



HAL
open science

Modeling the biomass allocation of tree resprout in a fire-prone savanna

Kouadio Jean-Philippe Akpoué, Sébastien Barot, Xavier Raynaud, Jacques Gignoux

► **To cite this version:**

Kouadio Jean-Philippe Akpoué, Sébastien Barot, Xavier Raynaud, Jacques Gignoux. Modeling the biomass allocation of tree resprout in a fire-prone savanna. *Ecological Modelling*, 2021, 448, pp.109527. 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2021.109527 . hal-03216950

HAL Id: hal-03216950

<https://hal.science/hal-03216950>

Submitted on 24 Apr 2023

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Modeling the biomass allocation of tree resprout in a fire-prone savanna**

2
3 Jean-Philippe Akpoué¹, Sébastien Barot¹, Xavier Raynaud¹, Jacques Gignoux¹

4 ¹*Institute of Ecology and Environmental Sciences, CNRS UMR 7618, 4 place Jussieu, bât. 44-45,*

5 *CC 237, 75005 Paris, France*

6
7 Kouadio.akpoue@upmc.fr; sebastien.barot@ird.fr; xavier.raynaud@sorbonne-universite.fr;

8 jacques.gignoux@sorbonne-universite.fr

9 10 **ABSTRACT**

11 Young savanna trees can quickly grow back from belowground storage structures after top
12 kill. This capacity is a tolerance trait that confers persistence at the plant individual level, enabling
13 them to survive diverse disturbance regimes.

14 We simulated the growth of a single resprouting stem (without and with fire) of a deciduous
15 tree species that allocates its photo-assimilates during the vegetation season to reserves,
16 belowground and aboveground parts (leaves and stem). As savannas grow under highly seasonal
17 climates, the model considers that trees are leafless during the dry season and following growth is
18 only possible thanks to reserves. Stem architecture constrains the leaf biomass to be proportional to
19 stem length rather than biomass. We compared the success of different allocation strategies, with
20 and without fire and according to the seasonality. To do so, the height of the resprouting stem after
21 50 yrs and the time to reach 2 m were modeled for three species of a humid savanna.

22 The viable and faster growth strategies are those for which allocation to belowground parts
23 is <40%. There is very little sensitivity to allocation to reserves since successful growth is observed
24 for allocation to reserves between 0.5% and 85% of photo-assimilates. In the literature and in our
25 results, there is little impact of fire on the stem height or the time needed to escape the fire trap. Our
26 model suggests that (1) allocation to leaves is determinant as leaves are the primary source of
27 assimilates that can then be turned into fire-resistant structures (reserves and roots) and (2) fire and
28 dry season only weakly slows down tree growth and successful strategies compared to the wet
29 season and fire allows resprouts to grow quickly at the beginning of the rainy season without fire.

30
31 **Keywords:** Resprouting ability; Fire; Biomass allocation strategy; Photosynthesis rate;
32 Translocation rate; Plant architecture.

1. INTRODUCTION

Savanna is a vegetation type characterized by the coexistence of grasses and trees (Higgins et al., 2000). In most savanna ecosystem, fire occurs frequently and strongly affects tree mortality and the recruitment of saplings into the larger size classes (Govender et al., 2006). Savanna tree species are adapted to fire: after a top kill –the loss of all or part of their aboveground biomass – they are able to quickly grow back from belowground storage structures such as lignotubers (Lehmann et al., 2014). Topkill is mainly due to fire (Archibald and Bond, 2003; Bellingham and Sparrow, 2000; Wigley et al., 2009), and herbivores (Sankaran et al., 2005). The ability to grow back (resprouting) is a tolerance trait that confers persistence to the plant individuals, enabling them to survive diverse disturbance regimes (Clarke et al., 2013). At the community level, this gives rise to an ecosystem that is resilient to severe disturbance such as very frequent fires. The resprouting ability is determined by the development and protection of a viable bud bank (Blarer and Doebeli, 1996; Charles-Dominique et al., 2015) and the storage of carbon reserves that are replenished between fires (Hoffmann et al., 2000). It also depends on plant anatomy or architecture (Verdaguer and Ojeda, 2002), plant size before disturbance (Canadell and López-Soria, 1998; Pate et al., 1990), disturbance intensity (I and Maparet, 2006; Vesik and Westoby, 2004a, b), disturbance frequency (Morrison and Renwick, 2000), nutrients and water availability (Cruz et al., 2003). Resprouting ability is thought to increase with stem size (Moreno and Oechel, 1993), but in some tree species, decreases in the largest size classes (Trollope 1974). The survival of a young tree and its recruitment into the reproductive adult stage depend on its ability to escape the ‘fire trap’ (Bond and Keeley, 2005), i.e. the flame zone (usually from 0 to 2-3m high; (Menaut and Cesar, 1979; N’Dri et al., 2014)) where young tree resprouts can survive but are prevented from producing a perennial stem by repeated top-kill for many consecutive years. Establishing such a perennial stem requires accumulating enough photo-assimilates to develop, between two fires events, a stem that is tall enough for its terminal bud to be above the flame zone. Allocation of carbon in all compartments

1 (leaves, stems, roots, reserves) of the resprout is also constrained by its architecture (leaf to stem
2 ratio, dependent on stem height, stem diameter, internode length, number of leaves per node...).

