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## SUMMARY (200 WORDS)

- Phenology, the study of seasonal timing of events in nature, plays a key role in the matching between organisms and their environment. Yet, it has been poorly integrated in trait-based descriptions of the plant phenotype. Here, we focus on three phases of reproductive phenology - time of flowering, time of seed dispersal and duration of seed maturation - , to test how these traits relate to other recognized dimensions of plant functioning.
- Traits describing reproductive phenology, together with reproductive plant height, seed mass, area of a leaf, and traits involved in leaf economics were compiled for 139 species growing under Mediterranean climate conditions.
- Across all species, flowering time was positively related to reproductive height, while the duration of seed maturation was related to leaf economics. Relationships differed among growth forms however: flowering time and reproductive height were related both in annuals and herbaceous perennials, while the duration of seed maturation was related to seed mass only in annuals; no correlations were found for woody species.
- Phenology relates to other dimensions of plant functioning in a complex manner, suggesting that it should be considered as an independent dimension in the context of plant strategies.
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## Introduction

Reproductive phenology describes the temporality of key events in the life cycle of organisms (Lechowicz, 2002; Schwartz, 2003). It corresponds to a period when resource allocation is diverted towards reproduction at the expense of parental growth and survival (Cohen, 1976). The timing of reproductive events has long been known to play a key role in the matching between organisms and their environment (Rathcke \& Lacey, 1985). As such, it is an important component of ecology strategies (Grime, 1977; Weiher et al., 1999; Wolkovich \& Cleland, 2014) and represents a critical dimension of plant functioning. Yet, the link between reproductive events and other plants functional dimensions - defined as groups of correlated phenotypic traits reflecting constraints and trade-offs that structure the plant phenotype
(Westoby et al., 2002; Laughlin, 2014) - remains understudied (Table 1 and see Wolkovich \& Cleland, 2014).

There is currently no consensus as to how many functional dimensions are required to describe adequately plant phenotypes (Westoby et al., 2002; Laughlin, 2014; Gillison, 2019). A popular scheme initially described by Westoby (1998) and further tested by Diaz et al. (2004); Laughlin et al. (2010); Díaz et al. (2016), postulates that at least three dimensions are of prime importance for plant structure and function: (1) the first one pertains to plant regeneration, which describes a trade-off between the production of few large seeds (favoring establishment) or of many small seeds (favoring dispersion) (Leishman et al., 2000), (2) the second one describes plant stature and competitive ability and (3) the third one relates to resource use by leaves, and represents a trade-off between the rate of resource acquisition and the efficiency of resource conservation (the "leaf economics spectrum": Wright et al., 2004). Other schemes have been proposed however (see Craine, 2009; Laughlin, 2014; Gillison, 2019 for reviews) including e.g. the Leaf-Life-form-Root strategy (Gillison, 2013; Gillison, 2019), which involves other traits related to the photosynthetic performance as leaf inclination, leaf phyllotaxis and woody green-stem photosynthesis, or the seed-phytomer-leaf theoretical model (Hodgson et al. (2017) which proposes a framework explaining the size syndrome in plants (correlation between organ and plant size) by allometric and allocation constraints.

Here, our objective is to assess how reproductive phenology relates to selected dimensions of the plant phenotype as identified in the schemes described above, a topic which has been poorly investigated to date (Wolkovich \& Cleland, 2014). Indeed, although reproductive phenology has been included in the list of traits of major interest for long (Weiher et al., 1999; Laughlin, 2014), very few studies have clearly indentify its coordination with other plant functions. Table 1 shows that trait-based studies that have taken reproductive phenology into account have mainly focused on flowering. Besides being one of the most conspicuous stages, onset of flowering is indeed a good descriptor of the beginning of the reproductive period and is known to be strongly under selection (Ehrlén, 2015). Much less is known about other aspects of reproductive phenology however, such as the patterns of seed maturation length and seed dispersal time (cf. Willson \& Traveset, 2000; Heydel \& Tackenberg, 2017).

Several hypotheses have been formulated about relationships between reproductive phenology and other dimensions of plant structure and function. First, Primack (1987) postulated a
triangular-shaped relationship between the period necessary to mature seeds and their mass at dispersal time. Assuming physiological constraints on the upper value of the rate of seed development, plant species cannot exceed a maximal seed mass for a given seed maturation period. As a consequence, a long seed maturation period can result in large or small seeds, while the combination of a short seed maturation period and large seeds appears impossible. Only few studies confirmed this hypothesis, showing a positive relationship between the two traits on a limited number of species (Table 1). A second hypothesis, which applies to herbaceous plants growing under a seasonal climate, states that plants that flower early have little time for maternal plant growth resulting in a small size at time of reproduction (Primack, 1987; Bolmgren \& Cowan, 2008). We thus expect a positive relationship between the onset of flowering and maximum plant height. Although this relationship has been found significant for herbaceous species in a number of studies (Table 1), whether it also holds for other growth forms such as woody species has seldom been tested. Finally, reproductive phenology is expected to depend on plant growth rate at least for herbaceous species, as suggested by the study of Sun and Frelich (2011), who found that fast growing species tended to flower earlier than slow growing species. However, inconsistent results have been found regarding to the correlations between the onset of flowering and leaf traits assumed to be related to plant growth (Table 1).

None of studies listed in Table 1 have actually tested simultaneously all the hypotheses mentioned above using data collected on the same set of species, which results in a fragmented view as to how reproductive phenology integrates more broadly into plant functioning. In a recent study, we showed that low stature species (annuals, herbaceous and small woody perennials) growing in the Mediterranean region of southern France could be arrayed along a fast-slow phenological continuum (Segrestin et al., 2018). This continuum describes a temporal coordination of plant reproductive phases and runs from fast species associated with early onset flowering, early dispersal and short seed maturation period, to slow species, associated with late flowering, delayed dispersal and long seed maturation. Here, we use the same set of 139 species to test how these traits characterizing plant reproductive phenology relate to other major functional dimensions, including the characteristics of seeds, the size syndrome, the leaf economics spectrum and their water use efficiency. First, we performed multivariate analyses including all traits to assess (i) the shape and structure of the phenotypic space occupied by the 139 species, and (ii) the position of reproductive phenology in that space. Second, we more specifically tested whether: (1) a
triangular-shaped relationship between the seed maturation period and seed mass at maturity was observed; and if so, whether different growth forms occupy specific regions of the triangle; (2) a positive correlation between plant reproductive height and the onset of flowering was observed in herbaceous species, and (3) reproductive phenology was related to leaf traits. Finally, since patterns of trait covariations can be influenced by the phylogenetic relationships among species (Felsenstein, 1985), we tested the effects of accounting for phylogeny on the outcomes of the analyses.

