are more important variables than carbon
55 fluxes in determining weekly rates of wood formation in a temperate Oak. Zweifel et al.
56 (2010) found a close relationship between stem radius changes and monthly and half-
57 hourly NEP and monthly GPP but their study was based on stem radius measurements,
58 which also include the swelling and shrinking of stems due to changes in water balance
59 as well as the growth and regeneration of the phloem.

60 A detailed view on the importance of different environmental factors and photosyn-
61 thetic production may help us perceive the effects of changing climate on secondary
62 growth and the acclimation capacity of trees. The aim of this study is to examine which
63 climatic and ecophysiological factors explain best the intra-annual dynamics of cell pro-
64 duction and maturation in Scots pines (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) in different environments.
65 Thus, we selected six Scots pine stands (three in Finland along a latitudinal gradient and
66 three in France along an altitudinal gradient) from which we have three to four years
67 (depending on the stand) of wood formation monitoring and environmental data, includ-
68 ing measured daily average of temperature, radiation, and precipitation, air humidity as
69 VPD, and modelled soil moisture and GPP. The total number of tracheids at different
70 stages of cell differentiation and the number of mature tracheids (i.e., tracheids that had

71 completed differentiation) were obtained from microcore samplings.

72 We used machine-learning as a tool for modelling the intra-annual tracheid production
73 and maturation dynamics from environmental data. As opposed to traditional statistical
74 analysis, advanced machine learning methods learn quickly and automatically, poten-
75 tially with very large numbers of variables and samples. Similar to traditional statistical
76 analysis, results can help understanding biological mechanisms. In practice, we employed
77 black box models, a tool that offers great flexibility with regard to modelling. Although
78 black box models cannot always be interpreted at the coefficient level - there may in
79 fact be no coefficients, e.g., decision tree and nearest-neighbour methods (Hastie et al.,
80 2001) - the results obtained can be interpreted by way of relative performance evaluation:
81 comparing the performance of the models using different input data. For example, if soil
82 moisture as an input predictor leads to excellent prediction of growth at one site, but poor
83 prediction at another site, it suggests that this particular environmental measurement is
84 more relevant to the trees under the conditions of the first site.

85 2. Materials and Methods

86 2.1. Study Sites

87 The studied Scots pines grew on six sites in Finland and France (Figure 1) where
88 mean annual air temperature ranged from 0.8°C to 10.0°C (Table 1). Finnish sites lay
89 in the boreal zone and French sites in the temperate zone. Sites 1 and 2 are Scots pine
90 monocultures, site 3 a mixture of Scots pine and Norway spruce (*Picea abies* (L.) Karst.)
91 and the French sites (4-6) are mixtures of Scots pine, Norway spruce and silver fir (*Abies*
92 *alba* Mill.). The studied pines in boreal sites were middle-aged whereas the ones in the
93 temperate sites were clearly more aged (Table 1). The sites 1 and 2 are introduced in
94 detail by Hari et al. (1994) and Hari and Kulmala (2005), respectively, and sites 4-6 in
95 Cuny et al. (2015).

96 The air temperature (T), precipitation (P) and air relative humidity (RH) were mea-
97 sured at each site except for Ruotsinkylä (site 3). Solar radiation (I) were measured at

Figure 1: Site map.

98 SMEARI and SMEARII whereas the solar radiation at the French sites was measured
 99 at a nearby meteorological station and used for all the sites. For Ruotsinkylä, T, RH, P
 100 and I were attained from the nearby (5 km) weather station maintained by the Finnish
 101 Meteorological Institute. Special weather events such as drought, heavy winds etc. were
 102 not recorded in the study sites during the measured years.

103 Vapour Pressure Deficit (VPD, Pa) was computed as

$$V = v - RH \frac{v}{100}, \quad (1)$$

104 where RH (%) is relative humidity, and v (Pa) the saturated water pressure,

$$v = e^{77.345 - 7235.42/T - 8.2 \log(T) + 5.7113T/1000} \quad (2)$$

105 where temperature (T) is in Kelvins.

106 2.2. GPP estimates

107 We predicted daily gross primary production (GPP) and soil water content (S) using
 108 an empirical model PRELES (Peltoniemi et al., 2015). The GPP section of the model has
 109 been validated using measurements from seven pine and spruce stands located between
 110 latitudes $44^\circ 27'$ and $67^\circ 22'$ (Mäkelä et al., 2008). In the model, soil water content (S) is

Table 1: Sites, and their mean annual temperature (T, °C), with mean average temperatures from the coldest and the warmest month in parenthesis, precipitation (P, mm/year), mean VPD (kPa) with mean average VPD of the month with highest VPD in parenthesis, altitude (m), latitude (N), mean tree age (years), height (H, m), diameter at 1.3 m (D, cm), number of stems (N, ha⁻¹), and data range. The first three sites are in Finland, and the other three sites are in France.

	name	T (min:max)	P	VPD	alt.	lat.	age	H	D	N	data range
1	SMEARI	0.8 (-11:12)	580	0.16 (0.44)	390	67°5	90	9	14	770	2007-2009
2	SMEARII	4.3 (-8:17)	590	0.31 (0.75)	181	61°9	46	16	18	755	2007-2010
3	Ruotsinkylä	5.9 (-9:19)	703	0.28 (0.74)	60	60°2	38	18	18	1002	2007-2010
4	Grandfontaine	8.6 (1:16)	1520	0.24 (0.45)	650	48°6	119	27	53	431	2007-2009
5	Abreschviller	9.2 (1:17)	1190	0.22 (0.39)	430	48°6	162	36	33	253	2007-2009
6	Walscheid	10 (1:19)	900	0.36 (0.68)	370	48°5	95	31	52	189	2007-2010

111 calculated using a bucket model using precipitation as an inflow and evapotranspiration
112 and runoff as outflows. We simplified the calculation of evapotranspiration (E) as follows:

$$E = \beta_E G \frac{V}{V^{\kappa_E}} + \alpha_E (1 - f_{APAR}) PAR f_{W,E}, \quad (3)$$

113 where G is GPP, V is VPD, PAR is the daily sum of photosynthetic photon flux density,
114 β_E , κ_E , α_E , and f_{APAR} parameters and $f_{W,E}$ a soil water modifier as in Peltoniemi et al.
115 (2015). The chosen soil water model is parametrized at site 2 leading there to similar
116 results with the original model but with less complexity.

117 Briefly, PRELES predicts the GPP as a product of 1) potential daily light use ef-
118 ficiency (LUE), 2) fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation (f_{APAR}) de-
119 scribing the photosynthesising leaf area, 3) photosynthetically active radiation (PAR),
120 and 4) modifying factors that in suitable conditions result in 1 and in unsuitable con-
121 ditions to less than one decreasing the potential GPP. The modifying factors are four
122 independent functions with PAR, temperature history, VPD and relative extractable soil
123 water (REW) as determinants. We used the same model parameters for each site (Ta-
124 ble A.7) using the values that Peltoniemi et al. (2015) have estimated and tested for
125 SMEARII (site 2). The leaf area increases in early season and decreases in late season
126 but we treated it as a constant since the changes in it are partly reflected in the factor of
127 temperature history. The acceptable performance against empirical data (Mäkelä et al.,

2008) allows such simplification to decrease the complexity of the model. Since we are not interested in the overall level of GPP in the stand but the interannual variation in the studied Scots pines, we did not include the exact stand characteristics in the model (e.g. maximum LAI). Thus, we treated GPP as a relative value describing the daily photosynthesis of Scots pines during a growing season inside a stand.