3 (Thornley, 1972) argues that for plant growth (without disturbances), two processes are
4 important: the first is the utilization of substrate for growth and how this utilization depends upon
5 substrate concentration, the second concerns the transport of substrate between different plant parts
6 (roots, shoots and leaves) and how this depends upon the substrate concentrations in the plant parts.
7 For this model, the growth pattern of a plant depends upon the mechanisms by which substrate is
8 transported around the plant, and the way in which substrate is utilized for growth of the plant parts.
9 For (Lacointe, 2000) carbon assimilates flow during plant growth from “source” areas such as
10 leaves to “sink” areas where they are taken up and used. The assimilate fluxes from sources to sinks
11 are mainly dependent on the source-sink distances and on the respective abilities of the different
12 sinks to take up and use the assimilates that are available to them. Both models use quite complex
13 representations of allocation. (Müller et al., 2000) compare two different conceptions of carbon
14 allocation in plants, the *ratio* and *allometric* views. In the ratio view, a plant has a certain biomass
15 at any point in time and allocates it proportionally to different structures. In the allometric view,
16 allometry is seen as the quantitative translation of growth into allocation. Plants evolve allometric
17 patterns in response to numerous selection pressures and constraints such as fire. Also, models of
18 tree growth and assimilate movement have been developed to study resprouting in savanna and
19 have been used to compare the consequences of contrasted tree strategies (Bond and Midgley, 2001;
20 Clarke et al., 2013; William J. Bond and Jeremy J. Midgley, 2003), such as seeding (investment
21 into the next generation) or resprouting (investment into the current generation) (Bellingham and
22 Sparrow, 2000). These models suggested that the success of these allocation strategies depends on
23 ecosystem productivity, disturbance regime and competition for resources (nutrients and light).
24 However, they did not consider the allocation of carbon reserve at each time contained in
25 belowground parts and stems, though these reserves may play an important role to escape the fire
26 trap. Reserves of carbon in belowground parts and stems are vitally needed to resume growth at the

1 beginning of the rainy season after a top kill or a drought event. Previous reviews (Bellingham and
2 Sparrow, 2000; Bond and Midgley, 2001; William J. Bond and Jeremy J. Midgley, 2003) of
3 resprouting ecology were based on models of how trees escape fire effects, concentrating on the
4 role of fire frequency and severity and their interaction with basal sprouting and other types of
5 resprouting (Clarke et al., 2013).

6 Here, we propose a new model simulating the allocation of carbon reserve between
7 belowground and aboveground parts, and reserves, to determine the range of allocation strategies
8 allowing a resprout to grow and escape the fire trap in fire prone savannas. The model is based on
9 field observations from Ernest et al., 2009 where the carbon allocation and biomass partitioning
10 patterns have been measured and studied. It simulates the growth of a single resprouting stem that
11 allocates its photo-assimilates during the vegetation season between reserves, belowground parts,
12 and aboveground parts, and compares the success of different allocation strategies with or without
13 fire, seasonality and according to plant architecture characteristics. We considered as successful
14 strategies those allowing a resprout to escape the fire trap (assuming an average flame height of 2
15 m) after some time and as unsuccessful all the other. We aim at answering the following questions:
16 (1) which biomass allocation strategies allow escaping the fire trap in fire-prone savannas? (2) Are
17 the best allocation strategies the same with and without fire? and seasonality? (3) Does resprout
18 architecture influence the success of allocation strategies? (4) What is the effect of the
19 photosynthesis and translocation rates on the allocation strategy success?

20


21

22

23

1 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2 Model description



3
4 **Figure 1:** Conceptual model of resprout biomass allocation where s , r , p , q , GB_l , GB_s , a , b and B_{pmax} are respectively
5 the allocation rates to aboveground parts, to belowground parts, to reserves, the rate of biomass lost due to respiration,
6 allocation to leaves, allocation to stem, photosynthesis rate, translocation rate and the maximum reserve that resprout
7 can contains (see text).

8 Model Purpose

9 The model consists of a system of differential equations and aims at simulating the
10 allocation of biomass between reserves, belowground parts (roots), aboveground parts (leaves and
11 stem) of an individual tree with a single resprout stem and the consequences of this biomass
12 allocation strategies for its growth and survival against fire.

13 Main assumptions

14 The main assumption of our model (figure 1) is that plant reserves allow regrowth after a
15 loss of leaves either due to the dry season in the case of deciduous species or to the removal of all
16 aboveground parts by fire. The individual tree (called 'resprout' hereafter) is described by the
17 biomass of leaves B_l , stems B_s , belowground parts B_r and reserves B_p (Table 1) with a minimal
18 architecture description (Table 1). Reserves are located in the belowground parts and the stem.
19 Seasonality is modelled by considering that active growth only occurs during the wet season (9

1 months each year) and that plants are in a dormant state (leafless) during the dry season (3 months
2 each year). During the wet season, belowground parts, leaves and stem are present, and leaves can
3 fix carbon. During the dry season, the resprout loses its leaves (we assume a deciduous species) and
4 no photosynthesis occurs. At the beginning of the dry season, only belowground parts and stem
5 remain. When fire occurs during the dry season, the stem burns and only belowground biomass
6 persist. In the next parts, we will note D^+F^+ to describe simulations with seasonality (wet and dry
7 season) and a yearly fire, D^+F^- for simulations with seasonality (wet and dry season) but no fire and
8 D^-F^- for simulations with only wet season and no fire.

9 **Model constraints**

10 Different constraints are considered to account for plant architecture: (1) the size of
11 belowground parts and stem limits the size of the reserve compartment; (2) the sum of the allocation
12 coefficients (Table 1) is equal to 1 due to mass conservation; (3) the stem biomass limits leaf
13 biomass as leaves are carried by the stem.

14 The next part presents how reserve biomass are created, lost, and allocated to resprout
15 compartments.

16 **2.1. Production of new biomass (G)**

17

18 New biomass that is allocated during each time step results from the net photosynthesis
19 aB_1 and use of reserves bB_p , where a is the rate of photosynthesis ($\text{g g}^{-1}\text{month}^{-1}$) and b is the
20 translocation rate between 0.1 and 0.9 ($\text{g g}^{-1}\text{month}^{-1}$) (Table 1). We assume that the resprout cannot
21 transfer all reserve without loss so the maximum translocation is 90% of reserve and the minimum
22 we can interpret is 10%.

