Interim Report   IR-04-080

Spatio-Temporal Development of Forests – Current Trends in Field Methods and Models

Georg Gratzer (georg.gratzer@boku.ac.at)
Charles Canham (ccanham@ecostudies.org)
Ulf Dieckmann (dieckmann@iiasa.ac.at)
Anton Fischer (a.fischer@wzw.tum.de)
Yoh Iwasa (yiwasscb@mbox.nc.kyushu-u.ac.jp)
Richard Law (rl1@york.ac.uk)
Manfred Lexer (lexer@edv1.boku.ac.at)
Holger Sandmann (hsandmann@sfu.ca)
Thomas A. Spies (spiest@fsl.orst.edu)
Bernhard E. Splechtna (bernhard.splechtna@boku.ac.at)
Jerzy Szwagrzyk (rlgazda@cyf-kr.edu.pl)

Approved by

Leen Hordijk
Director, IIASA

December 2004

Contents

Spatio-Temporal Development of Forests

– Current Trends in Field Methods and Models

Georg Gratzer[1*], Charles Canham[²], Ulf Dieckmann[³], Anton Fischer[4], Yoh Iwasa[5],

Richard Law[6], Manfred J. Lexer[7], Holger Sandmann[8], Thomas A. Spies[9], Bernhard E.

Splechtna[1], and Jerzy Szwagrzyk[10]

1 Georg Gratzer, Institute of Forest Ecology, BOKU - University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Peter-Jordan-Strasse 82,

A-1190 Vienna, Austria

2 Charles Canham, Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, USA

3 Ulf Dieckmann, Adaptive Dynamics Network, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria

4 Anton Fischer, Geobotany, Department of Ecology, Center of Life and Food Sciences, Technische Universität München, Germany

5 Yoh Iwasa, Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan

6 Richard Law, Department of Biology, University of York, UK

7 Manfred Lexer, Institute of Silviculture, BOKU - University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Vienna, Austria

8 Holger Sandmann, School of Resource and Environmental Management, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada

9 Thomas A. Spies, USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Corvallis, Oregon, USA

10 Jerzy Szwagrzyk, Department of Forest Botany and Nature Conservation, Agricultural University, Krakow, Poland

* corresponding author (georg.gratzer@boku.ac.at)

1   **Abstract**

2   We present a critical review of current trends in research of spatio-temporal

3   development of forests. The paper addresses (1) field methods for the development of

4   spatially-explicit models of forest dynamics and their integration in models of forest

5   dynamics, (2) strengths and limitations of traditional patch models versus spatially-explicit,

6   individual-based models, and (3) the potential for moment-based methods in the analysis of

7   forest dynamics. These topics are discussed with reference to their potential for solving open

8   questions in the studies of forest dynamics. The study of spatio-temporal processes provides a

9   link between pattern and process in plant communities, and plays a crucial role in

10   understanding ecosystem dynamics. In the last decade, the development of spatially-explicit,

11   individual-based models shifted the focus of forest dynamics modelling from the dynamics of

12   discrete patches to the interactions among individual organisms, thus encapsulating the theory

13   of "neighbourhood" dynamics. In turn, the stochastic properties and the complexity of

14   spatially-explicit, individual-based models gave rise to the development of a new suite of so-

15   called moment-based models. These new models describe the dynamics of individuals and of

16   pairs of individuals in terms of their densities, thus directly capturing second-order

17   information on spatial structure. So far, this approach has not been applied to forests; we

18   indicate extensions needed for such applications. Moment-based models may be an important

19   complement to spatially explicit individual-based models in developing a general spatial

20   theory of forest dynamics. However, both kinds of models currently focus on fine scales,

21   whereas a critical issue in forest dynamics is to understand the interaction of fine-scale

22   processes with coarser-scale disturbances. To obtain a more complete picture of forest

23   dynamics, the relevant links and interactions between fine-, intermediate-, and coarse-scale

24   processes ought to be identified. Intensive links between modelling work and field studies

1   designed across different scales are a promising means to create a new perspective on forest

2   dynamics.

3

4   **Introduction**

5   Studies of forest dynamics, i.e., of the changes of forest composition and structure

6   over time, have received much scientific attention since the early concepts of forest

7   succession by Cowles and Clements (Cowles 1899, Clements 1916; cited in Glenn–Lewin

8   and van der Maarel 1992). The spatio-temporal development of forests may be described as

9   changes of tree populations due to birth and colonization, growth, and death of trees. This

10 biotic development is driven by disturbance events set on a stage of a spatially heterogeneous

11 environment (White 1979, Pickett and White 1985, Spies and Turner 1999).

12   Spatio-temporal processes involve the development of spatial patterns over time, thus

13 providing a link between pattern and process in plant communities, and playing a crucial role

14 in understanding ecosystem dynamics. An important cornerstone in the study of spatio–

15 temporal dynamics was Watt's synthesis "Pattern and process in the plant community" (Watt

16 1947). He described plant communities as a mosaic of patches in different phases, with an

17 orderly time sequence of phases at a given place. Watt's (1947) findings from his long-term

18 field studies were extraordinarily influential during the second half of the last century

19 (Leibundgut 1959, van der Maarel 1996). In particular, Watt's identification of phases in the

20 dynamics of beech forests laid the foundation for the concept of gap-phase dynamics, which

21 has become a dominant theme in forest ecology (Urban and Shugart 1992). Research on gap-

22 phase dynamics originally focused on ecosystems in humid climates, where natural

23 disturbances were generally of low intensity and small spatial extent (e.g., Runkle 1985,

24 Brokaw 1985). At the same time, scientists working in more xeric ecosystems were

1   documenting the pervasive role of coarse-scale disturbance by fires in structuring the spatio-

2   temporal dynamics of entire landscapes (Lertzman et al. 1998).

3   These two lines of inquiry were united through the development of a theory of patch

4   dynamics, in which the spatio-temporal dynamics of the system were described through a

5   demographic analysis of the birth, growth, and death of patches rather than of individual

6   organisms (Levin and Paine 1974, Shugart and West 1977, Urban 1990, Belsky and Canham

7   1994, Weishampel and Urban 1996). In its basic form, the theory treats ecosystems as

8   mosaics of discrete and internally homogeneous patches created by disturbance events,

9   embedded in a relatively uniform "matrix". Through succession, disturbance patches

10   gradually fade into the background matrix. This approach has now been applied to a wide

11   range of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, ranging from tropical savannas to coastal sea-

12   grass communities (Botts 1997, Loucks et al. 1985, Dayton et al. 1994, Ramage and Schiel

13   1999, Sousa 1985, Jensen and Bell 2001). It has also had wide application in conservation

14   biology (Pickett and Thompson 1978, Shugart and West 1981, White 1987, Baker 1992). As a

15   first approximation, patch dynamics provide an apt and useful conceptual model for many

16   ecosystems and landscapes.

17   The reason why Watt (1947) treated plant communities as a mosaic of patches was

18   pragmatic: he found it "impractical" to describe communities in "terms of their characters"

19   (the individual plants) and "their spatial relations to each other". More than 50 years after

20   Watt's (1947) seminal paper, advances in spatial ecology allow for quantifications of both,

21   the effects on and the responses of individual plants to their local spatial structure (Pacala

22   1997). The importance of local processes in plant interactions and of their effects on

23   community dynamics is now widely acknowledged (Silander and Pacala 1985, Tilman 1994,

24   Lehman and Tilman 1997, Murrell and Law 2003, Amarasekare 2003), giving rise to the

25   development of a neighbourhood-oriented perspective in plant community dynamics (Stoll

1   and Weiner 2000, Purves and Law 2002). In forest dynamics, recognition of neighbourhood

2   processes has so far mainly been in terms of the growth response of target trees to

3   surrounding competitors (Biging and Dobbertin 1992, Stoll et al. 1994, Soares and Tomé

4   1999, Ledermann and Stage 2001). The community response to neighbourhood interactions,

5   however, has rarely been characterised. Consequently, forest dynamics research faces major

6   challenges (i) to describe vegetation development and spatial structures; (ii) to identify the

7   relevant processes that generate spatial structures, e.g., disturbances, dispersal, species

8   interactions, or herbivory; and (iii) to understand the consequences of the so generated spatial

9   structures for community dynamics. The third challenge entails integrating processes acting at

10   different scales, e.g., by studying the interaction of fine-scale neighbourhood processes with

11   coarser-scale disturbances. To better understand the complex interplay of these processes and

12   of their different intensity in driving forest dynamics in different systems and, within systems,

13   at different temporal and spatial scales, forest ecologists have collected a variety of empirical

14   information. This includes information on disturbance regimes (Lorimer 1984, Pickett and

15   White 1985, Lorimer and Frelich 1989, Duncan and Stewart 1991, Veblen et al. 1994,

16   Parshall 1995, Villalba and Veblen 1997, Mast *et al*. 1998, Fischer et al. 2002) and on biotic

17   processes and life-history traits of tree species in relation to heterogeneous habitats and

18   disturbances (Runkle 1981, Lusk and Smith 1998, Lavorel and Chesson 1995, Lertzman

19   1995, Lehmann and Tilman 1997).

