Title: Mean annual precipitation predicts primary production resistance and resilience to extreme
 drought

Authors: Ellen Stuart-Haëntjens^{a,*†}, Hans J. De Boeck^b, Nathan P. Lemoine^c, Pille Mänd^d,
 György Kröel-Dulay^e, Inger K. Schmidt^f, Anke Jentsch^g, Andreas Stampfli^h, William R. L.
 Andereggⁱ, Michael Bahn^j, Juergen Kreyling^k, Thomas Wohlgemuth^l, Francisco Lloret^m, Aimée
 T. Classenⁿ, Christopher M. Gough^a, Melinda D. Smith^c

^a Virginia Commonwealth University, Department of Biology, USA

^b University of Antwerp, Department of Biology, Belgium

^c Colorado State University, Department of Biology and Graduate Degree Program in Ecology, USA

^d University of Tartu, Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, Department of Botany, Estonia

^e MTA Centre for Ecological Research, Institute of Ecology and Botany, 2-4 Alkotmány u., 2163-
 Vácrátót, Hungary

^f University of Copenhagen, Department of Geosciences and Natural Resource Management, Denmark

^g University of Bayreuth, Bayreuth Center of Ecology and Environmental Research, Department of
 Disturbance Ecology, Germany

^h Bern University of Applied Sciences, School of Agricultural, Forest and Food Sciences, Switzerland

ⁱ University of Utah, Department of Biology, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA

^j University of Innsbruck, Institute of Ecology, Austria

^k University of Greifswald, Institute of Botany and Landscape Ecology, Germany

^l Swiss Federal Institute for Forest, Snow and Landscape Research WSL, Forest Dynamics Research Unit,
 Switzerland

^m CREAF, University Autònoma Barcelona, Spain

ⁿ University of Vermont, Rubenstein School of Environment & Natural Resources, Burlington, VT, USA

*Corresponding author: Ellen Stuart-Haëntjens (goodrichstej@vcu.edu)

†Current address: Department of Biology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond,
Virginia 23284, USA

Abstract

Extreme drought is increasing in frequency and intensity in many regions globally, with uncertain consequences for the resistance and resilience of ecosystem functions, including primary production. Primary production resistance, the capacity to withstand change during extreme drought, and resilience, the degree to which production recovers, vary among and within ecosystem types, obscuring generalized patterns of ecological stability. Theory and many observations suggest forest production is more resistant but less resilient than grassland production to extreme drought; however, studies of production sensitivity to precipitation variability indicate that the processes controlling resistance and resilience may be influenced more by mean annual precipitation (MAP) than ecosystem type. Here, we conducted a global meta-analysis to investigate primary production resistance and resilience to extreme drought in 64 forests and grasslands across a broad MAP gradient. We found resistance to extreme drought was predicted by MAP; however, grasslands (positive) and forests (negative) exhibited opposing resilience relationships with MAP. Our findings indicate that common plant physiological mechanisms may determine grassland and forest resistance to extreme drought, whereas differences among plant residents in turnover time, plant architecture, and drought adaptive strategies likely underlie divergent resilience patterns. The low resistance and resilience of dry grasslands suggests that these ecosystems are the most vulnerable to extreme drought – a vulnerability that is expected to compound as extreme drought frequency increases in the future.

Keywords (max 6): forest, grassland, extreme drought, primary productivity, resistance, resilience

1. Introduction

The frequency and intensity of extreme droughts are predicted to increase throughout the century in many regions across the globe (IPCC, 2013), with widespread effects on ecosystem functioning anticipated but poorly quantified or understood (Bahn et al., 2014; Easterling et al., 2000; Ingrisch and Bahn, 2018). Ecosystem sensitivity to climate extremes is commonly characterized as *resistance* and *resilience*: *resistance* quantifies the immediate change in ecosystem functioning (e.g., primary production) following a perturbation; and *resilience* is the extent to which ecosystem functioning returns to pre-event levels (Lloret et al., 2011; MacGillivray et al., 1995). Global understanding of how these measures of drought sensitivity relate to one another is limited, with most studies examining resistance or resilience to drought, but not both (Donohue et al., 2016). Moreover, whether grasslands and forests within the same geographic regions follow similar, or unique, patterns of primary production resistance and resilience within the same climate space is unknown, but essential in order to generalize the stability of ecosystem functioning across the global climatic continuum.