23 When leaves are absent, growth is only possible by the translocation of reserves to aboveground
24 parts. Afterwards, the growing leaves start to produce photosynthates that are allocated to the
25 different compartments (belowground and aboveground parts).

2.2. Respiration costs

Stem and belowground parts have a maintenance cost proportional to their biomass (rate q) whatever the season. The respiration cost in the dry season represents 1/10 of respiration in the wet season (to take active growth in account).

2.3. Allocation to reserves

Reserves consist in starch or other photo-assimilates, stored in stem and roots. This imposes a limit on the pool of reserves, which must be kept lower than a maximal proportion of these compartments. This leads to the following equation:

$$B_{plim} = 1 - \frac{B_p}{B_{pmax}} (B_r + B_s)$$

where B_{plim} represents the decrease in the transfer to reserves and B_{pmax} the maximum proportion of reserves within plant organs (Figure 1). The allocation to reserves B_p is therefore:

$$pB_{plim}(aB_l + bB_p)$$

and the dynamic of reserves biomass is:

$$\frac{dB_p}{dt} = pB_{plim}(aB_l + bB_p) - bB_p \quad (1)$$

2.4. Allocation to belowground parts

The imposition of constraints on the size of the reserve pool ensure that the allocation coefficients sum to 1. To satisfy this, we pose the correction term α :

$$pB_{plim} + \alpha(r + s) = 1, \text{ so } pB_{plim} + \alpha(1 - p) = 1 \text{ and finally } \alpha = 1 - p \frac{(B_{plim})}{(1-p)}. \text{ With the maintenance}$$

cost, the roots biomass dynamic is:

$$\frac{dB_r}{dt} = r \left(\frac{(1-pB_{plim})}{(1-p)} \right) (aB_l + bB_p) - qB_r \quad (2)$$

1 Note that $\frac{dB_r}{dt}$ can be negative if the respiration (qB_r) exceeds the biomass allocation to belowground
 2 parts. This matches the common observation that plants can lose parts to adjust their growth to their
 3 carbon budget.

4 **2.5. Allocation to aboveground parts**

5 First, the part of G allocated to aboveground parts (GA), is computed from the allocation
 6 coefficients and the corrective term α as:

$$7 \quad GA = s\alpha G = \frac{[s(1 - pB_{plim})(aB_l + bB_p)]}{(1 - p)}$$

8 Where s represents the allocation coefficient to aboveground parts (Figure 1). Then, this biomass is
 9 distributed between leaves and stem, according to architecture constraints. Here, we assume that all
 10 aboveground growth after fire is allocated to a single stem and that there are strong architectural
 11 relations between leaf biomass and stem biomass. h (cm) represents the height of the stem and d
 12 (cm) its basal diameter. The stem has a constant volumetric mass m characteristic of the species (g
 13 cm^{-3}) relating its biomass to its volume: $B_s = mv$, where v is the stem volume. The height/diameter
 14 ratio ($f=h/d$) is constant and species-specific. The stem has a paraboloid profile relating the volume
 15 to the stem diameter and height $v = \pi d^2 \frac{h}{8}$. This profile is a frequently used, simple but realistic
 16 representation of the stem taper (Gignoux et al, 2016). The number of leaves per stem important
 17 length is characterized by two parameters: e the average internode length and n the number of
 18 leaves per node. We therefore assume that (1) if the stem is less than one year old then the leaves
 19 were formed at the same time as the stem, (2) if the stem is older and has lost its leaves, these leaves
 20 are replaced by short axes having a negligible stem biomass and bearing a foliar surface and
 21 biomass equivalent to that formerly set during the previous growing season. Leaves have a constant
 22 average biomass m_l (g). From these constraints, we calculate:

1 • The stem height h from stem biomass: $v = \pi d^2 \frac{h}{8}$ so $h = \left(8f^2 \frac{B_s}{\pi m}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$

2 • The leaf biomass B_l carried by a stem of height h : $B_l = nm_l \frac{h}{e}$

3 • Finally, the leaf biomass from the stem biomass: $B_l = \frac{\left(nm_l \left(8f^2 \frac{B_s}{\pi m}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)}{e}$

4 We pose:

5 $\beta = \frac{\left(nm_l \left(8f^2 \frac{1}{\pi m}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)}{e}$, Thus:

6 $B_l = \beta B_s^{\frac{1}{3}}$.

7 For the new growth to take place in accordance with this relation, the respective growth rates of B_l

8 and B_s (hence their derivatives) must verify:

9 $\beta^3 \frac{dB_s}{dt} = 3B_l^2 \frac{dB_l}{dt}$. Since,

10 $GA = GB_l + GB_s$,

11 where GB_l and GB_s are respectively the leaves and stem growth, we solve the system to find:

12 $GB_l = \left(\frac{\beta^3}{(\beta^3 + 3B_l^2)}\right) GA$ and $GB_s = \left(3 \frac{B_l^2}{(\beta^3 + 3B_l^2)}\right) GA$.