20   At the same time, the need for a comprehensive representation of the complex

21   processes and their potential for simulation called for the application of computer models. The

22   conceptual shift in forest dynamics described above, from the patch to the individual, was

23   paralleled by the development of models of ecosystems dynamics. Starting from patch

24   models, rapid advances in computing power over the past 20 years have led to a proliferation

25   of spatially explicit individual-based models (DeAngelis & Gross 1992, Judson 1994, Grimm

1   1999). These models allow some degree of mechanistic realism to be incorporated into the

2   modelling of neighbourhood interactions. Most recently, developments in moment-based

3   methods in discrete and continuous space have sought to bridge the gulf between

4   oversimplified, analytical mean-field models and highly complex, individual-based simulation

5   models. Moment-based methods enable analysis of the nonlinear, spatially localized,

6   stochastic processes that underlie biologically generated spatial patterns (Pacala and Levin

7   1997, Dieckmann and Law 2000). Yet, with the exception of a pair-approximation model on a

8   spatial lattice (Iwasa 2000), such approaches have not yet been applied to forest dynamics.

9   Although the need for intensive integration of empirical and modelling approaches is

10   increasingly acknowledged (Jeltsch and Moloney 2002), examples of such integration in

11   forest dynamics research are still rare. This also applies to the large body of spatial ecological

12   theory which remains poorly tested by empirical methods (Amarasekare 2003, Murrell et al.

13   2001).

14   In this review we first present an overview of current field methods for studying biotic

15   processes and disturbances. We stress the importance of including spatial processes in studies

16   of forest dynamics and present two different modelling approaches that incorporate a

17   neighbourhood-oriented perspective on forest dynamics by discussing, in turn, spatially-

18   explicit, individual-based models and a new class of moment-based models. We particularly

19   emphasize the latter family of models, because, so far, they have hardly been applied to forest

20   dynamics studies and are not as well known to the ecological community. We suggest ways to

21   strengthen the link between ecological theory and forest dynamics studies and discuss options

22   for better integrating empirical work and modelling in addressing future challenges in forest

23   dynamics research.

24

Field Methods

There are three basic approaches available for collecting information on change of forests with time: retrospective (e.g., "historical" photographs, pollen records), prospective (e.g., permanent sample plots), and space-for-time approaches (e.g., chronosequences). In the absence of long time series on permanent sample plots (PSPs), retrospective methods and chronosequences are most frequently used for studies of forest dynamics. The use of chronosequences requires the existence of similar sites, a precondition which is hard to meet. Pickett (1991) mentioned the suitability of space-for-time substitutions for getting insight into trends in life-history types, the order of dominant species, stages of succession, and regional differences. Which approach is the most appropriate depends mainly on the studied ecosystem, the research question, the available data, and also on the spatial scale of the studied processes. The formulation of a research question and the subsequent design of a field study always include a decision about grain and extent, even if not explicitly stated. The selection of the appropriate scale for the research question in mind is probably the most crucial decision that has to be made beforehand. However, such a decision is not always straightforward, particularly when the scale of the studied process is unclear.

Models of spatio-temporal processes rely heavily on empirical data that characterize the following processes in both space and time: (i) colonization (seed production, seed dispersal, and germination requirements), (ii) growth (growth potentials, competitive relationships), and (iii) death (mortality rates). Below, we briefly review field methods for collecting empirical data for these demographic processes and for characterizing disturbance regimes.

1   *Colonization*

2   Phenological observations and seed traps provide basic information on minimum

3   diameters (or age) of maturation, flowering patterns, as well as the timing, frequency, and

4   quantity of seed production for many species. More difficult to obtain is quantitative

5   information on dispersal distances and patterns of dispersed seeds. Seed rain studies usually

6   estimate seed production and dispersal from randomly placed seed traps in forest stands or in

7   open areas using some regular orientation of seed traps around or adjacent to the potential

8   seed source (e.g., Clark et al. 1999). This is based on assumptions on the origin of seeds in the

9   trap which may bias the results (Nathan and Mueller-Landau 2000). More precise predictions

10   of seed dispersal patterns can be gained through the development of mechanistic models of

11   seed dispersal (Nathan and Mueller-Landau 2000, Nathan et al. 2001). A second approach is

12   to measure distance and distribution of already germinated seeds. Inverse modelling

13   approaches using maximum-likelihood estimation were successfully used to estimate

14   distribution and numbers of recruits relative to the distribution of parent trees in a stand

15   (Ribbens et al. 1994). Problems with all these methods arise in dealing with far dispersers and

16   stochastic (extreme) events that transport seeds over long distances, but may be very

17   important for the survival and distribution of a particular species. Mechanistic models that

18   couple seed release with aerodynamic processes are the most promising approach to derive

19   dispersal distances of wind dispersed seeds of far dispersers (Greene and Johnson 1993, Clark

20   et al. 1999, Jongejans and Telenius 2001, Nathan et al. 2001, Nathan et al. 2002, Nathan et al.

21   2003). While these models describe the movement of seeds from point sources, Cousens and

22   Rawlinson (2001) showed that both the shape of plant canopies and the position of seeds

23   within canopies influence the shape of seed shadows, particularly for species with short

24   dispersal distances. More complexity is added when considering secondary dispersal or

25   differential seed deposition patterns on different microsites, caused by different roughness of

1 surfaces or preferences of zoochorous dispersed seeds (Nathan and Mueller-Landau 2000).

2 Methods using already germinated seeds simultaneously account for non-random seed

3 distribution and germination requirements, such as availability and distribution of safe sites,

4 but the underlying processes are then very difficult to interpret.

5 *Growth*

6 In many models growth is included as the potential growth for an individual tree

7 relative to its size and reduced by a competition factor, the latter being estimated based on the

8 distance to neighbouring trees (e.g., Wykoff and Monserud 1987) or through direct light

9 measurements (Pacala et al. 1993). The potential growth rate of a species is relatively easy to

10 obtain using standard methods of growth and yield research, e.g., height-growth curves

11 developed from stem analysis of top-height trees of even-aged stands (e.g., Heger 1968,

12 Carmean and Lenthall 1989, Chen et al. 1998). However, actual growth varies from year to

13 year mainly due to age (and size) related growth pattern, climate fluctuations, and changes in

14 the light environment due to disturbances. Growth measurements on seedlings, saplings, and

15 mature trees on permanent plots, in relation to measurements of local resources, provide the

16 best source of data for characterizing the response of species to resource variation. This can

17 also include the feedback of neighbouring trees on resource availability. In the absence of

18 long-term data, the use of tree rings to measure past growth along resource gradients provides

19 a means for quantifying species-specific growth-responses (e.g. Pacala et al. 1994).

20 *Mortality*

21 Mortality is best studied in PSPs as they follow tree and cohort development through

22 time, thus measuring mortality directly. In the absence of PSPs, dendrochronological methods

23 can provide estimates of past mortality rates (Dynesius and Jonsson 1991). Alternatively,

24 growth-mortality relationships for various tree species can be established using growth as an

1   indicator of tree vigour and thus of mortality risk (Kobe et al. 1995, Wyckoff and Clark 2000,

2   Gratzer et al. 2004).

3   *Disturbance regimes*

4   Depending on the system and type of disturbance, methods to reconstruct disturbance

5   history include (1) descriptions and measurements of change in forest horizontal structure

6   (Tanaka and Nakashizuka 1997, Valverde and Silvertown 1997), (2) age structure analysis

7   (Duncan and Stewart 1991, Quigley and Platt 1996), and (3) dendroecological reconstructions

8   of fire histories and gap creation events (Lorimer and Frelich 1989, Cherubini et al. 1996,

9   Brown and Swetnam 1994, Villalba and Veblen 1997, Nowacki and Abrams 1997). A variety

10   of methods have been developed for quantifying interactions between different types of

11   disturbances (e.g., Veblen et al. 1994, Fischer 1992) and between weather patterns and

12   disturbance events (Villalba and Veblen 1997, 1998, Mast et al. 1998), especially for forest

13   fires and insect outbreaks. Except for studies using charcoal records and pollen data (e.g.,

14   Long et al. 1998, Calcote 1995), most of these methods are limited in the time domain, as

15   they cannot provide information on events dating back to before the last stand-replacing

16   disturbance. Limitations in space are imposed by the extent and grain of the study and the

17   data available for the reconstruction. These limitations must be made explicit since

18   disturbance regimes can only be defined for a particular area. Consequently, results obtained

19   through such studies are only valid at the observed scale, while, e.g., extrapolating results to

20   larger scales will underestimate coarse-scale disturbances (Wimberly et al. 2000).

21

1   **Models of Forest Dynamics**

2   *Patch models*

3   The numerous patch models available in the literature can be subdivided into two

4   major categories:

5   • Finite state automata (Shugart 1998) or state-transition models classify vegetation on a

6   given patch into a finite number of states and assign transition probabilities from one

7   state to another, depending on the presence of a system-driving operator. The most

8   common operator in these models is the passage of time, but others can readily be

9   considered, for instance, disturbances such as fire (e.g., Kessel and Potter 1980,

10   Gullison and Bourque 2001).

11   • Individual tree models keep track of the birth, growth, and death of each individual

12   tree on the simulated patches (e.g., Botkin et al. 1972, Shugart and West 1977, Kienast

13   1987, Leemans and Prentice 1989, Bugmann 1994). The earliest of these models were

14   developed in forestry to predict the growth of forest stands (e.g., Newnham 1964).