2.3. Sample Collection and Preprocessing

Xylem formation in stems was monitored by repeatedly collecting microcores at a height of 1.3 m. They were collected from each site from four to five randomly selected dominant trees once or twice a week in spring and early summer, and once a week in late summer and autumn. The first samples were taken between early April and mid-May and the sampling continued to mid-September in Finland and to late November in France. From the images taken of the current-year ring samples, the number and diameters of tracheids in different tracheid formation phases were measured along one representative tracheid row. The details of the sampling and the laboratory analyses are described by Kallioikoski et al. (2012), Jyske et al. (2014) and Cuny et al. (2012, 2014). In order to study the rate of differentiating tracheid production (RDTP) and the rate of mature cell production (RMTP), we recorded both the total number of tracheids (i.e., the sum of tracheids in all formation phases) and the mature tracheids (i.e., tracheids which have completed the cell formation and entered the mature stage).

Noise is unavoidable in this kind of data, and we took a number of steps to produce reasonable rates for RDTP and RMTP from the measurements. The procedure is exemplified in Figure 2. As a first step, we considered a time scale of weeks, rather than days; averaging by week provides at least one measurement for most weeks during the growing season. We considered week $t = 1$ of the year as the first to seventh day inclusive, and so on. In the cases where measurements for more than one tree were available, we used the average number of cells of all trees for each week, since we were interested in the relative differences in the rates among particular sites rather than individual trees. We assume zero new tracheids on all weeks prior to the first measurement and posterior to

Table 2: Sites and the number of missing values which are smoothed over. All site-years not appearing had complete data time series.

	Site	Year (Num. Missing)
1	SMEARI	2008(1), 2009(6)
2	SMEARII	2007(11)
4	Grandfontaine	2007(5), 2008(4), 2009(6)
5	Abreschviller	2007(9), 2008(1), 2009(1)
6	Walscheid	2007(9), 2008(1), 2009(5)

Table 3: Summary of notation. $\mathbf{x}_t$ and y_t can be considered general inputs and output, respectively.

variable	range	symbol
t	$\in \{1, \dots, 52\}$	time index (week number)
$\mathbf{x}_t = [x_1, \dots, x_p]$	$\in \mathbb{R}^p$	data input for week t , of p variables
y_t	$\in \mathbb{R}$	growth at week t (number of cells)
$\hat{y}_t$	$\in \mathbb{R}$	estimated growth given input, with black box model
$T(t)$	$\in \mathbb{R}$	avg. air temperature week t

the last measurement of each year (i.e., outside of the growing season). For all other weeks (i.e., during the growing season), we plugged in a value from a linear fit between the surrounding values. For example, if $\tilde{y}_t$ is the average number of measured tracheids at week t , and we have $\tilde{y}_{23} = 12$ and $\tilde{y}_{26} = 18$ but weeks 24 and 25 are missing, then we plugged in values $\tilde{y}_{24} = 14$ and $\tilde{y}_{25} = 16$. The number of values affected by this operation is signaled in Table 2. We smoothed these measurements with a weighted average,

$$\bar{y}_t \leftarrow 0.05\tilde{y}_{t-2} + 0.25\tilde{y}_{t-1} + 0.40\tilde{y}_t + 0.25\tilde{y}_{t+1} + 0.05\tilde{y}_{t+2} \quad (4)$$

and furthermore capped this value such that $\bar{y}_t \leftarrow \max(\bar{y}_t, \bar{y}_{t-1})$. This ensured that RDTP and RMTP are never negative. Since we already smoothed (averaged) by week as an initial step, more advanced smoothing was not needed.

In the final step, we converted the running cumulative sum of total number of cells and the number of mature cells into a rate (of new tracheids/week); as we were primarily interested in modelling the week-to-week rate of tracheid production, indicated henceforth as y_t .

Figure 2: Example of preprocessing: for SMEARI in the year 2007. Raw tracheid-counts (total) have been averaged by week, smoothed, capped to prevent negative growth, and then a differential is taken to represent week-by-week growth (RDTP).

2.4. Black Box Models

A black box refers to a data driven model where inputs and outputs are the focus, as opposed to the internal mechanism. Thus, the mechanism of mapping inputs to outputs is not designed by domain knowledge, but rather constructed automatically from data. The chosen algorithm is of a lesser importance than its predictive performance, and the focus is on interpreting relative results.

Instances of explanatory variables (i.e., inputs), each associated with a target variable (i.e., output), are used as training data to build a model. In our case, input attributes were environmental data and the week number, and the target variable was the rate of tracheid production/maturation (RDTP/RMTP) for a given week; See Table 3. These instances were fed into an off-the-shelf learner along with the target variable, and a model was built. With this model, the target RDTP and RMTP (output) for any particular week can be estimated automatically from environmental records on and prior to this week (input).

183 After an empirical trial of some popular learning algorithms, we chose ridge regres-
 184 sion (Hastie et al., 2001) to use as a black box. This kind of model extends ordinary
 185 least squares regression with a penalty regularization term on the coefficients to avoid
 186 overfitting (i.e., avoid excessively large coefficients), such that the error function for MSE
 187 to be minimized is

$$E(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{t=1}^{52} (\boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \mathbf{x}_t - y_t)^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{t=1}^{52} (\hat{y}_t - y_t)^2 + \frac{1}{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \quad (6)$$

188 where $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the vector of coefficients, and λ is a parameter on the penalty, that is automat-
 189 ically tuned via internal cross validation. Essentially, it is MSE plus a penalty term. We
 190 used the Python programming language, and in particular the scikit learn package³ for
 191 the ridge regression implementation. Although we found that ridge regression provided
 192 good results on our data, any predictive regression model can be used (e.g., ordinary
 193 linear regression, decision tree regressors, k -nearest neighbours).

194 2.5. Variables for the Black Box

195 Given an algorithm, and a chosen output variable (RDTP and RMTP in our case)
 196 the remaining task is the configuration of input, i.e., choosing and/or creating transfor-
 197 mations of explanatory variables. From a knowledge-blind point of view, all predictive
 198 power will come from some time horizon of the input (environmental measurements) up
 199 to the current week t ; as well as the week number t . In other words, the week number
 200 t , and a time horizon of environmental measurements is provided to the black box, to
 201 output an estimate at week t .

202 Regarding the length of time horizon, we conducted a pilot study on the effect of
 203 different horizons on predictive accuracy based on models of multiple environmental

³<http://scikit-learn.org>

Figure 3: Figure 3a represents a simple linear model in graphical form, and Figure 3b shows the general concept of an inner layer to provide non-linearity. This layer ($z_1, \dots, z_4$) can either be viewed as part of a (non-linear) black box, or as a different configuration of the input to a (linear) black box.

measurements, and found that in general, accuracy improved for most sites up until including about 10 weeks of environmental history. For other sites (whose model did not benefit from such a long horizon) the longer time horizon still did no harm, since an appropriately regularized black box model (as ridge regression that we chose) learns coefficients close (or at) zero for the variables corresponding to the oldest weeks. Therefore we used a time horizon of 10 weeks for all models. In practice this means that the model makes an estimation of growth (in number of tracheids) at the current week, as a function of environmental measurements at the present week *and* all measurements of the prior 10 weeks.

