



Tree diversity does not always improve resistance of forest ecosystems to drought

Charlotte Grossiord, André Granier, Sophia Ratcliffe, Olivier Bouriaud, Helge Bruelheide, Ewa Chećko, David Ian Forrester, Seid Muhie Dawud, Leena Finér, Martina Pollastrini, et al.

► To cite this version:

Charlotte Grossiord, André Granier, Sophia Ratcliffe, Olivier Bouriaud, Helge Bruelheide, et al.. Tree diversity does not always improve resistance of forest ecosystems to drought. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2014, 111 (41), pp.14812-14815. 10.1073/pnas.1411970111 . hal-01190150

HAL Id: hal-01190150

<https://hal.science/hal-01190150>

Submitted on 1 Sep 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 *Classification:* Biological Sciences (Major), Ecology (Minor)

2

3 **Tree diversity does not always improve resistance of forest ecosystems to**
4 **drought**

5

6 **Short title:** Diversity and drought resistance

7

8 Charlotte Grossiord,^a André Granier,^a Sophia Ratcliffe,^b Olivier Bouriaud,^c Helge
9 Bruelheide,^{d, e} Ewa Chećko,^f David I. Forrester,^g Seid Muhie Dawud,^h Leena Finér,ⁱ Martina
10 Pollastrini,^j Michael Scherer-Lorenzen,^k Fernando Valladares,^l Damien Bonal,^{a,1} Arthur
11 Gessler^{m, n}

12

13 ^aINRA, UMR 1137 Ecologie et Ecophysiologie Forestières, 54280 Champenoux, France. ^b

14 Institut für Spezielle Botanik und Funktionelle Biodiversität, University Leipzig, 04103

15 Leipzig, Germany. ^c University of Suceava, Forestry Faculty, 720229, Suceava, Romania. ^d

16 Institute of Biology / Geobotany and Botanical Garden, Martin Luther University Halle

17 Wittenberg, Am Kirchtor 1, 06108 Halle, Germany. ^e German Centre for Integrative

18 Biodiversity Research (iDiv), Deutscher Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany. ^f University of

19 Warsaw, Faculty of Biology, Białowieża Geobotanical Station, 17-230 Białowieża, Poland. ^g

20 Chair of Silviculture, Faculty of Environment and Natural Resources, Freiburg University,

21 79108 Freiburg, Germany. ^h University of Copenhagen, Department of Geosciences and

22 Natural Resource Management, Rolighedsvej 23, 1958 Copenhagen, Denmark. ⁱ Finnish

23 Forest Research Institute, P.O. Box 68, 80101 Joensuu, Finland. ^j University of Florence,

24 Dept. of Agri-food and Environmental Sciences, Section of Soil and Plant Science, 50144
25 Florence, Italy. ^k Faculty of Biology / Geobotany, University Freiburg, Germany. ^l Museo
26 Nacional de Ciencias Naturales, MNCN, CSIC, E-28006 Madrid, Spain. ^m Long-term Forest
27 Ecosystem Research (LWF), Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape
28 Research (WSL), 8903 Birmensdorf, Switzerland. ⁿ Berlin-Brandenburg Institute of Advanced
29 Biodiversity Research (BBIB), 14195 Berlin, Germany

30

31 **Keywords:** biodiversity, climate change, forest ecosystems, ecology

32 **Significance statement**

33 In the context of climate change, expected drier and warmer environmental conditions will
34 have drastic consequences on forest functions and services and may bring about important
35 drought-induced die-off events. Biodiversity promotes forest ecosystem performance and
36 resistance to insect pests and diseases, but whether or not diverse forests are also better
37 adapted to deal with drought stress remains unknown. Within our study network of 160 forest
38 stands across Europe, we found that mixed species forests are less exposed to drought stress
39 in some regions only. Therefore, managing forest ecosystems for high tree species diversity
40 does not necessarily assure improved resistance to the more severe and frequent drought
41 events predicted for the future.

