1 Spatial and evolutionary parallelism between shade and
2 drought tolerance explains the distributions of conifers
3 in the conterminous United States

4

5 **Marta Rueda^{1*}, Oscar Godoy² and Bradford A. Hawkins¹**

6

7 *¹Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Irvine,*
8 *CA, USA.*

9 *²Instituto de Recursos Naturales y Agrobiología de Sevilla (IRNAS-CSIC), Sevilla E-*
10 *41012, Spain.*

11

12

13

14

15

ABSTRACT

Aim Gymnosperms do not follow a latitudinal diversity gradient across the Northern Hemisphere but are influenced by geography at continental scales. Tolerance to physiological aridity is thought to be the main driver of this distribution, yet through evolutionary time conifers have also faced conditions of frost, shade and fire. We tested four predictions to evaluate how environmental stressors and geographic and evolutionary patterns of traits influence conifer distributions: (1) environmental variables related to aridity are most important in explaining geographic patterns of traits; (2) traits responsible of survival in stressful conditions have evolved under a niche conservatism constraint; (3) phylogenetic correlations among traits as the result of complex evolutionary responses to multiple abiotic stressors are widespread; (4) there are parallelisms between spatial trait associations and correlated trait evolution.

Location The contiguous United States

Methods We combined conifer occurrences with 10 traits related to drought, freezing, shade and fire. The spatial distribution of traits was mapped and the relationships between environment and trait geographic patterns explored. Niche conservatism was assessed comparing patterns of trait evolution against Brownian motion. We computed geographic and phylogenetic correlations among traits to determine the correspondence between spatial and evolutionary trade-offs.

Results (1) Maximum temperature followed by precipitation were the environmental variables that best describe the geographic distributions of traits; (2) most traits contain a phylogenetic signal consistent with niche conservatism: major exceptions being fire-related traits and frost tolerance; (3)

41 drought and shade tolerances show one of the strongest phylogenetic negative
42 correlations; (4) the drought-shade tolerance trade-off is mirrored at the
43 biogeographical scale.

44 **Main conclusions** Contrary to angiosperms, cold does not seem to have been a
45 major driver in the evolutionary history of temperate conifers. A strong trade-
46 off between drought and shade tolerance is the simplest explanation for
47 understanding the current distributions of conifers in North America.

48

49 *Keywords:* Conifers, National Forest Inventory, niche conservatism, southern
50 North America, phylogenetic correlations, trait evolution, trait geographical
51 patterns

52

53

INTRODUCTION

Tolerance to abiotic stresses is a major driver of species distributions. Among abiotic stresses, temperature extremes, water and light availability are considered to be the main factors limiting world-wide plant distributions as well as affecting plant competitive relations (Valladares & Niinemets, 2008; Martinez-Tilleria *et al.*, 2012, Kunstler *et al.*, 2005). At the biogeographical scale, fundamental differences in the distribution of angiosperms and gymnosperms in the Northern Hemisphere have indicated that woody angiosperms follow a latitudinal diversity gradient - founded on a limited ability of angiosperm clades to adapt to mid-Tertiary cooling (Hawkins *et al.*, 2014; Zanne *et al.*, 2014). Conifer distribution seems, however, to be more influenced by geographic characteristics at continental scales (Leslie *et al.*, 2012). Indeed, whereas angiosperm dominated forests of the north comprise species from younger clades than forests of the south (Hawkins *et al.*, 2014), recently diverged species in Northern Hemisphere gymnosperm lineages are broadly concentrated in mountainous areas of western North America and southern China (Leslie *et al.*, 2012). An explanation for this distribution pattern must encompass a variety of specific environments but also a history of trait evolution that is poorly known in comparison with the more diverse angiosperms (but see Willson *et al.*, 2008; Pittermann *et al.*, 2012; Cornwell *et al.*, 2015). Because adaptive shifts are inextricably linked through space and time (Prinzing *et al.*, 2001), functional traits of extant conifers should represent an evolutionary response to abiotic stressors operating at geographical scales ranging from a few meters to continental, and across deep evolutionary time. Further, macroecological patterns are not independent of the evolution of the lineages involved in

generating them (Hernandez *et al.*, 2013), so identifying emergent geographical distributions in tree traits and the strongest underlying stressor(s) has obvious implications for explaining the predominance of conifers in some areas and not in others.

Gymnosperms, and conifers in particular, dominated terrestrial ecosystems during the Permian (c. 298-252 Ma), a period characterized by widespread aridity (Parrish, 1995). Most Permian ancestors are, however, extinct and extant gymnosperms lineages (i.e., crown groups), largely comprise post-Eocene radiations (Crisp & Cook, 2011), suggesting that the current conifer-dominated north temperate forests are the combined result of retained ancestral characters plus evolutionary responses to environmental change during the last 34 million of years of the Cenozoic. The cooler and drier events after the Eocene climatic optimum (~50 Ma), the uplift of the Rocky Mountains, and competition with angiosperms (Bond, 1989; Ruddiman, 1990; Zachos *et al.*, 2007; Zanazzi *et al.*, 2008), among other events, represented a challenge for conifers in the Cenozoic, likely resulting in new adaptive responses. Throughout North America, for example, conifers are the dominant component of northern boreal forest, along the southeastern Gulf Coast and on the mountain slopes of the west. With some exceptions (e.g. conifer-dominated areas of the Pacific Northwest), each of these regions is characterized by strong physiological aridity, even where precipitation is moderate or high, because water in the soil remains frozen for most of the year, rapidly percolates through sandy soils, or its absorption is reduced by surface runoff from mountain slopes (Graham, 1999). Yet, along these regions, conifers also have had to face other physiological stresses like increase of shade and cold conditions, or poverty of nutrients on soils common,

for instance, of sandy and slope soils. Tree adaptations to multiple abiotic stresses are, however, highly complex, with mounting evidence suggesting that acquisition of tolerance to a given environmental stress compromises plant performance under a different stress (Niinemets & Valladares, 2006; Koehler *et al.*, 2012; Laanisto & Niinemets, 2015). Thus, for instance, adaptations that allow woody species to grow in shade can compromise their ability to grow in dry conditions, such that restricted co-tolerance of these two key stress factors is considered the main constraint limiting the combinations of species in forests across gradients of cold and water availability (Niinemets & Valladares, 2006, Laanisto & Niinemets, 2015).

