

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Globally, tree fecundity exceeds productivity gradients

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1879967> since 2022-11-19T16:13:38Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1111/ele.14012

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

Global tree-fecundity is linked to the intensity of species interactions

Valentin Journe,¹ Robert Andrus,² Marie-Claire Aravena,³ Davide Ascoli,⁴ Yves Bergeron,⁵ Roberta Berretti,⁴ Daniel Berveiller,⁶ Michal Bogdziewicz,⁷ Thomas Boivin,⁸ Raul Bonal,⁹ Dale Brockway,¹⁰ Thomas Caignard,¹¹ Rafael Calama,¹² J. Julio Camarero,¹³ Chia-Hao Chang-Yang,¹⁴ Natalie L. Cleavitt,¹⁵ Benoit Courbaud,¹ Francois Courbet,⁸ Thomas Curt,¹⁶ Adrian J. Das,¹⁷ Evangelia Daskalidou,¹⁸ Hendrik Davi,⁸ Nicolas Delpierre,⁶ Sylvain Delzon,¹¹ Michael Dietze,¹⁹ Sergio Donoso Calderon,³ Laurent Dormont,²⁰ Josep Espelta,²¹ Timothy J. Fahey,¹⁵ William Farfan-Rios,²² Catherine A. Gehring,²³ Gregory S. Gilbert,²⁴ Georg Gratzer,²⁵ Cathryn H. Greenberg,²⁶ Qinfeng Guo,²⁷ Andrew Hacket-Pain,²⁸ Arndt Hampe,¹¹ Qingmin Han,²⁹ Janneke Hille Ris Lambers,³⁰ Kazuhiko Hoshizaki,³¹ Ines Ibanez,³² Jill F. Johnstone,³³ Daisuke Kabeya,²⁹ Christopher L. Kilner,³⁴ Thomas Kitzberger,³⁵ Johannes M.H. Knops,³⁶ Richard K. Kobe,³⁷ Georges Kunstler,¹ Jonathan G.A. Lageard,³⁸ Jalene M. LaMontagne,³⁹ Mateusz Ledwon,⁴⁰ Francois Lefevre,⁸ Theodor Leininger,⁴¹ Jean-Marc Limousin,⁴² James A. Lutz,⁴³ Diana Macias,⁴⁴ Eliot J.B. McIntire,⁴⁵ Christopher M. Moore,⁴⁶ Emily Moran,⁴⁷ Renzo Motta,⁴ Jonathan A. Myers,⁴⁸ Thomas A. Nagel,⁴⁹ Kyotaro Noguchi,⁵⁰ Jean-Marc Ourcival,⁴² Robert Parmenter,⁵¹ Ian S. Pearse,⁵² Ignacio M. Perez-Ramos,⁵³ Lukasz Piechnik,⁵⁴ John Poulsen,³⁴ Renata Poulton-Kamakura,³⁴ Tong Qiu,³⁴ Miranda D. Redmond,⁵⁵ Chantal D. Reid,³⁴ Kyle C. Rodman,⁵⁶ Francisco Rodriguez-Sanchez,⁵⁷ Javier D. Sanguinetti,⁵⁸ C. Lane Scher,³⁴ Harald Schmidt Van Marle,³ Barbara Seget,⁵⁴ Shubhi Sharma,³⁴ Miles Silman,⁵⁹ Michael A. Steele,⁶⁰ Nathan L. Stephenson,¹⁷ Jacob N. Straub,⁶¹ I-Fang Sun,⁶² Samantha Sutton,³⁴ Jennifer J. Swenson,³⁴ Margaret Swift,³⁴ Peter A. Thomas,⁶³ Maria Uriarte,⁶⁴ Giorgio Vacchiano,⁶⁵ Thomas T. Veblen,² Amy V. Whipple,²³ Thomas G. Whitham,²³ Andreas P. Wion,⁶⁶ Boyd Wright,⁶⁷ S. Joseph Wright,⁶⁸ Kai Zhu,²⁴ Jess K. Zimmerman,⁶⁹ Roman Zlotin,⁷⁰ Magdalena Zywiec,⁵⁴ James S. Clark,³⁴

¹Universite Grenoble Alpes, Institut National de Recherche pour Agriculture, Alimentation et Environnement (INRAE), Laboratoire EcoSystemes et Societes En Montagne (LESSEM), 38402 St. Martin-d'Herès, France

²Department of Geography, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO 80309 USA

³Universidad de Chile, Facultad de Ciencias Forestales y de la Conservacion de la Naturaleza (FCFCN), La Pintana, 8820808 Santiago, Chile

⁴Department of Agriculture, Forest and Food Sciences, University of Torino, 10095 Grugliasco, TO, Italy

⁵Forest Research Institute, University of Quebec in Abitibi-Temiscamingue, Rouyn-Noranda, QC J9X 5E4, Canada

⁶Universite Paris-Saclay, Centre national de la recherche scientifique, AgroParisTech, Ecologie Systematique et Evolution, 91405 Orsay, France

⁷Department of Systematic Zoology, Faculty of Biology, Adam Mickiewicz University, Umultowska 89, 61-614 Poznan, Poland

⁸Institut National de Recherche pour Agriculture, Alimentation et Environnement (INRAE), Ecologie des Forets Mediterranennes, 84000 Avignon, France

⁹Department of Biodiversity, Ecology and Evolution, Complutense University of Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain

¹⁰Southern Research Station, USDA Forest Service, Auburn, AL 36849 USA

¹¹Universite Bordeaux, Institut National de Recherche pour Agriculture, Alimentation et Environnement (INRAE),