42

43 **Abstract**

44 Climate models predict an increase in the intensity and frequency of drought episodes in the
45 Northern Hemisphere. Among terrestrial ecosystems, forests will be profoundly impacted by
46 drier climatic conditions with drastic consequences for the functions and services they supply.
47 Simultaneously, biodiversity is known to support a wide range of forest ecosystem functions
48 and services. However, whether biodiversity also improves the resistance of these ecosystems
49 to drought remains unclear. We compared soil drought exposure levels in a total of 160 forest
50 stands within five major forest types across Europe along a gradient of tree species diversity.
51 We assessed soil drought exposure in each forest stand by calculating the stand-level increase
52 in carbon isotope composition of late wood from a wet to a dry year ($\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$). $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$
53 exhibited a negative linear relationship with tree species diversity in two forest types,
54 suggesting that species interactions in these forests diminished the drought exposure of the
55 ecosystem. However, the other three forest types were unaffected by tree species diversity. We

56 conclude that higher diversity enhances resistance to drought events only in drought-prone
57 environments. Managing forest ecosystems for high tree species diversity does not necessarily
58 assure improved adaptability to the more severe and frequent drought events predicted for the
59 future.

60 \body

61 Biodiversity plays an important role in ecosystem functioning by promoting a wide range of
62 functions and services (1-3). This beneficial effect of biodiversity is determined by
63 mechanistic processes directly under the influence of species interactions: complementarity
64 among species for resource use through ecological niche partitioning and/or facilitation
65 processes increase ecosystem performance because resources are better shared among
66 neighboring species and are thus potentially more available (4). Previous studies have
67 demonstrated that, apart from enhancing performance, diverse terrestrial ecosystems may also
68 be more resilient and more resistant to biotic stresses such as insect pests or diseases (5, 6).
69 However, it remains unclear whether higher biodiversity also leads to improved resistance of
70 terrestrial ecosystems to the more frequent droughts expected in temperate regions (7). The
71 rare case studies published so far have shown contrasting results. Two reported that species in
72 more diverse ecosystems could be more resistant to drought stress (8, 9) while another
73 suggested that enhanced biodiversity could trigger higher exposure to drought (10).
74 Improving our understanding of how species diversity influences the resistance of terrestrial
75 ecosystems to a fluctuating climate is crucial.

76 More frequent and intense droughts will greatly affect the carbon and water cycles of the
77 terrestrial biosphere (11), in particular in forested ecosystems (12). Many societies around the
78 world rely on forests for essential services such as wood production, hunting or watershed
79 protection. We therefore urgently need to improve our knowledge of the physiological
80 response of these ecosystems to drier climatic conditions in order to propose new climate-
81 smart management options. Forests, though influenced by local environmental conditions,
82 play a major role in the global carbon and water balance as they release into and assimilate
83 from the atmosphere huge amounts of CO₂ while losing water vapour through transpiration.
84 Tree species are known to vary widely in the ecological strategies they use to deal with
85 drought stress. It could therefore be expected that in highly diverse forests composed of tree

86 species with contrasting functional traits, limited water resources could be better partitioned
87 among the neighboring species as a result of complementarity and facilitation processes (4).
88 Such forests should be more resistant to deal with drought stress since the trees should be able
89 to maintain better access to diminishing water resources as the drought progresses. In
90 contrast, if the interacting species in a diverse forest have similar functional traits (i.e.
91 functional redundancy), ecological niche overlap (13) may lead to more stressful conditions
92 during drought than in pure stands due to lower water availability for each species.

93 Carbon isotope composition in C_3 plant tissues ($\delta^{13}C$) provides an integrated record of the
94 ratio of intercellular to atmospheric CO_2 concentrations during the period when the carbon
95 was fixed, and thus reflects the balance between net CO_2 assimilation and stomatal
96 conductance (14). Plants typically react towards drought stress by closing their stomata and
97 reducing carbon assimilation rates. However, leaf stomatal conductance is affected to a
98 greater extent than assimilation, causing a concomitant increase in $\delta^{13}C$ (14, 15). Therefore,
99 under soil drought conditions, $\delta^{13}C$ from organic material has been widely accepted as an
100 indicator of the intensity of drought exposure in plants (16, 17) (*SI Appendix*). If
101 complementarity for water use is occurring among species, $\delta^{13}C$ values should increase less
102 between wet and dry soil conditions with increasing tree species diversity (i.e. a negative
103 relationship). Inversely, if tree species occupy redundant ecological niches, $\delta^{13}C$ values should
104 either have a similar or higher increase between wet and dry conditions with increasing tree
105 species diversity (i.e. a null or positive relationship).