Ecological theory (Grime, 2001) and observations (Petrakis et al., 2016; Schwalm et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2015) suggest a tradeoff between the resistance and resilience of primary production, with the different life and evolutionary histories of resident grassland and forest plant species portending different functional responses to extreme drought. Forests, containing assemblages of long-lived woody species completing life cycles over decades to centuries, are expected to be more resistant and less resilient because of the increased energetic cost and time associated with rebuilding biomass prior to reproduction (MacGillivray et al., 1995). Conversely, grassland plant species with annual turnover of production may be less resistant but more resilient, exhibiting greater immediate vulnerability to extreme drought but capable of rapid re-

establishment, growth, and reproduction by resident plants (Hoover et al., 2014). Forest drought resistance has been attributed to mechanisms that limit water loss, increase water supply (hydraulic lift), or increase water-use efficiency (WUE) (Baldocchi et al., 2004; Wolf et al., 2013). Additionally, trees generally maintain root systems that access deep soil water (Jackson et al., 1996) while grasslands have shallower root systems and maintain high evapotranspiration rates during drought, depleting soil moisture at a faster rate (Teuling et al., 2010; Wolf et al., 2013).

Precipitation amount and variability, and how plant traits are arrayed across precipitation gradients (Engelbrecht et al., 2007; López et al., 2016), may shape an ecological and evolutionary tradeoff between primary production resistance and resilience. Though adaptations of forest and grassland plants to water availability differ, ecosystems globally exhibit lower primary production sensitivity to annual variation in precipitation when located in wet environments, suggesting more mesic grasslands and forests could exhibit greater resistance to extreme drought (Huxman et al., 2004; Knapp and Smith, 2001). Conversely, the greater sensitivity of production to year-to-year precipitation in dry ecosystems suggests more rapid and complete resilience following drought.

In order to bridge the gap between ecological theory and empirical observations of production sensitivity and functional response, we conducted a global meta-analysis of primary production resistance and resilience to extreme drought in forests and grasslands across a broad gradient of mean annual precipitation (MAP) (230 mm to 2467 mm yr⁻¹). The goals of this meta-analysis were 1) to evaluate where different ecosystems exhibit shared or divergent responses across a common precipitation continuum, 2) test the theory that forests are more resistant, but

less resilient, than grasslands, and 3) observe whether traditional resistance-resilience trade-off theory applies at the ecosystem scale.

2. Methods

2.1 Study criteria

We conducted a Web Of Science search on January 6, 2017 that included the following terms: (extreme* or severe disturbance), (resistance or resilience or recovery), (biomass or productivity or production or cover), and (grass* or forest or shrubland or woodland or savannah or heath* or tundra or alpine). We used studies that crossed with these terms as well as additional studies cross-referenced from papers found in this search. Out of 435 papers, a total of 45 studies containing 72 sites (43 grasslands, 21 forests, 4 shrublands, and 4 woodlands) met our inclusion criteria. Due to the small sample size (Lemoine et al., 2016), shrublands and woodlands were eliminated from the quantitative analysis. Most of the sites selected were in North America and Europe, with one site from each of the following continents: Asia, Australia, Africa, and South America (Fig. 1).