The evolutionary response to environmental stressors further depends on the tendency of lineages to retain niche-related traits through speciation events and over macroevolutionary time (phylogenetic niche conservatism (PNC); Ackerly, 2003; Cooper *et al.*, 2010; Wiens *et al.*, 2010). Strong PNC results in similar evolutionary trajectories among closely related species, which are constrained to live in environments akin to those that permitted their ancestors to diversify (Prinzing *et al.*, 2001). For instance, PNC can explain in part why some geographic regions or environments support specific lineages (Crisp & Cook, 2012). In contrast, distantly related species will be generally found in different environmental conditions, although unrelated clades can have similar ecological requirements due to convergence or stasis (Paradis, 2012).

The present study uses a trait-based approach to identify the role of environmental stressors, evolutionary relatedness and phylogenetic conservatism on the current distribution of conifers across the southern half of North America. Specifically, we test four predictions: (1) we expect climatic

variables related to aridity to weigh more heavily in explaining geographic patterns of conifer trait distributions, as conifer dominated forest throughout North America occur under physiological aridity conditions. If differences in drought tolerance primarily explain conifer distribution, then, (2) we expect strong PNC in drought tolerance and drought related traits. We further expect that other traits responsible of conifer survival under abiotic stressful conditions show strong PNC patterns. (3) We additionally expect to find phylogenetic correlations among traits, most notably a drought-shade tolerance trade-off, as the result of complex evolutionary process of conifers to multiple abiotic stressors. (4) Finally, we expect parallelisms between spatial traits association and correlated trait evolution if PNC has had an important role determining the distributions of conifers.

To test these four predictions, we combine local conifer occurrence data from the US Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) database with 10 traits believed to play key functional roles with respect to four selective forces that have affected the evolution of temperate-zone conifers: drought, freezing, shade and fire (Latham & Ricklefs, 1993; Niinemets & Valladares, 2006; He *et al.*, 2012; Keeley, 2012). We merge both data sets to: (1) map the spatial distributions of conifer functional traits, (2) quantify the relationship between environmental variables and community functional trait distributions, (3) assess phylogenetic niche conservatism for the traits, and (4) compute geographic and phylogenetic correlations among traits to determine the correspondence between environmental and evolutionary trade-offs.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Forest Inventory data and geographical analyses

Occurrences of conifers in the contiguous USA were extracted from the US Forest Service's Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) database (<http://www.fia.fs.fed.us/>, accessed in July 2012). The FIA protocol records, per plot site and per species, the number of trees ≥ 12.7 cm diameter at breast (dbh) in four subplots (168.3 m²) 36.6 m apart, and the number of trees ≥ 2.54 cm in diameter in nested microplots (13.5 m²). In this study we utilized the data from both the subplots and the microplots. For inclusion in the geographical analyses, a site had to support at least two conifer species and be coded as a 'natural stand' (i.e. tree plantations are not considered). Sites containing only one species were excluded, as the dependent variable in our community level study is the average trait value per plot site (see below). This criterion did not bias site selection to any particular region. We also did not include any sites from Alaska. All angiosperm records were also removed and species records were merged under currently recognized names. We used The Plant List (<http://www.theplantlist.org>; accessed in February 2014) as the source of information on synonyms. Our selection criteria rendered a total of 53,160 sites containing 88 of the approximately 108 North American conifer species (the specific limits of some taxa remain unresolved).

Species trait information

We selected 10 traits for which data could be obtained for more than 60% of the species (Appendix S1). These traits represent axes of ecological strategies of trees with respect to drought tolerance, shade tolerance, frost tolerance and fire tolerance/resistance and were obtained from various sources (Appendix

S2). We followed Shipley's (2010) definition and considered traits as "any measureable property of a thing or an average property from a collection of things." Therefore, our traits include a mixture of characteristics at different plant scales from physiology to morphology, and plant performance. Five traits are continuous (wood density, seed size, height, bark thickness, minimum number of frost-free days); three are ordinal (drought, shade, and fire tolerance); and two are binary (seed dispersal mode and fire resistance). The minimum number of frost-free days was taken as a measure of frost tolerance (see Appendix S2). Realized cold tolerance (minimum temperature at which species can be grown) was *a priori* also taken into account, however it was highly correlated with frost ($p = 0.82$). We chose frost tolerance instead of cold tolerance because the former can be related to physiological aridity when water is not accessible because it is beginning to be or is frozen in the ground. Height, seed mass and bark thickness were log-transformed prior to analyses. Overall, our traits can be grouped in lower level physiological/morphological functional traits like seed size, wood density, and height, and higher level performance traits like the various tolerance traits, which represent the whole integrated plant phenotype. These higher level performance or tolerance traits may compensate for the absence in this study of other widely used plant functional traits, such as specific leaf area or percentage of nitrogen in leaves, which we decided do not include due to limited information (values for substantially fewer than 50% of the species were available).

Environmental data

We selected six environmental variables to examine the relationship between environment and the geographical structure of species traits across sites. We extracted two measures of temperature and two of precipitation from the 30 Arc-second WorldClim database: Bio5 (maximum temperature of the warmest month), Bio6 (minimum temperature of the coldest month), Bio12 (annual precipitation), and Bio18 (precipitation in the warmest quarter or ‘summer rainfall’). We also extracted a measure of solar insolation from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (www.nrel.gov/gis/data_solar.html; accessed in October 2014): summer normal direct insolation (summer radiation), at a ~10 km resolution. All of these climate variables vary over broad to intermediate scales but because of the grain at which they are measured have no variation at local scales. To represent proxies for potential local processes, we also generated two variables containing relatively small-scale variation: elevation and dominant soil type. The elevation of each site was estimated using the digital elevation model gtopo30 (<http://ita.cr.usgs.gov/GTOPO30>), whereas the dominant soil type was generated from the wss_gsmsoil_US_[2006-07-06] database, available from <http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov> (accessed in October 2014). Spatial patterns of all environmental variables are mapped in Appendix S3. Because FIA sites on private land are shifted one to several kilometers in location to comply with Federal privacy laws, the local variables, especially elevation, contain an unknown amount of error.

Phylogeny

We obtained phylogenetic relatedness and divergences times for the sampled species by pruning the molecular-based gymnosperm phylogeny of Burleigh *et*

al. (2012). Briefly, this phylogeny was constructed incorporating core nucleotide sequence data from gymnosperms (Coniferophyta, Cycadophyta, Ginkgophyta, and Gnetophyta), with sequences from the “basal angiosperm” lineages (e.g. *Amborella*, Nymphaeales) and Moniliformopses taxa as outgroups. This included plastid and mitochondrial loci as well as nuclear 18S rDNA, 26S rDNA, and internal transcribed spacer (ITS), which was aligned using Muscle (Thompson *et al.*, 1994). Maximum likelihood analyses to estimate the optimal topology and molecular branch lengths used the general time reversible (GTR) nucleotide substitution model, and a final chronogram was obtained by incorporating the fossil constraints on seed plant clades of Won & Renner (2006). The final pruned phylogeny included 83 out of the 88 conifer species sampled by the FIA (Appendix S4).