106 In a previous study, we analyzed the influence of drought on the relationship between tree
107 species diversity and the increase in stand-level carbon isotope composition between a wet
108 and dry year ($\Delta\delta^{13}C_s$) in boreal forests (10). Species diverse forests were shown to be more
109 affected by drought stress than less diverse ones (i.e. a positive relationship between $\Delta\delta^{13}C_s$
110 and tree species diversity). In the present study, we have extended our research to five major

forest types across Europe which extends from northern hemi-boreal forests to southern Mediterranean forests. Our objective was to test whether the relationship between $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ and tree species diversity would be consistent across a large range of climatic and edaphic conditions. At each of the five study sites, we selected a set of representative canopy trees in 21 to 42 forest stands varying in tree species diversity. For each site, we used a water balance modeling approach to select one year within the last 14 years with high drought stress and one “reference” year when no drought occurred (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S1 and S2). We measured the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ in the tree rings of the selected canopy trees and calculated $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ for each stand.

Results

Within a given forest type, there was a large variability among species in $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S3), pointing out that drought response highly varied across tree species. Nevertheless, whatever the forest type, $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}$ always displayed positive values (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S3), which is consistent with the considerable literature on the impact of drought on tree- or species-level $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (16, 17). This result confirmed that the tree rings selected for the targeted dry year coincided with years when all tree species clearly suffered from a severe and long-lasting water shortage.

Mean site $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ values were highly variable across the different forest types (Fig. 1). This can be partly explained by the large differences in the intensity of drought stress during the selected dry years across forest types (*SI Appendix*, Table S3). We found a wide variability in $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ among forest stands within a given forest type (Fig. 2). The observed range of values (typically around 2 ‰) suggested highly contrasting ecosystem-level carbon and water trade-offs among stands indicating highly contrasting soil water availability during the dry year. Among the confounding factors that were included in the $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ statistical model

(competition intensity, light interception levels, microclimate and soil nutrient availability), in the hemi-boreal and mountainous beech forest types only competition intensity explained part of the large variability (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S4), the other factors being non-significant (*SI Appendix*, Table S4). In the temperate beech and thermophilous deciduous forest types, variations in $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ were only significantly correlated with tree species diversity (Fig. 2, Table S4). Variations observed in the Mediterranean forest were not explained by tree diversity, nor by any of the confounding factors (*SI Appendix*, Table S4).

Discussion

The positive relationship between $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ and tree species diversity that had been previously observed for boreal forests (10) indicated a higher drought exposure in the more diverse stands. This previous study suggested that drought stress could exacerbate competition for water among neighboring tree species. However, in the present study, we found evidence that such a detrimental effect of tree species diversity cannot be generalized to European forest types. Indeed, we observed either no relationship (hemi-boreal, mountainous beech, Mediterranean forests) or negative relationships (temperate beech, thermophilous deciduous forests) between $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ and tree species diversity (Fig. 2).

The negative relationship between $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ and tree species diversity that we observed for temperate beech and thermophilous deciduous forests implies that water availability was higher in diverse stands than in pure ones under drought conditions. These observations are consistent with other studies in which tree species diversity was found to reduce drought stress (8, 9). Higher water availability in more diverse stands suggests niche partitioning and/or facilitation processes among the interacting species. Below-ground partitioning may occur when species that extend their root systems towards deeper soil layers coexist with

others that occupy the superficial layers. Facilitation mechanisms such as hydraulic lift whereby deeper rooting tree species take up water and redistribute it via their root system to drier superficial soil layers are also known to take place in mixed forest ecosystems (18). Higher functional diversity of the fungal community could also partially improve water availability in more diverse stands (19). These underlying processes nevertheless remain speculative and future research is needed to shed light on the relative contribution of these potential processes (20).