For the resistance analysis, only studies based on terrestrial ecosystems that justified the drought as “extreme” and reported primary productivity from a true control, or a full reference year prior to the event, were included. Post-event productivity one year following the event was required for inclusion in the resilience analysis. Justification of extremity could include: 1) time-scales (Girard et al., 2012; Rondeau et al., 2013; Schwalm et al., 2012), 2) drought return time (Kreyling et al., 2008), 3) standardized precipitation-evapotranspiration index (SPEI) (Cavin et al., 2013; Falk et al., 2008), or 4) >60% decrease in annual precipitation (Hoover et al., 2015). Acceptable metrics of primary production included net primary production (NPP), gross primary production (GPP) (Litton et al., 2007), basal area increments (BAI) (for functional types in

which BAI is significantly correlated with productivity) (Lempereur et al., 2015), and cover (in arid and semi-arid ecosystems only) (Zhang et al., 2016). All 64 forest and grassland sites were used in the resistance analysis, while 10 forests and 22 grasslands were included in the resilience analysis.

Fig. 1. Global map displaying site locations included in the analyses. Blue circles indicate use in the resistance model only while orange circles represent sites used in both the resistance and resilience models.

2.2 Extremity validation

For natural events only, modelled standardized precipitation-evapotranspiration index (SPEI) for each site served as an independent check on author-reported drought extremity. Modelled SPEI values were extracted from DroughtNet using the Precipitation Trends Tool (drought-net.org). Author assessments of extreme drought and modelled SPEI agreed in >90% of the cases. The remaining 10% fell in higher latitudes where the SPEI model generates higher uncertainty (Nathan Lemoine, direct correspondence). To avoid potential experimental bias,

analyses were run twice: once including all sites (experimental and natural) and then, including only natural cases that agreed with modelled SPEI.

2.3 Metrics of resistance and resilience

Using previously published metrics, resistance was quantified as the change in ecosystem functioning following drought, and resilience the extent to which ecosystem functioning returned to pre-event levels one year post-drought (Gazol et al., 2017; Hoover et al., 2014; Lloret et al., 2011; MacGillivray et al., 1995; Nimmo et al., 2015; Pretzsch et al., 2013). To standardize site comparison, we calculated the log response ratio effect sizes of primary production resistance, quantified as production during drought divided by control (or pre-drought) production, and resilience, production one-year post drought divided by control (or pre-drought) production, for each site.

2.4 Statistical analysis

Data were analyzed using two separate Bayesian analysis of covariance models, one for each response variable (resistance and resilience). Each model included ecosystem type (forest, grassland) as a categorical predictor, author-reported MAP as a continuous predictor, and the interaction between ecosystem type and MAP. We placed weakly informative priors [$N(0, 1)$] on all parameter estimates (Lemoine et al., 2016). These conservative priors state that it is unlikely that a one standard deviation change in MAP would yield a change of > 1 log response ratio unit, thereby guarding against overestimated effect sizes with small datasets (Button et al., 2013; Lemoine et al., 2016). Models were allowed a warm-up of 5,000 iterations for each of four Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains, and the next 5,000 iterations from each chain were

saved as posterior parameter estimates (20,000 total estimates). Convergence was checked using posterior density and trace plots.

Additional models were run using the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) mean site aridity index (MAI) in place of MAP, and we used Bayesian linear regression to determine how resistance varied with resilience. MAI, or MAP divided by potential evapotranspiration (PET), was calculated using modelled PET value extracted from DroughtNet. Results for MAI and MAP models were similar, but we present MAP results since the metric requires no modelling and is thus, a more accurate measurement.

Differences between forest and grassland resistance and resilience were explored using contrasts. After the model was run, we calculated the predicted resistance and resilience for forests and grasslands and the mean precipitation of each ecosystem type, respectively. This generated 20,000 posterior estimates of forest and grassland resistance/resilience. To evaluate mean differences between forests and grasslands when resistance and resilience values were normalized for precipitation, we derived adjusted values at the grand (i.e., all sites included) mean annual precipitation of MAP = 828 mm. Contrasts were conducted by calculating the difference between forests and grasslands for every posterior chain (Kruschke, 2015).