Analytical protocols

Forest community data and geographical analyses

To generate community data with species trait information, we first generated a presence-absence matrix of the 88 conifer species across all sites. We then calculated an average value per plot site of each of the 10 traits. A common procedure when scaling traits from species to communities is to weight traits by species relative abundances or basal area within sites. However, we decided to take a conservative approach of presence-absence data to avoid confounding factors that can affect these relative weights but were not included in our study such as pests, windbreaks, or angiosperm trees.

Once the community trait matrix was obtained, the environmental relationships with the geographic distribution of each community trait were

assessed with random forest (RF) models. Briefly, RF is a powerful machine-learning method for regression designed to produce accurate predictions that do not overfit the data (Breiman, 2001). In RF bootstrap samples are drawn to construct multiple regression trees. Each tree is grown with a randomized subset of predictors, i.e. the number of predictors used to find the best split at each node is a randomly chosen subset of the total number of predictors. Random Forests finally combines the predictions of these multiple independent regression trees into a robust composite model. The relative importance of the predictors is assessed by the decrease in explained variance resulting from permutations of the focal variable. We selected RF over more traditional parametric linear modelling approaches because it does not assume linearity and stationarity of relationships (i.e. it can model scale-dependence). The non-stationarity violates a basic assumption of all parametric linear methods, whereas RF is able to disentangle interacting effects and identify nonlinear and scale-dependent relationships that often occur at the scale of the analysis performed here among multiple, correlated predictors (Cutler *et al.*, 2007).

We generated 10 RF models (one for each trait) in the R package *RandomForest* (Liaw & Wiener, 2002) to statistically account for the spatial pattern of conifer traits across sites, using the climatic, elevation, and soil type variables as predictors. For each model we generated 200 regression trees and recorded the percentage of the explained variance (*pseudo-R*²). We also ranked the importance of each variable ranging from 100 (the strongest predictor) to 0 (no predictive power) according to their node purity values. We assessed the

sign of the relationship between the average community trait and environmental variables with Pearson correlations.

An unresolved analytical issue with respect to the use of trait values averaged over entire communities is that similarities in species composition across communities can potentially generate spuriously strong associations among the variables themselves as well as with environmental gradients (Zelený & Schaffers, 2012). Therefore, we also conducted multiple regression analyses at the species level to test whether environmental predictors of spatial pattern of conifer traits were found at the species level as well as at the community level. For these analyses the species were the units of analysis, in which traits comprised their species-level values and environmental variables were generated by calculating the average value of each variable across all sites where each species occurs. We generated eight multiple linear models and two models including a binomial function for the binomial traits (see dispersal type and fire resistance). Environmental predictors were the same as in the random forest models but the categorical variable soil type was excluded. These analyses were also repeated to account for the phylogenetic relationships between species (Butler & King, 2004). The aim of the species-level analyses was to provide independent evidence that the statistical relationships among traits and environments identified at the community level were not due solely to the repeated co-occurrence pattern of species across sites (Zelený & Schaffers, 2012). When the community-level and species-level approaches generated substantially different models interpretation of the former may not be robust.

Phylogenetic comparative analyses

We tested for niche conservatism in each trait using the general approach of Butler & King (2004). We used phylogenetic generalized least squares (PGLS) to fit three models of evolution: a white noise (WN) model of random variation, in which species trait differences are independent of their phylogenetic relatedness (i.e. the traits are labile), a Brownian motion (BM) model of gradual and continuous drift in species' traits, which is sufficient to demonstrate PNC according to one definition (Blomberg *et al.*, 2003), and an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) model of constrained evolution where the random component of character evolution is pulled towards local optima, which satisfies the more stringent definition of PNC by Losos (2008). We used *Geiger* in R (Harmon *et al.*, 2008) to calculate the log-likelihood of each model, and model fits were evaluated using the weights of the Akaike information criterion (AIC_w). We also calculated Pagel's λ and Blomberg's *K* for each tree trait for potential comparison with other studies. For seed dispersal type and fire resistance, we calculated the *D* value, a measure of phylogenetic signal for binary traits (Fritz & Purvis, 2010), and tested the estimated *D* value for significant departure from both random association and the clumping expected under a Brownian model of evolution. For that, we used the R package *Caper*.

Geographic and evolutionary correlations among traits

We computed Pearson correlations between the geographic distributions of each trait to assess geographic correlations. We further generated a single evolutionary variance-covariance matrix among traits to assess the degree of correlated evolution from ancestral characters to extant species [function *evol.vcv* (Revell, 2012)]. This function permits assessing the evolutionary

liability of each trait (diagonal elements) and between each pair of traits (off-diagonal elements) taking into account the non-independence of the data. To further compare the degree of correlated evolution among traits we calculated an evolutionary correlation matrix using PGLS (Butler & King, 2004).

RESULTS

Geographical patterns of the traits

Five traits (drought, shade and frost tolerance, wood density and seed size) show a strong geographical pattern across the contiguous USA (Fig. 1); there is a latitudinal gradient in the east and altitudinal gradients in both the eastern and the western USA. In general, conifers comprising northern boreal and montane forests have lower wood density, produce smaller seeds and are more tolerant to shade and frost but are less tolerant to drought. In addition, the strength of the strong trade-off found between shade and drought is lower at southern latitudes. RF models revealed that these geographical patterns are largely explained by maximum temperature, except seed size, which was best predicted by summer radiation (Table 1).

The two traits related to fire (tolerance and resistance) have regional patterns coinciding with those areas where fires are more frequent and/or intense (e.g. western and southeastern forests). Yet, whereas in the southeastern USA conifer-dominated forests are in general both tolerant and resistant to fire, this pattern is not found in the west, where conifers show low tolerance to fire despite being fire resistant (Fig. 1). Again, RF models found that temperature was the main predictor of fire tolerance and resistance, although

maximum temperature for the former and minimum temperature for the latter (Table 1).

The three remaining traits (height, bark thickness, seed dispersal type) show geographical structure at regional or intermediate scales (Fig. 1). Conifers are tallest along the west coastal, western-montane and Appalachian forests, whereas trees are shortest in semi-arid habitats. Bark thickness shows a similar pattern to height, particularly in the western USA, where taller trees have thicker barks. Finally, conifers whose seeds are dispersed by animals tend to be more frequent in xeric and alpine environments. RF models found that precipitation was the main predictor for these traits. Specifically, annual precipitation was the main predictor of tree height and seed dispersal type, and summer precipitation was for bark thickness (Table 1).