For the three other forest types (hemi-boreal, mountainous beech and Mediterranean), the relationship between $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ and tree species diversity was non-significant (Fig. 2), suggesting that no net resource partitioning or facilitation processes were occurring. For these three forest types, tree species diversity did not play an important role in modulating ecosystem-level response to drought stress, despite strong functional differences among species in their response to drought (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S3). Intra-specific and inter-specific interactions therefore seem to have an equal influence on the level of drought exposure in these ecosystems. The tree species that compose these forests may be “ecological equivalents” (21) that use similar competitive strategies to deal with drought stress. However, for both the hemi-boreal and mountainous beech forests, the variability among stands in $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ was partly explained by competition intensity (i.e. basal area, *SI Appendix*, Fig. S4). Stands with higher basal area showed the greatest increase in $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$, and thus the strongest soil water limitation. In these forest types, silvicultural practices controlling stand basal area may therefore be one management option to improve resistance to drought.

Environmental conditions are highly variable along the North-South gradient considered in this study and could account for the inconsistency of the response among the different forest types. Negative relationships occurred in the temperate beech and thermophilous deciduous forests, the two sites that showed the highest mean drought stress intensity and the highest

drought stress frequency over the past 14 years (*SI Appendix*, Table S3). In contrast, drought events in the boreal and hemi-boreal forests were moderate and rather rare (*SI Appendix*, Table S3), and these are the sites where we observed positive relationships (10) or no effect of species interaction. Thus, overall, the global pattern we found seems consistent with the “stress-gradient hypothesis” (22, 23), though our study was not designed to test this hypothesis. This hypothesis indeed suggests that facilitation and complementarity processes should occur more frequently and should be more important under drier conditions while competition should dominate under favorable ones. The Mediterranean forest was also characterized by high drought stress intensity and frequency (*SI Appendix*, Table S3), but we found no effect of species interactions. We suspect that the very shallow soils found at this site prevented any chance for the establishment of below-ground complementarity processes such as root stratification.

We conclude that higher tree species diversity offers a greater resistance to drought events in some forest types, but that this pattern cannot be generalized to all forest ecosystems. Forest response is likely to be context-dependent. Local tree species associations are probably interacting with local environmental conditions and this would explain the complexity of the relationship between biodiversity and forest resistance to drought stress we observed across Europe. Managing forest ecosystems for high tree species diversity does not necessarily assure improved resistance to the more severe and frequent drought events predicted for the future.

Materials and methods

Experimental sites. The sites used in this study are included in a permanent network of stands established in 2011-2012 in existing mature forests in five European countries (Germany, Poland, Romania, Italy, Spain) within the framework of the FP7-FunDivEurope

project (24). The study areas include highly variable climatic conditions and host Europe's most important broadleaved and coniferous tree species (*SI Appendix*). In each site 21 to 42 forest stands (30 m × 30 m) were selected for a total of 160 stands covering a gradient of tree species diversity, from pure to the local maximum of between three and five species per stand (*SI Appendix*). Each level of tree species diversity was replicated approximately ten times, but with different species compositions: the experimental set-up was not designed to separate the effect of the presence of particular species or particular combinations of species from the effect of tree species diversity. To minimize confounding factors among stands within a given site, stands were selected for similar developmental stage, soil characteristics, slope, altitude, past management practises, or canopy structure characteristics (24). This focuses the study on rather average site conditions and is not suited to assess the influence of species diversity across a wider range of environmental factors. With this design we aimed, however, to eliminate other local factors that could have affected ecosystem functioning as much as tree species diversity. Nevertheless, some variability among stands within a given site could not be avoided and stand characteristics were included in the statistical analyses as confounding factors. A detailed description of stand selection and characteristics can be found in *SI Appendix* and (24). To characterize each stand's tree species diversity, we calculated the Shannon diversity index of each stand with species basal area as a surrogate for abundance in the equation (*SI Appendix*).

Selection of target years. In order to select a year with non-limiting soil water conditions during the growing season and a year with severe soil drought during the growing season, we used the water balance model BILJOU (25) to estimate the daily relative extractable water in the soil (REW, unitless) for each site during the period from 1997 to 2010 (*SI Appendix*, Fig.

S1). Based on REW, a water stress index (25) was calculated and used to select the two years (SI Appendix, Fig. S2).