13 Equations for the dynamics of leaf biomass B_l and stem biomass B_s then follow:

14
$$\frac{dB_l}{dt} = s \left[\frac{\beta^3}{(\beta^3 + 3L^2)} \right] \frac{[(1-pB_{plim})(aB_l + bB_p)]}{(1-p)} \quad (3)$$

15
$$\frac{dB_s}{dt} = s \left[3 \frac{B_l^2}{(\beta^3 + 3B_l^2)} \right] \frac{[(1-pB_{plim})(aB_l + bB_p)]}{(1-p)} - qB_s \quad (4)$$

Simulation experiment

The allocation parameters (r , s and p ; Table 1) are unknown and we aim at determining the successful allocation strategies. Thus, we explored all possible combinations of the values of these allocation rates between 0 and 1 with a step of $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. The others parameters (number of leaves per node (n), stem height (h) in cm, the diameter (d) of the trunk in cm for 3 species (*Bridelia ferruginea*, *Crossopteryx febrifuga* and *Piliostigma thonningii*) were obtained from Gignoux et al., 2016 and had been collected at the Lamto ecological station in Ivory Coast (Menaut & César, 1979), which data we use as a baseline study case. The three species we have used are dominant species commonly found in all the Guinean savanna zone in Africa ("Guinean forest-savanna mosaic" WWF ecoregion). More specifically, in the Lamto savanna in Ivory Coast, more than 90 % of the woody layer is composed of four species (Menaut and César 1979): *Bridelia ferruginea* Benth. (Phyllanthaceae), *Crossopteryx febrifuga* (Afzel. ex G. Don) Benth. (Rubiaceae), *Cussonia arborea* Hochst. ex A.Rich. (Araliaceae), and *Piliostigma thonningii* (Schum.) Milne-Redhead (Caesalpiniaceae). We chose three of these species to parameterize our model as they are representative of this ecosystem and their characteristics, such as photosynthetic and growth rates, are known (Gignoux et al., 2016). They are also all display very strong resprouting abilities and have extensive belowground storage systems.

Stem wood densities (m in g cm^{-3}) were collected in an online database (Tree functional attributes and ecological database, 2020). The average constant biomass of well-developed leaves (m_l in g), and the mean inter-node length (e in cm) were calculated from data on single stem individuals (Gignoux et al., 2016). Then, we explored photosynthesis rate a (from 2 to $3 \text{ g g}^{-1} \text{ month}^{-1}$) and translocation rate b (from 0 to 90% of reserve biomass), and we assumed that the maximum proportion of reserve B_{pmax} represents 65% of reserve compartment $B_s + B_r$ and the resprout maintenance rate (q) for the stem is 15% of the living parts of the plant.

1 Simulations were run for 50 years using a monthly time step. Differential equations were
 2 numerically integrated using the R package deSolve (Soetaert et al., 2010) under R 4.0 (R Core
 3 Team, 2020). We initially put r , s and p at zero; the initial belowground biomass at 10 g and reserve
 4 biomass at 6.5 g. Output variables were the height of resprout at the end of the 50th rainy season and
 5 the time to reach 2 m in height. Model was parameterized for the three tree species and three
 6 environmental conditions D^+F^+ , D^-F^- and D^+F^- (Table 1). Results for D^+F^+ , D^-F^- are given in the
 7 main text and those for D^+F^- are given in appendix.

8 **Table 1:** Parameters of model

9

Definition	parameter	units	values		
			<i>Piliostigma thonningii</i>	<i>Crossopterix febrifuga</i>	<i>Bidelia ferruginea</i> :
Photosynthesis rate	a	$g\ g^{-1}month^{-1}$	2* and 3*		
Translocation rate	b	$g\ g^{-1}month^{-1}$	0.1 and 0.9		
Maintenance cost rate	q	$g\ g^{-1}month^{-1}$	15%*		
Belowground parts allocation rate	r	$g\ g^{-1}$	From 0 to 1		
Stem and leaves allocation rate	s	$g\ g^{-1}$	From 1-r to 1		
Reserves allocation rate	p	$g\ g^{-1}$	1-r-s		
Maximal reserves	pmax	$g\ g^{-1}$	65%*		
Ratio h/d	f	-	39.73	82.5	93.23
Mean inter-node length	e	cm	3.73	3.3	3.35
Number of leaves per node	n	-	1	2	1
Mean Stem density **	m	gcm^{-3}	0.65 ± 0	0.8 ± 0	0.59 ± 0.08
Mean leaf biomass	ml	g	3.98 ± 2.12	5 ± 4.6	5.25 ± 6.8

10

11 *Values were adjusted to produce realistic resprout growth, because data was not available for savanna species.

12 ** Online database of tree functional and ecological attributes (Tree functional attributes and ecological database, 2020).

13

3. RESULTS


3.1. Effect of the allocation strategies on resprout height

Here, we analyze the effect of allocation strategies on resprout height after 50 years depending on fire presence. The successful allocation strategies are those with a high investment to the aboveground parts where (Figure 2) $s > r$ and the maximum allocation to belowground part in these cases is generally less than 40%.


Fire mostly reduces the height of resprouts after 50 years, without changing qualitatively the distribution of successful allocation strategies. In D+F- (Figure 2), only strategies for which $s=0$ do not allow resprouts to grow and reach more than 0.1 m (minimum height we consider in our model), i.e. are unviable.

In the D⁺F⁺ model, no strategy allowed resprouts to reach more than 4 m (figure 2). There are more unviable strategies that do not allow resprouts to reach 0.1m. In D⁺F⁻, the maximum heights are respectively 8.7 m and 11.88 m, for $a = 2 \text{ month}^{-1}$ and $a = 3 \text{ month}^{-1}$; and 6.53 m and 8.36 m (for the same a value) for D⁺F⁺. Overall, the parameter space of successful strategies (Figure 2) is larger in D⁺F⁻ than D⁺F⁺ for all combination of translocation rate b and photosynthesis rate a .

The parameter space of successful strategies does not change with the translocation rate (Figure 2, vertical comparison) in D⁺F⁻ and D⁺F⁺, whereas the photosynthesis rate increases the parameter space of successful strategies (Figure 2, horizontal comparison).



1




2

Figure 2: Effect of allocation strategies on the height (m) of 50 yr old *Ptilostigma thonningii* resprout, for 4 combinations of photosynthesis rate (a) and translocation rate of reserves (b), without and with fire. x axis: the allocation rates to aerial parts (leaves and stem), y axis: the allocation rates to roots. The first row represents simulation when $b=0.1$ and the second when $b=0.9$. The first column represents simulation when $a=2 \text{ g g}^{-1}\text{month}^{-1}$ and the second when $a=3 \text{ gg}^{-1}\text{month}^{-1}$. Because the sum of the three allocation rates is always 1, all strategies lie within the bottom left triangle. Shade levels indicate the height of the resprouting stem after 50 years, from 0 to more than 4 meters.