Overall, the RF models explained high to very high levels of site-level variation of the observed geographic patterns for traits, with broad-scale climatic variables characterizing hot, dry habitats generating physiological aridity in trees (primarily temperature and secondarily precipitation) being the strongest predictors, as predicted.

Multiple regression analyses at the species level confirmed the random forest results that temperature and precipitation were the most important predictors, though some traits were further explained by additional variables like elevation (again associated with physiological aridity for trees growing on mountain slopes). Only seed traits, size and dispersal, and shade tolerance rendered different predictors. For instance, annual precipitation instead of maximum temperature better explains shade tolerance at the species

level. Conversely, maximum temperature rather than annual precipitation and summer insolation better explained seed species traits (Appendix S5 and S6).

Phylogenetic comparative analyses

The phylogenetic analyses indicate that conifer trait evolution has been strongly constrained. An Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) model, which describes trait evolution under stabilizing selection, best fit the trait values across species in six of the eight continuous traits (Table 2). The best fit could not be determined unambiguously for fire tolerance (OU and WN models provided similar fits). For frost tolerance, Akaike weight ($wAIC$) suggests an OU as best model, but its higher α values (Table 2) and large evolutionary variances (Table 3) compared to the other traits provides little evidence of conservatism. For the two binary traits, we obtained a D value of 0.010 for seed dispersal type, which indicates this trait is phylogenetically conserved (according to a Brownian motion model of evolution). On the other hand, a D value of 0.855 suggests that fire resistance is labile. In short, drought and shade tolerance of conifers currently inhabiting North America have evolved in a manner consistent with niche conservatism (defined by constrained evolution). The same is true for wood density, seed size, height and bark thickness, which likely represent adaptive traits related to conifer survival when exposed to aridity and/or shade conditions.

Geographic and evolutionary correlations among traits

Phylogenetic correlation analyses indicate multiple correlated evolutionary processes among traits (Table 3). As predicted, one of the strongest relationships found was between shade and drought tolerance, targeting this

trade-off as one the most important determinant of recent conifer evolution. Wood density shows negative evolutionary correlations with frost and shade tolerance. However, the phylogenetic correlation between wood density and drought was not significant. Seed size also shows strong evolutionary correlations with wood density, drought tolerance and shade tolerance. Finally, height and bark thickness show positively correlated evolution, probably due to allometric scaling, and surprisingly, fire tolerance shows no evolutionary correlation with any trait.

Correlations among geographic distributions of traits range from non-existent to very high (Table 4). However, as a result of the high number of sites included in the analysis ($n = 53,160$), all correlations were significant. Therefore, we decided to consider as sufficiently robust those correlations with $r > 0.70$. Among these, the correlation between shade and drought tolerance was remarkable. Correlations between shade tolerance and wood density, drought and frost tolerance, drought tolerance and wood density, frost tolerance and wood density, and height and bark thickness were also noteworthy (all >0.71 , Table 4).

DISCUSSION

In this study, we combined geographic and phylogenetic approaches to investigate the ecological and evolutionary drivers of conifer distribution through the contiguous US. The benefits of such combination were clear. Both type of analyses independently point out to the trade-off between shade and drought tolerance as the main driver of recent conifer evolution and distribution. Moreover, the strong phylogenetic conservatism found for shade

and drought tolerances provides a link to connect this ecological-evolutionary parallelism, suggesting that the current environmental variation of the continental US sort different conifer lineages according to their conserved tolerance. Therefore, this strongly conserved trade-off has been key on promoting conifer evolution, but it has simultaneously limited lineage distribution, not allowing drought tolerant lineages of southern latitudes (e.g. *Pinus*, *Juniperus*) to occur in higher altitudes and latitudes, whereas the reverse is true for shade tolerant lineages (e.g. *Abies*).

More specifically, our four predictions are fulfilled to varying degrees. First, temperature followed by precipitation are the strongest climatic variables explaining contemporaneous geographic patterns of functional traits and stress tolerances of North American conifers (see Table 1), although relationships between particular traits and environmental variables vary somewhat depending on whether a community- or species-focus approach is used. This is a predictable result, as both temperature and/or precipitation have been documented to explain broad geographical patterns of many organisms (Gaston, 2000). More significant, however, is that when compared to woody angiosperms, whose distributions across North America are explained by adaptations to cold (Hawkins *et al.*, 2014), maximum instead of minimum temperatures become the major factor influencing conifer responses to freezing, shade, drought, and fire. The different stressors that angiosperm and gymnosperm trees cope with can explain this controversy. While angiosperm trees face cold as the main abiotic filter, conifers generally occur in environments where several environmental stressors co-occur simultaneously.

449 Second, most of the traits we examined contained a phylogenetic signal
450 consistent with niche conservatism (see Table 2). Clearly, the strongest
451 evolutionary trait association was the negative correlation between shade and
452 drought tolerances, which in its interaction with current environmental
453 variability generate the basis of the conifer pattern across the contiguous US (see
454 Table 4, Fig. 1). On the other extreme, fire tolerance and resistance represent
455 major exceptions to niche conservatism patterns. More unexpected, however,
456 frost tolerance exhibits a pattern of minimal evolutionary significance. In part,
457 these findings suggest that cold was not a major driver in the evolutionary
458 history of North American conifers. In other words, potential adaptations to cold
459 during the mid-Tertiary cooling of the global climate does not explain the current
460 distribution of conifers across the southern half of North America, although
461 obviously frost tolerance is an adaptive trait of conifers at continental scales,
462 differentiating geographically species that can survive in high latitudes and
463 altitudes from those that cannot (Fig. 1). Given our results, it seems more
464 probable that the evolutionary tendency of some shade-adapted lineages
465 allowed the colonization of higher latitudes and altitudes by conifers after
466 retreat of the ice sheets, as boreal coniferous forests started to assemble in the
467 western volcanic highlands and in the high latitudes by the mid-Eocene (Graham,
468 1999). Likewise, the evolutionary tendency to be drought adapted allowed more
469 xeric clades (e.g. *Juniperus* and *Pinus*) to radiate into the increasingly dry post-
470 Eocene habitats of the continental interior. In any case, selection towards shade
471 or drought tolerance proves rather stable (Table 2) and geographically well
472 correlated with wood density. Wood density has been identified as a key trait in
473 woody species distributions (Chave *et al.*, 2009), and for North American

conifers wood density seems to summarize the combination of the shade-drought spectrum that involves multiple morphological and physiological adaptations acting in combination (Valladares, 2003; Cescatii & Niinemets, 2004). Low wood density in boreal clades (e.g. *Chamaecyparis*, *Thuja*, *Abies* and *Picea*) is consistent with their adaptation to shade conditions. Certainly, the attainment of low wood density would allow species living in dense forests to be taller (note that wood density is negatively correlated with height, Table 3) and better compete for light (Bigler & Veblen, 2009). Moreover, although it is known that drought tolerance in conifers is associated with an increase in wood density (Pittermann *et al.*, 2012), the phylogenetic correlation between drought tolerance and wood density was not significant although its value was relatively high (see Table 3). Since the association of high wood density with drought-induced embolism resistance is widely accepted (Chave *et al.*, 2009), we acknowledge that in this specific case the more taxonomically restricted information available for wood density in comparison with drought tolerance might account for the lack of significance in the phylogenetic correlation.