A *linear* model of input is often insufficient for most predictive variables. For example, the week number t correlates to low/zero RDTP/RMTP for both low values (beginning of the year) and high values (end of the year). Similarly, although basic temperature variables such as the *sum* and *average* can be modeled by a simple linear combination of variables, the relationship of temperature to tracheid formation is in practice non-linear. A well-known way to allow non-linearity in statistical models is via basis functions, for example a polynomial transformation Hastie et al. (2001).

The basis functions can be viewed as an inner layer that provides non-linear predictive power (Figure 3). This strategy is used by a plethora of approaches including neural networks and latent variable models (Hastie et al., 2001).

223 As well as automatic/blind variable transforms, we looked at two expert functions.
 224 First, as a short term response to environmental drivers, we used

$$D(T(t); c) = 1_{T(t) > c} \left[\frac{1}{1 + \exp(-0.1T(t))} \right] \quad (7)$$

225 as inspired by Schiestl-Aalto et al. (2015), except that we did not sum cumulatively. Es-
 226 sentially this function acts as switch which yields zero whenever the average temperature
 227 is at or below a threshold $c^\circ C$, and otherwise returns a value between 0 and 1 representing
 228 the weekly temperature (closer to 1 represents higher temperature, Figure 4). We set pa-
 229 rameters $c = \{0, 5, 10\}$, i.e., we include three variables, $D(T(t); 0)$, $D(T(t); 5)$, $D(T(t); 10)$,
 230 in the same model. Unlike Schiestl-Aalto et al. (2015) we average by week (rather than
 231 by day) and consider the tracheid production/maturation *rate* rather than cumulative
 232 number. Note that $D = 0$ corresponds to zero *change* in a cumulative temperature sum.
 233 Including D over a time horizon in the model (as we did) offers approximate predictive
 234 power to a cumulative sum inside D itself (depending on the length of the time horizon).

235 Secondly, we used a timing variable also inspired from (Schiestl-Aalto et al., 2015):

$$O(t; t_o, o, T(\dots, t)) = \max \left(0, 4 \frac{[o\sqrt{t'} - t']}{o^2} \right) \quad (8)$$

$$t' = \max(0, t - t_o, t - \min_t(T(t) > 0)) \quad (9)$$

236 where t' begins counting at week number t_o unless the temperature is still below zero,
 237 in which case it begins on the first week of average temperature above $0^\circ C$. In other
 238 words: the signal of this function begins (raises above 0) at the first instance when the
 239 week number is at least t_o and temperature is above 0. It also yields a value $O \in$
 240 $[0, 1]$ increasing sharply at first and decreasing gradually after that (Figure 4). There is
 241 empirical evidence suggesting that trees in the cold northern Finland start to grow at
 242 lower temperatures (Jyske et al., 2014). Therefore, to attain a reasonable fit, we set $o =$
 243 $\{4.5, 5.0\}$ for Finnish sites and $o = \{5.0, 6.0\}$ for French sites; and $t_o = \{11, 12, 13, 14\}$.

Figure 4: Illustrations of the shapes of short-term response to temperature (D) and growth timing with (O). The horizontal axis is time (in weeks). Note that for purposes of illustration we have chosen the temperature data from Site 1 (SMEARI) during 2007.

244 In other words, we included a total of eight O variables per model.

245 Therefore, rather than manual calibration of a single function, we used several differ-
 246 ent calibrations which the black box automatically calibrates with additional parameters
 247 (e.g., coefficients). Therefore in-depth domain knowledge is not required and the model
 248 is still heavily data driven, even though in this particular case, the functions we used
 249 were derived from experts. This could be called a ‘grey box’.

250 Lupi et al. (2010) show that the timing of cell maturation (hence possibly the rate of
 251 mature tracheid production) is dependent on the number of tracheids produced earlier in
 252 the season. Including the measured number of tracheids early in the season in the model
 253 detracts from the applicability of a model, since it requires measurements in order to run
 254 the model. Instead, we also consider as a variable the *predicted* number of tracheids over
 255 the time horizon as an additional variable for predicting the number of mature tracheids
 256 (denoted P).

257 An overview of variables used in the model is given in Figure 5. In the results we
 258 experiment with different combinations of variables, for example $(D.O.G)^5$ means that
 259 we used D and O and G variables, via polynomial transformation of degree 5.

Figure 5: Model variables. Shaded nodes represent environmental measurements (temperature T , relative humidity RH , and solar radiation I) and the week number (t). Nodes with a dashed outline were used only indirectly. Second-level nodes represent higher-level variables (V =VPD, G =GPP, S =soil moisture, the growth-timing variable O , and the short term response to environmental drivers D). The direction of arrows represent flow of information, e.g., the week number and mean weekly temperature were used in the calculation of growth timing factor O . For brevity, we excluded nodes and connections used in the estimation of the soil moisture variable, the polynomial transformations, and the growth-prediction variable used only for prediction of mature tracheids (P).

2.6. Evaluation

As we built models separately for each site, we also evaluated them on a per-site basis, in order to compare and contrast the predictive power of different inputs in different temperature environments. For a given site, and a given year, we scored a model with the *mean squared error* (MSE).

We built the models on data from all available years (52 data points per year) except the final year, which we held aside for testing the model. We repeated this procedure but instead holding aside the penultimate year, and then again for the ante-penultimate year of measurements for evaluation. The results of the three years were then averaged together. This procedure is similar to hold-one-out cross validation (except that the number of years varies per site).

2.7. Interpretation: Opening the Black Box

The large number of variables created in the black box corresponds to an equally large number of coefficients in the regression model that we used, and makes it difficult to analyze the model. For the purpose of interpretation, we additionally run the models with decision-tree regressors. These are powerful non-linear models, that are relatively easy to interpret (Hastie et al., 2001). On account of the inherent non-linearity, there was no need for basis transformations, which reduces the number of variables. Furthermore,

in this case since the intention is for interpretation rather than accuracy evaluation, we trained the models on all available data for each site. In each case, we selected the best set of predictors (as determined by the standard black-box evaluation) for the model, with a minimum of 10 samples per leaf and a maximum depth of 5, to enforce a parsimonious (more easily interpretable) model.

The decision-tree models can be interpreted as follows. First note that for clarity and simplicity we have simply denoted the six different parameterizations of the growth-timing function as $a, \dots, f$ (refer to Eq. (8) for the full form). For example, $O(a)[-3]$ in Figure A.8a is short-form for $O(t-3; 5, 11, T(\dots, t-3))$. If this function produces a value greater than 0.85, and (passing then to the right branch) the value of $D(T(t-9); 0)$ is not more than 0.57 (branching to the left), then growth at the current week t is projected to be 2.46 cells. The value 2.46 was average growth of the 11 different weeks that met this criterion over all three years of data. When building the model, each criterion is chosen greedily based on the MSE. An MSE values in the diagrams refer to the error under each particular criteria. Exactly as in Table A.6, this MSE value may be generally higher for some sites, such as Site 3 Ruotsinkylä. Finally, note that we have de-standardized data for interpretation, thus $T[-1] \leq 10.06$ (for example, Figure A.9a) actually refers to the temperature one week ago not being more than 10.06°C (therefore, it makes sense that for this site, growth should be coming to a stop, and hence the left side showing lower values).