1 3.2. Effect of the allocation strategies on the time to reach 2m

Without Fire



2
3

With fire



4
5
6
7
8
9

Figure 3: Comparison of the time to reach 2m for *Piliostigma thonningii* resprout. Panel and axis description as in figure 2. In this figure, when light gray becomes dark, the time to reach 2m becomes bigger and bigger (from 6 month to 20 years).

1 Here, we analyze the impact of allocation strategies on the time to reach 2 m (Figure 3).


2 Overall, the number of years necessary to reach 2 m as a function of the allocation rates
3 follows the same pattern as the height reached by resprouts after 50 years. In D⁺F⁺ and D⁺F⁻, the
4 more the resprouts allocate biomass to their aboveground parts, the faster they reach 2 m (Figure 3).
5 The increase in the photosynthesis rate has a positive impact on the parameter space of successful
6 strategies, compared to the translocation rate (Figure 3). The minimum time for successful
7 strategies to reach 2 m is similar for *Piliostigma thonningii* and *Bridelia ferruginea* with and
8 without fire and is about 0.5 year (6 months) when $a = 3 \text{ gg}^{-1}\text{month}^{-1}$ and $b = 0.9 \text{ gg}^{-1}\text{month}^{-1}$ for,
9 and 0.42 years (5 months) for *Crossopteryx febrifuga* for the same values. We did distinguish
10 between resprouts which reached 2m before 2 years and those after 2 years to take in account field
11 observation of plant growth (Figure 3). Fire increases the time to reach 2 m and reduces the
12 parameter space domain in which reaching 2 m is possible.

13 14 3.3. Effect of plant architecture on allocation strategies

15
16 Overall, the allocation strategies and their interactions with fire and the photosynthesis rate have
17 a similar impact on the growth of the three species present (Figure 4).


18 There are however some differences between species. In D⁺F⁺, the parameter space of
19 successful strategies allowing a resprout to reach more than 4 m tends to decrease for *Crossopteryx*
20 *febrifuga* and *Bridelia ferruginea* (Figure 4). The parameter space of successful strategies is larger
21 for *Crossopteryx febrifuga* than *Bridelia ferruginea* (Figure 4), which is itself larger than
22 *Piliostigma thonningii*. Unviable strategies that do not allow to reach 0.1 m remain the same for all
23 species. Finally, *Piliostigma thonningii*, whatever its allocation strategy, never reaches 4m.

Without Fire



1


With fire



2
3


4 **Figure 4:** Comparison of *Piliostigma thonningii*, *Bridelia ferruginea* and *Crossopteryx febrifuga*, according to effect
5 of the allocation strategies on the height (m) of 50 yr old resprout for 4 combinations of photosynthesis rate (a) and
6 translocation rate of reserves (b). Panel and axis description as in figure 2.

Without Fire



1

With Fire



2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Figure 5: Comparison of the time to reach 2m for *Piliostigma thonningii*, *Bridelia ferruginea* and *Crossopteryx febrifuga* according to the rate of allocation to belowground parts (y axis) and the rate of allocation to aboveground parts (x axis). Panel and axis description as in figure 2.

1 4. DISCUSSION

2 4.1. Which biomass allocations strategies allow resprout escaping the fire trap in fire- 3 prone savannas?

4 In all simulations, successful strategies allowing to reach more than 2 m are those where $s > r$.
5 The maximum allocation to belowground parts in these cases is when $r < 50\%$. Allocation to
6 belowground parts or reserves can be as low as 0.5% of reserves and still allows to reach 2 m. We
7 think that this is likely because a higher allocation to aboveground parts in the growing season
8 assures the production of foliar surface at the beginning of the rainy season. Ernest et al., (2009)
9 measured the allocation to aboveground biomass in *Acacia karoo* after fire and found that leaves
10 accounted for more than 75% of the total aboveground biomass.

11 In D^+F^+ , the parameter space of allocation strategies that never allow resprouts to reach 0.1
12 m increases considerably (black regions of Figures 2 and 4) and corresponds to resprouts allocating
13 between 60 to 90 % of their biomass to belowground parts. Thus, allocating biomass to
14 aboveground parts in ecosystems with an annual fire does seem to be a favorable survival strategy.
15 Indeed, large reserves are not necessary in this model as photosynthesis, quickly after the beginning
16 of the rainy season, ensures the production of biomass. This result is unexpected, because the
17 commonly accepted view is that plants need to build up large reserves to resume their growth as
18 quickly as possible at the beginning of the vegetation season in fire prone savannas.

19 However Ernest et al., 2009 and Gignoux et al., 2016 noted that resprouts of savanna tree species
20 first invested in leaf biomass, with leaves accounting for up to 75% of the total aboveground
21 biomass to ensure a faster growth in the beginning of growth season when reserve in belowground
22 part decreases considerably. These experimental measurements support our model results
23 suggesting that allocating most resources to aerial parts at the beginning of the growth season can
24 be an efficient strategy. We observe the same trend for the time to reach 2 m as for the height after
25 50 years: successful strategies are those with an allocation to aboveground parts higher than 12.5 %.

1 Such strategies allow a quick regrowth, which leads both to a short time to reach 2 m and a tall stem
2 after 50 yrs. On the other hand, it would be logical that later in the season, there would be a greater
3 allocation to the reserve than to aboveground parts. One limitation of our model is thus the use of
4 fixed allocation rates and using variable allocation rates with time might extend the range of
5 allocation values for successful strategies. However, using variable allocation rates increases the
6 complexity of the model and was beyond the scope of this work.