Our results also indicate that other traits probably play an important role in determining conifer distributions; this is the case of seed size, which broadly shows a latitudinal pattern in the east and an altitudinal pattern in the west of the USA (Fig. 1). Maximum insolation instead of maximum temperature explains geographical pattern of seed size, consistent with the fact that conifers with proportionally larger seeds are present in those areas where summer radiation is intense, namely the desert areas of the west and the highest, nearly bare peaks of the Rockies. Geographical differences are partly driven by the strong PNC showed by seed size (see Table 2). Small seeds found in those clades living in

higher latitudes (e.g. *Chamaecyparis*, *Picea*, *Tsuga*, *Thuja*) could be interpreted as a pre-adaptation to cold, as a rapid recolonization after the Last Glacial Maximum was facilitated for those ancestors with smaller, wind-dispersed seeds (e.g. McDonald *et al.*, 1989). However, given the negative evolutionary correlation between seed size and frost tolerance (Table 3), our findings point more to an adaptation to the lack of large animal dispersers at colder high latitudes (Willig *et al.*, 2003). Likewise, larger seeds observed in *Juniperus* and pines associated with xeric open habitats, both piñon-juniper woodland and timberline, are consistent with the adaptation to seed dispersal by animals, particularly birds, in very dry environments (note the high positive phylogenetic correlation between drought tolerance and seed size in Table 3). Large seeds filled with large quantities of nutrient for seedlings are more attractive to animals, which constitutes an evolutionary advantage to species growing in such stressful habitats (Lanner, 1998).

There is a general consensus that fire has historically been a significant environmental stressor that has shaped conifer-dominated forests and has selected for adaptations to fire in the majority of conifers (Bond & Scott, 2010; He *et al.*, 2012; Cornwell *et al.*, 2015). Indeed, in the Northern Hemisphere, fire-controlled woodland fossils can be traced to the mid-Eocene (Graham, 1999) or earlier (He *et al.*, 2012). However, and despite this evidence, we found no phylogenetic signal of conservatism in fire resistance and tolerance. The geographical pattern of both traits suggests instead current species-specific adaptations to the two fire regimes – infrequent crown fires and low intensity frequent surface fires – common in the USA (see Fig. 1). It could be that adaptations to fire tolerance and/or resistance are masked by selection for

greater height and bark thickness. Survival of surface fires may be enhanced by greater height and bark thickness (Jackson *et al.*, 1999; Keeley, 2012; He *et al.*, 2012), whereas species adapted to intense crown fires usually have much thinner bark (Keeley, 2012). Geographical patterns for height and bark thickness, with higher and thicker bark conifers located in the western of the USA, might support this scenario, but these could also reflect differences in primary productivity. On the other hand, others specific traits not considered here may drive evolutionary adaptations to fire. Cornwell *et al.* (2015) found that gymnosperm litter attributes have a phylogenetic component that may have large influences on fire behavior in surface fire regimes. Their study notes the low flammability of the non-*Pinus* Pinaceae, mainly components of the boreal forest (e.g. *Picea*, *Abies*, *Larix*, *Tsuga*), suggesting that the small needles dropped by these species form densely packed litterbeds that help suppress surface fires. This would explain why areas in California dominated by the non-*Pinus* Pinaceae burned less frequently in the past than similar areas dominated by larger leaved species (e.g. Schwilk & Caprio, 2011).

Finally, it should be noted that some phylogenetic patterns we found and mismatches between geographical and evolutionary trait associations might be an artifact of differential extinction rather than identifying, for example, conservatism of the trait of interest (Crisp & Cook, 2012). This is because researchers assume that extinct species represent intermediate states of extant species, but there is no guarantee of this and the former can possess unique combinations of traits that no longer exist (see Diniz-Filho *et al.*, 2013), biasing understanding of patterns. Obviously, phylogenetic analyses could be improved using phylogenies that explicitly incorporate fossil data (Crisp & Cook, 2012;

Slater & Harmon, 2013), but in most cases combining fossil and phylogenetic data is challenging due to gaps in the fossil records. An additional limitation of this study is that trait values are assigned at species level, that is, potential adaptation at the population level or intraspecific trait variation are not taken into account. This constraint has no easy solution, given the lack of information at the intraspecific level for species extending over broad scales. On the other hand, the importance of accounting for intraspecific variation at macroecological scales when interspecific variation is expected to be large is still debated (Albert *et al.*, 2012; Siefert *et al.*, 2015).

To conclude, in contrast to the angiosperms, many aspects of gymnosperm evolution, ecology and biogeography remain poorly studied (but see Leslie *et al.*, 2012; Fragnière *et al.*, 2015). Here, we have shown that the strong trade-off between drought and shade tolerance, which is summarized in wood density as a key functional trait, is the simplest explanation for understanding the current distribution of conifers across southern North America. In addition to the already well-known drought tolerance of conifers, essential for the colonization of the xeric habitats of the continental interior and sandy coastal soils, the acquisition of tolerance to shade was key in the colonization of higher latitudes by gymnosperms, whereas the perhaps taken for granted frost tolerance is pushed into the background. Surprisingly, other factors thought key in the evolutionary history of North American conifers such as the tolerance and resistance to wildfires do not appear relevant but still show strong geographical structure. Future questions need to address the evolutionary rates of traits through the phylogeny. This would be helpful for understanding which traits are more evolutionary constrained at a

macroecological scale as well as to quantify possible evolutionary trajectories of future conifer responses facing global change.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

M.R. acknowledges post-doctoral financial support provided by the Spanish Ministry of Education (BVA-2010- 0596). O.G. acknowledges post-doctoral financial support provided by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (JCI-2012-12061). We also thank Andrew Kerkhoff and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on the manuscript.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article.