15   Most patch models based on individual trees follow the concept of the JABOWA

16   model pioneered by Botkin, Janak and Wallis in the 1970s. The model was originally

17   developed as part of the Hubbard Brook Ecosystem study in the north-eastern forests of the

18   US to explain species composition and succession at sites along an altitudinal gradient under

19   current climate (Botkin et al. 1972, Botkin 1993). The key assumptions of JABOWA are:

20   • The forest consists of many small patches of land each 0.01-0.1 ha in size which is

21   approximately the area an adult individual tree can dominate. On the one hand this

22   allows for an individual to achieve maximum size, on the other hand the death of a

23   single large tree significantly influences the light regime at a patch.

1   • No interaction among the simulated patches is considered (i.e., the forest is either

2   envisaged as a mosaic of independent patches or the simulated patches are taken to be

3   independent samples from the entire forest).

4   • The position of each tree on a simulated patch is unknown. Horizontally, the model

5   assumes homogeneous competition throughout the entire patch.

6   • All leaf biomass of each simulated tree is located at the top of the tree in an infinitely

7   thin layer.

8   Over the years, there have been many modifications to the original model formulation.

9 For comprehensive reviews see, for instance, Bugmann (2001), Price et al. (2001), and Keane

10 et al. (2001). Because of the relative ease of parameter estimation, numerous models were

11 developed for a diverse range of ecosystems, including models for alpine tundra (Humphries

12 et al. 1996) and prairie (Coffin and Lauenroth 1990). A major reason for ongoing model

13 development and application is the need for individual-based simulators of vegetation change

14 sensitive to climate, to assess the likely impacts of global climate change on forest

15 composition and structure. Several review papers questioned the applicability of classical gap

16 models for research on impacts of climate change due to erroneous scaling assumptions and

17 misleading parameterization schemes (e.g., Schenk 1996, Loehle and LeBlanc 1996). Besides

18 attempts to add more physiological realism with particular emphasis on a more mechanistic

19 representation of carbon fixation and allocation (e.g., Prentice et al. 1993, Friend et al. 1993,

20 Bugmann et al. 1997, Lasch et al. 2003), model variants were developed that consider spatial

21 interaction between patches. Amongst the earliest of these spatially explicit model variants

22 was the ZELIG-model (Smith and Urban 1988, Urban 1990) where the patches are arranged

23 on a rectangular grid corresponding to a total area of up to several hectares. Such model

24 variants are useful for examining seed dispersal and other landscape processes that involve

1   spatial interactions between patches, such as fire and insect outbreaks (e.g., Lexer and

2   Hönninger 2001).

Spatially explicit individual-based models

4   Spatially explicit, individual-based models (SEIBs) such as ZELIG (Urban et al.

5   1989), and SORTIE (Pacala et al. 1996), shift the focus from dynamics of discrete patches to

6   interactions among individual organisms, and allow a more detailed treatment of

7   environmental heterogeneity at a variety of spatial scales.

8   Specifically, models such as ZELIG, which operates within the patch model paradigm

9   of homogeneous competition within patches, and SORTIE, where dynamics evolve as a

10   result of local dispersal and local competition, treat forests as sets of individual trees rather

11   than as mosaics of discrete gaps. In changing the focus, these models encapsulate an emerging

12   theory of "neighbourhood" dynamics, in which fine-scale spatial interactions regulate the

13   demography of component tree species (Pacala et al. 1996). The specific mechanisms for

14   these spatial processes take many forms:

15   •   Seed dispersal and seedling recruitment are highly localized processes for many forest

16   trees. Estimates of the mean seed and seedling dispersion distances away from parent

17   trees are less than 20 m for many temperate tree species (Ribbens et al. 1994, Clark et

18   al. 1998, LePage et al. 2000), although longer distance dispersal is also important

19   (Greene and Johnson 1993, Clark et al. 1999). Stand structure and the presence of

20   gaps within a stand also influences effective seed dispersal distances (LePage et al.

21   2000).

22   •   The spatial distribution and abundance of tree seed predators can be strongly

23   influenced by the spatial distribution of seed sources (particularly of large-seeded tree

species), with potentially significant effects on patterns of tree seedling establishment (Schnurr et al. 2002, Schnurr et al. submitted).

- The activity of even large herbivores such as white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) may be influenced by fine-scale spatial variation in both soil nutrient availability and the abundance and nitrogen content of saplings that form a critical winter food source (Tripler et al. 2002).

- Resource competition between sessile plants is clearly a spatial process. In the case of competition for light, the geometry of both solar radiation and plant canopies interacts with the spatial distribution of individuals to determine the availability of light to individuals in a forest (Canham et al. 1994, 1999). There is a large literature on tree competition based on phenomenological analyses of the distance to, size, and species of neighboring trees (e.g., Bella 1971). Non-spatial models are often effective in describing relatively uniform and even-aged stands, but spatial models provide distinct advantages in more heterogeneous stands (e.g., Lorimer 1983).

- Tree species vary significantly in their effects on soil chemistry and soil nutrient availability (Zinke 1962, Finzi et al. 1998). The effects of mixtures of different tree species are not necessarily additive (Finzi and Canham 1998). When species effects are non-additive, non-spatial models are likely to either overestimate or underestimate average resource conditions within a stand.

The shift to SEIB models has been facilitated by the development of new methods of examining field data, in which measurements of environmental factors (e.g., light) and critical demographic rates (e.g., recruitment, growth, and mortality) are analyzed in terms of the spatial distributions of neighbouring trees and of physical environmental factors (i.e., Ribbens et al. 1994, Pacala et al. 1994, Kobe et al. 1995, Canham et al. 1994, 1999, LePage et al.

1   2000, Canham et al. *submitted*), as outlined in the section on field methods above. These

2   methods allow a tight linkage between the models and the parameterization of these models

3   based on field data, thus allowing quantification of uncertainty in both parameter values and

4   model predictions (Pacala et al. 1996).

5   The shift to a neighbourhood perspective has also had important implications for

6   analysis of forest disturbance regimes. Past studies of wind disturbance have tended to focus

7   on the extremes of a gradient in windstorm severity, from very small, isolated treefall gaps

8   with discrete edges (e.g. Runkle 1985, Brokaw 1985), to large, catastrophic disturbance in

9   which most canopy trees are felled (e.g. Canham and Loucks 1984, Peterson 2000). It is

10   becoming increasingly clear that the wind disturbances which most frequently drive forest

11   ecosystem dynamics in many temperate and tropical forests falls in between these extremes

12   (e.g. Walker et al. 1991). Intermediate-severity storms (e.g. hurricanes, typhoons, extra-

13   tropical cyclones, severe thunderstorms) create a wide range of damage across large regions,

14   as a result of heterogeneity in topography and the meteorology of the storm event (e.g.

15   Peterson and Pickett 1995, Boose et al. 1994), and because of variation among species and

16   tree sizes in susceptibility to mortality or damage from winds of a given severity (e.g.

17   Zimmerman et al. 1994, Canham et al. 2001). The extremely heterogeneous patterns of

18   canopy disturbance created by these events are very difficult to incorporate in traditional

19   patch models or theories.   Patch dynamic models (i.e. Levin and Paine 1974) have

20   traditionally used patch size as a metric of the magnitude of disturbance effect. This becomes

21   untenable for intermediate-severity storms, in part because of the difficulty of identifying

22   discrete edges to patches, but more fundamentally because it ignores the pronounced

23   heterogeneity at a wide range of spatial scales that is so distinctive in intermediate-severity

24   disturbance events.

25

1   *Moment-based models*

2   SEIB models have two properties, stochasticity and complexity, that cause difficulties

3   when trying to extract succinct ecological predictions from these models. Stochasticity stems

4   from the fact that – at the level of the individual – colonization, growth, and death are random

5   events: in the corresponding models, no two realizations of a spatio-temporal process, based

6   on different sets of random numbers, will give the same results. This can be instructive, for

7   example, in estimating the expected natural range of variability in a finite-sized plot. But

8   stochasticity also hides the underlying ecological signal, unless a great many realizations are

9   carried out to obtain reliable averages. The complexity of SEIB models is evident from the

10   intricate mechanisms they often try to incorporate, as noted above. Given the scope for

11   incorporating such complexity, investigations by different groups of scientists will almost

12   always differ in at least a few structural details, making it difficult to compare results and to

13   assess reliably the structural stability of SEIB models (Grimm 1999).

14   These considerations motivate the development of theory in which the deterministic

15   ecological signal embedded in SEIB models is itself the state variable, and in which

16   mechanistic detail is subsumed by standard model components (Bolker and Pacala 1997, Law

17   and Dieckmann 2000b). So-called moment-based models are a promising step in this

18   direction, and are currently being developed by translating earlier work in statistical physics

19   into the context of biological populations of interacting individuals. The models jointly deal

20   with the dynamics of the density p_i of individuals of type i, and of the density of pairs $p_{ij}(r)$

21   of individuals of type i and j that are situated a distance r apart in space (types i and j could

22   represent species for instance, or states such as size classes, or both). These densities are the

23   first two moments of a spatial distribution of individuals, calculated by integration over the

24   spatial distribution. The pair density is a member of a class of second-order statistics widely

1   used in spatial pattern analysis (Dale et al. 2002, Wiegand and Moloney 2004); other related

2   statistics include Ripley's *K*, the semi(co)variance, and the spatial covariance (Ripley 1977,

3   Burrough 1995). One can think of moment-based models as stepping from the static

4   description of spatial pattern to the dynamics of how spatial structures changes over time.

5   Since the density of individuals lies at the core of nonspatial ecological theory, moment-based

6   models contain the traditional nonspatial theory of population dynamics as a special case.