3. Results

3.1. The Rate of Differentiating Tracheid Production (RDTP)

The *timing of growth* variable (O , Eq. (8)) showed in general the lowest MSE values and had the best average rank explaining the rate of new tracheid production (RDTP, Table 4a) when all available variables were tested as input separately. However, it was the best factor only at the two warmest sites while elsewhere mainly air temperature as

304 a polynomial function or as a growth-response variable (D , Eq. (7)) was the best single
305 predictor for RDTP.

306 When different variables were combined to predict RDTP, the combination of week
307 number and temperature resulted in the best average rank (Table 5a). However, O
308 alone resulted in lower MSE value (Table A.6a,c) than any of the combinations at the
309 two warmest sites (5,6) where it mostly succeeded to predict the onset and cessation of
310 RDTP but failed to predict the observed dynamics in-between with satisfactory manner
311 (Figure 6e,f).

312 At the sites 3 and 4, the lowest MSE values resulted from models including either
313 temperature as the only variable or combined with the week number (t) (Table 5a,
314 Table A.6a,c). However, the inclusion of t lowered MSE value only a little in site 3
315 (Table A.6) and it was pruned from the most topmost variables in the decision-tree
316 (Figure A.8c, Figure A.9a) indicating that at these sites (3,4), the observed changes in
317 RDTP were mainly connected to the changes in air temperature. The models with lowest
318 MSE values for these sites succeeded to predict some of the intra-annual dynamics of
319 RDTP (Figure 6c,d). The decision tree analysis revealed that with high temperatures
320 (i.e., in the middle of the growing season), current temperature was the most important
321 variable but also temperatures from 9-10 weeks earlier were important for estimation
322 (Figure A.8c, Figure A.9a).

323 The best RDTP models at the coldest sites (1,2) included O and GPP (Table 5a).
324 For site 2, the decision tree models revealed that with small O values current GPP
325 mattered whereas GPP earlier in the season seemed to be important with higher O
326 values (Figure A.8b). In addition to O and GPP, temperature in the form of D and
327 VPD were included in the best model for the coldest site (1). The decision tree model
328 showed that O was again the most important variable while the timing of most important
329 temperatures (as D) occurred 8-9 weeks earlier the actual growth. GPP and VPD were
330 pruned away, indicating their lesser importance (Figure A.8a).

3.2. The Rate of Mature Tracheid Production (RMTP)

Overall, the expert *timing of growth* variable (O , Eq. (8)) was the best single variable to predict RMTP even it was not the best one at any of the sites (Table 4b). The week number was the best single variable at the two warmest sites (5,6). In the chilliest site (1), D was the best single variable. GPP was the best predictor for the chilliest French and warmest Finnish sites (sites 2-4).

The combination of O and GPP resulted in the best average rank when predicting RMTP (Table 5b). However, week number (t) alone at the warmest site 6 and D at the chilliest site 1 showed the lowest MSE values for RMTP (Table A.6b,d) but the model fits were poor (Figure A.7a,f). At all other sites, GPP was included in the best models to predict RMTP. In addition, the inclusion of O and T at site 5, T at site 4, and O at site 2 improved the model performance (Table 5b, Table A.6d). In general, the model fits for RMTP (Figure A.7) were poorer as for RDTP (Figure 6). Inclusion of the predicted number of cells did not result to lower MSE values at any site even it resulted into a high rank at sites 3 and 4 (Table 5b).

The detailed view on model behaviour at site 2 illustrated that with low O values, previous GPP mattered whereas with higher O values, the important GPP risen from four weeks earlier (Figure A.10b). At the site 4, GPP was most important but if it had been high, then also T was involved (Figure A.11a). At site 5, GPP was most important in small O values whereas in high O , temperature was more important than GPP. The decision tree analysis revealed that overall, the most important O values have occurred already 4-10 weeks earlier in the sites where it was included in the best models.

4. Discussion

We applied fundamental computational methods for gaining new insights into relationships between intra-annual dynamics of tree growth and environment. We built black box models on several years of environmental measurements associated with rates of tracheid production and maturation in Scots pine stems, for six sites spread along an

Table 4: Results with individual variables: week of the year (t), air temperature (T), soil moisture (S), VPD (V), GPP (G) and the expert variables of environmental drivers D , and growth timing O . A superscript indicates the degree of polynomial on the variable, e.g., $(T)^5$ implies that variables $T, T^2, \dots, T^5$ were used. The per-site ranking of each of the seven black box models is shown with respect to the other models (only the top 3 rankings are displayed for clarity). This ranking is based on an average error over three years (Table A.6).

(a) Ranks – Rate of tracheid production (RDTP)							
Dataset	$(t)^5$	$(T)^5$	$(S)^5$	$(V)^5$	$(G)^5$	D	O
SMEARI					2	1	3
SMEARII	1	3					2
Ruotsinkylä	2	1					3
Grandfontaine		1				2	3
Abreschviller	2	3					1
Walscheid	2	3					1
avg rank	2.67	2.50	7.00	5.83	4.33	3.50	2.17

(b) Ranks – Rate of mature tracheid production (RMTP)							
Dataset	$(t)^5$	$(T)^5$	$(S)^5$	$(V)^5$	$(G)^5$	D	O
SMEARI		3				1	2
SMEARII					1	2	3
Ruotsinkylä	2				1		3
Grandfontaine					1	2	3
Abreschviller	1	3					2
Walscheid	1				3		2
avg rank	2.67	4.50	6.50	5.67	3.00	3.17	2.50

Figure 6: Measured (y) and estimated ($\hat{y}_t$) total new tracheids formed per week (vertical axis) of the black box model for all years tested. The variables of the model were those which obtained the top rank in Table 5 (each site modeled separately).

Table 5: Results with combinations of variables, calculated and displayed similarly to Table 4. Note that predicted number of tracheids P is only used as a variable for number of mature tracheids (in $(P.T.G)^5$, 5b); in 5a we instead include the $(D.O.G.)^5$ variable set.

(a) Ranks – Rate of tracheid production (RDTP)						
Dataset	$(T.t)^5$	$(T.G)^5$	$(D.O.G.V)^5$	$(O.G)^5$	$(O.T.G)^5$	$(D.O.G)^5$
SMEARI		2	1			3
SMEARII	3			1		2
Ruotsinkylä	1			3		2
Grandfontaine	1	3	2			
Abreschviller	3			2		1
Walscheid	1		3			2
avg rank	2.33	4.67	3.67	3.67	4.33	2.33

(b) Ranks – Rate of mature tracheid production (RMTP)						
Dataset	$(T.t)^5$	$(T.G)^5$	$(D.O.G.V)^5$	$(O.G)^5$	$(O.T.G)^5$	$(P.T.G)^5$
SMEARI	1	2				3
SMEARII		3		1	2	
Ruotsinkylä		3		1		2
Grandfontaine		1	3			2
Abreschviller			2	3	1	
Walscheid			2	1	3	
avg rank	4.83	3.00	3.50	2.50	3.50	3.67

altitude gradient in France and along a latitude gradient in Finland. Given environmental data over a time horizon of 10 weeks, the models were able to estimate the weekly rate of tracheid production to within a fraction of a tracheid on average.