Appendix S1 Species list and trait values

Appendix S2 Trait explanation and data sources

Appendix S3 Geographical patterns of the environmental variables

Appendix S4 Phylogenetic topology

Appendix S5 Results from multiple regression models for the continuous trait values

Appendix S6 Results from PGLS models for the continuous trait values

BIOSKETCH

Marta Rueda is post-doctoral fellow interested in biogeography and global ecological and evolutionary patterns. Her current research interest also includes fragmentation theory and community phylogenetic at broad scales.

Oscar Godoy is a post-doctoral fellow interested in the functional and evolutionary determinants of species interactions, mainly plant competition, and their consequences for community and ecosystem dynamics.

Bradford A. Hawkins is interested in ecological and phylogenetic patterns across a range of spatial scales, with a focus on linking local and biogeographical processes.

REFERENCES

Ackerly, D.D. (2003) Community assembly, niche conservatism, and adaptive evolution in changing environments. *International Journal of Plant Sciences*, **164**, S165-S184.

Albert, C.H., de Bello, F., Boulangeat, I., Pellet, G., Lavorel, S. & Thuiller, W. (2012) On the importance of intraspecific variability for the quantification of functional diversity. *Oikos*, **121**, 116-126.

Bigler, C. & Veblen, T.T. (2009) Increased early growth rates decrease longevity of conifers in subalpine forests. *Oikos*, **118**, 1130-1138.

Blomberg, S.P., Garland, T. & Ives, A.R. (2003) Testing for phylogenetic signal in comparative data: behavioral traits are more labile. *Evolution*, **57**, 717-745.

Bond, W.J. (1989) The tortoise and the hare: ecology of angiosperm dominance and gymnosperm persistence. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **36**, 227-249.

623 Bond, W.J. & Scott, A.C. (2010) Fire and the spread of flowering plants in the
 624 Cretaceous. *New Phytologist*, **188**, 1137-1150.
 625 Breiman, L. 2001. Random forests. *Machine learning*, **45**, 5-32.
 626 Butler, M.A. & King, A.A. (2004) Phylogenetic comparative analysis: a modeling
 627 approach for adaptive evolution. *The American Naturalist*, **164**, 683-695.
 628 Burleigh, J.G., Barbakuk, W.B., Davis, J.M., Morse, A.M. & Soltis, P.S. (2012)
 629 Exploring diversification and genome size evolution in extant
 630 gymnosperms through phylogenetic synthesis. *Journal of Botany*, **Article ID**
 631 **292857**.
 632 Cescatti, A. & Niinemets, U. (2004) Sunlight capture. Leaf to landscape.
 633 *Photosynthetic adaptation. Chloroplast to landscape*. (ed. by W.K. Smith, T.C.
 634 Vogelmann and C. Chritchley), pp. 42-85. Springer Verlag, Berlin.
 635 Chave, J., Coomes, D., Jansen, S., Lewis, S.L., Swenson, N.G., & Zanne, A.E. (2009)
 636 Towards a worldwide wood economics spectrum. *Ecology Letters*, **12**, 351-
 637 366.
 638 Cooper, N., Jetz, W. & Freckleton, R.P. (2010) Phylogenetic comparative
 639 approaches for studying niche conservatism. *Journal of Evolutionary*
 640 *Biology*, **23**, 2529-2539.
 641 Cornwell, W.K., Elvira, A., van Kempen, L., van Logtestijn, R.S.P., Aptroot, A. &
 642 Cornelissen, J.H.C. (2015) Flammability across the gymnosperm phylogeny:
 643 the importance of litter particle size. *New Phytologist*, **206**, 672-681.
 644 Crisp, M.D. & Cook, L.G. (2011) Cenozoic extinctions account for the low diversity
 645 of extant gymnosperms compared with angiosperms. *New Phytologist*, **192**,
 646 997-1009.

647 Crisp, M.D. & Cook, L.G. (2012) Phylogenetic niche conservatism: what are the
648 underlying evolutionary and ecological causes? *New Phytologist*, **196**, 681-
649 694.

650 Cutler, D.R., Edwards, T.C. Jr, Beard, K.H., Cutler, A., Hess, K.T., Gibson, J. & Lawler,
651 J.J. 2007. Random forests for classification in ecology. *Ecology*, **88**, 2783-
652 2792.

653 Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Gouveia, S.F. & Lima-Ribeiro, M.S. (2013) Evolutionary
654 macroecology. *Frontiers of Biogeography*, **5**, 195-203.

655 Fragnière, Y., Bétrisey, S., Cardinaux, L., Stoffel, M., Kozłowski, G. (2015) Fighting
656 their last stand? A global analysis of the distribution and conservation
657 status of gymnosperms. *Journal of Biogeography*, **42**, 809-820.

658 Fritz, S.A. & Purvis, A. (2010) Selectivity in mammalian extinction risk and threat
659 types: a new measure of phylogenetic signal strength in binary
660 traits. *Conservation Biology*, **24**, 1042-1051.

661 Gaston, K.J. (2000) Global patterns in biodiversity. *Nature*, **405**, 220-227

662 Graham, A. (1999) *Late Cretaceous and Cenozoic history of North American*
663 *vegetation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.

664 Grubb, P.J. (2015) Trade-offs in interspecific comparisons in plant ecology and
665 how plants overcome proposed constraints. *Plant Ecology & Diversity*, 1-31.

666 Harmon, L.J., Weir, J.T., Brock, C.D., Glor, R.E. & Challenger, W. (2008) GEIGER:
667 investigating evolutionary radiations. *Bioinformatics*, **24**, 129-131.

668 Hawkins, B.A., Rueda, M., Rangel, T.F., Field, R. & Diniz-Filho, J.A.F. (2014)
669 Community phylogenetics at the biogeographical scale: cold tolerance,
670 niche conservatism and the structure of North American forests. *Journal of*
671 *Biogeography*, **41**, 23-38.

672 He, T., Pausas, J.G., Belcher, C.M., Schwilk, D.W. & Lamont, B.B. (2012) Fire-
 673 adapted traits of *Pinus* arose in fiery Cretaceous. *New Phytologist*, **194**, 751-
 674 759.

675 Hernández, C.E., Rodríguez-Serrano, E., Avaria-Llautureo, J., Inostroza-Michael,
 676 O., Morales-Pallero, B., Boric-Bargetto, D., Canales-Aguirre, C.B., Marquet, P.
 677 & Meade, A. (2013) Using phylogenetic information and the comparative
 678 method to evaluate hypotheses in macroecology. *Methods in Ecology and*
 679 *Evolution*, **4**, 401-415.

680 Jackson, J.F., Adams, D.C. & Jackson, U.B. (1999) Allometry of constitutive
 681 defense: a model and a comparative test with tree bark and fire regime. *The*
 682 *American Naturalist*, **153**, 614-632.