7   Since the original work on moment-based models in physics had focused on lattices, it

8   was natural that lattice-based ecological models, the so-called pair approximation models,

9   were also developed first (Matsuda et al. 1992). These models describe the densities p_{ij} of *ij*

10   pairs where *j* is in a neighbourhood (of constant size *z*) of *i* on a lattice; there is no

11   dependence on *r* in this case as all individuals in the neighbourhood are equivalent. Since the

12   density of individuals can be obtained from the density of pairs by summing over partners,

13    $p_i = \sum_j p_{ij}$, the former need not to be treated separately. To describe the dynamics $\frac{d}{dt} p_{ij}$ of

14   pair densities, the pair approximation assumes that the densities of triplets with a focal

15   individual *i* can simply be expressed as $p_{ijk} = p_{ij} p_k$. This can be interpreted by saying that

16   the pair approximation only traces spatial correlations among neighbours and that,

17   accordingly, any correlations of higher order or at longer distance are ignored. Despite this

18   simplification, pair approximation models have been applied successfully to a fairly wide

19   spectrum of ecological settings (e.g., Harada and Iwasa 1994, Satō et al. 1994, Harada et al.

20   1995, van Baalen 2000) and so far provide the only moment-based models that have been

21   applied to forests (Iwasa 2000).

22   Individual trees, however, do not grow naturally on neatly arranged lattices, and

23   therefore it is helpful to extend moment-based methods to spatial patterns given by collections

24   of points in continuous space (Bolker and Pacala 1997, Dieckmann and Law 2000, Law and

1   Dieckmann 2000a). Moment-based models in continuous space can be based on different

2   assumptions about how to express the density of triplets $p_{ijk}(r_{ij}, r_{jk}, r_{ki})$ in terms of pair

3   densities. Such assumptions are called "moment closures" and have recently been investigated

4   in some detail (e.g., Dieckmann and Law 2000, Murrell et al. 2004). They are all based on the

5   idea that the dynamics of triplet densities equilibrate more quickly than those of pair densities,

6   such that, after a short transitory period, pair densities are sufficient to characterize the spatial

7   structure of a system. While this time scale separation is often justified, certain spatio-

8   temporal processes may defy such simplification, especially when containing long-range

9   spatial structures.

10   Moment-based models in continuous space typically involve so-called dispersal and

11   interaction kernels. As noted earlier, dispersal kernels are already well established in forest

12   ecology and simply describe the probability density with which a seed of type i ends up at

13   distance r from its parent. In animal ecology, a dispersal kernel can also be used to describe

14   the movement of individuals throughout their life. An interaction kernel $c_{ij}(r)$ weighs the

15   impact of an individual j on an individual i over a spatial distance r. Such impact may lead,

16   for example, to decreased growth or fecundity, or to increased mortality. Integrating the

17   weights $c_{ij}(r)$ over all distances r, we recover the interaction coefficients

18     $\tilde{a}_{ij} = \int_0^\infty c_{ij}(r)\, 2\pi r\, dr$ of traditional ecological models such as the Lotka-Volterra model of

19   competition (Begon et al. 1996). By contrast, for spatially structured populations the

20   interaction coefficients are given by $a_{ij} = \frac{1}{p_i p_j} \int_0^\infty c_{ij}(r) p_{ij}(r)\, 2\pi r\, dr$ and, importantly, thus turn

21   out to directly depend on the pair densities $p_{ij}(r)$ that serve as the state variables of moment-

22   based models in continuous space. An interaction kernel thus allows for summing over all

23   interacting pairs in a neighbourhood with the appropriate weights and thus formally brings

1   such sums into a description of the spatio-temporal population dynamics. By defining SEIB

2   models in terms of dispersal and interaction kernels and by then studying the resultant

3   dynamics of pair densities, moment-based models help to establish a more canonical

4   modelling platform. This is likely to aid the systematic comparison of results between models

5   of different systems.

6   Moment-based models can account for two types of corrections relative to nonspatial

7   models (Dieckmann and Law 2000). First are correlation corrections, arising from the non-

8   random distribution of individuals, as measured by pair densities. The traditional nonspatial

9   models do not consider spatial correlations, which implies $p_{ij}(r) = p_i p_j$ and thus $a_{ij} = \widetilde{a}_{ij}$.

10   Once some spatial structure is present, $a_{ij} - \widetilde{a}_{ij}$ is different from zero and measures

11   corrections resulting from the spatial correlations present in the ecological pattern. A second

12   type of improvement – ignored by nonspatial models but potentially captured by moment-

13   based models – are fluctuation corrections. These arise from the fact that, even in a

14   hypothetical, infinitely large habitat, the number of individuals in a local neighbourhood is

15   finite and varies from one neighbourhood to another, with the result that different individuals

16   are bound to experience different local environments. Unless the ecological responses of

17   individuals to densities in their neighbourhood are linear – which rarely will be the case –

18   their response to the average local environment then differs from their average response to the

19   different environments. In particular canopy structure and asymmetric competition for light

20   are likely to induce such nonlinearities in the response of individuals to their local

21   environment. Moment-based models can capture these potentially large differences through

22   fluctuation corrections.

1   There still exists an appreciable gap between sufficiently realistic models of forest

2   dynamics and models currently amenable to theoretical analyses. Three extensions could

3   strengthen the utility of moment-based models for studying forest dynamics:

4   •   The most important extension needed is systematic incorporation of size structure in

5   moment-based models. With such additional structure, pair densities take three

6   arguments, $p_{ij}(s_i, s_j, r)$, and describe the densities of pairs formed by individuals of

7   species i and size s_i with individuals of species j and size s_j at distance r. The

8   study of competition kernels has already gone some way towards analyzing these

9   dependencies on size and distance (e.g., Biging and Dobbertin 1992, Stoll et al. 1994,

10   Soares and Tomé 1999, Ledermann and Stage 2001, Purves and Law 2002b), but their

11   effects on population dynamics have still to be explored.

12   •   A second important extension will be the incorporation of heterogeneities in local

13   environmental conditions e. This can be achieved through the introduction of extra

14   pair densities into moment-based models, $p_{ie}(r)$ for density-like environmental

15   factors (like nutrient concentrations) or $p_{ie}(e, r)$ for other factors (like temperature;

16   e.g., Law et al. 2001).

17   •   Thirdly, disturbances could be implemented in moment-based models by describing

18   the signature of their impact on pair densities. Depending on their frequency of

19   occurrence, such disturbances can be incorporated in moment-based models either as a

20   continuous deterministic flow or through discrete stochastic events.

21

1 **Perspectives and Conclusions**

2 *The role of SEIB models*

3   SEIB models in forest ecology have been a great success: they overcome the often

4 artificial spatial discreteness of patch models, respect the discreteness of individuals, and

5 encourage a mechanistic representation of factors determining vital rates. It was through the

6 development of SEIB models that the importance of neighbourhood processes for forest

7 dynamics was demonstrated (Pacala and Deutschman 1995, Kubo et al. 1996, Pacala 1997,

8 Jeltsch and Moloney 2002, Purves and Law 2002). The neighbourhood-oriented perspective

9 adopted in SEIB models thus provides a general framework for studying and understanding

10 forest dynamics by overcoming key limitations of traditional non-spatial models. However,

11 SEIB models are computationally demanding and thus limited to stand scales. For

12 applications at coarser scales, spatially explicit patch models are currently the only feasible

13 modelling approach at hand (Bugmann 2001).

14   The application of SEIB models helped to identify a number of fine-scale

15 neighbourhood processes as driving forces for tree-population dynamics. However, while

16 some of these processes – e.g., seed dispersal (Clark et al. 1999, Pastor et al. 1999, Chave

17 1999, Bleher et al. 2002) and competition for light (Canham et al. 1994, 1999, Chave 1999) –

18 are well described and readily included, other pattern generating processes – like plant-soil

19 feedback or interaction with herbivores – are still only rarely included in tree population

20 models, even though they are empirically well documented (e.g., Van Breemen and Finzi

21 1998, Binkley and Giardina 1998, Pastor et al. 1999). Thus, if one of the major challenges in

22 understanding forest dynamics remains the identification of important pattern-generating

23 mechanisms at different spatial and temporal scales (e.g., Levin and Pacala 1997, Parker and

24 Pickett 1998), SEIB models through their close linkage with field studies, provide a

1 promising route for this endeavour, because of their rich potential for exploring the

2 consequences of intricate spatial interactions.

3 *The potential of moment-based models*

4 The promise of moment-based models lies in their canonical structure and greater

5 mathematical tractability. As an alternative to including ever more mechanistic detail,

6 moment-based models may be a good complement to SEIB models in developing a general

7 spatial theory of forest dynamics. Yet, the extensions needed for moment-based models to

8 reflect some specific features of forest dynamics are by no means trivial: for instance,

9 incorporating size dependences, environmental heterogeneities, and spatial disturbances pose

10 many interesting challenges for theorists and empiricists. Even with the simplification that

11 moment-based models allow, there will be intricate couplings of variables in the dynamics.

12 While it would be unrealistic to expect general analytical mathematical insights from such

13 models in the immediate future, numerical analyses are readily feasible.

14 Yet, whenever a wide range of complex ecological mechanisms is to be considered

15 simultaneously, or when a tactical match with the quantitative details of a particular

16 ecosystem is required and sufficient data is available for model parameterisation, individual-

17 based models are likely to prove superior because of their essentially unlimited flexibility. In

18 other cases, moment-based models may offer a useful middle ground.