42 Biodiversity, Genes, and Communities (BIOGECO), 33615 Pessac, France
43 ¹²Centro de Investigacion Forestal - Instituto Nacional de Investigacion y Tecnologia Agraria y Alimentaria (INIA-
44 CIFOR), 28040 Madrid, Spain
45 ¹³Instituto Pirenaico de Ecologia, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas (IPE-CSIC), 50059 Zaragoza,
46 Spain
47 ¹⁴Department of Biological Sciences, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung 80424, Taiwan
48 ¹⁵Natural Resources, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, 14853 USA
49 ¹⁶Aix Marseille universite, Institut National de Recherche pour Agriculture, Alimentation et Environnement (IN-
50 RAE), 13182 Aix-en-Provence, France
51 ¹⁷USGS Western Ecological Research Center, Three Rivers, CA, 93271 USA
52 ¹⁸Institute of Mediterranean and Forest Ecosystems, Greece
53 ¹⁹Earth and Environment, Boston University, Boston, MA, 02215 USA
54 ²⁰Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive (CEFE), Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS),
55 34293 Montpellier, France.
56 ²¹Centre de Recerca Ecologica i Aplicacions Forestals (CREAF), Bellaterra, Catalunya 08193, Spain
57 ²²Washington University in Saint Louis, Center for Conservation and Sustainable Development, Missouri Botanical
58 Garden, St. Louis, MO 63110 USA
59 ²³Department of Biological Sciences, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ 86011 USA
60 ²⁴Department of Environmental Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064 USA
61 ²⁵Institute of Forest Ecology, Peter-Jordan-Strasse 82, 1190 Wien, Austria
62 ²⁶Bent Creek Experimental Forest, USDA Forest Service, Asheville, NC 28801 USA
63 ²⁷Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center, USDA Forest Service, Southern Research Station,
64 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709 USA
65 ²⁸Department of Geography and Planning, School of Environmental Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool,
66 United Kingdom
67 ²⁹Department of Plant Ecology Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute (FFPRI), Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-
68 8687 Japan
69 ³⁰Department of Environmental Systems Science, ETH Zurich, Switzerland 8092
70 ³¹Department of Biological Environment, Akita Prefectural University, Akita 010-0195, Japan
71 ³²School for Environment and Sustainability, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109
72 ³³Institute of Arctic Biology, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, AK 99700, USA
73 ³⁴Nicholas School of the Environment, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708 USA
74 ³⁵Department of Ecology, Instituto de Investigaciones en Biodiversidad y Medioambiente (Consejo Nacional de
75 Investigaciones Cientificas y Tecnicas - Universidad Nacional del Comahue), Quintral 1250, 8400 Bariloche, Ar-
76 gentina
77 ³⁶Health and Environmental Sciences Department, Xian Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou, China, 215123
78 ³⁷Department of Plant Biology, Program in Ecology, Evolutionary Biology, and Behavior, Michigan State Univer-
79 sity, East Lansing, MI 48824
80 ³⁸Department of Natural Sciences, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M1 5GD, UK
81 ³⁹Department of Biological Sciences, DePaul University, Chicago, IL 60614 USA
82 ⁴⁰Institute of Systematics and Evolution of Animals, Polish Academy of Sciences, Slawkowska 17, 31-016 Krakow,
83 Poland
84 ⁴¹USDA, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, PO Box 227, Stoneville, MS 38776
85 ⁴²CEFE, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, 1919 route de Mende, 34293 Montpellier Cedex 5, France
86 ⁴³Department of Wildland Resources, and the Ecology Center, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322 USA
87 ⁴⁴Department of Biology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131 USA
88 ⁴⁵Pacific Forestry Centre, Victoria, British Columbia, V8Z 1M5 Canada
89 ⁴⁶Department of Biology, Colby College, Waterville, ME 04901 USA

- 90 ⁴⁷School of Natural Sciences, UC Merced, Merced, CA 95343 USA
- 91 ⁴⁸Department of Biology, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO
- 92 ⁴⁹Department of forestry and renewable forest resources, Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana,
- 93 Slovenia
- 94 ⁵⁰Tohoku Research Center, Forestry and Forest Products Research Institute, Morioka, Iwate, 020-0123, Japan
- 95 ⁵¹Valles Caldera National Preserve, National Park Service, Jemez Springs, NM 87025 USA
- 96 ⁵²Fort Collins Science Center, 2150 Centre Avenue, Bldg C, Fort Collins, CO 80526 USA
- 97 ⁵³Inst. de Recursos Naturales y Agrobiologia de Sevilla, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas (IRNAS-
- 98 CSIC), Seville, Andalucia, Spain
- 99 ⁵⁴W. Szafer Institute of Botany, Polish Academy of Sciences, Lubicz 46, 31-512 Krakow, Poland
- 100 ⁵⁵Department of Forest and Rangeland Stewardship, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO, USA
- 101 ⁵⁶Department of Forest and Wildlife Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706 USA
- 102 ⁵⁷Department of Biologia Vegetal y Ecologia, Universidad de Sevilla, 41012 Sevilla, Spain
- 103 ⁵⁸Bilogo Dpto. Conservacin y Manejo Parque Nacional Lanin Elordi y Perito Moreno 8370, San Marten de los
- 104 Andes Neuquun Argentina
- 105 ⁵⁹Department of Biology, Wake Forest University, 1834 Wake Forest Rd, Winston-Salem, NC 27106 USA
- 106 ⁶⁰Department of Biology, Wilkes University, 84 West South Street, Wilkes-Barre, PA 18766 USA
- 107 ⁶¹Department of Environmental Science and Ecology, State University of New York-Brockport, Brockport, NY
- 108 14420 USA
- 109 ⁶²Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Ecology and Sustainability, College of Environmental Studies, National
- 110 Dong Hwa University, Hualien, Taiwan
- 111 ⁶³School of Life Sciences, Keele University, Staffordshire ST5 5BG, UK
- 112 ⁶⁴Department of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology, Columbia University, 1113 Schermerhorn Ext.,
- 113 1200 Amsterdam Ave., New York, NY 10027
- 114 ⁶⁵Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences - Production, Territory, Agroenergy (DISAA), Univer-
- 115 sity of Milan, 20133 Milano, Italy
- 116 ⁶⁶Department of Forest and Rangeland Stewardship, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA
- 117 ⁶⁷Botany, School of Environmental and Rural Science, University of New England, Armidale, NSW, 2350, Aus-
- 118 tralia
- 119 ⁶⁸Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Apartado 0843n03092, Balboa, Republic of Panama
- 120 ⁶⁹Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, PR 00936 USA
- 121 ⁷⁰Geography Department and Russian and East European Institute, Bloomington, IN 47405 USA

122

123 —

124 *keywords:* climate | competition | forest regeneration | seed consumption | species interactions

125 | tree fecundity

Abstract

Increasing evidence points to intense species competition in wet tropical forests that that may be explained by interactions involving seeds, seedlings, and their consumers. Lack of tree fecundity data across temperate to tropical communities precludes analysis of how the seed resource contributes to biotic interactions that can drive biogeographic diversity patterns. A global synthesis of raw seed-production data shows a 2.4 order of magnitude increase in seed abundance from cold, dry to warm, wet climates, driven by a 2.0 order of magnitude increase in seed production for a given tree size. The modest increase in forest productivity across the same climate gradient cannot explain this 100-fold increase in seed production or the 250-fold increase in seed mass per forest area reported here. The increase in seeds per tree can arise from adaptive evolution driven by intense species interactions or from the direct effects of a warm, moist climate on tree fecundity. Either way, the massive differences in seed supply to temperate versus tropical communities ramifies through food webs, affecting community and ecosystem dynamics, including seedling competition, populations of seed consumers and frugivore-seed dispersers, all of which appear to be especially important in the wet tropics.