A prominent result related to models including the week number, either as such or embedded in the timing of growth variable O , indicate that tracheid production and maturation had a regular pattern in all environments, especially in warm sites. Day length follows the week number but the light hours are not totally responsible for the beginning and cessation of growth demonstrated by the applicability of variable O , which in general resulted to better performance than solely week number. In this variable, the timing was triggered by the week number but tracheid production activated earlier (or later) if the spring temperature increased early (or late) following thereafter a regular pattern. Regarding the connection between week number and daylight hours, it may be worth noting that day length varies most greatly in the northern sites, and that the northernmost site has constant daylight (24 hours) for several weeks around the summer

372 solstice.

373 The high predictive power of the timing of growth (*O*) stresses the weather-independent
374 part of new tracheid production even at the most temperature limited site of this study
375 where mean annual temperature is barely over 0°C . This supports the developmental
376 control of xylogenesis (Cuny and Rathgeber, 2016) and the significance of photoperiod as
377 a driver also there. Seo et al. (2011) studied Scots pine stands in northern Finland and
378 found that 2/3 of radial growth took place within four weeks of midsummer regardless
379 of the beginning of the growing season, probably because cambial activity needs to end
380 early for the produced tracheids to mature during favorable weather. Also at the warm
381 environment, the maximum rate of tracheid production is reported occurring around the
382 time of maximum day length and not during the warmest period (Rossi et al., 2006;
383 Cuny et al., 2012).

384 The extended period of tracheid formation in warm climates seen in this study is
385 widely known and reported also by other studies. The earlier onset of new tracheid
386 formation increases the number of tracheids and the maturation of tracheids ends later
387 (Lupi et al., 2010; Rossi et al., 2011). The important role of temperature to determine the
388 rate of tracheid production at several sites in this study (sites 1, 3 and 4) stress the role
389 of air temperature as a regulator for the timing of wood formation and therefore support
390 the earlier findings (Swidrak et al., 2011; Zhai et al., 2012; Jyske et al., 2014). The
391 allocation of assimilated carbon during tracheid production and differentiation requires
392 daily minimum temperatures above 5°C (Rossi et al., 2008; Körner, 2015) and possibly
393 explains the strong temperature dependency of the production of mature tracheids at
394 the northernmost site.

395 Carbohydrates are needed to supply energy for cell division, to generate turgor pres-
396 sure during cell expansion and to produce polysaccharides during cell-wall formation
397 (Muller et al., 2011). GPP was included in the best combinations predicting the rate of
398 tracheid production at the two northernmost sites. In addition, it was the best predictor
399 alone or it was included in a combination for the production of mature tracheids at all

400 sites where the model prediction was acceptable (sites 2-4, Table 4b). This is in line
 401 with Chan et al. (2015) who showed that recently photosynthesized carbon correlates
 402 even with daily growth in southern Finland. Also Schiestl-Aalto et al. (2015) found that
 403 GPP accelerates the sink activity, i.e., tracheid formation. Zweifel et al. (2010) found a
 404 close relationship between stem radius changes and monthly GPP but the relationship
 405 was even stronger with net ecosystem production (NEP). Simultaneous photosynthetic
 406 production seemed not to limit or accelerate the rate of mature tracheid production in
 407 very warm or cold areas of Scots pines but since the model performance was poor in
 408 these sites, the drivers for the maturation can not be stated. Nevertheless, GPP is not
 409 necessarily limiting growth at temperate sites (Delpierre et al., 2016a). In addition, the
 410 model for GPP was parameterized in Southern Finland and it might be less accurate
 411 in very cold or warm environments. It must be also taken into consideration that the
 412 GPP model was a simplification without e.g., a module for the interannual changes in
 413 leaf area, a factor that differs especially between the Northern and the Southern sites of
 414 this study. Also the simplified model for soil water dynamics is insufficiently evaluated
 415 for different sites but during the study years, the sites did notably not suffer from soil
 416 water deficit as suggested also by the model. Low soil moisture most probably influences
 417 the inter-annual dynamics of tracheid production and maturation but such conditions
 418 did not occur during these study years.

419 Low tree water status causes reduction in the turgor, enlargement, and division of
 420 tracheids, and correspondingly a reduction in diameter increment (Eilmann et al., 2011;
 421 Oberhuber et al., 2014). Even if the sites of this study did not suffer from low soil mois-
 422 ture, the northernmost site surprisingly indicated sensitivity to air humidity as VPD was
 423 included in the best combination of variables to model the tracheid production (Table 1).
 424 It was also relatively competitive even as a single variable. The reason for this remains
 425 unknown but possibly the trees there have not prioritized the investments in water trans-
 426 port system that is weaker for evaporative demand than the trees in warmer boreal and
 427 temperate environments. This indicates that even if there is water available, the trees

fail to transport enough water from soil causing a decrease in tree water potential, turgor pressure and optimal rate of tracheid production as found also in temperate trees (Delpierre et al., 2016a). Nevertheless, the studied trees at the different sites varied a little in size and age and thus they have differences for example, in their water storage capacity that might influence further their environmental responses.

It is perhaps worth remarking that the week number corresponds not only directly to day length, but also indirectly to all other variables. Mathematically, temperature can be viewed as a function of the week number: $T(t) = f(t) + \epsilon(t)$ where $f(t)$ is the expected (average) temperature at week t and $\epsilon(t)$ is some quantity reflecting the variation from that expected value. Measuring temperature directly ‘adjusts’ the function by precision $\epsilon(t)$, but the underlying relationship between week number and temperature ($f(t)$) remains and can be inferred by our data-driven model even without current temperature measurements. All other environmental predictors are similarly related to t . This helps explain why appropriate functions of the week number (such as the polynomials and the growth timing function, Eq. (8)) were such powerful predictors. On the other hand, since the decision-tree model (Figure A.8c) ignored t , this indicates that temperature still plays a dominant role.

We selected ridge regression as the underlying black box model because it performed best overall in terms of MSE in our initial empirical trials. However, to obtain this performance it was essential to include the polynomial basis functions to obtain a non-linear decision boundary. The relative benefits of using decision tree models are the inherent non-linearity, leading to fewer variables, and overall they offer some additional interpretation of the underlying process. Both methods have been a staple of the machine learning community for some years.

The idea of trying more complex models is tempting. However, the target attribute (rates of tracheid production and maturation, measured by microcoring) is noisy. This is certainly the main limitation in obtaining any further explanatory power from the model. More frequent measurements over several years could help to improve the model’s

456 performance and thus give reliable view on the important variables. However, microcores
457 are always taken from a slightly different spot, and the stem is not regular, and therefore
458 it is not possible to eliminate noise completely. A general disadvantage of the black box
459 model is that it requires significant investment in data gathering, and its performance
460 is heavily dependent on both the quality and quantity of data, and the year-to-year
461 variability of a particular site. On the other hand, decision trees models are unstable
462 in the sense that quite different models can be created for relatively small variations in
463 the training data. In particular, obtaining microcore data is labour intensive. With an
464 increasing amount of data available, that disadvantage is being gradually mitigated.

465 The actual response functions of the main variables, i.e., their exact effect on tracheid
466 production and maturation, is difficult to isolate from the black box models, but the deci-
467 sion tree analysis revealed some of the important periods at each study site. Nevertheless,
468 the detailed understanding on the time horizons, significant periods and causal effect of
469 the important variables to wood formation requires further ecophysiological studies in
470 the framework of the whole tree water and carbon balance but the current study assists
471 to utilize the main environmental drivers.