19 *Links between field studies and models*

20 Even with more models developed and parameterised, empirical studies will remain

21 fundamental to progress in understanding forest dynamics. Both SEIB and moment-based

22 models have stimulated recent empirical work in forest dynamics by highlighting the need for

23 quantifying certain mechanistic assumptions about, e.g., competition and dispersal. The

24 development of new methods of analysis of field data is largely triggered by the current gaps

1 in our knowledge, which become evident in the process of parameterising the corresponding

2 models. Still, information on resource-mortality and resource-growth responses, as well as on

3 dispersal distances, is missing for many tree species around the world (e.g., Chave 1999,

4 Gratzer et al. 2004). Such information is not only necessary for modelling forest dynamics but

5 also for its own right and for applications in forest management.

6 Future interactions between models and field work will go far beyond the traditional

7 unidirectional way of data collection for model development and parameterisation. It is

8 already clear now that models will become a more integral part of studies on forest dynamics:

9 models will be used for hypothesis generation before empirical studies are devised and carried

10 out, for assessing the grain and extent of empirical studies adequate for capturing essential

11 properties of the ecological processes under investigation, and for extrapolating results of

12 empirical studies to longer time scales. It will thus be fruitful to explicitly plan for the

13 interaction between empirical and modelling work by identifying the desired connections in

14 advance, allowing for bi-directional feedback and continuous progress.

15 One of the crucial problems in understanding forest dynamics is the frequent lack of

16 adequate data for validating model results. Long-term ecological studies ought to fill this gap

17 by capturing slow phenomena, rare events, as well as subtle and complex processes (*sensu*

18 Pickett 1991). To achieve this in the context of forest dynamics, long-term ecological studies

19 will have to extend over decades.

20

21 *On the interaction of fine scale neighbourhood processes with coarser scale disturbances*

22 A critical issue in forest dynamics is to understand the interaction of fine-scale

23 neighbourhood processes with coarser-scale disturbances. In the section on field methods we

24 presented state-of-the-art methods for analyzing disturbance regimes. All of the presented

1 approaches struggle with temporal and spatial limitations (e.g., Lertzman and Fall 1998). At

2 least the former limitation can be overcome by using spatially explicit models. So far,

3 however, only few attempts in this direction have been undertaken (e.g., Wiegand et al. 1998,

4 Canham et al. 2001, Menard et al. 2002).

5   By linking a neighbourhood-oriented perspective on forest development with an

6 approach from disturbance ecology, Dube et al. (2001) bridged the gap between these two

7 realms of investigating forest dynamics. They characterized canopy gaps according to a

8 species' light requirements and could thus move beyond the (practically useful but

9 theoretically often unjustified) geometrical characterization of gaps or expanded gaps. This

10 can be seen as an extension of the neighbourhood perspective towards disturbance ecology.

11 Most studies simulating disturbances are based on simply removing trees of different

12 diameters (e.g., Menard et al. 2002), even though this practice ignores the specific

13 characteristics of disturbance events. In general, disturbances vary not only in size but also

14 greatly differ in severity and residuals (Turner et al. 1998): they therefore leave "fingerprints"

15 in the landscape that are specific to the characteristics of the disturbance (disturbance agents

16 and intensity) but also depend on species- and structure-specific susceptibilities to the

17 disturbances. Models of disturbances might have to consider these species-specific feedback

18 mechanisms (the creation of micro-sites and the response of regeneration to these spatial

19 heterogeneities and to the presence of surviving seed trees) in order to capture the essential

20 effects of disturbances on forest dynamics.

21   If also interactions between disturbances are to be considered, even more complexity

22 has to be added to models. Such complexity across scales requires strategies for dealing with

23 scaling issues. The most promising way of addressing this would be an application of

24 hierarchy theory (Pattee 1973, Allen and Hoekstra 1992, Ahl and Allen 1996). The theory is

25 based on the assumption that ecological systems exhibit a loose vertical and horizontal

24

coupling in structure and function and are thus highly decomposable. Such a loose coupling allows for distinguishing between different hierarchical levels (vertical) and subsystems (horizontal) at the same vertical level (Wu and David 2002, Wu 1999, Parker and Pickett 1998). However, whether or not coupling in nature typically are sufficiently loose to justify such simplification currently remains an open empirical question.

Both SEIB models and moment-based methods in continuous space are working on fine spatial scales. To obtain a more complete picture of forest dynamics, and to move towards a general theory for the spatio-temporal developments of forests, all relevant links and interactions between processes at fine, intermediate, and coarse spatial scales must be identified and understood. Field studies designed across different scales, in conjunction with models describing the spatio-temporal development of forests, would seem to offer the most promising means for creating a new perspective on forest dynamics.

1   **References**

2   Ahl, V., and Allen, T.F.H. 1996. Hierarchy theory: a vision, vocabulary, and epistemology.

3   Columbia University Press, New York.

4   Allen, T.F.H., and Hoekstra, T.W. 1992. Toward a unified ecology. Columbia University

5   Press, New York.

6   Amarasekare P. 2003. Competitive coexistence in spatially structured environments: a

7   synthesis. Ecology letters 6: 1109-1122.

8   Baker, W. 1992. The landscape ecology of large disturbances in the design and management

9   of nature reserves. Landscape Ecol. 7:181-194.

10   Begon M., Mortimer M. and Thompson D.J. 1996. Population ecology. A unified study of

11   animals and plants. Blackwell Science Oxford.

12   Bella, I. E. 1971. A new competition model for individual trees. Forest Science 17:364-372.

13   Belsky, A. J. and Canham, C. D. 1994. Forest gaps and isolated savanna trees: an application

14   of patch dynamics in two ecosystems. BioScience 44:77-84.

15   Biging, G. S. and Dobbertin, M. 1992. A comparison of distance-dependent competition

16   measures for height and basal area growth of individual conifer trees. For. Sci. 38:695-

17   720.

18   Binkley, D., and Giardina, C. 1998. Why trees affect soils in temperate and tropical forests:

19   the warp and woof of tree/soil interactions. Biogeochemistry 42:89-106.

20   Bleher, B., Oberrath, R. and Böhning-Gaese, K. 2002: Seed dispersal, breeding system, tree

21   density and the spatial pattern of trees - A simulation approach. Basic and Applied

22   Ecology 3: 115-123.

23   Bolker B and Pacala S.W. 1997. Using moment equations to understand stochastically driven

24   spatial pattern formation in ecological systems. Theor. Popul. Biol. 52:179–197.

1   Boose, E. R., D. R. Foster, and F. Marcheterre. 1994. Hurricane impacts to tropical and

2   temperate forest landscapes. Ecological Monographs 64:369-400.

3   Botkin, D.B., Janak, J. F. and Wallis, J. R. 1972. Rationale, limitations, and assumptions of a

4   northeastern forest simulator. IBM Journal of Research and Development 16: 106-116.

5   Botkin, D.B. 1993. Forest Dynamics: An Ecological Model. Oxford University Press.

6   Botts, P.S. 1997. Spatial pattern patch dynamics and successional change: Chironomid

7   assemblages in a Lake Erie coastal wetland. Freshwater Biol. 37(2): 277-286

8   Brokaw, N. V. L. 1985. Treefalls, regrowth, and community structure in tropical forests. pp.

9   53-69 in: Pickett, S. T. A. and White, P. (eds.), The ecology of natural disturbance and

10   patch dynamics. Academic Press, Orlando FL.

11   Brown, P.M. and Swetnam, T.W. 1994: A cross-dated fire history from coast redwood near

12   Redwood National Park, California. Can. J. For. Res. 24: 21-31.

13   Bugmann, H. 1994. On the ecology of mountainous forests in a changing climate: A

14   simulation study. Ph.D. Thesis No. 10'638, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich

15   (ETHZ), Switzerland, 258 pp.

16   Bugmann, H., Grote, R., Lasch, P., Lindner, M. and Suckow, F. 1997. A new forest gap

17   model to study the effects of environmental change on forest structure and functioning.

18   In: Mohren, G.M.J., Kramer, K. and Sabaté, S. (eds.), Global Change Impacts on Tree

19   Physiology and Forest Ecosystems. Forestry Sciences 52, Kluwer Academic Publishers,

20   255-261.

21   Bugmann 2001. A review of forest gap models. Climatic change 51: 259-305.

1   Burrough, P. A. 1995. Spatial aspects of ecological data. In: Jongman, R.H.G., ter Braak, C.

2   F. and van Tongeren, O.F.R. (eds.), Data analysis in community and landscape ecology,

3   pp 213-251. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

4   Calcote, R.R. 1995. Pollen source area and pollen productivity: Evidence from forest hollows.

5   J. Ecol. 83: 591-607.

6   Canham, C.D., Finzi, A.C., Pacala, S.W. and Burbank, D. H. 1994. Causes and consequences

7   of resource heterogeneity in forests: Interspecific variation in light transmission by

8   canopy trees. Can. J. For. Res. 24: 337-349.

9   Canham, C.D., Coates, K.D., Bartemucci, P. and Quaglia, S. 1999. Measurement and

10   modeling of spatially-explicit variation in light transmission through interior cedar-

11   hemlock forests of British Columbia. Can. J. For. Res. 29: 1775-1783.

12   Canham, C. D., LePage, P. T. and Coates, K. D. submitted. A neighborhood analysis of

13   canopy tree competition: effects of shading versus crowding. submitted to Can. J. For.