## Material and methods

## Study sites and environmental conditions

This study is based on a dataset which combines data for 139 species (Table S2, Supplementary material), collected during several surveys conducted between 1998 and 2010 in four sites located in the Mediterranean region of Southern France (Table 2). The climates of these sites are classified as Mediterranean humid to sub-humid, with a marked summer drought, frosts in winter and unpredictability of precipitation in timing and amount, with generally frequent heavy rainfall events in autumn (Daget, 1977). Daily values of temperature, precipitation and Penman-Monteith evapotranspiration (PET) were taken from meteorological stations closest to the sites. A detailed description of each site and experimental designs are given in Segrestin et al. (2018).

## Collection of trait data

Reproductive phenology was characterized at the population level, defined here as a group of individuals of the same species growing in similar conditions in the same site, during a given year. Onset of flowering (flowering hereafter) and dispersal (dispersal hereafter) were assessed in the different sites from weekly surveys, either from the monitoring of 10 marked individuals per population (in Cazarils) or from visual assessment of the first flowering and dispersing individuals in different plots (in Camp Redon, Montpelliérais old-fields, and La Fage).

Eight other traits were measured on selected individuals from the same populations (Table 3). Seed mass (SM hereafter) was used as a marker of the plant regeneration axis. Reproductive plant height ( $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{rep}}$ hereafter) and the area of a leaf (LA hereafter) were used for the plant stature axis. We chose to focus on reproductive height, and not on vegetative height, as it allows a better standardization across species (Garnier et al., 2007). Indeed, vegetative height
is a very dynamic trait, whose value changes rapidly during the growing season, especially in herbaceous plants ( $82 \%$ of the species studied here). Given that vegetative phenology widely differs among the 139 species studied, deciding at what time plant height should be measured remains a difficult, unsolved question (discussed in Violle et al., 2009). Leaf mass per area (LMA hereafter), leaf dry matter content (LDMC hereafter), mass-based leaf nitrogen content ( $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ hereafter) and mass-based leaf phosphorus content ( $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ hereafter) were used to describe the "leaf economics spectrum" axis. Leaf carbon isotope ratio ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ : ${ }^{12} \mathrm{C}\left(\delta^{13} \mathrm{C}\right.$ hereafter) was used as a surrogate of water use efficiency (Farquhar et al., 1989). Leaf width, which is more directly linked to the leaf boundary-layer conductance to water vapor, and hence transpiration, than LA (cf. Wright et al., 2017 and references therein) was also measured, but only in 3 of the 4 study sites (FAG, CRE and CAZA, Table 2). This results in a substantial number of missing values in the global data set, and we thus did not consider this trait for further analyses. However, using the available data for the three sites, we found that leaf width was very strongly correlated with LA, ( $r=0.75$, P value $\ll 0.001$; Fig. S1, Supporting information, and see Hodgson et al., 2017), resulting in little loss of information overall. All traits were measured according to standardized protocols described in PérezHarguindeguy et al. (2013), and only on blades (i.e. after removing the petiole when required) for leaf traits. Leaf traits could not be measured on Ruscus aculeatus (which bear cladodes) and Aphyllanthes monspeliensis (no leaf), and were therefore left out of the analyses involving leaf traits. Further details on sampling and trait data can be found in Navas et al. (2010) for Cazarils, Kazakou et al. (2007) for Camp Redon, Garnier et al. (2004) and Vile et al. (2006) for Montpelliérais old-fields, and Bernard-Verdier et al. (2012) for La Fage.

Overall, the dataset included 604 populations across the four sites for which at least one phenological value and one trait value were available. Of the 139 species measured, 28 species were represented by one population, 62 species were represented by 2 to 5 populations, and 49 species by more than 5 populations. Bromopsis erecta was the most represented species in the dataset with 21 populations. The 139 species could be allocated to three growth forms: 51 annuals, 63 hemicryptophytes herbaceous perennials (excluding geophytes) and 25 low stature woody perennials (chamaephytes ranging from 3.7 cm to 66 cm in reproductive height).

Normalization of phenological data and water deficit index

The Mediterranean climate of southern France is characterized by a strong seasonality, with cold winters and a summer drought (Daget, 1977) (cf. climate diagrams of the four sites in Segrestin et al., 2018). Consequently, most of the plant activity (vegetative and reproductive) occurs in spring, after late winter frosts and before the summer drought, with limited activity during autumn (Chollet et al., 2014). To account for temperature differences between years and sites, onset of flowering and dispersal were expressed on a growing degree day basis ( ${ }^{\circ}$ C.days: e.g. Diekmann, 1996) summing daily mean temperatures since January $1^{\text {st }}$ of the year of measurements and using a $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ base temperature and a $18^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ threshold temperature (discussed in e.g. Ansquer et al., 2009). In the four sites, most of the above-ground biomass of herbaceous species (even all in the case of annuals) disappears during winter (field observations and Chollet et al., 2014 for the FAG site). We therefore assume that physiological activity starts in late winter, when temperatures increase, and stops at the end of spring/early summer, when high temperatures combine with the onset of drought. The length of seed maturation period ("seed maturation" hereafter) was also assessed in degree days ( $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . d a y s\right)$, as the difference between the degree days at the onset of dispersal and at the onset of flowering (seed maturation $=$ dispersal - flowering, expressed in ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.days); it is interpreted as the minimum degree days required to produce at least one seed.