472 5. Conclusions

473 Our novel application of machine learning tools to analyze tracheid production showed
474 that the most important environmental factors affecting the intra-annual dynamics of
475 differentiating and mature tracheid production in Scots pine stems vary under different
476 climates. The formation of new tracheids was partly weather-independent, especially
477 at the warm temperate environments, but GPP 0-10 week earlier played a role in the
478 coolest boreal sites. In sites where mean temperatures were between these outer bound-
479 aries, current and previous temperature was the most influential environmental factor.
480 GPP and its history was on average the best single predictor for the rate of mature
481 tracheid production and it was included as a predictor in the most accurate models. Our
482 findings identifying the most important variables for growth can be used in building up

483 detailed physiological theories on the production and maturation of Scots pine tracheids
484 in different climates.

485 Acknowledgements

486 This study was supported by the Academy of Finland (257641, 277623), the Academy
487 of Finland Finnish Centre of Excellence Program (272041) and COST action FP1106.
488 We also thank Annikki Mäkelä for the help in GPP modelling.

489 References

- 490 Babst, F., Bouriaud, O., Papale, D., Gielen, B., Janssens, I.A., Nikinmaa, E., Ibrom, A., Wu, J.,
491 Bernhofer, C., Koestner, B., Gruenwald, T., Seufert, G., Ciais, P., Frank, D., 2014. Above-ground
492 woody carbon sequestration measured from tree rings is coherent with net ecosystem productivity at
493 five eddy-covariance sites. *New Phytologist* 201, 1289–1303. PT: J; TC: 7; UT: WOS:000338510200024.
- 494 Chan, T., Hölttä, T., Berninger, F., Mäkinen, H., Nöjd, P., Mencuccini, M., Nikinmaa, E., 2015. Sepa-
495 rating water-potential induced swelling and shrinking from measured radial stem variations reveals a
496 cambial growth and osmotic concentration signal. *Plant, Cell & Environment* , In Press.
- 497 Cuny, H., Rathgeber, C.B., 2016. Xylogenesis: “coniferous trees of temperate forests are listening to
498 the climate tale during the growing season, but only remember the last words!”. *Plant Physiology*
499 doi:{10.1104/pp.16.00037}.
- 500 Cuny, H.E., Rathgeber, C.B.K., Frank, D., Fonti, P., Fournier, M., 2014. Kinetics of tracheid develop-
501 ment explain conifer tree-ring structure. *NEW PHYTOLOGIST* 203, 1231–1241. doi:{10.1111/nph.
502 12871}.
- 503 Cuny, H.E., Rathgeber, C.B.K., Frank, D., Fonti, P., Makinen, H., Prislan, P., Rossi, S., del Castillo,
504 E.M., Campelo, F., Vavrcik, H., Camarero, J.J., Bryukhanova, M.V., Jyske, T., Gricar, J., Gryc, V.,
505 Luis, M.D., Vieira, J., Cufar, K., Kirdyanov, A.V., Oberhuber, W., Treml, V., Huang, J.G., Li, X.,
506 Swidrak, I., Deslauriers, A., Liang, E., Nojd, P., Gruber, A., Nabais, C., Morin, H., Krause, C., King,
507 G., Fournier, M., 2015. Woody biomass production lags stem-girth increase by over one month in
508 coniferous forests. *Nature Plants* 1, 15160. PT: J; TC: 1; UT: WOS:000364417300001.
- 509 Cuny, H.E., Rathgeber, C.B.K., Lebourgeois, F., Fortin, M., Fournier, M., 2012. Life strategies in
510 intra-annual dynamics of wood formation: example of three conifer species in a temperate forest in
511 north-east France. *TREE PHYSIOLOGY* 32, 612–625. doi:{10.1093/treephys/tps039}.
- 512 Delpierre, N., Berveiller, D., Granda, E., Dufrêne, E., 2016a. Wood phenology, not carbon input, controls
513 the interannual variability of wood growth in a temperate oak forest. *New Phytologist* 210, 459–470.

514 Delpierre, N., Vitasse, Y., Chuine, I., Guillemot, J., Bazot, S., Rutishauser, T., Rathgeber, C.B.K.,
 515 2016b. Temperate and boreal forest tree phenology: from organ-scale processes to terrestrial ecosystem
 516 models. *Annals of Forest Science* 73, 5–25. PT: J; TC: 3; UT: WOS:000370753300002.
 517 Eilmann, B., Zweifel, R., Buchmann, N., Pannatier, E.G., Rigling, A., 2011. Drought alters timing,
 518 quantity, and quality of wood formation in scots pine. *Journal of experimental botany* 62, 2763–2771.
 519 PT: J; TC: 45; UT: WOS:000290813300024.
 520 Fritts, H.C., 1976. *Tree Rings and Climate*. Academic Press, New York.
 521 Gea-Izquierdo, G., Bergeron, Y., Huang, J.G., Lapointe-Garant, M.P., Grace, J., Berninger, F., 2014.
 522 The relationship between productivity and tree-ring growth in boreal coniferous forests. *Boreal En-
 523 vironment Research* 19, 363–378. PT: J; TC: 0; UT: WOS:000345732000003.
 524 Hari, P., Kulmala, M., 2005. Station for measuring ecosystem-atmosphere relations (smear ii). *Boreal
 525 Environment Research* 10, 315–322. PT: J; TC: 231; UT: WOS:000233128500001.
 526 Hari, P., Kulmala, M., Pohja, T., Lahti, T., Siivola, E., Palva, L., Aalto, P., Hämeri, K., Vesala, T.,
 527 Luoma, S., Pulliainen, E., 1994. Air pollution in eastern lapland : challenge for an environmental
 528 measurement station. *Silva Fennica* 28, 29–39.
 529 Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J., 2001. *The Elements of Statistical Learning*. Springer Series in
 530 Statistics, Springer New York Inc., New York, NY, USA.
 531 Jyske, T., Makinen, H., Kalliokoski, T., Nojd, P., 2014. Intra-annual tracheid production of norway
 532 spruce and scots pine across a latitudinal gradient in finland. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
 533 194, 241–254. PT: J; TC: 1; UT: WOS:000339131400022.
 534 Kalliokoski, T., Reza, M., Jyske, T., Makinen, H., Nojd, P., 2012. Intra-annual tracheid formation of
 535 norway spruce provenances in southern finland. *Trees-Structure and Function* 26, 543–555. PT: J;
 536 TC: 3; UT: WOS:000301779200024.
 537 Körner, C., 2015. Paradigm shift in plant growth control. *Current opinion in plant biology* 25, 107–114.
 538 PT: J; TC: 4; UT: WOS:000359889900015.
 539 Lempereur, M., Martin-StPaul, N.K., Damesin, C., Joffre, R., Ourcival, J.M., Rocheteau, A., Rambal, S.,
 540 2015. Growth duration is a better predictor of stem increment than carbon supply in a mediterranean
 541 oak forest: implications for assessing forest productivity under climate change. *New Phytologist* 207,
 542 579–590. PT: J; TC: 2; UT: WOS:000357824400013.
 543 de Lis, G.P., Rossi, S., Vázquez-Ruiz, R.A., Rozas, V., García-González, I., 2015. Do changes in spring
 544 phenology affect earlywood vessels? perspective from the xylogenesis monitoring of two sympatric
 545 ring-porous oaks. *New Phytologist* , n/a–n/a.
 546 Lupi, C., Morin, H., Deslauriers, A., Rossi, S., 2010. Xylem phenology and wood production: resolv-
 547 ing the chicken-or-egg dilemma. *Plant Cell and Environment* 33, 1721–1730. PT: J; TC: 50; UT:
 548 WOS:000281638000010.