Wood sample preparation and analyses. We selected a subsample of dominant and co-dominant trees per species and per stand to avoid confounding factors related to light interception (SI Appendix). For each tree, we extracted one wood core at breast height and carefully extracted the latewood for each selected year. Latewood sections from a given species, a given year and a given stand were bulked and analyzed for $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ with a mass spectrometer. By selecting only the latewood, whose $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ mainly characterizes the functioning of the trees during the second part of the growing season, we avoided potential effects related to the remobilization of stored photosynthates from the previous growing season (26) or to a favorable spring climate.

Stand-level carbon isotope composition. We calculated the stand-level $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ for each year using species-level $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, with the sum of basal area of each species in each stand as the weighting factor for the contribution of each species (SI Appendix). $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ was then defined as the increase in stand-level $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ between the dry and the wet conditions and therefore characterizes the ecosystem-level physiological response to soil drought.

Characterization of confounding factors. The following stand characteristics were measured in order to take them into account in the statistical model: leaf area index (i.e. light regimes), soil C/N (i.e. nutrient availability), stand basal area (competition intensity) and altitude (local climatic conditions).

Data analyses. For each site, linear mixed models were used to determine the fixed effects of the Shannon diversity index and the confounding factors on $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ (*SI Appendix*, Table S4). Interactions between the Shannon index and the confounding factors were initially integrated into the model but then were removed because none were significant.

Footnotes

¹To whom correspondence should be addresses. e-mail: bonal@nancy.inra.fr

Author contributions: DB, AG^a, and AG^{l,m} designed the research; OB, HB, EC, LF, MP, M S-L and FV selected the sites; CG, DB, AG^a, AG^{m,n}, MP and SMD performed research; CG, DB, AG^a and AG^{l,m} analyzed the data. All authors contributed to the writing of the paper. DB and AG^{m,n} contributed to the supervision of the work in a similar manner and share a similar position (latest) as co-authors.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

This article contains supporting information online.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. We are especially grateful to Bogdan Jaroszewicz, Fillipo Bussotti, Timo Domish and all the site technicians for establishing the study stands and for their logistical help. We thank Daniel Avăcăriței, Iulian Dănilă, Gabriel Duduman and Ionuț Bărnoaiea for their help with the wood core sampling. We also thank Francois Geremia for the wood sample preparation and Pierre Montpied for his advice on statistical analyses. We thank the technical Isotope Platform of INRA Nancy and the Isotope Facility of UC Davis for the carbon isotope analyses. Two anonymous reviewers significantly contributed to the improvement of a previous manuscript. The research leading to these results received funding

282 from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) under grant
283 agreement n° 265171. This research was conducted in the framework of the Laboratory of
284 Excellence ARBRE (ANR-12- LABXARBRE-01) supported by the French National Research
285 Agency. AG^{m,n} acknowledges financial support from the DFG (GE 1090/8-1). EC
286 acknowledges financial support from the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education.
287

288 **References**

- 289 1. Balvanera P, et al. (2006) Quantifying the evidence for biodiversity effects on
290 ecosystem functioning and services. *Ecol Lett* 9(10): 1146-1156.
- 291 2. Zavaleta ES, Pasari JR, Hulvey KB, Tilman GD (2010) Sustaining multiple ecosystem
292 functions in grasslands communities requires higher biodiversity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
293 *USA* 107(4): 1443-1446.
- 294 3. Hector A, Bagchi R (2007) Biodiversity and ecosystem multifunctionality. *Nature*
295 448(7150): 188-190.
- 296 4. Loreau M, et al. (2001) Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: current knowledge
297 and future challenges. *Science* 294(5543): 804-808.
- 298 5. Zhu Y, et al. (2000) Genetic diversity and disease control in rice. *Nature* 406(6797):
299 718-722.
- 300 6. Jactel H, Brockerhoff EG (2007) Tree diversity reduces herbivory by forest insects.
301 *Ecol Lett* 10(9): 835-848.
- 302 7. IPCC (2007) Climate change 2007: Synthesis report. *Contribution of Working Groups*
303 *I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on*
304 *Climate Change*. eds Pachauri RK, Reisinger A (Cambridge University Press,
305 Cambridge), p104.
- 306 8. Lebourgeois F, Gomez N, Pinto P, Mérian P (2013) Mixed stands reduce *Abies alba*
307 tree-ring sensitivity to summer drought in the Vosges mountains, western Europe. *For*
308 *Ecol Manag* 303: 61-71.
- 309 9. Pretzsch H, Schütze G, Uhl E (2013) Resistance of European tree species to drought
310 stress in mixed versus pure forests: evidence of stress release by inter-specific
311 facilitation. *Plant Biol* 15: 483-495.