Since water deficit is one of the major constraints on plants in the Mediterranean, we assessed the species capacities to reproduce during drought periods. We used the soil water deficit during seed maturation (SWD ${ }_{\text {SMP }}$ ) proposed by Segrestin et al. (2018) to quantify water availability during the reproductive period: daily soil water content was estimated using a bucket-type model based on rainfall, PET, and soil total available water capacity (TAW) (see Boulant et al., 2008 for model description). The simulated data were used to calculate a relative soil water content (S) as a proportion of TAW on a daily basis. The cumulative soil water deficit during the seed maturation (SWD ${ }_{\text {SMP }}$ ) was computed for each population as follows:

$$
S W D_{S M P}=\sum_{d=F L O}^{D I S P} \max \left(-\ln \left(\frac{s_{d}}{s_{l i m}}\right) ; 0\right) \quad(\text { Equation 1) }
$$

With $S_{d}$ the relative soil water content at day $d(d \in[F L O: D I S P])$, and $S_{\text {lim }}$ is the $S$ value under which it is considered that water is limiting for plant growth (fixed here at $50 \%$ of the total available water). The log-transformation of the ratio reflects the log-linear relationship between soil water content and soil water potential (Hillel, 1971). The opposite value of this log ratio was used to express SWD $_{\text {SMP }}$ in positive values: low water availability during seed
maturation results in high values of the index. SWD Smp $^{\text {sekes null (no water deficit during }}$ seed maturation) or positive values. It accounts not only for the length of the water deficit period, but also for its intensity.

## From population to species values

To study patterns of trait covariations at the inter-specific level, we used a method of estimation of the species mean values that takes into account potential sources of intraspecific variations. Species mean values for each trait were extracted from the linear mixed models described as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i j k}=\mu+\alpha_{i}+u_{j}+v_{k}+\varepsilon_{i j k} \tag{Equation2}
\end{equation*}
$$

With $y_{i j k}$ the trait value of species $i$ surveyed in site $j$ during year $k ; \mu$ the overall mean; $\alpha_{i}$ the species $i$ fixed effect ( $i \in[1: 139]$ ); $u_{j}$ the site $j$ random effect $(j \in[1: 4]) ; v_{k}$ the year $k$ random effect ( $k \in[1: 8]$ ); $\varepsilon_{i j k}$ the random error term. The sum of $\mu$ and $\alpha_{i}$ computed for species $i$, called best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP: Henderson, 1975), was extracted from these models for each species and used in the analyses. The relevance of $u_{j}$ and $v_{k}$ random factors was assessed by a model selection based on Akaike information criterion (AIC) comparisons. A random factor was included only if it improved the AIC value at least by two points. When no random factor was selected, BLUPs were equivalent to arithmetic means per species. Raw values of $\mathrm{H}_{\text {rep }}$, LA, SM, LMA, LDMC, $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$, and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ were $\log 10$ transformed before applying these models to fulfill normality assumptions.

The procedure described above to assess species means was not applied to estimate the water deficit index at the species level ( $\mathrm{SWD}_{\text {Smp }}$; Equation 1). Rather, for species surveyed in several populations, we selected the highest calculated SWD $_{\text {SMP }}$, since these were considered to be better indicators of the ability of a plant to cope with drought than average values (cf. Chiariello, 1989; Skelton et al., 2015). The species SWD ${ }_{\text {SMP }}$ values were log-transformed prior to analyses to fulfill normality assumptions and avoid heteroscedasticity.

## Statistical analyses

The trait distributions were represented by violin plots, showing density curves of traits values computed with kernel density smoothing functions. The distributions of non phenological traits found in our dataset were compared to large datasets representing their worldwide distribution. We used trait data from Díaz et al. (2016) for $H_{\text {rep }}$, LA, SM, LMA and $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$;

Wright et al. (2004) for $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass, }}$, Flores et al. (2014) for LDMC, and Cornwell et al. (2017) for $\delta^{13} \mathrm{C}$. Differences in trait values between growth forms were tested using ANOVAs and posthoc Tukey's tests (R package "multcomp" - Hothorn et al., 2008).

We performed a principal component analysis on the 12 traits (Table 3) which were previously centered and scaled. The species loadings on the two first principal components were extracted and differences in their values between growth forms were tested using ANOVAs and post-hoc Tukey’s tests (R package "multcomp" - Hothorn et al., 2008).

The correlations between traits were estimated using Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) for all species. The P values of the correlation tests were adjusted for multiple comparison tests using Holm method (Holm, 1979). For three of the relationships (FLO vs. $\mathrm{H}_{\text {rep }}$, SMP vs. SM and SWD $_{\text {SMP }}$ vs. LMA) correlation tests were also performed for each growth form separately. When significant ( P value $<.05$ ), we computed estimators of the slope and the intercept of the relationship using a standardized major axis method (SMA) with the R package "smatr" (Warton et al., 2012). Finally, we tested the correlation between seed maturation and a "leaf economics" axis using the species coordinates on the first component of a PCA including LMA, LDMC, $P_{\text {mass }}$ and $N_{\text {mass }}$.

## Phylogeny

A phylogenetic tree for the 139 species was extracted from the mega-phylogeny revised by Qian and Jin (2016). All the studied genera were available in the phylogeny and 21 missing species were branched in polytomy to the youngest common ancestor of the corresponding genus.

We accounted for a potential bias in the estimation of the Pearson’s correlation coefficient due to the phylogenetic correlation structure between species. Phylogenetic Pearson’s correlation coefficients were computed from phylogenetic trait variance-covariance matrices (phyl.vcv function in the 'phytools' R package Revell, 2012). The matrices account for the phylogenetic signal in the relationships using a Pagel's lambda ( $\lambda$ ) estimation by maximum likelihood. The P values of the phylogenetic correlations were computed using the typical t statistic $\left(t=r \sqrt{\frac{n-2}{1-r^{2}}}\right.$ ) and a Student's t -distribution with degrees of freedom $\mathrm{n}-2$; where n is the number of species.