549 Mäkelä, A., Pulkkinen, M., Kolari, P., Lagergren, F., Berbigier, P., Lindroth, A., Loustau, D., Nikinmaa,
 550 E., Vesala, T., Hari, P., 2008. Developing an empirical model of stand gpp with the lue approach:
 551 analysis of eddy covariance data at five contrasting conifer sites in europe. *Global Change Biology*
 552 14, 92–108. PT: J; TC: 49; UT: WOS:000251415000008.

553 Muller, B., Pantin, F., Genard, M., Turc, O., Freixes, S., Piques, M., Gibon, Y., 2011. Water deficits
 554 uncouple growth from photosynthesis, increase c content, and modify the relationships between c
 555 and growth in sink organs. *Journal of experimental botany* 62, 1715–1729. PT: J; TC: 109; UT:
 556 WOS:000288553000002.

557 Oberhuber, W., Gruber, A., Kofler, W., Swidrak, I., 2014. Radial stem growth in response to microcli-
 558 mate and soil moisture in a drought-prone mixed coniferous forest at an inner alpine site. *European*
 559 *Journal of Forest Research* 133, 467–479. PT: J; TC: 0; UT: WOS:000333425500006.

560 Ohtsuka, T., Saigusa, N., Koizumi, H., 2009. On linking multiyear biometric measurements of tree
 561 growth with eddy covariance-based net ecosystem production. *Global Change Biology* 15, 1015–1024.
 562 PT: J; UT: WOS:000263752300019.

563 Partanen, J., Leinonen, I., Repo, T., 2001. Effect of accumulated duration of the light period on
 564 bud burst in norway spruce (*picea abies*) of varying ages. *Silva Fennica* 35, 111–117. PT: J; UT:
 565 WOS:000167986300010.

566 Peltoniemi, M., Markkanen, T., Harkonen, S., Muukkonen, P., Thum, T., Aalto, T., Makela, A., 2015.
 567 Consistent estimates of gross primary production of finnish forests - comparison of estimates of two
 568 process models. *Boreal Environment Research* 20, 196–212. PT: J; TC: 4; UT: WOS:000353934400005.

569 Plomion, C., Leprovost, G., Stokes, A., 2001. Wood formation in trees. *Plant Physiology* 127, 1513–1523.
 570 PT: J; TC: 278; UT: WOS:000172824500029.

571 Ren, P., Rossi, S., Gricar, J., Liang, E., Cufar, K., 2015. Is precipitation a trigger for the onset of
 572 xylogenesis in *juniperus przewalskii* on the north-eastern tibetan plateau? *Annals of Botany* 115,
 573 629–639. PT: J; TC: 3; UT: WOS:000354066600007.

574 Rossi, S., Anfodillo, T., Cufar, K., Cuny, H.E., Deslauriers, A., Fonti, P., Frank, D., Gricar, J., Gruber,
 575 A., King, G.M., Krause, C., Morin, H., Oberhuber, W., Prislan, P., Rathgeber, C.B.K., 2013. A
 576 meta-analysis of cambium phenology and growth: linear and non-linear patterns in conifers of the
 577 northern hemisphere. *Annals of Botany* 112, 1911–1920. PT: J; TC: 5; UT: WOS:000327717100021.

578 Rossi, S., Deslauriers, A., Anfodillo, T., Morin, H., Saracino, A., Motta, R., Borghetti, M., 2006. Conifers
 579 in cold environments synchronize maximum growth rate of tree-ring formation with day length. *New*
 580 *Phytologist* 170, 301–310. PT: J; TC: 132; UT: WOS:000236248200012.

581 Rossi, S., Deslauriers, A., Gricar, J., Seo, J.W., Rathgeber, C.B.K., Anfodillo, T., Morin, H., Levanic,
 582 T., Oven, P., Jalkanen, R., 2008. Critical temperatures for xylogenesis in conifers of cold climates.
 583 *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 17, 696–707. PT: J; TC: 110; UT: WOS:000260114200003.

584 Rossi, S., Morin, H., Deslauriers, A., Plourde, P.Y., 2011. Predicting xylem phenology in black spruce un-
585 der climate warming. *Global Change Biology* 17, 614–625. PT: J; TC: 26; UT: WOS:000284851500049.

586 Schiestl-Aalto, P., Kulmala, L., Mäkinen, H., Nikinmaa, E., Mäkelä, A., 2015. Cassia - a dynamic
587 model for predicting intra-annual sink demand and interannual growth variation in scots pine. *New*
588 *Phytologist* 206, 647–659. PT: J; TC: 0; UT: WOS:000351742300019.

589 Seo, J.W., Eckstein, D., Jalkanen, R., Rickebusch, S., Schmitt, U., 2008. Estimating the onset of cambial
590 activity in scots pine in northern finland by means of the heat-sum approach. *Tree physiology* 28,
591 105–112. PT: J; TC: 56; UT: WOS:000252571800012.

592 Seo, J.W., Eckstein, D., Jalkanen, R., Schmitt, U., 2011. Climatic control of intra- and inter-annual
593 wood-formation dynamics of scots pine in northern finland. *Environmental and experimental botany*
594 72, 422–431. PT: J; SI: SI; TC: 19; UT: WOS:000293810300011.

595 Swidrak, I., Gruber, A., Kofler, W., Oberhuber, W., 2011. Effects of environmental conditions on onset
596 of xylem growth in *pinus sylvestris* under drought. *Tree physiology* 31, 483–493. PT: J; NR: 71; TC:
597 19; J9: TREE PHYSIOL; PG: 11; GA: 780XF; UT: WOS:000291893600003.

598 Vaganov, E.A., Hughes, M.K., Shashkin, A.V., 2006. *Growth Dynamics of Conifer Tree Rings*. volume
599 XIV. Springer Heidelberg.

600 Zhai, L., Bergeron, Y., Huang, J.G., Berninger, F., 2012. Variation in intra-annual wood formation,
601 and foliage and shoot development of three major canadian boreal tree species. *American Journal of*
602 *Botany* 99, 827–837. PT: J; TC: 6; UT: WOS:000303665300015.

603 Zweifel, R., Eugster, W., Etzold, S., Dobbertin, M., Buchmann, N., Haesler, R., 2010. Link between
604 continuous stem radius changes and net ecosystem productivity of a subalpine norway spruce forest
605 in the swiss alps. *New Phytologist* 187, 819–830. PT: J; TC: 18; UT: WOS:000280122500023.

606 **Appendix A. Individual MSE Results**

Table A.6: *Total* error accumulated over three years.