14   Res.

15   Canham, C. D., Papaik, M. J. and Latty, E. F. 2001. Interspecific variation in susceptibility to

16   windthrow as a function of tree size and storm severity for northern temperate tree

17   species. Can. J. For. Res. 31: 1-10.

18   Canham, C.D. and Loucks, O.L. 1984. Catastrophic windthrow in the presettlement forests of

19   Wisconsin. Ecology 65: 803-809.

20   Carmean, W.H., Lenthall, D.J., 1989. Height-growth and site-index curves for jack pine in

21   north central Ontario. Can .J. For. Res. 19: 215-224.

22   Chave, J. 1999. Study of structural, successional and spatial patterns in tropical rain forests

23   using TROLL, a spatially explicit forest model, Ecol. Modell. 124, 233-254

1   Chen, H.Y.H, Klinka, K., Kabzems, R.D. 1998. Height growth and site index models for

2   trembling aspen (Populus tremuloides Michx.) in northern British Columbia. For. Ecol.

3   Manag. 102: 157-165.

4   Cherubini, P., Piussi, P. and Schweingruber, F.H. 1996. Spatiotemporal growth dynamics and

5   disturbances in a subalpine spruce forest in the Alps: a dendroecological reconstruction.

6   Can. J. For. Res. 26: 991-1001.

7   Clark, J.S., Macklin, E. and Wood, L. 1998. Stages and spatial scales of recruitment limitation

8   in southern Appalachian forests. Ecol. Monogr. 68 (2): 213-235.

9   Clark, J.S., Silman, M., Kern, R., Macklin, E., HilleRisLambers, J. 1999. Seed dispersal near

10   and far: Patterns across temperate and tropical forests. Ecology 80 (5): 1475-1494.

11   Coffin, D. P. and W. K. Lauenroth. 1990. A gap dynamics simulation model of succession in

12   the shortgrass steppe. Ecol. Model. 49:229-266.

13   Condit, R., Ashton, P.S., Baker, P., Bunyavejchewin, S., Gunatilleke, S., Gunatilleke, N.,

14   Hubbell, S.P., Foster, R.B., Itoh, A., LaFrankie, J.V., Lee, H.S., Losos, E., Manokaran,

15   N,. Sukumar, R., and Yamakura, T.Y. 2000. Spatial patterns in the distribution of

16   tropical tree species. Science 288: 1414-1418.

17   Cousens, R. D. and Rawlinson A.A. 2001. When will plant morphology affect the shape of a

18   seed dispersal 'kernel'? J. of Theor. Biol. 211: 229-238.

19   Dale, M.R.T., Dixon, P., Fortin, M.-J., Legendre, P., Myers, D.E. and Rosenberg, M.S. 2002.

20   Conceptual and mathematical relationships among methods for spatial analysis.

21   Ecography 25: 558-577.

22   Dayton, P.K., Currie,V. Gerrodette,T., Keller, B.D., Rosenthal,-R., and Tresca,-D.V. 1994.

23   Patch dynamics and stability of some California kelp communities. Ecol. Monogr. 54(3)

24   p. 253-289.

1   DeAngelis, D. L. and L. J. Gross (eds) 1992. Individual-Based Models and Approaches in Ecology.

2   Routledge, Chapman and Hall, New York.

3   Dieckmann, U. and Law, R. 2000. Relaxation projections and the method of moments. In:

4   Dieckmann, U., Law, R. and Metz, J.A.J. (eds.), The geometry of ecological

5   interactions: simplifying spatial complexity, pp. 412-455. Cambridge University Press,

6   Cambridge, UK.

7   Dubé, P., Fortin, M.-J., Canham, C.D. and Marceau, D.J. 2001. Quantifying gap dynamics

8   and spatio-temporal structures in spatially-explicit models of temperate forest

9   ecosystems. Ecol. Model. 142 (1-2): 39-60.

10   Duncan, R.P. and Stewart, G.H. 1991. The temporal and spatial analysis of tree age

11   distributions. Can. J. For. Res. 21: 1703-1710.

12   Dynesius, M. and Jonsson, B.G. 1991. Dating uprooted trees: comparison and application of

13   eight methods in a boreal forest. Can. J. For. Res. 21: 655-665.

14   Finzi, A. F. and Canham, C. D. 1998. Synergistic effects of litter mixtures on net N

15   mineralization in a southern New England forest. For. Ecol. Manag. 105:135-148.

16   Finzi, A.C., Canham, C.D. and van Breemen, N. 1998. Canopy tree-soil interactions within

17   temperate forests: species effects on pH and cations. Ecol. Appl. 8: 447-454.

18   Fischer, A., 1992: Long term vegetation development in Bavarian Mountain Forest

19   ecosystems following natural destruction. Vegetatio 103: 93-104.

20   Fischer, A., Lindner, M., Abs, C. and Lasch, P. 2002. Vegetation dynamics in Central

21   European forest ecosystems (near natural as well as managed) after storm events. – Folia

22   Geobotanica 37, 17-32.

1   Friend, A., Shugart, H.H. and Running, S.W. 1993. A physiology based gap model of forest

2   dynamics. Ecology 74: 792-797.

3   Glenn-Lewin, D.C. and van der Maarel, E. 1992. Patterns and processes of vegetation

4   dynamics. In: Glenn-Lewin, D.C., Peet, R. and Veblen, T. (eds.): Plant succession. pp.

5   11-59. Chapman and Hall.

6   Gratzer, G., Darabant, A., Chhetri, P.B., Rai, P.B., Eckmüllner, O. Interspecific variation in

7   the response of growth, crown morphology and survivorship to light for six tree species

8   in the conifer belt of the Bhutan Himalayas. Canadian Journal of Forest Research. In

9   press.

10   Greene, D.F. and Johnson, E.A. 1993. Seed mass and dispersal capacity in wind-dispersed

11   diaspores. Oikos 67: 69–74.

12   Grimm, V 1999. Ten years of individual-based modelling in ecology: what have we learnt and

13   what could we learn in the future? Ecol. Model. 115:129-148.

14   Gratzer, G., Darabant, A., Chhetri, P.B., Rai, P.B., Eckmüllner, O. 2004. Interspecific

15   variation in the response of growth, crown morphology and survivorship to light for six

16   tree species in the conifer belt of the Bhutan Himalayas. Canadian Journal of Forest

17   Research 34, in press.

18   Gullison, J. J. and Bourque, C. P.-A. 2001. Spatial prediction of tree and shrub succession in a

19   small watershed in northern Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia, Canada. Ecol. Model.,

20   137: 181-199.

21   Harada, Y. and Iwasa, Y. 1994. Lattice population dynamics for plants with dispersing seeds

22   and vegetative propagation. Res. Popul. Ecol. 36: 237–249

1   Harada, Y., Ezoe, H., Iwasa, Y., Matsuda, H. and Satō, K. 1995. Population persistence and

2   spatially limited social interaction. Theor. Popul. Biol. 48: 65–91

3   Heger, L., 1968. A method of constructing site-index curves from stem analysis. For. Chron.

4   44: 11-15.

5   Humphries, H.C., Coffin, D.P. and Lauenroth, W.K. 1996. An individual-based model of

6   alpine plant distributions. Ecol. Model. 84: 99-126.

7   Iwasa, Y. 2000. Lattice models and pair approximation in ecology. In: Dieckmann, U., Law,

8   R. and Metz, J.A.J. (eds.), The geometry of ecological interactions: simplifying spatial

9   complexity, pp. 227-251. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

10 Jeltsch, F. and Moloney, K. A. 2002. Spatially-explicit vegetation models: what have we

11   learned? Progress in Botany 63:326-343.

12 Jensen, S. and Bell, S. 2001. Seagrass growth and patch dynamics: Cross-scale morphological

13   plasticity. Plant Ecology. 155 (2): 201-217.

14 Jongejans, E. and Telenius, A. 2001. Field experiments on seed dispersal by wind in ten

15   umbelliferous species (Apiaceae). Plant Ecology 152: 67–78.

16 Judson, O. 1994. The rise of the individual-based model in ecology. Trends Ecol. Evol. 9: 9–

17   14.

18 Kessel, S.R. and Potter, M.W. 1980. A quantitative succession model for nine Montana forest

19   communities. Environ. Manage. 4: 227-240.

20 Kienast, F., 1987. FORECE – A forest succession model for southern Central Europe. Oak

21   Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, ORNL/TM-10575, Publ. No. 2989.

22 Kobe, R.K., Pacala, S.W., Silander, J.A., and Canham, C.D. 1995. Juvenile tree survivorship

23   as a component of shade tolerance. Ecol. Appl. 5: 517-532.

1 Kubo T., Iwasa Y. and Furumoto N. 1996. Forest spatial dynamics with gap expansion: total

2   gap area and gap size distribution. J.theor.Biol. 180: 229-246.

3 Lavorel, S., Chesson, P. 1995. How species with different regeneration niches coexist in

4   patchy habitats with local disturbances. Oikos 74: 103-114.

5 Law, R. and Dieckmann, U. 2000a. A dynamical system for neighborhoods in plant

6   communities. Ecology, 81: 2137-2148.