## Results

At the species level, flowering ranged from $46^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days (Viola alba) to $1965{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days (Ruscus aculeatus), dispersal ranged from $470{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days (Veronica persica) to $2485{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days (Inula conyza), the seed maturation ranged from $129^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days (Erigeron sumatrensis) to $1425{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days (Centaurea aspera) and SWD ${ }_{\text {Smp }}$ ranged from $0 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{mm}$ days (Avena barbata, Briza media, Lolium multiflorum, Microthlaspi perfoliatum and Poa pratensis) to $32.9 \mathrm{~mm} / \mathrm{mm}$ days (Eryngium campestre) (Fig. 1). No difference was observed between growth forms in their flowering date but annuals showed shorter seed maturation period than herbaceous and woody perennials, resulting in earlier dispersal dates and lower water deficit experienced during the seed maturation for this group of species (Fig. 1).
$\mathrm{H}_{\text {rep }}$ ranged from 3.7 cm (Ononis striata) to 104.9 cm (Scabiosa atropurpurea) and LA ranged from $.036 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ (Arenaria aggregata) to $91.3 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ (Dipsacus fullonum). Woody and annual species appeared to be slightly shorter at reproduction than herbaceous perennials. Woody species had the smallest leaves, while annuals had intermediate leaf size and herbaceous perennials had the largest ones. When comparing to global databases, the range of values of size-related traits in our dataset covers a large proportion of that displayed by small stature plants (Fig 2a,b), but it is clear from Fig. 2a that our sampling of species does not include tall (woody) species. SM ranged from 0.02 mg (Achillea millefolium) to 208.3 mg (Ruscus aculeatus). No difference in seed mass was detected between growth forms (Fig. 2c). SM values in our dataset covered a large range of the values found in global databases but their median was slightly lower, which is probably the consequence of the lack of tall woody species in our data set.

LMA ranged from $24.6 \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{m}^{-2}$ (Poa trivialis) to $167.8 \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{m}^{-2}$ (Eryngium campestre) and LDMC from $126 \mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ (Bellis perennis) to $546.7 \mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ (Stipa pennata). $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ values were relatively high and ranged from $11.4 \mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ (Orlaya grandiflora) to $53.5 \mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ (Vicia hybrida) and $0.7 \mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ (Thymus serpyllum) to $5.3 \mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ (Rumex acetosa) respectively. In legumes (22 species) $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ values ranged from 23.8 to $53.5 \mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$, while these values ranged from 11.5 to $46.1 \mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ for the 117 non-N-fixing species. Finally, the $\delta^{13} \mathrm{C}$ values in our dataset covered a smaller proportion of the variation found in global databases and ranged from -31 (Thymus vulgaris) to -26.1 \% (Cerastium glomeratum) which are typical values for $\mathrm{C}_{3}$ species. We found significant differences between growth forms in their LMA and LDMC with annual < herbaceous perennials < woody perennials (Fig. 2d,e) and in their $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ with
annual and herbaceous perennials > woody perennials (Fig. 2g). Leaf trait values cover a large range of values, mostly comparable to those compiled from global databases (Fig. 2d,e,f,g).

## Patterns of trait co-variations

The two first principal components (PC1 and PC2) of the PCA conducted on the 12 traits available for 112 species (excluding species with at least one missing trait value) account respectively for $27.9 \%$ and $20.9 \%$ of the total variability. Phenological traits strongly contribute to the first principal component (Fig. 3a), which describes the fast-slow phenological continuum (Segrestin et al., 2018): species with early flowering and fast seed maturation (negative values in the axis) contrast with species with late flowering and longer seed maturation (positive values in the axis). Growth forms are discriminated along this axis (ANOVA, $\mathrm{F}=24.15$, $\mathrm{df}=2$ and 109, P value $\ll .001$ ), with annual species showing significantly lower values than herbaceous and woody perennial species (post-hoc Tukey test). Size-related ( $\mathrm{H}_{\text {rep }}$ and LA) and leaf economics traits (LMA, LDMC, $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ ) are well represented on the first plane of the PCA (Fig. 3a) and these functional dimensions appeared independent. They cannot be clearly associated to a unique principal component however. Growth forms were also discriminated along PC2 (ANOVA, F $=9.72$, $\mathrm{df}=2$ and 109 , P value $\ll .001$ ), with woody species having significantly lower values than herbaceous species (post-hoc Tukey test).

All bivariate relationships were tested and the P values were corrected for multiple test comparisons (Fig. 3b). The strongest correlations were found (1) among phenological traits, supporting the strong coordination among the different phenological phases, and (2) between Hrep and LA, in agreement with a coordination among different size dimensions, although SM relates significantly to LA only. Correlations between leaf traits were in line with those of the leaf economics spectrum (Wright et al., 2004). This analysis revealed significant relationships between reproductive phenology and only three other traits: (1) $\mathrm{H}_{\text {rep }}$, which was positively related to both FLO and DISP, (2) LA, which was positively related to FLO, and (2) LMA, which was positively related to SMP and SWD ${ }_{\text {Smp. }}$. When all species were considered, no relationship between seed mass and any of the phenological traits was detected. Similarly, no correlation was detected between $\delta^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and any of the phenological traits. Accounting for phylogeny led to changes in the strength of the correlations (higher between leaf economics traits for example), but results remained qualitatively unchanged for most of the relationships (Fig. S2). The relationship between LA and FLO was no longer
significant and a positive relationship between LDMC and SWDsmp was detected however (Fig. S2).

## Growth forms effects on bivariate relationships

To explicitly test our hypotheses and provide further insights into the results of the previous section, we focused on four specific relationships. Bivariate relationships between FLO and $H_{\text {rep }}$, SMP and SM, SMP and a "leaf economics" axis (Fig. 4) and SWD ${ }_{\text {SMP }}$ and a "leaf economics" axis (Fig. 5) and were analysed in more detail to assess the effects of growth forms on the associations between reproductive phenology and the other dimensions of the phenotype. First, we found that the positive correlation between FLO and $H_{\text {rep }}$ was significant only for annual and perennial herbaceous (Fig. 4a and Table 4), with non-significantly different SMA slopes (common slope $=.063$, Likelihood ratio $=3.49, \mathrm{df}=1, \mathrm{P}$ value $=.062$ ). Second, we found little support for a linear relationship between SMP and SM (Table 4). Rather, a triangular shaped relationship between these two traits was observed: there was no species with short SMP and large seeds, while species with a long seed maturation period had either small or large seeds (Fig. 4b). The correlation between the two traits was found to be significant in annuals, the line of which delimiting the left hand side of the triangle (Fig. 4b): annuals had the largest seeds at a given SMP, which means that they had a higher rate of seed filling than perennials. The correlation between SMP and the "leaf economics" axis was significant when considering all species only (Fig.4c, Table 4). Species with conservative leaf traits (high LMA and LDMC and low $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ ) tend to mature their seed longer than species with acquisitive leaf traits (Fig. 4c). However, no correlation was found between the two traits when the analysis was conducted on each growth form separately (Fig. 4c and Table 4). Finally, we found a significant correlation between SWD SMP and the "leaf economics" axis when considering all species, which was significant for herbaceous perennial herbaceous only when each growth form was analysed separately (Fig. 5 and Table 4). Again, these results remained qualitatively unchanged when accounting for phylogeny (Table 4).