To account for potentially confounding variables, we tested for, but found no support for, significant differences between the resistance and resilience of: author-reported natural versus experimentally imposed drought events; managed versus unmanaged ecosystems; extreme drought events only versus extreme drought events with heatwaves; use of pre-event versus control production derivation of resistance/resilience; and GPP versus NPP metrics of production (SI Table 1). Similarly, we found no significant difference between the resistance and resilience of pulse (<2-year duration) versus press (>2-year duration) drought events (*sensu* Hoover et al.

204 2015). We found no correlation between modelled SPEI and resistance or resilience (SI Fig. 1).
205 Sample sizes were too low to compare resistance and resilience of plant functional types within
206 ecosystem functional types (see site characteristics in SI Table 1; examples include C3 versus C4
207 grasslands evergreen needleleaf versus deciduous broadleaf for forests).

209 **3. Results**

210 *3.1 Resistance*

211 We found that the resistance of both forests and grasslands increased along a common
212 continuum of MAP [Probability of an effect: $\Pr(\text{MAP slope} > 0) = 0.95$] (Fig. 2A, SI Table 2).
213 Contrary to theoretical expectations, forests and grasslands exhibited the same trend across a
214 MAP gradient of > 2000 mm [$\Pr(\text{Interaction}) = 0.70$]. Forest and grassland sites with low MAP
215 exhibited similarly low primary production resistance, and thus were more likely to decline
216 following extreme drought irrespective of ecosystem type, whereas forest and grassland sites
217 with higher MAP were more resistant. Similar trends were found when MAI was substituted for
218 MAP (SI Fig. 2, SI Table 3). Forests were, on average, wetter than grasslands and thus had
219 higher average resistance [$\Pr(\text{Forests} > \text{Grasslands}) = 0.96$] (Fig. 3A, SI Table 4). However, the
220 lack of an interaction suggests that forests and grasslands exhibited similar resistance across an
221 overlapping range of MAP (Fig. 2A). Our findings demonstrate that mean differences in the
222 resistance of forests and grasslands is attributed to their distribution in climate space rather than
223 unique resistance sensitivities (i.e., slopes) across MAP.

Fig. 2. Resistance (A) and resilience (B) of forest (closed circles) and grassland (open circles) primary production following extreme drought against mean annual precipitation. Resistance was calculated as the log response ratio of drought productivity divided by pre-drought productivity. Resilience was calculated as the log response ratio of post-drought productivity divided by pre-drought productivity. The shaded area depicts the 95% Bayesian credible interval of the regression.

Fig. 3. Forest versus grassland contrasts of resistance (a) and resilience (b) following extreme drought ($\pm$ standard deviation).

3.2 Resilience

In contrast to resistance, forests and grasslands exhibited opposing primary production resilience patterns across the MAP gradient [$\text{Pr}(\text{Interaction}) = 1.00$]. Grassland resilience was positively correlated with both MAP [$\text{Pr}(\text{Grassland MAP slopes} > 0) = 1.00$] and MAI [$\text{Pr}(\text{Grassland MAI slopes} > 0) = 0.96$] (Fig. 2B, SI Fig. 3, SI Table 5&6). Conversely, forest primary production resilience was unrelated to MAP [$\text{Pr}(\text{Forest MAP slope} < 0) = 0.84$], but negatively related to MAI [$\text{Pr}(\text{Forest MAI slope} < 0) = 0.95$]. Notably, forest resilience was negatively related to MAP when experimentally manipulated sites were removed from the analysis ($N = 2$) [$\text{Pr}(\text{Forest MAP slope} < 0) = 0.98$] (SI Fig. 4, SI Table 7). Across sites, grasslands remained more resilient than forests when resilience was normalized to mean MAP [$\text{Pr}(\text{Grasslands} > \text{Forests}) = 0.97$] (Fig. 3B, SI Table 8), indicating that differences in resilience were not attributed to the occupation of different climate space.