Introduction

Understanding seed production can help resolve the paradox of extreme tree diversity in the warm latitudes where intense competition is expected to limit coexistence [1, 2, 3, 4]. High net primary productivity (NPP) that comes with long growing seasons accelerates growth, increases plant competition, and elevates mortality rates [5, 6, 7]. This coincidence of high diversity with intense competition is increasingly explained by coexistence mechanisms involving interactions between seeds and seedlings through their natural enemies [8, 9, 10]. Tree fecundity determines the density of competing offspring and the diets of consumers and seed dispersers that depend on them [11, 12, 13], and it is clearly subject to adaptive evolution [14, 15]. If there is a latitudinal gradient in seed production, is it a product of greater seed production for a given tree size, or is it the case that tropical trees are simply larger and/or embedded in more productive communities, as assumed in the Dynamic Global Vegetation Models (DGVMs) used to understand effects of climate change [16, 17]? Temperate-tropical fecundity gradients that go beyond what could be explained by differences in tree size or NPP would provide evidence that biogeographic diversity trends depend on this critical demographic variable that is a foundation for many forest food webs [18, 19]. While forest inventory data continue to improve estimates of growth and mortality across climate gradients [7, 20], fecundity evidence has remained unavailable. This synthesis allows us to quantify the fecundity gradient on a global scale and determine that it is amplified in warm/moist climates beyond what can be explained by tree size or NPP.

Seed and seedling densities are the starting point not only for competition, but also for consumer-based explanations of coexistence that were first recognized in the tropics [8, 9]. Intense plant competition is an inevitable consequence of long growing seasons and high annual growth [21, 22, 23]. Accumulating evidence indicates that consumer pressure is likewise intense [24, 25, 4]. Selection for high seed production might offset high losses to biotic interactions, while at the same time intensifying them by increasing density- and frequency-dependent interactions. By the widely invoked Janzen-Connell mechanism [8, 9], a host tree can escape its specialist consumers where that host is rare, i.e., a density-dependent process. A generalist consumer imposes indirect competition between its multiple hosts, as an increase in one attracts the natural enemies it shares with others, a density- and frequency-dependent process. The seed diversity available to consumers could differ from that of trees, because the

171 abundant species may not produce large seed crops, and vice versa. There is potential for an
 172 arms race between species [26, 27] as selective pressures balance the benefits of producing more
 173 seed against the costs of diverting resources from growth and defense [28, 29]. Taken together,
 174 tree fecundity is a foundation for community interactions that increasingly appear to be most
 175 intense in tropical forests.




Figure 1: a) Climate effects on fecundity could be I) negligible, in which case there is no latitudinal fecundity gradient (right), or there could be direct (II) or indirect effects through adaptive responses to intense species interactions in tropical climates (III). Both II and III could be amplified beyond what could be explained by gradients in tree size or NPP. Either way, there is potential for positive feedback involving arrows in green. b) Orders of magnitude increases from cold/dry to warm/moist for individual (ISP) and community (CSP) seed production compared with NPP. Curves are sections through surfaces (dashed lines) in Fig. 2, with scales for moisture deficit (above) and temperature (below). Curves are in proportion to minimum values in cold, dry conditions. Confidence intervals (95%) are not visible for ISP and NPP due to the large number of trees. They are wider for CSP due to fewer inventory plots at high temperatures (Fig. 2b).

176 Fecundity could vary due to climate directly or indirectly, the latter through adaptation to
 177 biotic interactions that, in turn, respond to climate (Fig. 1a). Because reproductive effort
 178 depends on both seed sizes and numbers [30], and it varies with tree size [31], *individual seed*
 179 *productivity* (ISP) is standardized for tree basal area,

$$\begin{aligned}
 ISP_{ij} &= \frac{\hat{f}_{ijs} \times g_s}{\text{basal area}_i} \\
 &= \text{g m}^{-2}\text{yr}^{-1}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

180 depending on mass of a seed g_s produced by species s , where the estimate of mean seed
 181 production \hat{f}_{ijs} for tree i at location j accounts for the uncertainty in its seed production each
 182 year, $f_{ijs,t}$ (see Methods). If seed production is determined solely by tree size, as assumed in
 183 ecological models (reviewed in [31]), then climate effects could come through its effects on past
 184 growth that results in larger trees (Fig. 1a, II), and ISP (standardized for size) will be constant
 185 across climate gradients.

186 While ISP_{ij} quantifies production by individuals, *community seed production*, CSP_j , quan-
 187 tifies seed density on the forest floor, the starting point for interactions between seeds, seedlings,

188 consumers, and dispersers. [We hereafter omit subscripts to reduce clutter.] Like NPP, CSP is
189 a community property, defined as the seed production summed over all trees on a plot (g ha^{-1}
190 yr^{-1} , eqn 4). CSP might scale as a fraction of NPP, as suggested by some empirical evidence
191 [32] and assumed in DGVMs [16, 17], predicting high CSP where NPP is highest in warm/moist
192 climates [33]. If ISP is determined as a simple fraction of tree size, or CSP as a fraction of
193 NPP, then it is hard to invoke biotic interactions as an explanation for variation along climate
194 gradients.

195 Alternatively, if the responses are amplified beyond what could be explained by the effects
196 of climate on size or NPP, then climate gradients could be a driver of intense biotic interactions
197 in the tropics. There are at least two potential causes for fecundity amplification (Fig. 1a). First,
198 ISP might have flexibility to respond to a longer growing season [34, 35] well in excess of tree
199 growth, which is limited by mechanical and hydraulic constraints on tree size [36, 37]. At the
200 community scale, NPP is further constrained by the compensatory losses in stand biomass as
201 mortality increases to offset increases in growth [22]. Thus, while NPP increases with warm,
202 wet conditions, the lack of structural constraints on producing more seeds might allow for a
203 disproportionate fecundity response, the *amplification* of figure 1a, II.

204 Amplification could also be driven by intense species interactions in the wet tropics [4, 38]
205 that increase selection for seed production, mediated by allocation trade-offs between seeds
206 versus growth and defense [39, 40]. Whether amplification occurs as a direct response to
207 climate or as an adaptive response to intense biotic interactions (Fig. 1a, II and III), the density-
208 and frequency-dependent processes involving competition, consumers, and seed dispersers have
209 community-wide implications. A potential arms race follows from the feedback between high
210 seed production and the selection pressures to offset mortality losses (green arrows in Fig. 1a).