## DISCUSSION

Reproductive phenology is a major axis of phenotypic variation in plants from the Mediterranean

The Mediterranean climate is characterized by a strong seasonality in temperature and water availability (Daget, 1977), making of phenology a critical component of the match between
plants and their environment. The species developmental cycles must be synchronized with favorable periods for plant growth to ensure survival and reproduction. Although one can consider these conditions as strong filter on phenological strategies, the reproductive phenology was found to vary substantially among species. The three traits selected spanned a wide range of values and defined a fast-slow phenological continuum (Segrestin et al., 2018). The dispersal date, which correlates with flowering date and seed maturation period, plays a central role in this continuum. Since it captured variation in both flowering and seed maturation between species and also allowed a better discrimination between groups of species, dispersal appeared as a better functional marker of reproductive phenology than flowering. Whether this conclusion holds in other climatic contexts (in aseasonal tropical climates for example), or for other growth forms (especially for trees), requires further testing however. Finally, this continuum strongly contributed to the first principal component of the PCA conducted with our dataset, allowing us to identify phenology as a major axis of variation among the species selected.

The eight non-phenological traits were used to capture four functional dimensions: a seed dimension, a plant size dimension, a 'leaf economy' dimension and the ability to cope with drought. Almost $50 \%$ of the variance of these eight traits, together with the four phenological traits, was captured by a two dimensional phenotypic space suggesting strong constraints on the phenotype. In this plane, the loadings of $\mathrm{H}_{\text {rep }}$, LA, SM, LMA and $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$, were surprisingly very similar to those found by Díaz et al. (2016) for more than 2,200 plant species and based on six plant traits. Despite the lack of tall woody species in our dataset, the wide range of trait values covered by the 139 studied species, therefore allows the description of a phenotypic space very similar to the one described at the global scale. It suggests that local flora of the Mediterranean region shares the same phenotypic constraints (at least on the 5 traits mentioned above) as worldwide distributed species. We also found positive relationships between height, leaf area and seed mass in agreement with the seed-phytomer-leaf theory (Hodgson et al., 2017). Reproductive phenology does not contribute an independent dimension of this phenotypic space, at least for the set of species studied here. Again, whether this conclusion holds in other climatic contexts, or for other growth forms (especially for trees), requires further testing. A more detailed description of the relationships between reproductive phenology and other traits are given in the following sections.

Onset of the reproduction and reproductive plant height in herbaceous species

Consistent with several studies from diverse ecosystems (see Table 1), the most robust relationships between phenology and other plant traits were those involving the temporality of reproductive events (flowering and dispersal) and the reproductive plant height of herbaceous species. In the four sites, most of the above-ground biomass of herbaceous species (even all in the case of annuals) disappears during winter. By contrast with woody species, the plant size at reproduction for these species results from vegetative growth between the onset of the growing season and the onset of the reproduction (Jia et al., 2011). In this context, Mooney et al. (1986) showed that late-season flowering annuals are generally larger at maturity than early-season annuals. We found that a longer period of maternal growth resulted in taller plants at reproduction for herbaceous species (also reported by Jia et al., 2011 on 48 herbaceous alpine species; Sun \& Frelich, 2011 on 25 herbaceous species), while these traits were uncoupled in woody species. Our study confirms that the relationship between phenology and plant stature applies for herbaceous species, which remains to be tested under the conditions of aseasonal climates. Our dataset doesn't account for all type of herbaceous species however, especially geophytes. This group of species is known to reproduce in early or late season, thanks to their high level of reserves, allowing a decoupling between vegetative and reproductive growth (Grainger, 1939). Unlike other herbaceous species, geophytes can skip the vegetative growth before flowering. We can therefore hypothesize a different relationship between phenology and plant stature for this group of species, which remains to be tested. We further confirm that in woody species of small stature, plant size and flowering tend to be uncoupled (Bolmgren \& Cowan, 2008; Du \& Qi, 2010).

Although herbaceous species with early reproduction cannot reach a tall stature due to limits on plant growth rate, one can expect late species to be either small or tall, depending on a combination of initial seed mass, onset of vegetative growth and growth rate (cf. Benjamin \& Hardwick, 1986; Hodgson et al., 2017). However, very few small stature species reproduced late. This can be explained by evolutionary constraints, as stronger competition for light or accessibility to pollen (through wind or pollinators) is expected at the end of the growing season, due to the increasing height of the plant community (Bazzaz et al., 2000).

The positive relationships found between onset of flowering and reproductive plant height for annuals and herbaceous perennials shared similar slopes and intercepts, which implies that species from these two groups with the same flowering date showed similar reproductive height. This may contradict the finding that annuals generally have higher vegetative growth rate than herbaceous perennials (e.g. Pitelka, 1977; Garnier, 1992). Two hypotheses may
explain this result: (1) reproductive height in herbaceous species is often reached by the development of reproductive structures which does not necessarily relate to the growth rate of the vegetative structures (due to differences in resources allocation for example); (2) since perennial species were probably several years old, they were likely able to use reserves stored belowground, allowing them to initiate growth earlier than annuals.

## Seed mass at maturity and seed phenology

Seed mass at maturity, which varies by several orders of magnitude among species, is a critical component of plant performance. It is known to play a key role in plant establishment, with large-seeded species having higher survivorship during the seedling stage than smallseeded species (Moles \& Westoby, 2004). Moreover, the trade-off between seed mass and the number of seeds produced each year (Moles \& Leishman, 2008) describes a continuum of regeneration strategies from species with high colonization capacities (maximizing establishment with large seeds) to species with high dispersal capacities (maximizing space occupancy with small seeds). Surprisingly, only few studies have tested the relationship between the position of species in this continuum and the temporality of their reproductive events.