3.3 Resistance-Resilience Trade-off Theory

We found no evidence that the theoretical assumption of a tradeoff between functional resistance and resilience applies at the ecosystem scale [$\text{Pr}(> 0) = 0.55$], nor did we find evidence that tradeoffs differed among ecosystem types [$\text{Pr}(\text{Interaction}) = 0.80$] (Fig. 4, SI Table 9).

Fig. 4. The resistance and resilience of forest and grassland primary productivity following extreme drought. Open circles represent grasslands and closed circles represent forests.

4. Discussion

Our findings suggest that the theoretical expectations that forest and grassland ecosystems, with different life and evolutionary histories, should exhibit tradeoffs in their primary production resistance and resilience following extreme drought are not supported. Rather, grasslands and forests displayed a common resistance relationship with MAP but opposing patterns of resilience. On average, forests were more resistant than grasslands; however, differences in mean ecosystem resistance were attributed to climate space rather than inherent differences in sensitivity to precipitation. A common continuum of shifting plant physiological adaptation to increasingly dry environments, such as control of stomatal conductance, as well as functional diversity of drought “tolerating” and “avoiding” species

(Anderegg and Hillerislambers, 2016; Craine et al., 2012; Dry et al., 2007), may stabilize grasslands and forests equally during periods of extreme drought with a linear decline in function (Huxman et al., 2004). Production of drier ecosystems can be more sensitive to inter-annual precipitation variability (Huxman et al., 2004), suggesting drier ecosystems may operate closer to water limitations, supporting our results. Although some observational studies found forests to have a higher water-use efficiency than grasslands during drought (Baldocchi et al., 2004; Wolf et al., 2013), those findings may reflect the forest plant functional type observed (Beer et al., 2009) rather than inherent differences between ecosystem type (i.e. grassland versus forest). Strengthening this idea further, a WUE synthesis across a range of ecosystems and plant functional types found that WUE was higher for broad-leaf forests compared to needleleaf forests, but generally did not differ between forests and grasslands (Beer et al., 2009).

Opposing relationships between forest and grassland resilience with MAP could potentially be explained by differences among predominant resident plant species in drought adaptations, plant architecture and anatomy, and turnover time life history. Dry-adapted woody species may be more drought tolerant than their wetter counterparts, and, therefore recover more rapidly and fully following extreme drought (Anderegg and Hillerislambers, 2016; Bannister, 1986; Gazol et al., 2017; López et al., 2016; Wright et al., 2013). Additionally, increased mortality events noted in drier forest ecosystems following extreme drought (Allen et al., 2015, 2010) may decrease competition for water and other resources, allowing surviving individuals to rapidly compensate when precipitation returns (Bottero et al., 2017; Reed et al., 2014). Such mortality production compensation has been noted following other heterogeneous mortality events (Stuart-Haëntjens et al., 2015). Since mesic forests are more resistant to extreme drought, less mortality may occur, dampening this compensatory growth that contributes to resilience.

When mortality does occur, the degree of the growth response due to reduced inter-tree competition for water could be of lesser magnitude since mesic ecosystems are less likely to be water-limited (Huxman et al., 2004).

Grasslands, having evolved in more variable and often drier climates than forests, and being prone to frequent, biomass reducing disturbance regimes such as grazing, mowing or burning, likely possess a higher prevalence of traits that support rapid re-establishment and regrowth following perturbation (Ingrisch et al., 2017; Stampfli et al., 2018). Since grasses do not maintain tall woody structures, but often senesce when extremely water-stressed (Moran et al., 2014), the majority of aboveground biomass must regenerate following drought alleviation. Mesic grasslands often rapidly regrow when water availability returns, sometimes overshooting pre-drought productivity (Carter and Blair, 2012; Hofer et al., 2016; Stampfli et al., 2018), while dry grasslands recover more slowly, likely due to a general water-limitation (Reich, 2014; Schwalm et al., 2017) or because droughts cause higher plant mortality in dry than in mesic biomes.