7 However, our model does not take in account the functional role of belowground parts, they are not
8 only reserve storage organs, but they also absorb water or mineral nutrients. This implies that water
9 and mineral nutrients are not limiting, which is unlikely. Considering the limitation by water and
10 mineral nutrients would necessarily give more importance to allocation to belowground parts and
11 this consideration could alter our results on the successful strategies of allocation of biomass by
12 increasing available biomass each time and its translocation in all parts of the resprout.

13 **4.2. Are the best allocation strategies the same with and without fire, and seasonality?**

14 In D^+F^- and D^-F^- , resprouts grow with less disturbance than in D^+F^+ and almost any set of
15 allocation parameter leads to successful strategies, in contrast to D^+F^+ (Appendix 3). The height of
16 resprouts after 50 yrs in the D^+F^+ regime is lower than in D^+F^- ; and the parameter space leading to
17 successful strategies is also smaller. This difference may be due to the reserves accumulated in
18 belowground parts during the first year before fire. Thus, resprouts begin the growth season in the
19 second year with more reserve in belowground parts than in first year (appendix 4). The effects of
20 fire on savanna plants have been studied by several authors (Gignoux et al., 1997) that have shown
21 that fire slows the growth of resprouts by top kill. In our model, fire reduces resprout biomass and
22 the parameter space of successful strategies. These results are consistent.

23 Despite differences, the D^+F^- has substantially the same effects as the D^+F^+ on successful allocation
24 strategies. In D^+F^- and D^+F^+ , the successful strategies always correspond to a large investment in
25 aerial parts ($>12.5\%$, appendix 3). The similarity of D^+F^- and D^+F^+ effects on successful allocation

1 strategies can be explained by the fact that the plant is dormant during the dry season (but stem is
2 still there) and fire occurs only in the dry season and destroys the stem, so that there is no new
3 biomass production and biomass allocation in both cases, and during a part of the year production is
4 lost and rebuild the year after. Fire effects seem to reinforce the dry season effect, i.e. they do not
5 change the pattern of responses, but increase their intensity.

6 By contrast, in the D^+F^- model, resprouts have successful allocation strategies even when
7 they allocate between 60 and 90% of their biomass to belowground parts and the parameter space of
8 successful strategies is much larger than in the other cases (appendix 3). This may be due to the fact
9 that, in the wet season, the plants grow normally without major disturbances, hence without
10 biomass losses to fire or dry season.

11 In summary the biomass allocation strategies allowing resprouts to escape the fire trap are
12 those with more than 12.5 % allocation to aboveground parts (stem and leaves) and there are more
13 successful allocation strategies without fire than with fire. Also, D^+F^- and D^+F^+ are similar in their
14 impact on resprouts success allocation strategy, and we offer that D^+F^+ (model with dry season and
15 fire) are like drought (like in D^+F^-) when we compare both with wet season model (appendix 3).

16 **4.3.Does resprout architecture influence the success of allocation strategies?**

17 The parameter space leading to successful strategies is larger for *Crossopteryx febrifuga*
18 than for the other two species (Figure 4 and figure 5) in all simulations (D^+F^+ , D^+F^- , and D^-F^-). This
19 suggests that *C febrifuga* has better allocation strategies than *Piliostigma thonningii* and *Bridelia*
20 *ferruginea* in fire prone ecosystems (as savannas). In the model, the only differences between these
21 species are their architecture. This implies that plant architecture could significantly influence the
22 success of their biomass allocation strategies and plant growth (Kaggwa-Asiimwe et al., 2013). In
23 our model, *C febrifuga* and the two other species mainly differ by the number of leaves per node (*C*
24 *febrifuga* has 2 while others have only 1) and the internode length (Table 1). Indeed, *C febrifuga*
25 has the smallest internode length (3.33 cm) and *P thonningii* (3.75 cm) the 14% biggest (Table 1). If

1 we assume the same internode length and individual leaf surface for all species, the species with 2
2 leaves per node will carry twice more leaf surface for the same stem length than a species with 1
3 leaf per node. This is certainly an advantage when putting up leaves quickly at a low cost in stem
4 biomass is important.

5 However, we did not take into account the impact of the architecture on the survival of the
6 stem, while indeed plant architecture can significantly affect light distribution and penetration in the
7 crop canopy, and thus change plant growth, biomass partitioning, boll distribution, and yield
8 potential (Kaggwa-Asiimwe et al., 2013). Furthermore, we used the same respiration cost for
9 aboveground and belowground parts, because of lack of information about plant belowground parts
10 respiration cost in savanna species. This consideration could have influenced biomass loss or gain
11 by respiration. In fact, respiration cost can differ between stem and roots according to plant species
12 and environmental condition (Anekonda et al., 1994; Hansen et al., 1994). In summary, the success
13 of allocation strategies depends on the tree architecture and especially the parameters which
14 decrease stem biomass necessary for the establishment of a given quantity of leaves such as the
15 internode length and the numbers of leaves per node. The cubic relation between stem and leaf
16 biomass, which constrains the quantity of leaves available to grow, emphasize the role of plant
17 architecture on plant growth.

18

19 **4.4. What is the effect of the photosynthesis and translocation rates on the allocation** 20 **strategies success?**

21 High photosynthesis rate increases the parameter space allowing for successful strategies
22 (either in terms of height after 50 yrs, or the time needed to reach 2 m). This is due to the increase in
23 biomass that is permitted when photosynthesis increases but this does not change the general pattern
24 of successful strategies. However, because of the lack of information concerning savanna tree
25 photosynthesis rate, the value for this parameter might not be correct. In Fig 3 and 5, we have thus

1 distinguished resprouts that reach 2m within 2 years from those that reach 2m after two years. The
2 second case seems more realistic (field observation where plant cannot reach to meters before 2
3 years), and the first may be due to our estimation.