211 Biogeographic variation in fecundity remains largely unknown. Fecundity studies typically
212 report on one to a few species from one to a few sites. Recent compilations of seed numbers
213 recognise the challenges posed by differing methods, some yielding estimates of stand averages
214 and others offering various individual-tree estimates that are difficult to compare [41, 42]. Efforts
215 to synthesize this literature globally report that seed size [43] or variation in seed numbers (e.g.,
216 [42]) increase with temperature or with variability in precipitation or temperature. Latitudinal
217 trends in seed size [43, 44] may not translate to trends in fecundity, which depends on the number
218 of seeds \times seed size. A decline in predicted seed-mass density (per forest floor) with increasing
219 latitude reported from a study that included only forests at low latitudes and mostly heath and
220 grasslands at high latitudes [43] highlights the need to separate variation in tree fecundity from
221 variation in tree abundance.

222 This synthesis extends the Masting Inference and Forecasting (MASTIF) network [45] to
223 determine the climate controls on seed production globally and the extent to which those trends
224 go beyond what can be explained by effects of size and productivity. Climate trends are
225 summarized by mean annual temperature and moisture deficit. We additionally allow for effects
226 of individual condition and local habitat variation by including tree diameter, shade class, and
227 soil cation exchange capacity (Materials and Methods).

228 **Results and Discussion**

229 Community seed production (CSP) increases 2.4 orders of magnitude to a global maximum in the
230 warm, moist tropics, primarily driven by a two order-of-magnitude increase in seed production
231 for a given tree size (ISP) (Fig. 1b). These increases align with the geographic trend in NPP
232 (panels in Fig. 2), but the amplification for seed production in excess of the NPP gradient
233 provides first evidence that it can play a central role in the species interactions hypothesized to




Figure 2: a) Climate responses for (a) ISP (seed mass per tree basal area, $\log_{10} \text{ g m}^{-2} \text{ y}^{-1}$) (b) CSP (seed mass per ha forest floor, $\log_{10} \text{ g ha}^{-1} \text{ y}^{-1}$), and (c) NPP ($\text{kg C m}^{-2} \text{ y}^{-1}$). Dashed lines indicate the transect from dry taiga to wet tropics in Fig. 1b. Note the linear scale for (c) and \log_{10} scales for (a) and (b). Convex hulls are defined by observations (red), including individual trees (a, c) and inventory plots (b). Surface transparency increases as the inverse of the predictive standard error—faded edges reflect increased uncertainty at data extremes. Coefficients are reported in Table S4 and Table S2 for NPP.

234 be most intense in warm, moist climates. If individual fecundity scales with tree basal area, then
 235 ISP (seed mass per tree basal area) would be flat in Fig. 1b. If community seed production
 236 scales with NPP, then CSP would increase no faster than NPP on the proportionate scale in Fig.
 237 1b. The amplification over size and NPP observed here has implications for trophic interactions,
 238 and it provides insights into cause.

239 A first important benchmark of this study is the exposure of fecundity trends with global
 240 climate. The average seed production for 95% of trees of a given size varies over five orders
 241 of magnitude, with ISP ranging from 0.000025 to 50 g per cm^2 of basal area (Figure S5a).
 242 The increase in ISP to its highest values in warm, moist climates (Fig. 2b) is driven more
 243 by temperature than by moisture (Table S4), amplified by moisture where temperatures are
 244 high (Figure S2c). The five order-of-magnitude range for individual ISP is matched by that
 245 for community seed production, with 95% of CSP values ranging from 50 g to 2500 kg ha^{-1}
 246 (Figure S5b). The 100-fold increase in ISP across the climate gradient is more than matched by
 247 the 250-fold increase in CSP.

248 Forest productivity cannot explain the global fecundity gradient evident at the individual or
 249 community levels. Like fecundity trends, NPP shows high values in warm, moist climates (Fig.
 250 2c). However, the three-fold range of NPP across this climate space is swamped by the 100-
 251 and 250-fold ranges for ISP and CSP (Fig. 1b). The amplification of both ISP and CSP means
 252 that not only do individual trees produce more seed for a given size in the wet tropics, but also
 253 that seed abundance is amplified at the community level (Figure S2f). [Community-level CSP
 254 need not necessarily track ISP responses due to heterogeneous size-species structures associated
 255 with local site conditions, past disturbance, and competition.] These results extend the previous
 256 discovery of a fecundity hotspot in the warm, moist southeastern North America [45] to a global
 257 pattern.

258 Fecundity trends that are amplified well beyond what can be explained by size or productivity
 259 alone could be driven by direct climate effects, by selective pressures due to high losses to biotic
 260 interactions, or both (Fig. 1a). The two order-of-magnitude climatic and latitudinal trend
 261 in seed mass per forest-floor area (CSP) has its most direct implications for density-dependent
 262 interactions, which include competition within tree species and frequency-dependent consumers.
 263 All else being equal, a 100-fold gradient in seed supply requires corresponding mortality losses




Figure 3: Species diversity in seeds (vertical axis) is lower than expected from species diversity in trees (horizontal axis). In both cases, diversity is evaluated from the Shannon index, $-\sum_s p_s \log p_s$, where p_s is the fraction of species s in basal area (trees) and CSP (seeds). Each point represents an inventory plot. Except at low tree diversity, points lie almost entirely below the 1:1 line (dashed). The legend at top left shows mean annual temperature (symbol color) and mass of the average seed (symbol size).

264 to yield similar densities of adult trees [21, 22]. Elevated densities of seeds, fruits, and nuts and
 265 their offsetting mortality losses increase selective pressure for the most competitive phenotypes.
 266 The bottom-up enrichment of food webs that cascades to higher trophic levels [18, 19, 25] must
 267 inevitably increase consumer and disperser densities that, in turn, impose frequency-dependence
 268 selection on seed and seedling survival [8]. The magnitude of amplification leaves no doubt that
 269 it intensifies species interactions in the wet tropics.

270 Frequency-dependent consumer pressures depend on diversity of the seed resource, which
 271 is poorly predicted by the standard inventory of trees. Species diversity of both seed mass and
 272 tree basal area is highest in the warm climates where diversity of the seed resource would be
 273 overestimated on the basis of tree diversity (Fig. 3). The lower species diversity for seeds in
 274 warm climates results from the fact that species having modest differences in tree basal area
 275 vary widely in fecundity; tendency for a subset of species to dominate seed production reduces
 276 seed diversity below that for trees. In the cool climates where seeds tend to be small (small,
 277 blue symbols in Fig. 3), the low diversity that would be estimated on the basis of trees masks
 278 an unexpectedly high seed diversity (Fig. 2). Although many studies do not record fecundity
 279 for species having the smallest seeds (e.g., Salicaceae), these are also the seeds that are least
 280 apparent to vertebrate consumers. Omission of these smallest seeds means that values are over-
 281 estimates, but still relevant for many consumers. The net effect of reduced seed diversity in warm
 282 climates affects frequency-dependent processes [46], such as host-specific seed predation. The
 283 concentration of seed mass in a smaller than expected species diversity reduces the apparency of
 284 weak producers, while potentially concentrating consumption on species that are not necessarily
 285 abundant, but that can dominate seed production.