Our findings are not without limitations, and particularly expose the need to evaluate extreme drought responses in underrepresented ecosystem types and geographic regions. Our meta-analysis could not robustly assess the resistance and resilience of shrublands and woodlands because sample sizes were low (4 of each ecosystem). However, these intermediary ecosystem types, occurring between forests and grasslands along precipitation continua, may display different resistance and resilience patterns (Ma et al., 2016; Peñuelas et al., 2007; Pereira et al., 2007). Similarly, the majority of studies incorporated in our analysis were temperate (64%) and most derive from temperate North America or Europe (92%), with Asia, South and Central Americas, Australia, and Africa representation disproportionally lower. This concentrated

distribution and representation of ecosystems in the literature highlights a need for broader investigation of primary production resistance and resilience to extreme drought.

5. Conclusions

Our findings offer new insights into global patterns of resilience and resistance, while raising new questions about the mechanisms underlying our observations. The congruent resistance behaviors of grasslands and forests across the precipitation gradient could be explained by a shared cross-ecosystem continuum of physiological adaptations that maximize water-use efficiency within a common precipitation climate domain (Ponce Campos et al., 2013). In contrast, the divergent resilience patterns of grasslands and forests may be caused by differences in mean plant turnover time, with regrown grassland species recovering to pre-drought biomass levels more rapidly than woody forest plant species (Grime, 2001). The low primary production resistance and resilience of dry grasslands indicates that these ecosystems could be the most vulnerable to forecasted intensification of climate extremes with changing climate (Cook et al., 2014). Moreover, though beyond the scope of our analysis, our findings reinforce those suggesting cumulative effects of repeated extreme events may be most profound for these ecosystems (Schwalm et al., 2017). The low resilience of mesic forests suggests greater vulnerability of these large carbon sinks to recurrent drought extremes (Saatchi et al., 2013), while the higher than expected resilience of dry forests could prompt a reconsideration of the vulnerability of these forests types. Climate extremes are major drivers of the global carbon cycle (Reichstein et al., 2013), making it essential to consider these divergent ecosystem responses when estimating the future impact of extreme droughts on biogeochemical cycling and climate feedbacks.

Acknowledgements

This work resulted from a collaboration that began at ‘After the extreme: Measuring and modeling impacts on terrestrial ecosystems when thresholds are exceeded’, held in Florence, Italy, in March 2016. We would like to thank the meeting organizers and funders, INTERFACE, and ClimMani. Thank you to Drs. Julie Zinnert, Robert Fahey, Scott Neubauer, and Edward Crawford for reading early versions of this manuscript, and to Tracey Saxby and Jason C. Fisher, Integration and Application Network, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science (ian.umces.edu/imagelibrary) for providing the grass and tree illustrations used in the graphical abstract.

Funding Sources: This work was supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation [grant numbers RCN-MSM-DEB-0955771, DEB-1354732, EF-1137378, DEB-1714972 and DEB 1655095]; the European Cooperation in Science and Technology [ClimMani, EU-COST Action, ES1308]; the U.S. Department of Agriculture [grant numbers NIFA-AFRI 2016-67012-25169 and NIFA-AFRICP-ESAM-2017-0552]; the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research [IUT34-9]; Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der Wissenschaftlichen Forschung [149862]; the Austrian Academy of Sciences [ClimLUC]; the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund [K112576]; the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences; a Spanish Government Grant [CGL2015-67419-R]; a Catalanian Government Grant [AGAUR 2017-SGR-1001]; and the U.S. Department of Energy [grant number DE-SC0010562].

Competing Financial Interests: Authors declare no competing financial interests.