683 Keeley, J.E. (2012) Ecology and evolution of pine life histories. *Annals of Forest*
 684 *Science*, **69**, 445-453.

685 Koehler, K., Center, A. & Cavender-Bares, J. (2012) Evidence for a freezing
 686 tolerance–growth rate trade-off in the live oaks (*Quercus* series *Virentes*)
 687 across the tropical–temperate divide. *New Phytologist*, **193**, 730-744.

688 Kunstler, G., Falster, D., Coomes, D.A., Hui, F., Kooyman, R.M., Laughlin, D.C.,
 689 Poorter, L., Vanderwel, M., Vieilledent, G., Wright, S.J. & Aiba, M. (2016)
 690 Plant functional traits have globally consistent effects on competition.
 691 *Nature*, **529**, 204-207.

692 Laanisto, L. & Niinemets, Ü. (2015) Polytolerance to abiotic stresses: how
 693 universal is the shade-drought tolerance trade-off in woody species? *Global*
 694 *Ecology and Biogeography*, **24**, 571-580.

695 Lanner, R. (1998) Seed dispersal in *Pinus*. *Ecology and biogeography of Pinus* (ed.
696 by D.M. Richardson), pp. 281-295. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
697 UK.

698 Latham, R.E. & Ricklefs, R.E. (1993) Continental comparisons of temperate-zone
699 tree species diversity. *Species Diversity in Ecological Communities: Historical*
700 *and Geographical Perspectives*. (ed. by R.E. Ricklefs and D. Schluter), pp.
701 294-314. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

702 Leslie, A.B., Beaulieu, J.M., Rai, H.S., Crane, P.R., Donoghue, M.J. & Mathews, S.
703 (2012) Hemisphere-scale differences in conifer evolutionary
704 dynamics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, **109**,
705 16217-16221.

706 Liaw, A. & Wiener, M. (2002) Classification and regression by RandomForest. *R*
707 *news*, **2**, 18-22.

708 Losos, J.B. (2008) Phylogenetic niche conservatism, phylogenetic signal and the
709 relationship between phylogenetic relatedness and ecological similarity
710 among species. *Ecology Letters*, **11**, 995-1007.

711 MacDonald, G.M., Cwynar, L.C. & Whitlock, C. (1998) The Late Quaternary
712 dynamics of pines in northern North America. *Ecology and biogeography of*
713 *Pinus* (ed. by D.M. Richardson), pp. 122-133. Cambridge University Press,
714 Cambridge, UK.

715 Martinez-Tilleria, K., Loayza, A.P., Sandquist, D.R. & Squeo, F.A. (2012) No
716 evidence of a trade-off between drought and shade tolerance in seedlings of
717 six coastal desert shrub species in north-central Chile. *Journal of Vegetation*
718 *Science*, **23**, 1051– 1061.

719 Ninemets, Ü. & Valladares, F. (2006) Tolerance to shade, drought, and
 720 waterlogging of temperate northern hemisphere trees and shrubs.
 721 *Ecological Monographs*, **76**, 521-547.

722 Paradis, E. (2012) *Analysis of phylogenetics and evolution with R*. 2nd edn.
 723 Springer Science & Business Media, New York, NY.

724 Parrish, J.T. (1995) Geologic evidence of Permian climate. *The Permian of*
 725 *northern Pangea, vol. 1: paleogeography, paleoclimates, stratigraphy* (ed. by
 726 P.A. Scholle, T.M. Peryt and D.S. Ulmer-Scholle DS), pp. 53-61. Springer,
 727 Berlin.

728 Pittermann, J., Stuart, S.A., Dawson, T.E. & Moreau, A. (2012) Cenozoic climate
 729 change shaped the evolutionary ecophysiology of the Cupressaceae
 730 conifers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, **109**, 9647-
 731 9652.

732 Prinzing, A., Durka, W., Klotz, S. & Brandl, R. (2001) The niche of higher plants:
 733 evidence for phylogenetic conservatism. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*
 734 *London B*, **268**, 2383-2389.

735 Revell, L.J. (2012) Phytools: an R package for phylogenetic comparative biology
 736 (and other things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 217-223.

737 Ruddiman, W.F. (1990) Changes in climate and biota on geological time scales.
 738 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, **5**, 285-288.

739 Shipley, B. (2010) *From plant traits to vegetation structure*. Cambridge University
 740 Press, Cambridge, UK.

741 Siefert, A., Violle, C., Chalmandrier, L., Albert, C. H., Taudiere, A., Fajardo, A.,
 742 Aarssen, L. W., Baraloto, C., Carlucci, M. B., Cianciaruso, *et al.* (2015) A

743 global meta-analysis of the relative extent of intraspecific trait variation in
 744 plant communities. *Ecology letters*, **18**, 406-1419.

745 Slater, G.J. & Harmon, L.J. (2013) Unifying fossils and phylogenies for
 746 comparative analyses of diversification and trait evolution. *Methods in*
 747 *Ecology and Evolution*, **4**, 699-702.

748 Schwilk, D.W. & Caprio, A.C. (2011) Scaling from leaf traits to fire behaviour:
 749 community composition predicts fire severity in a temperate forest. *Journal*
 750 *of Ecology*, **99**, 970–980.

751 Thompson, J.D., Higgins, D.G., & Gibson, T.J. (1994) CLUSTAL W: improving the
 752 sensitivity of progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence
 753 weighting, position-specific gap penalties and weight matrix choice. *Nucleid*
 754 *Acids Renner*, **22**, 4673-4680.

755 Valladares, F. (2003) Light heterogeneity and plants: from ecophysiology to
 756 species coexistence and biodiversity. *Progress in Botany* (ed. by K. Esser, U.
 757 Luttge, W. Beyschlag and F. Hellwig0, pp. 439–471. Springer Berlin
 758 Heidelberg.

759 Valladares, F. & Niinemets, U. (2008) Shade tolerance, a key plant feature of
 760 complex nature and consequences. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and*
 761 *Systematics*, **39**, 237–257.

762 Wiens, J.J., Ackerly, D.D., Allen, A.P., Anacker, B.L., Buckely, L.B., Cornell, H.V.,
 763 Damschen, E.I., Davis T.J., Grytnes, J.A., Harrison, S.P. & Hawkins, B.A.
 764 (2010). Niche conservatism as an emerging principle in ecology and
 765 conservation biology. *Ecology Letters*, **13**, 1310-1324.

766 Willig, M.R., Kaufman, D.M. & Stevens, R.D. (2003) Latitudinal gradients of
 767 biodiversity: pattern, process, scale and synthesis. *Annual Review of*
 768 *Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, **34**, 273-309.