286 The biogeographic variation between trees (ISP) and communities (CSP) is distinct from
 287 the large masting literature focused on variation in the magnitude of reproduction over time
 288 within trees or stands. Temporal variation in climate [47, 48, 49] that interacts with variable

289 storage and pollen supply [50, 51] is of great interest for understanding allocation shifts within
290 individuals, but it fundamentally differs from geographic variation in populations subjected to
291 divergent selection histories [47]. The 100-fold trend in expected ISP and CSP (Fig. 2a) is
292 still modest relative to the within-tree (over time) and between-tree variation that motivates
293 local-scale studies (Figure S2). The fact that the massive geographic trend in Fig. 2a can be
294 readily masked by other sources of variation emphasizes the importance of large data sets that
295 span broad coverage in individual condition, habitat, and climate.

296 Whether or not the amplified fecundity response in warm, moist climates represents a legacy
297 of adaptive evolution to intense species interactions, its 100-fold biogeographic gradient adds a
298 new dimension to the understanding of trophic processes that may control latitudinal diversity
299 gradients. The fact that both individual fecundity and community-level CSP overwhelm climate
300 responses in NPP (Fig. 2a) means that fecundity of many species can contribute to the selection
301 pressures on others and on their consumers [52]. If host-specific consumers regulate diversity
302 through density- and frequency-dependent attack, then their strongest impacts are occurring
303 where seed supply can support their highest numbers. The dramatic biogeographic trend sets
304 up the potential for an evolutionary arms race to increase fecundity in the warm, moist tropics.
305 Regardless of whether this arms race has occurred, the trends in stand-level seed rain imply
306 profound implications for food web dynamics. A positive feedback on selection pressure in
307 diverse tropical forests could ensue where species from every major angiosperm clade enrich
308 functional space and niche overlap. Declines in biodiversity that result from climate change,
309 habitat degradation, and human exploitation in the tropical regions where interaction strength
310 is intense is expected to ramify through food webs to a degree that is not expected where
311 interactions are loose and generally weak [53]. The temperate-tropical gradient can motivate
312 research on its contribution to consumer and disperser guilds [4] and the broader implications
313 for diversity.

References

- [1] R. H. MacArthur, *Geographical Ecology: Patterns in the Distribution of Species* (1972), princeton edn.
- [2] J. Chave, H. C. Muller-Landau, S. A. Levin, *The American Naturalist* **159**, 1 (2002).
- [3] J. H. Brown, *Journal of Biogeography* **41**, 8 (2014).
- [4] A. L. Hargreaves, *et al.*, *Science Advances* **5**, 1 (2019).
- [5] O. L. Phillips, A. H. Gentry, *Science* **263**, 954 (1994).
- [6] S. L. Lewis, *et al.*, *Journal of Ecology* **92**, 929 (2004).
- [7] N. L. Stephenson, P. J. Van Mantgem, *Ecology Letters* **8**, 524 (2005).
- [8] D. Janzen, *The American Naturalist* **104**, 501 (1970).
- [9] J. Connell, *Herbivores and the Number of Tree Species in Tropical Forests* (Pudoc, Wageningen, 1970), p. 298–312.
- [10] K. Zhu, C. W. Woodall, J. V. Monteiro, J. S. Clark, *Ecology* **96**, 2319 (2015).
- [11] J. Terborgh, *Community aspects of frugivory in tropical forests* (Springer, Dordrecht, 1986), vol. 15 of *Tasks for Vegetation Science*.
- [12] R. T. Corlett, *Biological Conservation* **163**, 13 (2013).
- [13] K. Mokany, S. Prasad, D. A. Westcott, *Nature Communications* **5**, 3971 (2014).
- [14] R. J. Petit, R. Bialozyt, P. Garnier-Géré, A. Hampe, *Forest Ecology and Management* **197**, 117 (2004).
- [15] H. X. Wu, R. Ker, Z. Chen, M. Ivkovic, *Evolutionary Applications* **14**, 834 (2021).
- [16] S. Sitch, *et al.*, *Global Change Biology* **9**, 161 (2003).
- [17] G. Krinner, *et al.*, *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* **19**, 1 (2005).
- [18] R. S. Ostfeld, F. Keesing, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **15**, 232 (2000).
- [19] A. E. Rosenblatt, O. J. Schmitz, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **31**, 965 (2016).
- [20] R. J. Brien, *et al.*, *Nature Communications* **11**, 1 (2020).
- [21] E. Assmann, *The principles of forest yield study. Studies in the organic production, structure, increment and yield of forest stands.* (1970).
- [22] J. S. Clark, *Journal of Ecology* **78**, 275 (1990).
- [23] N. L. Stephenson, *et al.*, *Ecological Monographs* **81**, 527 (2011).
- [24] R. Bagchi, *et al.*, *Nature* **506**, 85 (2014).
- [25] T. Levi, *et al.*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **116**, 581 (2019).

- 345 [26] R. Dawkins, J. R. Krebs, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological*
346 *Sciences* **205**, 489 (1979).
- 347 [27] M. Gruntman, D. Groß, M. Májeková, K. Tielbörger, *Nature Communications* **8**, 2235
348 (2017).
- 349 [28] A. B. Berdanier, J. S. Clark, *Ecosphere* **7**, e01313 (2016).
- 350 [29] J. D. Lauder, E. V. Moran, S. C. Hart, *Tree Physiology* **39**, 1071 (2019).
- 351 [30] M. Westoby, E. Jurado, M. Leishman, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* **7**, 368 (1992).
- 352 [31] T. Qiu, *et al.*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- 353 [32] G. Vacchiano, *et al.*, *Ecological Modelling* **376**, 40 (2018).
- 354 [33] S. Del Grosso, *et al.*, *Ecology* **89**, 2117 (2008).
- 355 [34] S. H. Yeoh, *et al.*, *Molecular Ecology* **26**, 5074 (2017).
- 356 [35] I. Mendoza, *et al.*, *Biotropica* **50**, 431 (2018).
- 357 [36] G. W. Koch, S. C. Sillett, G. M. Jennings, S. D. Davis, *Nature* **428**, 851 (2004).
- 358 [37] D. A. King, S. J. Davies, S. Tan, N. S. Md. Noor, *Functional Ecology* **23**, 284 (2009).
- 359 [38] L. S. Comita, *et al.*, *Journal of Ecology* **102**, 845 (2014).
- 360 [39] J. R. Obeso, *New Phytologist* **155**, 321 (2002).
- 361 [40] J. D. Fridley, *Journal of Ecology* **105**, 95 (2017).
- 362 [41] J. M. LaMontagne, I. S. Pearse, D. F. Greene, W. D. Koenig, *Nature Plants* **6**, 460 (2020).
- 363 [42] I. S. Pearse, J. M. LaMontagne, M. Lordon, A. L. Hipp, W. D. Koenig, *New Phytologist*
364 **227**, 1557 (2020).
- 365 [43] A. T. Moles, I. J. Wright, A. J. Pitman, B. R. Murray, M. Westoby, *Ecography* **32**, 78
366 (2009).
- 367 [44] S. Tautenhahn, H. Heilmeyer, L. Go, S. Klotz, C. Wirth, *Ecography* **31**, 457 (2008).
- 368 [45] J. S. Clark, *et al.*, *Nature Communications* **12**, 1 (2021).
- 369 [46] P. T. Green, K. E. Harms, J. H. Connell, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
370 **111**, 18649 (2014).
- 371 [47] J. S. Clark, D. M. Bell, M. C. Kwit, K. Zhu, *Global Change Biology* **20**, 1979 (2014).
- 372 [48] T. Caignard, *et al.*, *Scientific Reports* **7**, 1 (2017).
- 373 [49] M. Bogdziewicz, M. Fernández-Martínez, J. M. Espelta, R. Ogaya, J. Penuelas, *New*
374 *Phytologist* **227**, 1073 (2020).
- 375 [50] D. Kelly, *et al.*, *Ecology Letters* **16**, 90 (2013).