4 Nevertheless, this result helps us to analyze how photosynthesis rate alters plant allocation
5 strategies to escape fire trap. In the D⁺F⁺ model, resprouts grow more quickly than in the D⁺F⁻
6 model at the beginning of the growing season. This may be due to the architecture constraints we
7 implemented for stem and leaves production (see appendix 4 in which we compared of the growth
8 rate of the resprout with and without fire). Ernest et al., 2009 compared photosynthetic rates of
9 individual plants of *Acacia karroo* without and with fire and found that growth of plants in burnt
10 area was significantly greater than that of plants in unburnt areas. Our result is supported by this
11 study considering only resprouts growth in burnt and unburnt area.

12 Menaut et al., 1979 measured that after burning, root biomass decreased because of
13 transfers (translocation) of reserves from belowground parts to the growing shoots. In our results,
14 the increase of translocation rate facilitates the increase of the size of the parameters space that
15 leads to successful strategies. Thus, the higher this rate, the larger the amount of biomass available
16 for resprout growth, at least at the beginning of the rainy season. Increasing the translocation rate
17 has thus the same effect as increasing the photosynthesis rate. In summary, the increase of both the
18 rate of photosynthesis and the translocation rates has a positive effect on resprout growth and
19 increases the parameter space leading to successful strategies.

20 **5. CONCLUSION**

21 Our model allows for the study of how allocation strategies of resprouts affect stem
22 growth in a fire prone savanna considering some architecture and seasonality. This model be a
23 general simple model of tree resprouting that can be easily adapted to other situations such as arid
24 savannas or forests by incorporating new mechanisms (plant resistance, fire frequency, roots which
25 absorb soil carbon...). We conclude that (1) allocation to leaves is determinant as leaves are the

1 primary source of assimilates that can then be turned into fire-resistant structures (reserves and
2 belowground parts) and (2) fire only weakly slows down the plant growth compared to the dry
3 season. These results allowed us better interpret field observations about savanna trees resprouting
4 concerning allocation strategy. Finally, our model suggests that fire act in a similar manner than a
5 severe dry season on tree resprouting when we compare both with wet season.


6

7 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**


8 We would like to acknowledge the financial support of the Ministry of Higher Education
9 and Scientific Research of Côte d'Ivoire. We also thank Institute of Ecology and environmental
10 sciences of Paris for the provision of the logistics necessary for this PhD project.

Appendix

Without Fire




With Fire




Appendix 1: Comparison of *Bridelia ferruginea*, *Crossopteryx febrifuga* and *Piliostigma thonningii*, according to effect of the allocation strategies on the height (m) of 50 yrs old resprouts for 4 combinations of photosynthesis rate (a) and translocation rate of reserves (b). Panel and axis description as in figure 2.


Without Fire




With Fire



Appendix 2: Comparison of the time to reach 2m for *Bidelia ferruginea*, *Crossopteryx febrifuga* and *Piliostigma thonningii*, according to the rate of allocation to belowground parts (y axis) and the rate of allocation to aerial parts (x axis). Panel and axis description as in figure 2.



Appendix 3: Comparison of allocation strategies between three simulations for *Crossopteryx febrifuga*, according to plant architecture after 50 yr old for 4 combinations of photosynthesis rate (a) and translocation rate of reserves (b). Panel and axis description as in figure 2.



Appendix 4: Comparison of resprout growth rate (by utilization of resprout height) of *Crossopteryx febrifuga* resprout height for 50 yr (600 month) with and without fire when $a = 3 \text{ gg}^{-1}\text{month}^{-1}$ and $b=0.8$, allocation to belowground parts $r = 0.1$ and allocation to reserves $p = 0.69$ and allocation to aerial parts $s=0.21$.

Literature cited:

- Anekonda, T.S., Criddle, R.S., Libby, W.J., Bredenbach, R.W., Hansen, L.D., 1994. Respiration rates predict differences in growth of coast redwood. *Plant. Cell Environ.* 17, 197–203. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.1994.tb00283.x>
- Archibald, S., Bond, W.J., 2003. Growing tall vs growing wide: Tree architecture and allometry of *Acacia karroo* in forest, savanna, and arid environments. *Oikos* 102, 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2003.12181.x>
- Bellingham, P.J., Sparrow, A.D., 2000. Resprouting as a life history strategy in woody plant communities. *Oikos* 89, 409–416. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2000.890224.x>
- Blarer, A., Doebeli, M., 1996. Heuristic optimization of the general life history problem: A novel approach. *Evol. Ecol.* 10, 81–96. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01239349>
- Bond, W.J., Keeley, J.E., 2005. Fire as a global “herbivore”: The ecology and evolution of flammable ecosystems. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 20, 387–394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2005.04.025>
- Bond, W.J., Midgley, J.J., 2001. *Bond* 2001 16, 45–51. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347\(00\)02033-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(00)02033-4)
- Canadell, J., López-Soria, L., 1998. Lignotuber reserves support regrowth following clipping of two Mediterranean shrubs. *Funct. Ecol.* 12, 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2435.1998.00154.x>
- Charles-Dominique, T., Beckett, H., Midgley, G.F., Bond, W.J., 2015. Bud protection: A key trait for species sorting in a forest-savanna mosaic. *New Phytol.* 207, 1052–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13406>
- Clarke, P.J., Lawes, M.J., Midgley, J.J., Lamont, B.B., Ojeda, F., Burrows, G.E., Enright, N.J., Knox, K.J.E., 2013. Resprouting as a key functional trait: How buds, protection and resources drive persistence after fire. *New Phytol.* 197, 19–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12001>
- Cruz, A., Pérez, B., Moreno, J.M., 2003. Resprouting of the Mediterranean-type shrub *Erica australis* with modified lignotuber carbohydrate content. *J. Ecol.* 91, 348–356. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2745.2003.00770.x>
- Ernest, A., Schutz, N., Bond, W.J., Cramer, M.D., 2009. Juggling carbon: allocation patterns of a dominant tree in a Wre-prone savanna. *Oecologia* 160, 235–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-009-1293-1>
- Gignoux, J., Clobert, J., Menaut, J.C., 1997. Alternative fire resistance strategies in savanna trees. *Oecologia* 110, 576–583. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420050198>
- Gignoux, J., Konaté, S., Lahoreau, G., Le Roux, X., Simioni, G., 2016. Allocation strategies of savanna and forest tree seedlings in response to fire and shading: Outcomes of a field experiment. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep38838>
- Govender, N., Trollope, W.S.W., Van Wilgen, B.W., 2006. The effect of fire season, fire frequency, rainfall and management on fire intensity in savanna vegetation in South Africa. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 43, 748–758. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2006.01184.x>
- Hansen, L.D., Hopkin, M.S., Rank, D.R., Anekonda, T.S., Breidenbach, R.W., Criddle, R.S., 1994. The relation between plant growth and respiration: A thermodynamic model. *Planta* 194, 77–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00201037>
- Higgins, S.I., Bond, W.J., Trollope, W.S.W., 2000. Fire, resprouting and variability: A recipe for grass-tree