(a) MSE – Individual variables – Tracheid production (RDTP)

Dataset	$(t)^5$	$(T)^5$	$(S)^5$	$(V)^5$	$(G)^5$	D	O
SMEARI	0.791 (5)	0.750 (4)	1.939 (7)	0.840 (6)	0.564 (2)	0.516 (1)	0.666 (3)
SMEARII	0.711 (1)	0.736 (3)	1.867 (7)	1.166 (6)	0.759 (4)	0.816 (5)	0.718 (2)
Ruotsinkylä	1.619 (2)	1.607 (1)	2.863 (7)	2.340 (6)	2.138 (5)	1.821 (4)	1.697 (3)
Grandfontaine	0.135 (4)	0.082 (1)	0.439 (7)	0.181 (6)	0.174 (5)	0.113 (2)	0.115 (3)
Abreschviller	0.227 (2)	0.261 (3)	0.935 (7)	0.372 (6)	0.278 (4)	0.290 (5)	0.207 (1)
Walscheid	1.089 (2)	1.325 (3)	2.883 (7)	1.490 (5)	1.561 (6)	1.476 (4)	1.087 (1)
avg rank	2.67	2.50	7.00	5.83	4.33	3.50	2.17

(b) MSE – Individual variables – Mature tracheid production (RMTP)

Dataset	$(t)^5$	$(T)^5$	$(S)^5$	$(V)^5$	$(G)^5$	D	O
SMEARI	0.977 (4)	0.880 (3)	1.935 (7)	1.050 (5)	1.096 (6)	0.784 (1)	0.866 (2)
SMEARII	0.597 (4)	0.639 (5)	1.239 (7)	1.095 (6)	0.445 (1)	0.567 (2)	0.596 (3)
Ruotsinkylä	2.244 (2)	3.509 (6)	2.479 (4)	3.971 (7)	2.170 (1)	2.903 (5)	2.275 (3)
Grandfontaine	0.226 (4)	0.229 (5)	0.422 (7)	0.273 (6)	0.188 (1)	0.212 (2)	0.216 (3)
Abreschviller	0.265 (1)	0.285 (3)	0.675 (7)	0.285 (4)	0.298 (6)	0.286 (5)	0.284 (2)
Walscheid	1.954 (1)	2.556 (5)	2.886 (7)	2.857 (6)	2.325 (3)	2.429 (4)	1.978 (2)
avg rank	2.67	4.50	6.50	5.67	3.00	3.17	2.50

(c) MSE – Combinations of variables – RDTP

Dataset	$(T.t)^5$	$(T.G)^5$	$(D.O.G.V)^5$	$(O.G)^5$	$(O.T.G)^5$	$(D.O.G)^5$
SMEARI	0.755 (5)	0.573 (2)	0.131 (1)	0.821 (6)	0.631 (4)	0.604 (3)
SMEARII	0.738 (3)	0.949 (6)	0.808 (5)	0.625 (1)	0.745 (4)	0.657 (2)
Ruotsinkylä	1.606 (1)	2.142 (6)	2.059 (5)	1.880 (3)	1.925 (4)	1.862 (2)
Grandfontaine	0.086 (1)	0.104 (3)	0.091 (2)	0.139 (6)	0.114 (5)	0.105 (4)
Abreschviller	0.264 (3)	0.281 (5)	0.299 (6)	0.256 (2)	0.272 (4)	0.238 (1)
Walscheid	1.325 (1)	1.424 (6)	1.329 (3)	1.332 (4)	1.339 (5)	1.328 (2)
avg val.	0.80	0.91	0.79	0.84	0.84	0.80
avg rank	2.33	4.67	3.67	3.67	4.33	2.33

(d) MSE – Combinations of variables – RMTP

Dataset	$(T.t)^5$	$(T.G)^5$	$(D.O.G.V)^5$	$(O.G)^5$	$(O.T.G)^5$	$(P.T.G)^5$
SMEARI	0.874 (1)	0.882 (2)	1.047 (5)	0.936 (4)	1.175 (6)	0.897 (3)
SMEARII	0.638 (6)	0.530 (3)	0.630 (5)	0.396 (1)	0.470 (2)	0.536 (4)
Ruotsinkylä	3.489 (6)	2.973 (3)	3.370 (4)	2.779 (1)	3.449 (5)	2.932 (2)
Grandfontaine	0.225 (6)	0.177 (1)	0.185 (3)	0.188 (5)	0.185 (4)	0.178 (2)
Abreschviller	0.288 (6)	0.284 (4)	0.254 (2)	0.256 (3)	0.252 (1)	0.286 (5)
Walscheid	2.566 (4)	2.629 (5)	2.517 (2)	2.346 (1)	2.526 (3)	2.639 (6)
avg val.	1.35	1.25	1.33	1.15	1.34	1.24
avg rank	4.83	3.00	3.50	2.50	3.50	3.67

Figure A.7: Measured (y) and estimated ($\hat{y}_t$) RMTP (vertical axis) of the black box model for all years tested. The variables of the model were those which obtained the lowest MSE values (Table A.6) (each site modeled separately). No measurements for Ruotsinkylä available for the first year.

Table A.7: Parameters of the GPP model. In addition, we used soil depth (L_S) of 470 mm for the Boreal (Finnish) sites and of 1000 mm for the Temperate (French) ones. The temperature measured on January 1st was used as the priori estimate for the state of temperature acclimation (X). The model, modifiers and parameters are introduced in detail by Peltoniemi et al. (2015).

	symbol	value	unit
Coefficient for temperature dependence of snowmelt rate	m	2.5	$^{\circ}C^{-1}d^{-1}$
Delay parameter for the response of temperature acclimation state to the changes in ambient temperature	τ	11.7	—
Delay parameter of drainage	τ_F	1	—
Effective field capacity	θ_{FC}	0.448	mm
Effective wilting point	θ_{WP}	0.118	mm
Evaporation parameter	χ	0.0551	$mmmol^{-1}$
Light modifier parameter for saturation with irradiance	γ	0.0351	$mol^{-1}m^{-2}$
Potential light use efficiency	β_P	0.777	$gCmol^{-1}m^{-2}$
Sensitivity parameter of f_D to VPD	κ	-0.174	kPa^{-1}
Threshold above which the state of acclimation increases	X_0	-2.6	$^{\circ}C$
Threshold at which the acclimation modifier reaches its maximum	S_{max}	17.5	$^{\circ}C$
Threshold for W effect on P in modifier $f_{W,P}$	ρ_P	0.422	—
Threshold for W effect on evaporation in modifier $f_{W,E}$	ρ_E	0.717	—
Fraction of absorbed photosynthetically active radiation	f_{APAR}	0.81	—
Transpiration parameter	β_E	0.4	$(gCm^{-2})^{-1}$
Parameter adjusting transpiration with VPD	α_E	0.822	—

Figure A.8: Decision-tree models for the rate of tracheid production (RDTP) in the Finnish sites (Sites 1-3) trained on all years, pruned to a maximum depth of 5 and minimum of 10 samples per leaf. The higher predictors are in the graph the better predictors the more important they are. The **value** indicates the predicted value (in number of tracheids); (x) indicates one of the different parameterizations ($x = ^\circ C$ in the case of $D(x)$); [-t] signifies that the measurement comes from t weeks in the past. The instructions to interpret the figure is given in the section 2.7.

Figure A.9: Decision-tree models for the rate of tracheid production (RDTP) as in Figure A.8 but for the French sites (4-6)).

Figure A.10: As in Figure A.8 but for the rate of mature tracheid production (RMTTP) for the Finnish sites (1-3).

Figure A.11: As in Figure A.8 but for the rate of mature tracheid production (RMTP) for the French sites (4-6).