- 376 [51] M. Bogdziewicz, M. Pesendorfer, E. E. Crone, C. Pérez-Izquierdo, R. Bonal, *Ecology*
377 *Letters* **23**, 1820 (2020).
- 378 [52] T. G. Whitham, G. J. Allan, H. F. Cooper, S. M. Shuster, *Annual Review of Ecology,*
379 *Evolution, and Systematics* **51**, 587 (2020).
- 380 [53] D. R. Strong, K. T. Frank, *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **35**, 1 (2010).

381 **Acknowledgements**

382 We thank the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON) for access to sites and veg-
383 etation structure data, W. Koenig for useful data on crop production and S. Sitch for access
384 to TRENDY products. The project has been funded since 1992 by grants to JSC from the Na-
385 tional Science Foundation, most recently DEB-1754443, and by the Belmont Forum (1854976),
386 NASA (AIST16-0052, AIST18-0063), and the Programme d'Investissement d'Avenir under
387 project FORBIC (18-MPGA-0004) (*Make Our Planet Great Again*). Jerry Franklin's data re-
388 main accessible through NSF LTER DEB-1440409. Puerto Rico data were funded by NSF
389 grants, most recently, DEB 0963447 and LTREB 11222325. Data from the Andes Biodiversity
390 and Ecosystem Research Group were funded by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation and
391 NSF LTREB 1754647. MB was supported by grant no. 2019/35/D/NZ8/00050 from (Polish)
392 National Science Centre, and Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange Bekker pro-
393 gramme PPN/BEK/2020/1/00009/U/00001. Research by the USDA Forest Service and the the
394 USGS was funded by these agencies. Any use of trade, firm, or product names does not imply
395 endorsement by the U.S. Government.

396

397 **Supplementary Materials**

398 Materials and Methods Supplementary Text

399 Table S1 – S4

400 Fig S1 - S5

401 References (1 – 13)

Supplementary material

Materials and Methods

Fecundity data

Comprehensive data were needed to estimate climate effects due to the large variation in seed production. Masting, where large crop years exceed intervening years by orders of magnitude, is further complicated by spatio-temporal variation in habitat and climate. The many sources of variation means that biogeographic trends of interest can only be identified from broad coverage and large sample sizes, while accounting for individual tree condition, local habitat, and climate [45, 31].

The study uses crop-count and seed-trap data from the [Masting Inference and Forecasting \(MASTIF\)](#) project, including opportunistic data through the [iNaturalist project MASTIF](#) [56]. Observations include 12,053,732 tree-year observation from 748 species and 146,744 mature individuals. For crop-count data, an observation consists of tree species, diameter, crown shade class, the number of seeds/fruits or cones counted, and an estimate of the fraction of the total crop represented by the count. For seed-trap data, an observation consists of a count for a seed trap, trap location from an inventory plot where trees are measured and mapped, and trap area. Data models for the two data types in the MASTIF model include a beta-binomial distribution for crop counts (uncertainty in the count and in the crop-fraction estimate) and a redistribution model for seed counts (uncertainty in seed transport and in the count) [56]. Seed mass is taken as an average for the species, obtained from collections in our labs, supplemented with the TRY Plant Trait Database [57].

All observations provide estimates of ISP, including those on isolated trees. Because it requires seed production from a known area, only inventory plots offer estimates of CSP (Table S3). Together, ISP and CSP allow us to test how size-standardized seed production by individuals (ISP) and stand-level density of seed (CSP) vary with climate. As in all observational studies, geographic coverage is not uniform. The majority of sites are temperate (98%), while most observations (tree-years, 80%) and species (74%) are tropical. Sample sizes are included in Table S3 and their locations are shown in Figure S1. To clarify coverage, the distribution of data is displayed in each figure and detailed in the Supplement (Table S3, Figure S1).

Environmental and individual covariates

Predictors of fecundity for a given tree include diameter, crown class, climate, and soil and terrain covariates (Table S1). We included both linear and quadratic terms for diameter to allow changes of fecundity with tree size [31]. Crown class ranges from 1 (full sun) to 5 (full shade), following the protocol used in the National Ecological Observation Network (NEON) and the USDA Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program.

Climate variables include annual temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$) from the previous year, and moisture deficit (summed monthly evapotranspiration minus precipitation, mm) from the previous and current years. Because seasonality varies globally (there is no uniform definition of a 'growing season'), we describe climate with annual norms for temperature and moisture-deficit. Moisture deficit is defined as $(D_j = \sum_{k=1}^{12} PET_{jk} - P_{jk})$ for location j and month k , which is the basis for the familiar Standardized Precipitation Evapotranspiration Index (SPEI) [58], but omitting here the standardization, which allows for comparisons between sites.

To allow for changes in moisture access with tree size we included the interaction between moisture deficit and tree diameter. Climate variables were derived from [CHELSA](#) [59], [Terra-](#)

446 **Climate** [60], and local climate monitoring data where available. TerraClimate provides monthly
 447 but spatially coarse resolution [60] through 2020. CHELSA provides high spatial resolution (1
 448 km) but it is not available after 2016. We used regression to project CHELSA climate forward
 449 based on Terraclimate, followed by calibration to local weather data where available. Details
 450 are available in [45].