769 Willson, C.J., Manos, P.S. & Jackson, R.B. (2008) Hydraulic traits are influenced by
 770 phylogenetic history in the drought-resistant, invasive genus *Juniperus*
 771 (Cupressaceae). *American Journal of Botany*, **95**, 299-314.

772 Won, H. & Renner, S.S. (2006) Dating dispersal and radiation in the gymnosperm
 773 *Gnetum* (Gnetales) – clock calibration when outgroup relationships are
 774 uncertain. *Systematic Biology*, **55**, 610-622.

775 Zachos, J.C., Dickens, G.R. & Zeebe, R.E. (2008) An early Cenozoic perspective on
 776 greenhouse warming and carbon-cycle dynamics. *Nature*, **451**, 279-283.

777 Zanazzi, A., Kohn, M.J., MacFadden, B.J. & Terry, D.O. (2007) Large temperature
 778 drop across the Eocene-Oligocene transition in central North America.
 779 *Nature*, **445**, 639-642.

780 Zanne, A.E., Tank, D.C., Cornwell, W.K., Eastman, J.M., Smith, S.A., FitzJohn, R.G.,
 781 McGlinn, D.J., O'Meara, B.C., Moles, A.T., Reich, P.B. & Royer, D.L. (2014)
 782 Three keys to the radiation of angiosperms into freezing
 783 environments. *Nature*, **506**, 89-92.

784 Zelený, D. & Schaffers, A.P. (2012) Too good to be true; pitfalls of using mean
 785 Ellenberg indicator values in vegetation analyses. *Journal of Vegetation*
 786 *Science*, **23**, 419-431.

787

788

789 Table 1: Random forest models (200 trees) for mean trait values of 88 conifer species across the contiguous United States. The most
790 important predictor variables for each trait (>90) are highlighted in bold and the sign of the correlation provided. Results are ranked by
791 the explanatory power (R^2) of the model. Predictor variables are: Maximum temperature in warmest month (Max T), minimum
792 temperature in coldest month (Min T), annual precipitation (Ann P), summer precipitation (Sum P), summer normal direct insolation
793 (Sum insol), elevation (Elev), and soil type (Soil).

		R^2	Max T	Min T	Ann P	Sum P	Sum insol	Elev	Soil
794									
795	Frost tolerance	0.88	100 (+)	68.7	23.3	27.8	12.6	20.1	36.1
796	Drought tolerance	0.85	100 (+)	28.2	33.2	16.2	26.8	24.6	38.3
797	Wood density	0.81	100 (+)	68.5	34.9	19.6	16.4	27.3	26.7
798	Fire tolerance	0.78	100 (+)	67.9	33.9	26.9	37.4	34.8	47.1
799	Seed size	0.76	76.1	74.2	57.1	55.2	100 (+)	62.6	63.3
800	Shade tolerance	0.76	100 (-)	26.5	34.1	19.2	21.1	21.5	32.1
801	Seed dispersal type	0.73	71.2	30.9	100 (-)	32.9	33.2	52.4	29.9
802	Height	0.72	65.6	50.8	100 (+)	57.4	44.3	67.6	16.6
803	Bark thickness	0.69	58.1	62.5	42.3	100 (-)	68.3	59.2	27.9
804	Fire resistance	0.66	52.9	100 (+)	42.4	48.1	46.1	65.9	21.3

805
806

807 Table 2: Comparative fits of eight continuous and ordinal conifer traits to three alternative evolutionary models: an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck
808 process (OU; constrained evolution), Brownian motion (BM; drift) and white noise (WN; no phylogenetic signal). Model fits are
809 evaluated using Akaike weights ($wAIC$) and express the probability that each model is the best among those compared. Pagel's λ ,
810 Blomberg's K and the α of the OU model are also provided.
811

Trait	$wAIC$ -BM	$wAIC$ -OU	$wAIC$ -WN	λ	K	α
Drought tolerance	0	1	0	0.863	0.103	0.043
Wood density	0	1	0	0.953	0.161	0.041
Seed size	0	1	0	0.963	0.117	0.028
Shade tolerance	0	1	0	0.900	0.123	0.043
Bark thickness	0	1	0	0.916	0.083	0.036
Height	0	1	0	0.919	0.086	0.038
Frost tolerance	0	0.822	0.178	0.520	0.030	0.242
Fire tolerance	0	0.554	0.446	<0.001	0.033	0.241

812 Table 3: Variance (diagonal), covariance (upper-diagonal) and correlation (lower-diagonal) values resulting from the evolutionary
813 variance-covariance matrix and phylogenetic correlation analysis for eight continuous and ordinal conifer traits. Significant correlations
814 ($p < 0.05$) for the phylogenetic correlations are highlighted in bold.

	Shade tolerance	Drought tolerance	Frost tolerance	Fire tolerance	Wood density	Seed size	Height	Bark thickness
Shade tolerance	0.166	-0.086	0.950	-0.061	-0.001	-0.019	0.012	0.009
Drought tolerance	-0.625	0.170	-0.169	0.016	0.001	0.021	-0.004	-0.007
Frost tolerance	0.191	-0.293	484.495	-2.747	-0.113	-1.486	0.586	0.433
Fire tolerance	-0.145	0.132	-0.165	0.327	0.0001	0.0001	0.002	0.036
Wood density	-0.577	0.459	-0.235	-0.139	0.0003	0.001	-0.0005	-0.0005
Seed size	-0.334	0.569	-0.199	0.015	0.625	0.039	-0.003	-0.0003
Height	0.377	-0.456	0.290	0.136	-0.560	-0.319	0.008	0.007
Bark thickness	-0.097	-0.217	0.170	0.064	-0.212	-0.122	0.544	0.020

835 Table 4: Correlation coefficients resulting from Pearson correlation analysis for eight continuous and ordinal conifer traits. Coefficients
 836 higher than 0.7 are highlighted in bold.

837

838

	Shade tolerance	Drought tolerance	Frost tolerance	Fire tolerance	Wood density	Seed size	Height
Drought	-0.911						
Frost tolerance	0.678	-0.723					
Fire tolerance	-0.530	0.594	-0.641				
Wood density	-0.774	0.716	-0.840	0.552			
Seed size	-0.561	0.639	-0.558	0.311	0.458		
Height	0.156	-0.262	0.017	0.183	-0.068	-0.050	
Bark thickness	-0.235	0.135	-0.060	0.239	0.174	0.283	0.630

Figure captions

Figure 1. Geographical patterns for 10 traits across 98,400 plots for southern North American conifers. For illustrative purposes, natural stands with 1 species are also included to show their geographical patterns although they were not included in the analysis

Figure 1