In seasonal climates, late reproduction implies a potentially long maternal growth but a short period of time before the onset of the unfavorable period. The time-size tradeoff (Bolmgren \& Cowan, 2008) predicts that species with late reproduction should produce smaller seeds to avoid exposure to stressful conditions during the seed maturation period (Mazer, 1989). There is a lack of congruence between studies testing this hypothesis (see Table 1 and Table S1 for more details) and the sign of the relationships between the onset of the reproduction and the seed mass often depends on the group of species considered. Our results do not support the idea that species with late reproduction are time-limited for the production of large seeds. Indeed, flowering time had no influence on seed mass, and some species with late reproduction produced large seeds by tolerating water deficit during the period of seed maturation.

It is also assumed that the seed mass at maturity depends on the time of seed development (Moles \& Westoby, 2003; Heydel \& Tackenberg, 2017). This does not account for differences in the rate of seed development between species however, which might be the consequence of differences in the chemical composition of seeds and/or the production of particular appendages or surrounding structures (e.g. fruit flesh, pappus or other loose parts). For a given
seed maturation period, the final seed mass is thus likely to differ among species, depending on seed quality and structure. The triangular shaped relationship found here between seed mass and seed maturation period is consistent with this idea. The left-hand side of the triangle can be interpreted as a physiological limit of the seed-filling rate that only few species can achieve. Annual species had higher seed filling rate than both herbaceous and woody perennials. Furthermore, their seed mass, expressed on a $\log _{10}$ scale, was found to be linearly related with seed maturation period, which can be rewritten as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
S M=m_{0} * 10^{R S F R * S M P} \tag{Equation3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where SM is the seed mass at maturity, $\mathrm{m}_{0}$ is the initial mass of seed primordium, RSFR the relative seed filling rate and SMP the seed maturation period. Assuming similar RSFR for all annual species (close to the physiological limit), using equation 3 led to an estimation of RSFR of $5.9 \mu \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{g}^{-1} .{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. days $^{-1}$ for these species (slope value of a standardized major axis regression between the $\log _{10}$ of seed mass and the seed maturation period for annual species). Plant life-history characteristics, which imply different priorities in vegetative and reproductive allocation, must be considered to explain these phenological patterns (Jackson \& Bliss, 1984; Forrest \& Miller-Rushing, 2010; Ehrlén, 2015). A critical aspect is that annuals must produce a substantial amount of seeds every year to insure survival and dispersion, while reproduction by seeds is less critical for perennials. Our results thus suggest that annuals have evolved towards fast and short seed maturation periods in order to maximize seed production while limiting exposure to hazards or damaging conditions. Perennials, by contrast, can afford to have a slower filling rate, but mature their seeds during periods with higher risk of intense drought.

## Reproductive phenology and leaf traits

Sun and Frelich (2011) showed that fast growing herbaceous species tend to flower earlier than slower-growing species. This suggests a relationship between the postulated fast-slow continuum of plant functioning in the vegetative phase (Reich, 2014) and the fast-slow phenological continuum of reproductive events (Segrestin et al., 2018). However, there is a lack of congruence between studies on the relationships between leaf traits related to vegetative growth, and the temporality of reproductive events (cf. Table 1). Craine et al. (2012) found a negative relationship between $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ and flowering date for 431 herbaceous species from the Konza grassland while these traits were found independent for more than 130 herbaceous species from a pine forest ecosystem in the southwestern USA (Laughlin et
al., 2010). Ansquer et al. (2009), Duru et al. (2009) and Vile et al. (2006) found positive relationships between LMA, LDMC, flowering date and dispersal date for 31 herbaceous species, 19 grass species and 34 herbaceous species respectively, while no relationship was found between these traits by Jia et al. (2011) on 48 alpine herbs or Berrached et al. (2017) on 104 species from Algerian steppes. Here, we didn't found correlations between leaf traits related the growth rate of vegetative parts, and the plant reproductive schedule: flowering and dispersal dates were found independent to leaf traits related to the leaf economics spectrum (LMA, LDMC, $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ ). We therefore found little support for coordination between the developmental rhythms of vegetative and reproductive parts.

However, we found that conservative species (with high LMA, LDMC and low $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ ) tended to mature their seed longer than acquisitive species (with low LMA, LDMC and high $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$. We propose that this relationship is more likely to be the consequences of the plant capacity to cope with water deficit rather than coordination between vegetative and reproductive rhythms. Indeed in the four study sites, long seed maturation implies drought conditions during seed development. Soil water deficit during seed maturation (SWD ${ }_{\text {SMP }}$ ) was used as a proxy of phenological strategies regarding drought resistance during the seed development. No or low water deficit during this reproductive phase can be associated with escape strategies, while high SWDSmp describes avoidance or tolerance strategies during this phenological phase (Ludlow, 1989). Therefore, we expect species with high SWD SMP value to show adaptations to cope with drought in order to maintain the plant activity during low water availability periods. This is consistent with the fact that woody perennials, which avoided or tolerated drought (high SWD SMP ), showed conservative strategies at the leaf level (high LMA, LDMC and low $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ ), while annual species, which tended to escape drought during reproduction (low SWD Smp), had more acquisitive strategies (low LMA, LDMC and high $^{\text {L }}$ $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ ). Moreover, within the group of herbaceous perennials, we showed a clear relationship between SWD ${ }_{\text {SMp }}$ and leaf traits. Similarly, Craine et al. (2012) found that flowering under low water availability period is associated to high leaf density and Berrached et al. (2017) found that under drought conditions, deep rooted species tend to flower late in the season. In our case, the use of LW and $\delta^{13} \mathrm{C}$, which are commonly used to describe water use strategies, didn't lead to similar conclusions. Although very efficient to describe broad patterns, these traits are probably not precise enough and physiological measurements of drought resistance are required to clearly test this hypothesis. A more direct assessment of the
plant adaptation to drought would require estimating plant water status during these phenological stages (cf. Chiariello, 1989) which implies much more experimental effort.