7 Law, R. and Dieckmann, U. 2000b. Moment approximations of individual-based models. In:

8   Dieckmann, U., Law, R. and Metz, J.A.J. (eds.), The geometry of ecological

9   interactions: simplifying spatial complexity, pp. 252-270. Cambridge University Press,

10   Cambridge, UK.

11 Law, R., Purves, D.W., Murrell, D.J. and Dieckmann, U. 2001. Causes and effects of small-

12   scale spatial structure in plant populations. In: Integrating Ecology and Evolution in a

13   Spatial Context (eds J. Silvertown and J. Antonovics), pp 21 - 44. Blackwell Science,

14   Oxford.

15 Ledermann, Th. and Stage A.R. 2001: Effects of competitor spacing in individual-tree indices

16   of competition. Can. J. For. Res. 31:2143-2150.

17 Leemans, R. and Prentice, I.C. 1989. FORSKA, a general forest succession model.

18   Meddelanden från Växtbiologiska institutionen, Uppsala.

19 Lehman, C.L. and Tilman, D. 1997. Competition in spatial habitats. Pp. 185-203. In: Tilman,

20   D. and Kareiva, P. (eds.). Spatial Ecology: The Role of Space in Population Dynamics

21   and Interspecific Interactions. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

22 Leibundgut, H. 1959. Über Zweck und Methodik der Struktur- und Zuwachsanalyse von

23   Urwäldern. Schweiz. Z. Forstwes. 110: 111-124, Zürich.

1 Lepage, P.T., Canham, C.D., Coates, K.D. and Bartemucci, P. 2000. Seed source versus

2   substrate limitation of seedling recruitment in northern temperate forests of British

3   Columbia. Can. J. For. Res. 30:415-427.

4 Lertzman, K.P. 1995. Forest dynamics, differential mortality rates and variable transition

5   probabilities. J. Veg. Sci. 6:191-204.

6 Lertzman, K.P. and J. Fall. 1998. From forest stands to landscapes: Spatial scales and the

7   roles of disturbances. in Peterson, D. and V.T. Parker (eds.), Ecological Scale: Theory

8   and Applications. Columbia University Press.

9 Lertzman, K.P., B. Dorner, and J. Fall. 1998. Three kinds of heterogeneity in fire regimes: at

10   the crossroads of fire history and landscape ecology. Northwest Science 72 (Special

11   Issue):4-22.

12 Levin, S.A. and Pacala, S.W. 1997. Theories of simplification and scaling of spatially

13   distributed processes. Pp. 271-296. In: Tilman, D. and Kareiva, P. (eds.). Spatial

14   Ecology: The Role of Space in Population Dynamics and Interspecific Interactions.

15   Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

16 Levin, S.A. and Paine, R. T. 1974. Disturbance, patch formation, and community structure.

17   Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA) 71: 2744-2747.

18 Lexer, M.J. and Hönninger, K. 2001. A modified 3D patch model for spatially explicit

19   simulation of vegetation composition in heterogeneous landscapes. For. Ecol. Manag.

20   144: 43–65.

21 Loehle, C. and LeBlanc, D. 1996. Model-based assessments of climate change effects on

22   forests: a critical review. Ecol. Model. 90, 1-31.

23 Long, Z.T., Carson, W. P. and Peterson, C. J. 1998. Can disturbance create refugia from

24   herbivores: an example with hemlock regeneration on treefall mounds. J. Torrey Bot.

25   Soc. 125: 165-168.

1 Lorimer, C.G. 1983. Test of age-independent competition indices for individual trees in

2   natural hardwood stands. For. Ecol. Manag. 6: 343-360.

3 Lorimer, C.G. 1984. Methodological considerations in the analysis of forest disturbance

4   history. Can. J. For. Res. 15: 200 – 213.

5 Lorimer, C.G. and Frelich, L.E. 1989. A methodology for estimating canopy disturbance

6   frequency and intensity in dense temperate forests. Can. J. For. Res. 19: 651-663.

7 Loucks, O.L., Plumb-Mentjes, M.L. and Rogers,D. 1985. Gap processes and large-scale

8   disturbances in sand prairies. In: Pickett, S.T.A. and White, P.S. (eds.), The Ecology of

9   natural disturbance and patch dynamics. pp. 71-83. Orlando, Fla. (USA). Academic

10   Press.

11 Lusk, C.H. and Smith, B. 1998. Life history differences and tree species coexistence in an

12   old-growth New Zealand rain forest. Ecology 79:795-806.

13 Mast, J.N., Veblen, T.T. and Linhart, Y.B. 1998. Disturbance and climatic influences on age

14   structure of ponderosa pine at the pine/grassland ecotone, Colorado Front Range. J.

15   Biogeogr. 25: 743 – 755.

16 Matsuda, H.N., Ogita, A., Sasaki, A. and Satō, K. 1992. Statistical mechanics of population:

17   The lattice Lotka-Volterra model. Progress in Theoretical Physics 88: 1035–1049.

18 Ménard, A., P. Dubé, A. Bouchard, Canham, C.D. and Marceau, D.J. 2002. Evaluating the

19   potential of the SORTIE forest succession model for spatio-temporal analysis of small-

20   scale disturbances. Ecol. Modell. 153 (1-2): 81-96.

21 Moran, P.A.P. 1950. Notes on continuous stochastic phenomena. Biometrika 37: 17-23.

22 Murrell, D.J., Dieckmann, U. and Law, R. (2004). On moment closures for population

23   dynamics in continuous space. J. Theor. Biol., in press.

1 Murrell, D.J., Purves, D.W. and Law, R. 2001. Updating pattern and process in plant ecology.

2   Trends Ecol. Evol. 16: 529-530.

3 Nathan, R., and Mueller-Landau, H.C. 2000. Spatial patterns of seed dispersal, their

4   determinants and consequences for recruitment. Trends Ecol. Evol. 15: 278-285.

5 Nathan, R., Horn, H.S., Chave, J., and Levin, S.A. 2001. Mechanistic Models for Tree Seed

6   Dispersal by Wind in Dense Forests and Open Landscapes. Pp 69-82. In: Levey, D.J.,

7   Silva, W.R. and Galetti, M. (eds) Frugivory and Seed Dispersal: Ecological,

8   Evolutionary and Conservation Issues. CAB International, New York.

9 Nathan, R., Katul, G.G., Horn, H.S., Thomas, S.M., Oren, R., Avissar, R., Pacala, S.W. and

10   Levin, S.A. 2002. Mechanisms of long-distance dispersal of seeds by wind. Nature 418:

11   409-413.

12 Nathan, R., Perry, G., Cronin, J.T., Strand, A.E. and Cain, M.L. Methods for estimating long-

13   distance dispersal. OIKOS 103: 261–273.

14 Newnham, R.M. 1964. The development of a stand model for Douglas-fir. Ph.D. thesis,

15   University of British Columbia, Vancouver, 201 pp.

16 Pacala, S.W., Canham, C.D. and Silander, J. A. Jr. 1993. Forest models defined by field

17   measurements: I. The design of a northeastern forest simulator. Can. J. For. Res. 23:

18   1980-1988.

19 Pacala, S.W., Canham, C.D., Silander, J.A.Jr. and Kobe, R. K. 1994. Sapling growth as a

20   function of resources in a north temperate forest. Can. J. For. Res. 24:2172-2183.

21 Pacala, S. W., and Deutschman, D. H.. 1995. Details that matter: The spatial distribution of

22   individual trees maintains forest ecosystem function. Oikos, 74:357-365.

23 Pacala, S.W., Canham, C.D., Saponara, J., Silander, J.A. Jr., Kobe, R.K. and Ribbens, E.

24   1996. Forest models defined by field measurements: II. Estimation, error analysis and

dynamics. Ecol. Monogr. 66: 1-43.

Pacala, S.W. and Levin, S.A. 1997. Biologically generated spatial pattern and the coexistence of competing species. In: Tilman, D. and Kareiva, P. (eds.), Spatial Ecology: The Role of Space in Population Dynamics and Interspecific Interactions. pp. 204-232. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Parker, V.T. and Pickett S.T.A. 1998. Historical contingency and multiple scales of dynamics in plant communities, In: Peterson, D.L. and Parker V.T. (eds.), Ecological Scale: Theory and applications. pp. 171-191. Columbia Univ. Press, NY.

Parshall, T. 1995. Canopy mortality and stand-scale change in a northern hemlock-hardwood forest. Can. J. For. Res. 25: 1466-1478.

Pastor, J., Cohen, Y. and Moen, R. 1999. The generation of spatial patterns in boreal landscapes. Ecosystems 2: 439-450.

Pattee, H.H. 1973. Hierarchy theory: the challenge of complex systems. Braziller, New York.

Peterson, C.J. 2000. Damage and recovery of tree species after two different tornadoes in the same old growth forest: a comparison of infrequent wind disturbances. For. Ecol. Manag. 135: 237-252.

Peterson, C.J. and Pickett, S.T.A. 1995. Forest reorganization - a case-study in an old-growth forest catastrophic blowdown. Ecology 76: 763-774.

Peterson, C.J. and Campbell, J.E. 1993. Microsite differences and temporal change in plant-communities of treefall pits and mounds in an old-growth forest. B. Torrey Bot. Club 120: 451-460.

Pickett S.T.A. and White, P. S. (eds) 1985. The Ecology of Natural Disturbance and Patch Dynamics. Academic Press N. Y.

1   Pickett, S. and Thompson, J. N. 1978. Patch dynamics and the design of nature reserves. Biol.

2   Conserv. 13:27-37.

3   Pickett, S.T.A., 1991. Long-term studies: past experiences and recommendations for the

4   future. In: Risser, P.G. (ed.), Long-term ecological research. An international

5   perspective. Scope 47. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, 294p.