References

- Allen, C.D., Breshears, D.D., McDowell, N.G., 2015. On underestimation of global vulnerability to tree mortality and forest die-off from hotter drought in the Anthropocene. *Ecosphere* 6, art129. <https://doi.org/10.1890/ES15-00203.1>
- Allen, C.D., Macalady, A.K., Chenchouni, H., Bachelet, D., McDowell, N., Vennetier, M., Kitzberger, T., Rigling, A., Breshears, D.D., Hogg, E.H.T., Gonzalez, P., Fensham, R., Zhang, Z., Castro, J., Demidova, N., Lim, J., Allard, G., Running, S.W., Semerci, A., Cobb, N., 2010. A global overview of drought and heat-induced tree mortality reveals emerging

361 climate change risks for forests. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 259, 660–684.
 362 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2009.09.001>
 363 Anderegg, L.D.L., Hillerislambers, J., 2016. Drought stress limits the geographic ranges of two
 364 tree species via different physiological mechanisms. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 22, 1029–1045.
 365 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13148>
 366 Bahn, M., Reichstein, M., Dukes, J.S., Smith, M.D., Mcdowell, N.G., 2014. Climate-biosphere
 367 interactions in a more extreme world. *New Phytol.* 202, 356–359.
 368 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12662>
 369 Baldocchi, D.D., Xu, L., Kiang, N., 2004. How plant functional-type, weather, seasonal drought,
 370 and soil physical properties alter water and energy fluxes of an oak-grass savanna and an
 371 annual grassland. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* 123, 13–39.
 372 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2003.11.006>
 373 Bannister, P., 1986. Drought resistance, water potential and water content in some New Zealand
 374 plants. *Flora* 178, 23–40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0367-2530\(17\)30202-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0367-2530(17)30202-5)
 375 Beer, C., Ciais, P., Reichstein, M., Baldocchi, D., Law, B.E., Papale, D., Soussana, J.F.,
 376 Ammann, C., Buchmann, N., Frank, D., Gianelle, D., Janssens, I.A., Knohl, A., Köstner, B.,
 377 Moors, E., Rouspard, O., Verbeeck, H., Vesala, T., Williams, C.A., Wohlfahrt, G., 2009.
 378 Temporal and among-site variability of inherent water use efficiency at the ecosystem level.
 379 *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 23, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008GB003233>
 380 Bottero, A., D’Amato, A.W., Palik, B.J., Bradford, J.B., Fraver, S., Battaglia, M.A., Asherin,
 381 L.A., 2017. Density-dependent vulnerability of forest ecosystems to drought. *J. Appl. Ecol.*
 382 54, 1605–1614. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12847>
 383 Button, K.S., Ioannidis, J.P.A., Mokrysz, C., Nosek, B.A., Flint, J., Robinson, E.S.J., Munafò,

384 M.R., 2013. Power failure: why small sample size undermines the reliability of
 385 neuroscience. *Nat. Rev.* 14, 365–376. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3475>
 386 Carter, D.L., Blair, J.M., 2012. High richness and dense seeding enhance grassland restoration
 387 establishment but have little effect on drought response. *Ecol. Appl.* 22, 1308–1319.
 388 <https://doi.org/10.1890/11-1970.1>
 389 Cavin, L., Mountford, E.P., Peterken, G.F., Jump, A.S., 2013. Extreme drought alters
 390 competitive dominance within and between tree species in a mixed forest stand. *Funct.*
 391 *Ecol.* 27, 1424–1435. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12126>
 392 Cook, B.I., Smerdon, J.E., Seager, R., Coats, S., 2014. Global warming and 21st century drying.
 393 *Clim. Dyn.* 43, 2607–2627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-014-2075-y>
 394 Craine, J.M., Ocheltree, T.W., Nippert, J.B., Towne, E.G., Skibbe, A.M., Kembel, S.W.,
 395 Fargione, J.E., 2012. Global diversity of drought tolerance and grassland climate-change
 396 resilience. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* 3, 63–67. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1634>
 397 Donohue, I., Hillebrand, H., Montoya, J.M., Petchey, O.L., Pimm, S.L., Fowler, M.S., Healy, K.,
 398 Jackson, A.L., Lurgi, M., McClean, D., O'Connor, N.E., O'Gorman, E.J., Yang, Q., 2016.
 399 Navigating the complexity of ecological stability. *Ecol. Lett.* 19, 1172–1185.
 400 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12648>
 401 Dry, L., In, F., Sandquist, D.R., Cordell, S., 2007. Leaf - Allocation Traits in Trees of a
 402 Threatened 94, 1459–1469.
 403 Easterling, D.R., Meehl, G.A., Parmesan, C., Changnon, S.A., Karl, T.R., Mearns, L.O., 2000.
 404 Climate Extremes: Observations, Modeling, and Impacts. *Science* (80-.). 289, 2068–2074.
 405 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3078074>
 406 Engelbrecht, B.M.J., Comita, L.S., Condit, R., Kursar, T.A., Tyree, M.T., Turner, B.L., Hubbell,