## Conclusions

Our study is among the first to analyse the coordination between traits characterizing reproductive phenology and several other dimensions of plant functioning for a large number of species using data collected on the same populations. Phenological traits relate both to plant size and seed dimensions in annuals, while they relate to plant size only in herbaceous perennials. No correlations were found for woody species, suggesting that reserve accumulation in below- and above-ground organs across seasons allow these species to uncouple the timing of reproduction from other aspects of plant functioning. Whether reproductive phenology can be considered as an independent dimension of functional variation in plants thus appears to depend on the species group considered. Further understanding of the relationships between phenology and other plant traits would require including traits related to plant growth, reserve accumulation and biomass allocation to different organs in order to obtain a more integrated view of the plant phenotype.
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Table 1. Relationships between reproductive phenology and other functional traits found in
$\nearrow$ and $\searrow$ indicate respectively a positive and a negative correlation between the two traits considered, while $\leftrightarrow$ indicates a tested but not significant correlation. Each arrow is based on a different number of studies specified in brackets. Empty cells indicate that, to our knowledge, the relationship has not been tested. This table builds upon Wolkovich and Cleland (2014), completed with data from Hobbs and Mooney (1985); Mooney et al. (1986); Chiariello (1989); Mazer (1989); Eriksson and Ehrlén (1991); Smith-Ramírez et al. (1998); Moles and Westoby (2003); Louault et al. (2005); Vile et al. (2006); Bolmgren and Cowan (2008); Ansquer et al. (2009); Duru et al. (2009); Du and Qi (2010); Laughlin et al. (2010); Jia et al. (2011); Sun and Frelich (2011); Catorci et al. (2012); Craine et al. (2012); Berrached et al. (2017); Heydel and Tackenberg (2017); Zheng et al. (2017); Cortés-Flores et al. (2019). More details are given in Table S1, Supporting information.

|  | La Fage experimental station (FAG) | Cazarils (CAZ) | Montpelliérais old field succession (HGM) | Camp Redon (CRE) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Latitude | $43^{\circ} 55^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ | $43^{\circ} 46^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ | $43^{\circ} 51^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ | $43^{\circ} 38^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ |
| Longitude | $3^{\circ} 05^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ | $3^{\circ} 42^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ | $3^{\circ} 56^{\prime} \mathrm{E}$ | $2^{\prime}$ |
| Altitudinal range (m) | 765-830 | 240-310 | 100-160 |  |
| Mean annual temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) | 9.8 | 13.4 | 13.6 | 14.4 |
| GDDa ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{d}$ ) | 1926 | 3095 | 315 | 3448 |
| Mean annual precipitation (mm) | 1035 | 1076 | 952 | 782 |
| TAW range (mm) | 26.2-48.2 | 63.2 | 55.6-56.0 | 60 |
| PETa (mm) | 814 | 1294 | 1294 | 1261 |
| Reference | (Molénat et al., 2005) | (Aronson et al., 1998) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (Garnier et al., } \\ & 2004) \end{aligned}$ | (Kazakou et al., 2007) |
| Climatic data are based on daily climatic measurements averaged over the 1981-2010 period, taken from the meteorological stations closest to the sites (on site for FAG and CRE and at Saint-Martin-de-Londres [43 $47^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime N}$; $3^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 48^{\prime \prime E}$; 194m] and Vic Le Fesq [43${ }^{\circ} 52^{\prime} 12^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N} ; 4^{\circ} 04^{\prime} 188^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} ; 45 \mathrm{~m}$ ] for CAZ and HGM). GDDa (Bonhomme, 2000) is the total annual growing degree days, calculated as the sum of daily mean temperatures higher than a $5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ base temperature and lower than $18^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, for every day of the year. TAW is the total available water in the soil at full capacity. PETa is the annual potential evapotranspiration calculated using the Penman-Monteith equation. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Trait | Plant function | Abbreviation | Unit | Replicates per population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flowering | Beginning of the reproductive period | FLO | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days |  |
| Dispersal | First reproductive success in the reproductive period | DISP | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days |  |
| Seed maturation | Shortest reproductive period allowing reproductive success | SMP | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ days | 1 |
| Water deficit during SMP | Temporal match between the reproductive period and the summer drought period | $\mathrm{SWD}_{\text {SMP }}$ | $\mathrm{mm} / \mathrm{mm}$ days | 1 |
| Reproductive plant height | Plant stature, competitive ability, flower exposure, dispersal capacity | $\mathrm{H}_{\text {rep }}$ | cm | 23 |
| Leaf area | Organ size, competition for light, transpiration | LA | $\mathrm{mm}^{2}$ | 10 |
| Seed mass | Organ size, colonization-dispersal tradeoff | SM | mg | 5 |
| Leaf mass per area | Light capture per unit of biomass, photosynthetic capacity | LMA | kg.m ${ }^{-2}$ | 10 |
| Leaf dry mater content | Tissue density, light transmission, photosynthetic capacity | LDMC | $\mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ | 10 |
| Mass-based leaf nitrogen content | Protein concentration, photosynthetic capacity | $\mathrm{N}_{\text {mass }}$ | $\mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ | 4 |
| Mass-based leaf phosphorus content | ATP, metabolism rate | $\mathrm{P}_{\text {mass }}$ | $\mathrm{mg} . \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ | 4 |
| Leaf carbon isotope ratio 13C:12C | Water use efficiency | $\delta^{13} \mathrm{C}$ | \% | 3 |

Table 3. The 11 traits used as functional markers of different plant functions, including phenology, resource management, competitive abilities and reproduction (see Garnier et al., 2016 for details).

Table 4. Statistics of correlation tests performed on all species (All), annuals (A), herbaceous perennials (Hp) and woody perennials (W) separately, using Pearson correlation tests accounting or not for phylogeny.