6   Prentice, I.C., Sykes, M.T. and Cramer, W. 1993. A simulation model for the transient effects

7   of climate change on forest landscapes. Ecol. Model. 65, 51-70.

8   Purves, D.W. and Law, R. 2002a. Fine-scale spatial structure in a grassland community:

9   quantifying the plant's-eye view. J. Ecol. 90: 121-129.

10   Purves, D.W. and Law, R. 2002b. Experimental derivation of functions relating growth of

11   *Arabidopsis thaliana* to neighbour size and distance. J. Ecol. 90: 882-894.

12   Quigley, M.F. and Platt, W.J. 1996. Structure and pattern in temperate seasonal forests.

13   Vegetatio 123: 117-138.

14   Ramage, D.L. and Schiel, D.R. 1999. Patch dynamics and response to disturbance of the

15   seagrass Zostera novazelandica on intertidal platforms in southern New Zealand.

16   Marine-Ecology-Progress-Series; 189: 275-288

17   Ribbens, E., Silander, J.A. and Pacala, S.W. 1994. Seedling recruitment in forests: calibrating

18   models to predict patterns of tree seedling dispersion. Ecology 75: 1794-1806.

19   Ripley, B.D. 1977. Modelling spatial patterns. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series

20   B 39: 172-212.

21   Roe, A.L. 1967. Seed dispersal in a bumper Spruce seed year. U.S.For.Serv. Res. Pap.

22   Intermt. For. Range Exp. Sta. No. INT-39, 1967 pp. 10.

Runkle, J.R. 1981. Gap regeneration in some old-growth forests of the eastern United States. Ecology 62(4), pp 1041-1051.

Runkle, J.R. 1985. Disturbance regimes in temperate forests. In: Pickett, S.T.A. and White, P. (eds.), The Ecology of Natural Disturbance and Patch Dynamics, pp. 17-33 Academic Press, Orlando FL.

Satō, K., Matsuda, H. and Sasaki, A. 1994. Pathogen invasion and host extinction in lattice structured populations. J. Math. Biol. 32:251–268

Schenk, H.J., 1996. Modelling the effects of temperature on growth and persistence of tree species: a critical review of tree population models. Ecol. Model. 92: 1-32.

Schnurr, J. L., Canham, C. D., Ostfeld, R. S. and Inouye, R. S. submitted. Neighborhood analyses of small mammal dynamics: Implications for seed predation and seedling establishment. submitted to Ecology.

Schnurr, J. L., R. S. Ostfeld and C. D. Canham. 2002. Direct and indirect effects of masting on rodent populations and tree seed survival. Oikos. 96:402-410.

Shugart, H. H. 1984. A Theory of Forest Dynamics. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Shugart, H.H. and West, D.C. 1977. Development of an Appalachian deciduous forest succession model and its application to assessment of the impact of the chestnut blight. J. Environ. Manage. 5:161-179.

Shugart, H.H.,Jr. and West, D.C. 1981. Long-term dynamics of forest ecosystems. Am. Sci. 69: 647-652.

Shugart, H.H. 1998. Terrestrial ecosystems in changing environments. Cambridge (United Kingdom). Cambridge University Press. 537 p.

1   Smith, T.M. and Urban, D.L. 1988. Scale and resolution of forest structural pattern. Vegetatio

2   74: 143-150.

3   Soares, P. and Tomé, M. 1999. Distance-dependent competition measures for eucalyptus

4   plantations in Portugal. Ann. For. Sci. 56:307-319.

5   Sousa, W.P. 1985. Disturbance and patch dynamics on rocky intertidal shores. In: Pickett

6   S.T.A. and White, P. S. (eds.), The ecology of natural disturbance and patch dynamics.

7   Academic Press N. Y.

8   Spies, T. and Turner, M. 1999. Dynamic forest mosaics. In: Hunter, M.L. 1999 (ed.),

9   Managing biodiversity in forest ecosystems, pp 95-160. Cambridge University Press.

10   Stoll, P., Weiner, J. and Schmid, B. 1994. Growth variation in a naturally established

11   population of *Pinus sylvestris.* Ecology 75:660-670.

12   Tanaka, H. and Nakshizuka, T. 1997. Fifteen years of canopy dynamics analyzed by aerial

13   photographs in a temperate deciduous forest, Japan. Ecology 78: 612-620.

14   Tripler, C.E., Canham, C.D., Inouye, R.S. and Schnurr, J.L. 2002. Soil nitrogen availability,

15   plant luxury consumption, and herbivory by white-tailed deer. Oecologia, in press.

16   Turner, M.G., W.L. Baker, C. Peterson, and R.K. Peet. 1998. Factors influencing succession:

17   lessons from large, infrequent disturbances. Ecosystems 1: 511-523.

18   Urban, D. L., Shugart, H.H., Smith, T.M. and Bonan, G.B. 1989. Spatial applications of gap

19   models. For. Ecol. Manag. 42:95-110.

20   Urban, D.L. 1990. A versatile model to simulate forest pattern. In: A User's Guide to ZELIG

21   Version 1.0. Environmental Sciences Department, The University of Virginia,

22   Charlottesville, VA, 108 pp.

1   Urban, D.L. and Shugart, H.H. 1992. Individual-based models of forest succession. In: Glenn-

2   Lewin, D.C., Peet, R.K. and Veblen T.T. (eds.), Plant succession. pp. 249-292. Chapman

3   and Hall.

4   Valverde, T. and Silvertown, J. 1997. Canopy closure rate and forest structure. Ecology 78:

5   1555-1562.

6   Van Baalen, M. 2000. Pair approximations for different spatial geometries. In: Dieckmann,

7   U., Law, R. and Metz, J.A.J. (eds.), The geometry of ecological interactions: simplifying

8   spatial complexity, pp. 359-387. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

9   Van Bremen, N. and Finzi, A.C. 1998. Plant-soil interactions: ecological aspects and

10   evolutionary implications. Biogeochemistry 42: 1-19.

11   Van der Maarel, E.1996. Pattern and process in the plant community: Fifty years after A.S.

12   Watt. J. Veg. Sci. 7: 19-28.

13   Veblen, T. T., Hadley, K.S., Nel, E.M., Kitzberger, T., Reid, M. and Villalba, R. 1994.

14   Disturbance regime and disturbance interactions in a Rocky Mountain subalpine forest.

15   J. Ecol. 82: 125 – 135.

16   Villalba, R. and Veblen, T.T. 1997. Regional patterns of tree population age structures in

17   northern Patagonia: climatic and disturbance influences. J. Ecol. 85: 113–124.

18   Villalba, R. and Veblen, T.T. 1998. Influences of large scale climatic variability on episodic

19   tree mortality in northern Patagonia. Ecology, 79: 2624-2640.

20   Walker, L. R. N. V. L. Brokaw, D. J. Lodge, and R. B. Waide (eds.). 1991. Special issue:

21   ecosystem, plant, and animal responses to hurricanes in the Caribbean. Biotropica

22   23:313-521.

23   Watt, A.S. 1947. Pattern and process in the plant community. J. Ecol. 35: 1-22.

1   Weishampel, J.F. and Urban, D.L. 1996. Coupling a spatially-explicit forest gap model with a

2   3-D solar routine to simulate latitudinal effects. Ecol. Modell. 86: 101-111.

3   White, P. 1987. Natural disturbance, patch dynamics, and landscape pattern in natural areas.

4   Nat. Areas J. 7:14-22.

5   White, P.S. 1979. Pattern, process and natural disturbance in vegetation. Bot. Rev. 45, 229 –

6   99.

7   Wiegand, T., Moloney, K. A., Naves, J. and Knauer, F. 1999. Finding the missing link

8   between landscape structure and population dynamics: a spatially explicit perspective.

9   Am. Nat. 154:605-627.

10   Wiegand, T. and Moloney, K. A. 2004. Rings, circles, and null models for point pattern

11   analysis in ecology. Oikos 104:209-229.

12   Wimberly, M.C., Spies, T. A., Long, C. J. and Whitlock, C. 2000. Simulating historical

13   variability in the amount of old forests in the Oregon Coast Range. Conserv. Biol. 14:

14   167-180.

15   Wu, J. 1999. Hierarchy and scaling: Extrapolating information along a scaling ladder.

16   Canadian Journal of Remote Sensing 25(4): 367-380.

17   Wu, J. and J. L. David. 2002. A spatially explicit hierarchical approach to modeling complex

18   ecological systems: Theory and applications. Ecol. Model. 153: 7-26.

19   Wyckoff, P.H. and Clark, J.S. 2000. Predicting tree mortality from diameter growth: a

20   comparison of maximum likelihood and Bayesian approaches. Can. J. For. Res. 30: 156-

21   167.

1   Wykoff, W.R. and Monserud, R.A., 1987. Representing site quality in increment models: a

2   comparison of methods. In: Forest growth modelling and prediction, Vol. 1, USDA For

3   Serv Gen Tech Rep NC-120. North Central For Exp Stn, Saint Paul, MN, USA.

4   Zimmerman, J. K., E. M. Everham III, R. B. Waide, D. J. Lodge, C. M. Taylor, and N. V. L.

5   Brokaw. 1994. Responses of tree species to hurricane winds in subtropical wet forest in

6   Puerto Rico: implications for tropical tree life histories. Journal of Ecology 82:911-922.

7   Zinke, P. J. 1962. The pattern of influence of individual forest trees on soil properties.

8   Ecology 43:130-133.