451 Cation exchange capacity (CEC), used as an indicator of soil fertility, was obtained from
 452 soilGrid250 [61] as weighted mean from three soil depths: 0-5, 5-15 and 15-30 cm, weights are
 453 reported uncertainty. Slope and aspect were obtained from the global digital elevation model
 454 from the NASA shuttle radar topography mission [62] and, for latitudes above 61°, from USGS
 455 National Elevation Dataset [63] with a resolution at 30 meters for both products. The covariates
 456 for slope and aspect (u_1, u_2, u_3) constitute a length-3 vector,

$$\mathbf{u}_j = \begin{cases} u_{j,1} = \sin(s_j) \\ u_{j,2} = \sin(s_j) \sin(a_j) \\ u_{j,3} = \sin(s_j) \cos(a_j) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

457 for slope s , where aspect a is taken in radians [64].

Table S1: Covariates used to fit the MASTIF model and data sources. Subscripts are tree i , site j , and year t .

Covariate	Units	Data source
Diameter ($G_{ij,t}, G_{ij,t}^2$)	cm, cm ²	MASTIF
Crown class ($C_{ij,t}$)	ordinal (class 1-5)	MASTIF
Moisture deficit (D_j)	mm	terraClimate, CHELSA
Deficit anomaly ($D_{j,t}$)	mm	terraClimate, CHELSA
Temperature (T_j)	°C	terraClimate, CHELSA
Temperature anomaly ($T_{j,t}$)	°C	terraClimate, CHELSA
$D_j \times G_{ij,t}$	mm × cm	
CEC _{j} (0 - 30cm)	mmolc/kg	soilgrid250m
Slope, aspect (u_{1j}, u_{2j}, u_{3j})	radians	DEM, USGS

458 Model inference with MASTIF

459 The MASTIF model used to analyse seed trap/crop count data is detailed in [56]. This (hierar-
 460 chical) state-space, auto-regressive model accommodates dependence between trees and within
 461 trees over years through a joint analysis. For each tree i and year t there is a mean fecundity
 462 estimate $\hat{f}_{i,t} = \hat{\rho}_{i,t} \hat{\psi}_{i,t}$ that is the product of conditional fecundity $\hat{\psi}$ and maturation probability
 463 $\hat{\rho}_{i,t}$. The model for conditional fecundity is given by $\log \psi_{it} = \mathbf{x}'_{i,t} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(x)} + \beta_i^{(w)} + \gamma_{g[i],t} + \epsilon_{i,t}$, where
 464 \mathbf{x}_{it} is a design vector holding climate, soils, local crowding, and individual attributes (sTable
 465 S1), $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(x)}$ are fixed-effects coefficients, $\beta_i^{(w)}$ is the random effect for tree i , $\gamma_{g[i],t}$ are year effects
 466 that are random across groups g and fixed for year t , and $\epsilon_{i,t}$ is Gaussian error. The group
 467 membership for a tree i is $g[i]$, which is defined by species-ecoregions [56]. Conditional log
 468 fecundity ψ is censored at zero to allow for the immature state and for failed seed crops in larger
 469 individuals,

$$E[f] = \begin{cases} 0 & \psi \leq 1 \\ \psi & \psi > 1 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

470 This censoring means that seed production requires the potential to produce at least one seed
 471 and follows the same approach as a Tobit model for the linear scale, which is censored at zero
 472 rather than one. Fecundity can be calculated as mass of seeds, and it can be standardized for
 473 tree basal area as in eqn 1.

474 The posterior distribution includes parameters and latent variables for maturation state
 475 and tree-year seed production. Posterior simulation uses direct sampling and Metropolis and
 476 Hamiltonian Markov Chain (HMC) updates within Gibbs. Model structure and methodology
 477 was implemented with R (version 4.0, [65]) and the R package Mast Inference and Forecasting
 478 (MASTIF), detailed in [56].

479 **Uncertainty in fecundity estimates**

480 We evaluated weighted mean fecundity at the individual and plot scales (CSP), where weights
 481 accommodate year-to-year uncertainty for an individual tree and tree-to-tree uncertainty for a
 482 stand. For individual and stand-level CSP we included only trees > 7 cm in diameter, i.e., at
 483 least as large as the smallest measured size in inventory data.

484 Individual mean fecundity was obtained as

$$\hat{f}_{ijs} = \frac{\sum_t w_{ijs,t} \hat{f}_{ijs,t}}{\sum_t w_{ijs,t}} \quad (3)$$

485 where the weight $w_{ijs,t}$ is the inverse of the predictive coefficient of variation for the estimate,
 486 $w_{ijs,t} = CV_{ijs,t}^{-1}$. This is used rather than the predictive variance, because the mean tends to scale
 487 with the variance such that a variance weight would have the undesirable property of down-
 488 weighting the important large values while up-weighting the low values, which are dominated
 489 by noise. Community seed production (CSP) was evaluated from the individual means

$$CSP_j = \frac{1}{A_j} \frac{\sum_{ijs} w_{ijs} \hat{f}_{ijs}}{\sum_{ijs} w_{ijs}} \quad (4)$$

490 where A_j is plot area, and w_{ijs} is the inverse of the coefficient of variation evaluated as the
 491 root mean predictive variance for tree ij s divided by the the mean prediction for that individual.
 492 Because CSP requires a plot area, only trees on inventory plots are included in the CSP analysis.

493 **Net Primary Production**

494 We extracted Net Primary Production (NPP) from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectro-
 495 radiometer (MODIS) product MOD17 at 500 m resolution (MOD17A3HGFv006, [66]). For
 496 2000 to 2020, we merged yearly CSP estimates with NPP from matching site years, which are
 497 available from 2000 to 2020. Because seed production data span the interval 1959 to 2020, we
 498 used the location-specific mean NPP values for the limited number of earlier years.

499 Because MODIS NPP can depend on uneven cloud coverage, we compared MODIS with
 500 NPP predictions from DGVMs in the TRENDY project [67], using the S3 experiment. For each
 501 site we averaged NPP from 11 models (CABLE-POP, CLASSIC, CLM5.0, ISAM, JSBACH,
 502 JULES, LPJ-GUESS, LPX, OCN, ORCHIDEE, ORCHIDEE-CNP) for all sites and fitted them
 503 to the same climate variables (temperature, moisture deficit) used for ISP and CSP (Table
 504 S2). The two NPP products show similar main effects, but differ in temperature \times moisture
 505 interaction, which is negative for MODIS and positive for the aggregated DGVM. Despite this
 506 difference in the interaction term, the main effects dominated such that surfaces show the same
 507 trends (Figure S3). Thus, we included only MODIS results in S4.