| Correlation between | Correlation test |  |  |  | Phylogenetic correlation test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | r | t | p | $\lambda$ | r | t | p |
| Flowering and plant height |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 130 | . 45 | 5.7 | <.001*** | . 65 | . 46 | 5.8 | <.001*** |
| A | 47 | . 60 | 5 | <.001*** | . 69 | . 58 |  | <.001*** |
| Hp | 58 | . 47 | 3.9 | <.001*** | . 53 | . 50 | 4.4 | <.001*** |
| W | 25 | . 36 | 1.8 | . 082 | . 42 | . 35 | 1.8 | . 084 |
| Maturation period and seed mass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 120 | . 24 | 2.7 | .007** | . 49 | . 21 |  | .024* |
| A | 44 | . 38 | 2.6 | .012* | . 7 | . 22 | 1.5 | . 15 |
| Hp | 56 | . 22 | 1.7 | . 099 | 0 | . 22 | 1.7 | . 099 |
| W | 20 | -. 03 | -0.1 | . 905 | . 8 | -. 05 | -. 2 | . 843 |
| Maturation period and "leaf economics" axis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 114 | -. 31 | -3.5 | <.001*** | . 23 | -. 31 | -3.4 | <.001*** |
| A | 41 | -. 18 | -1.2 | . 248 | . 29 | -. 21 | -1.4 | . 181 |
| Hp | 56 | -. 14 | -1 | . 312 | . 16 | -. 14 | -1.1 | . 293 |
| W | 17 | . 19 | . 8 | . 456 | . 35 | . 27 | 1.1 | . 294 |
| SWD ${ }_{\text {SMP }}$ and "leaf economics" axis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 115 | -. 34 | -3.9 | <.001*** | . 19 | -. 34 | -3.8 | <.001*** |
| A | 41 | -. 17 | -1.1 | . 291 | 0 | -. 17 | -1.1 | . 291 |
| Hp | 56 | -. 31 | -2.4 | .021* | . 09 | -. 31 | 2.4 | .021* |
| W | 18 | . 21 | . 9 | . 402 | . 49 | . 27 | 1.1 | . 271 |
| n are the number of species considered (missing values can change the number of species between relationships), $r$ the Pearson's correlation coefficients, $t$ the $t$-statistics, $p$ the $P$ values and $\lambda$ the estimated Pagel's lambda using maximum likelihood. Significance levels are: *: $\mathrm{p}<0.05$; **: $\mathrm{p}<0.01$; ***: $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 1. Violin plots showing the distribution of phenological trait values (a: flowering, b: dispersal, c: seed maturation and d: soil water deficit during seed maturation) for all species (All, white violins on the left of each panel), annuals (A, black violins), herbaceous perennials (Hp, grey violins) and woody perennials (Wp, white violons on the right of each panel). The number of species is given in brackets. Boxplots, representing the quantiles of the distributions ( $0 \%, 25 \%, 50 \%, 75 \%$ and $100 \%$ ) are added to each violin. Post-hoc Tukey's tests were performed between growth forms (ANOVA F value and significance are reported in each panel) and violins that share the same letter are not significantly different (significance levels are: ns : $\mathrm{p}>0.1 ;{ }^{* * *}$ : $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ).


Figure 2. Violin plots representing the distribution of plant traits used in the analyses (a: reproductive plant height, b: leaf area, c: seed mass, d: leaf mass per area, e: leaf dry matter content, f: leaf carbon isotope ratio 13C:12C, g: mass-based leaf nitrogen content, h: massbased leaf phosphorus content). Each panel is divided in two parts: the left part represents a comparison between the trait distribution for all species (All) and for worldwide databases (Database, from Wright et al., 2004 for mass-based leaf phosphorus content; Flores et al., 2014 for leaf dry matter content; Díaz et al., 2016 for reproductive plant height, leaf area, seed mass, leaf mass per area and mass-based leaf nitrogen content; Cornwell et al., 2017 for leaf carbon isotope ratio 13C:12C) and the right part represents the trait distribution for annuals (A, black violins), herbaceous perennials (Hp, grey violins) and woody perennials ( Wp , white violons) in the present dataset. The number of species in each case is specifyed in brackets. Boxplots, representing the quantiles of the distributions ( $0 \%, 25 \%, 50 \%, 75 \%$ and $100 \%$ ) are added to each violin. Post-hoc Tukey's tests were performed between growth forms (ANOVA F value and significance are reported in each panel) and violins that share the same letter are not significantly different (significance levels are: ns: $\mathrm{p}>0.1$; .. $\mathrm{p}<0.1$; **: $\mathrm{p}<0.01$; ***: $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ).


Figure 2. Continued


Figure 3. (a) Correlation circle and projection of species on the first plane of a principal component analysis (PCA) computed for 41 annuals (black points), 53 perennials herbaceous (grey points) and 18 woody species (white points). (b) Summary diagram of the correlations between traits. Only significant correlations are shown (P values adjusted for multiple test comparisions < .05). Solid black lines connect traits that are correlated positively, and dotted grey lines connect traits correlated negatively. The thicknesses of the lines indicate the strength of the correlation (three levels per color). These analyses include (Table 3) (i) four phenological traits (bold characters): flowering (FLO), dispersal (DISP), seed maturation (SMP) and water deficit during seed maturation period (SWD ${ }_{\text {SMP }}$ ); (ii) three size traits: plant reproductive height ( $\mathrm{H}_{\text {rep }}$ ), leaf area (LA) and seed mass (SM); (iii) four 'leaf economics' traits (followed by an asterisk): leaf mass per area (LMA), leaf dry matter content (LDMC), mass-based leaf nitrogen content (Nmass), mass-based leaf phosphorus content (Pmass) and (iv) leaf carbon isotopic ratio $\left(\delta^{13} \mathrm{C}\right)$.




Figure 4. Relationships between (a) flowering date and reproductive plant height, (b) seed maturation period and seed mass at maturity and (c) seed maturation period and the leaf economics spectrum. The leaf economics spectrum is the species coordinates on the first component (PC1) of a PCA including leaf mass per area (LMA), leaf dry matter content (LDMC), massbased leaf nitrogen content (Nmass), massbased leaf phosphorus content (Pmass). (d) Correlation between the four traits of the leaf economics spectrum and PC1. The r value and significance of the correlations are given in Table 4. Black points represent annuals, grey points perenial herbaceous and open points woody species. When significant ( $\mathrm{p}<.05$ ), a SMA regression line is represented (black line for annuals and grey line for herbaceous perennials).



Figure 5. (a) Relationship between water deficit during seed maturation and the leaf economics spectrum, computed as the species coordinates on the first component (PC1) of a PCA including leaf mass per area (LMA), leaf dry matter content (LDMC), mass-based leaf nitrogen content (Nmass), mass-based leaf phosphorus content (Pmass). (b) Correlation between the four traits of the leaf economics spectrum and PC1. The r value and significance of the correlations are given in Table 4. Black points represent annuals, grey points perenial herbaceous and open points woody species. When significant ( $\mathrm{p}<.05$ ), a SMA regression line is represented (grey line for herbaceous perennials).