coexistence in savanna. *J. Ecol.* 88, 213–229. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2745.2000.00435.x>

Hoffmann, W.A., Bazzaz, F.A., Chatterton, N.J., Harrison, P.A., Jackson, R.B., 2000. Elevated CO₂ enhances resprouting of a tropical savanna tree. *Oecologia* 123, 312–317. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s004420051017>

I, D.M., Maparet, I., 2006. Post-Fire Resprouting of *Colophospermum mopane* Saplings in a Southern African Savanna 22, 231–234. <https://doi.org/10.1017/SO26646740500297X>

Kaggwa-Asiimwe, R., Andrade-Sanchez, P., Wang, G., 2013. Plant architecture influences growth and yield response of upland cotton to population density. *F. Crop. Res.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2013.02.005>

Lacointe, A., 2000. Carbon allocation among tree organs: A review of basic processes and representation in functional-structural tree models. *Ann. For. Sci.* 57, 521–533. <https://doi.org/10.1051/forest:2000139>

Lehmann, C.E.R., Anderson, T.M., Sankaran, M., Higgins, S.I., Archibald, S., Hoffmann, W.A., Hanan, N.P., Williams, R.J., Fensham, R.J., Felfili, J., Hutley, L.B., Ratnam, J., Jose, J.S., Montes, R., Franklin, D., Russell-smith, J., Ryan, C.M., Durigan, G., Hiernaux, P., Haidar, R., Bowman, D.M.J.S., Bond, W.J., 2014. Savanna Vegetation-Fire-Climate 548–552.

Menaut, J.C., Cesar, J., 1979. Structure and Primary Productivity of Lamto Savannas , Ivory Coast.

Moreno, J.M., Oechel, W.C., 1993. Demography of *Adenostoma fasciculatum* after fires of different intensities in southern California chaparral. *Oecologia* 96, 95–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00318035>

Müller, I., Schmid, B., Weiner, J., 2000. The effect of nutrient availability on biomass allocation patterns in 27 species of herbaceous plants. *Perspect. Plant Ecol. Evol. Syst.* 3, 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1078/1433-8319-00007>

N'Dri, A.B., Gignoux, J., Barot, S., Konaté, S., Dembélé, A., Werner, P.A., 2014. The dynamics of hollowing in annually burnt savanna trees and its effect on adult tree mortality. *Plant Ecol.* 215, 27–37. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-013-0276-9>

Pate, J.S., Froend, R.H., Bowen, B., Hansen, A., Kuo, J., 1990. Seedling Growth and Storage Characteristics of Seeder and Resprouter Species of Mediterranean-type Ecosystems of S. W. Australia. *Ann. Bot.* 65, 585–601. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aob.a087976>

Sankaran, M., Hanan, N.P., Scholes, R.J., Ratnam, J., Augustine, D.J., Cade, B.S., Gignoux, J., Higgins, S.I., Le Roux, X., Ludwig, F., Ardo, J., Banyikwa, F., Bronn, A., Bucini, G., Caylor, K.K., Coughenour, M.B., Diouf, A., Ekaya, W., Feral, C.J., February, E.C., Frost, P.G.H., Hiernaux, P., Hrabar, H., Metzger, K.L., Prins, H.H.T., Ringrose, S., Sea, W., Tews, J., Worden, J., Zambatis, N., 2005. Determinants of woody cover in African savannas. *Nature* 438, 846–849. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04070>

Thornley, J.H.M., 1972. A balanced quantitative model for root: Shoot ratios in vegetative plants. *Ann. Bot.* 36, 431–441. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aob.a084602>.

Trollope, W. S. W. (1974). Role of fire in preventing bush encroachment in the Eastern Cape. *Proceedings of the Annual Congresses of the Grassland Society of southern Africa*, 9(1), 67-72.

Verdaguer, D., Ojeda, F., 2002. Root starch storage and allocation patterns in seeder and resprouter seedlings of two Cape Erica (*Ericaceae*) species. *Am. J. Bot.* 89, 1189–1196. <https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.89.8.1189>

Vesk, P.A., Westoby, M., 2004. Funding the bud bank: A review of the costs of buds. *Oikos* 106, 200–208. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2004.13204.x>

Wigley, B.J., Cramer, M.D., Bond, W.J., 2009. Sapling survival in a frequently burnt savanna: Mobilisation of carbon reserves in *Acacia karroo*. *Plant Ecol.* 203, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-008-9495-x>

William J. Bond and Jeremy J. Midgley, 2003. THE EVOLUTIONARY ECOLOGY OF SPROUTING IN WOODY PLANTS 164.