Table S2: Coefficients for climate on NPP MODIS and NPP DGVM products. r^2 for NPP MODIS = 0.48, NPP DGVM = 0.52.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>P-value</i>
Climate effects on NPP (MODIS)				
<i>Intercept</i>	-	3.52e-01	2.46e-02	< 2e-16
<i>T</i>	$\beta_{N,T}$	1.54e-02	1.92e-03	4.99e-15
<i>D</i>	$\beta_{N,D}$	-1.81e-04	3.35e-05	8.41e-08
<i>T × D</i>	$\beta_{N,DT}$	-1.11e-05	2.65e-06	2.99e-05
Climate effects on NPP (DGVMs TRENDY)				
<i>Intercept</i>	-	1.455e-01	2.2e-02	7.71e-11
<i>T</i>	$\beta_{N,T}$	3.19e-02	1.72e-03	< 2e-16
<i>D</i>	$\beta_{N,D}$	-3.25e-04	3.01e-05	< 2e-16
<i>T × D</i>	$\beta_{N,DT}$	7.36e-06	2.38e-06	0.00205
NPP effect (MODIS) on \log_e ISP				
<i>Intercept</i>	-	3.98	0.027	<2e-16
<i>NPP</i>	β_{fN}	2.06	0.024	<2e-16
NPP effect (DGVMs TRENDY) on \log_e ISP				
<i>Intercept</i>	-	4.88	0.037	<2e-16
<i>NPP</i>	β_{fN}	1.64	0.047	<2e-16
NPP effect (MODIS) on \log_e CSP				
<i>Intercept</i>	-	8.70	0.38	<2e-16
<i>NPP</i>	β_{fN}	2.70	0.44	3.31e-09
NPP effect (DGVMs TRENDY) on \log_e CSP				
<i>Intercept</i>	-	9.26	0.44	<2e-16
<i>NPP</i>	β_{fN}	2.21	0.58	1.77e-4

508 **Supplementary Tables**

Table S3: Numbers of species, stands, trees, and tree-years for ISP analysis and complete inventories for CSP analysis by tropical and temperate regions. Complete inventories include all trees within a mapped plot and are needed to determine seeds per area in CSP. Because not all inventory plots use the same minimum diameter, the latter is based on trees > 7 cm.

Floristic Region	Species	Sites	Tree-years	Trees	Complete inventories
Tropical	559	64	9,723,438	85,261	47
Temperate	194	3506	2,330,294	61,461	204

Table S4: Coefficients for climate effect on individual (ISP), community fecundity (CSP). ISP and CSP fecundity are fitted on a natural log scale. r^2 for ISP = 0.2, CSP = 0.15.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Estimate</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>P-value</i>
Climate effects on \log_eISP				
<i>Intercept</i>	-	4.64e+00	4.93e-02	<2e-16
<i>T</i>	$\beta_{f,T}$	1.78e-01	6.01e-03	<2e-16
<i>T</i> ²	β_{f,T^2}	-5.60e-03	1.770e-04	<2e-16
<i>D</i>	$\beta_{f,D}$	2.72e-03	4.80e-05	<2e-16
<i>D</i> ²	β_{f,D^2}	-1.12e-07	1.14e-08	<2e-16
<i>T</i> × <i>D</i>	$\beta_{f,DT}$	-1.84e-04	1.73e-06	<2e-16
Climate effects on \log_eCSP				
<i>Intercept</i>	-	9.88e+00	5.61e-01	<2e-16
<i>T</i>	$\beta_{f,T}$	9.96e-02	7.88e-02	0.21
<i>T</i> ²	β_{f,T^2}	-2.38e-03	2.82e-03	0.40
<i>D</i>	$\beta_{f,D}$	9.21e-04	7.16e-04	0.20
<i>D</i> ²	β_{f,D^2}	2.87e-08	2.20e-07	0.90
<i>T</i> × <i>D</i>	$\beta_{f,DT}$	-1.19e-04	4.05e-05	3.60e-3

509 **Supplementary Figures**




Figure S1: MASTIF network data, including longitudinal (in green) and opportunistic (in orange) observations in North America (a), Europe (b), Asia (c), South and Central America (d), Africa (e) and Oceania (f). Number of observations are reported in Table S3.




Figure S2: Climate responses for ISP (seed mass per basal area) (a, b, c) and stand-level CSP, as g ha⁻¹ (d, e, f) showing marginal responses to temperature (a and d) and moisture deficit (d and e) with observations (dots) and the fitted model, and interactions between temperature and moisture deficit (c and f). Coefficient are reported in Table S4. Low and high values used for conditional plots in (c and f), labelled as Moist ($D = -1500$ mm) and Dry ($D = -50$ mm). Due to large sample size, confidence intervals around lines in (a, b, c) are not distinct from the predictive mean. Temperature and moisture deficit correspond here to a mean annual value for each sites.




Figure S3: Climate response for NPP from MODIS product (a) and DGVM product from TRENDY DGVM products




Figure S4: Relationships between NPP from MODIS and individual (standardized) fecundity ISP (a) and stand CSP (b), both positive ($p < 0.00001$) and both accounting for little of the variability ($r^2 = 0.05$ and 0.13 , respectively). Coefficient are reported in Table S4




Figure S5: Distribution of (a) ISP (g seed per m² basal area) and (b) CSP (g seed per ha basal area) fecundities. Black dotted lines represent the quantile at 2.5 and 97.5%.

References in Supplementary materials

- 510 [54] J. S. Clark, *et al.*, *Nature Communications* **12**, 1 (2021).
- 511 [55] T. Qiu, *et al.*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- 512 [56] J. S. Clark, C. L. Nuñez, B. Tomasek, *Ecological Monographs* **89**, 1 (2019).
- 513 [57] J. Kattge, *et al.*, *Global Change Biology* **26**, 119 (2020).
- 514 [58] S. M. Vicente-Serrano, S. Beguería, J. I. López-Moreno, *Journal of Climate* **23**, 1696
515 (2010).
- 516 [59] D. N. Karger, *et al.*, *Scientific Data* **4**, 1 (2017).
- 517 [60] J. T. Abatzoglou, S. Z. Dobrowski, S. A. Parks, K. C. Hegewisch, *Scientific Data* **5**, 170191
518 (2018).
- 519 [61] T. Hengl, *et al.*, *PLoS ONE* **12** (2017).
- 520 [62] T. G. Farr, *et al.*, *Reviews of Geophysics* **45** (2007).
- 521 [63] D. Gesch, *et al.*, *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* (American Society
522 for Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing, 2002), vol. 68, pp. 5–11.
- 523 [64] J. S. Clark, *Ecological Monographs* **60**, 135 (1990).
- 524 [65] R Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing* (R Foundation
525 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2020).
- 526 [66] S. W. Running, M. Zhao .
- 527 [67] S. Sitch, *et al.*, *Biogeosciences* **12**, 653 (2015).
- 528