10. Grossiord C, Granier A, Gessler A, Jucker T, Bonal D (2014) Does Drought Influence the Relationship Between Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functioning in Boreal Forests? *Ecosystems* 17(3): 394-404.
11. Breshears DD, et al. (2005) Regional vegetation die-off in response to global-change-type drought. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* 102(42): 15144-15148.
12. Allen CD, et al. (2010) A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals emerging climate change risks for forests. *For Ecol Manag* 259:660-684.
13. Rosenfeld JS (2002) Functional redundancy in ecology and conservation. *Oikos* 98(1): 156-162.
14. Farquhar GD, Ehleringer JR, Hubick KT (1989) Carbon isotope discrimination and photosynthesis. *Ann Rev Plant Physiol* 40: 503-537.
15. Keitel C et al. (2003) Carbon and oxygen isotope composition of organic compounds in the phloem sap provides a short-term measure for stomatal conductance of European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* L.). *Plant Cell Environ* 26(7): 1157-1168.
16. Ehleringer JR, Cooper TA (1988) Correlations between carbon isotope ratio and microhabitat in desert plants. *Oecologia* 76(4): 562-566.
17. O'Leary MH (1995) Environmental effects on carbon fractionation in terrestrial plants. *Stable Isotopes in the Biosphere*. eds Wada E, Yoneyama T, Minigawa M, Ando T, Fry BD (Kyoto University Press, Kyoto) pp. 78-91.
18. Zapater M, et al. (2011) Evidence of hydraulic lift in a young beech and oak mixed forest using ^{18}O soil water labelling. *Trees* 25(5): 885-894.
19. Buée M, et al. (2011). Influence of tree species on richness and diversity of epigeous fungal communities in a French temperate forest stand. *Func Ecol* 4(1): 22-31.

20. Pretzsch H, et al. (2014) Mixed Norway spruce (*Picea abies* [L.] Karst) and European beech (*Fagus sylvatica* [L.]) stands under drought: from reaction pattern to mechanism. *Trees*: 1-17
21. Goldberg DE, Werner PA (1983) Equivalence of competitors in plant communities: a hypothesis and field experimental approach. *Am J Bot* 70:1098–1104.
22. Bertness M, Callaway RM (1994) Positive interactions in communities. *Trends Ecol Evol* 9(5): 191-193.
23. He Q, Bertness MD (2014) Extreme stresses, niches, and positive species interactions along stress gradients. *Ecology* 95(6): 1437-1443.
24. Baeten L, et al. (2013) A novel comparative research platform designed to determine the functional significance of tree species diversity in European forests. *Perspect Plant Ecol Evol Syst* 15(5): 281-291.
25. Granier A, Bréda N, Biron P, Villette S (1999) A lumped water balance model to evaluate duration and intensity of drought constraints in forest stands. *Ecol Model* 116(2-3): 269-283.
26. Offermann CF, et al. (2011) The long way down - are carbon and oxygen isotope signals in the tree ring uncoupled from canopy physiological processes? *Tree Physiol* 31(10): 1088-1102.

353 **Figure legends**

354 **Figure 1:** Intensity of the physiological response to drought stress during the targeted dry
355 year. Mean $\pm$ SE of the increase in stand-level carbon isotope composition ($\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$, ‰)
356 between the dry year and the year without water stress are shown for all stands with all tree
357 species diversity levels for a given forest type. The increase in $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$ between dry and wet
358 conditions characterizes the intensity of drought stress to which the ecosystems were
359 subjected.

360

361 **Figure 2:** Increase in stand-level carbon isotope composition in relation to tree species
362 diversity for each forest type. Relationship between the increase in stand-level carbon isotope
363 composition ($\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_s$, ‰) and the Shannon diversity index for the hemi-boreal, mountainous
364 beech, temperate beech, thermophilous deciduous and Mediterranean forest types. Solid lines
365 show the statistically significant relationships ($P < 0.05$). Corresponding equations, R^2 and P -
366 values are given for each significant relationship.

367