407 S.P., 2007. Drought sensitivity shapes species distribution patterns in tropical forests.
 408 Nature 447, 80–82. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05747>

409 Falk, M., Wharton, S., Schroeder, M., Ustin, S.L., Paw U, K.T., 2008. Flux partitioning in an
 410 old-growth forest: seasonal and interannual dynamics. Tree Physiol. 28, 509–520.
 411 <https://doi.org/10.1093/treephys/28.4.509>

412 Gazol, A., Camarero, J.J., Anderegg, W.R.L., Vicente-Serrano, S.M., 2017. Impacts of droughts
 413 on the growth resilience of Northern Hemisphere forests. Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr. 26, 166–
 414 176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12526>

415 Girard, F., Vennetier, M., Guibal, F., Corona, C., Ouarmim, S., Herrero, A., 2012. Pinus
 416 halepensis Mill. crown development and fruiting declined with repeated drought in
 417 Mediterranean France. Eur. J. For. Res. 131, 919–931. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-011-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10342-011-0565-6)
 418 0565-6

419 Grime, J.P., 2001. Plant Strategies and Vegetation Processes. Wiley, New York.

420 Hofer, D., Suter, M., Haughey, E., Finn, J.A., Hoekstra, N.J., Buchmann, N., L??scher, A., 2016.
 421 Yield of temperate forage grassland species is either largely resistant or resilient to
 422 experimental summer drought. J. Appl. Ecol. 53, 1023–1034. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.12694)
 423 2664.12694

424 Hoover, D.L., Duniway, M.C., Belnap, J., 2015. Pulse-drought atop press-drought: unexpected
 425 plant responses and implications for dryland ecosystems. Oecologia 179, 1211–1221.
 426 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-015-3414-3>

427 Hoover, D.L., Knapp, A.K., Smith, M.D., 2014. Resistance and resilience of a grassland
 428 ecosystem to climate extremes. Ecology 95, 2646–2656. <https://doi.org/10.1890/13-2186.1>

429 Huxman, T.E., Smith, M.D., Fay, P.A., Knapp, A.K., Shaw, M.R., Loik, M.E., Smith, S.D.,

430 Tissue, D.T., Zak, J.C., Weltzin, J.F., Pockman, W.T., Sala, O.E., Haddad, B.M., Harte, J.,
 431 Koch, G.W., Schwinning, S., Small, E.E., Williams, D.G., 2004. Convergence across
 432 biomes to a common rain-use efficiency. *Nature* 429, 651–654.
 433 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02561>
 434 Ingrisch, J., Bahn, M., 2018. Towards a Comparable Quantification of Resilience. *Trends Ecol.*
 435 *Evol.* 251–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2018.01.013>
 436 Ingrisch, J., Karlowsky, S., Anadon-Rosell, A., Hasibeder, R., König, A., Augusti, A., Gleixner,
 437 G., Bahn, M., 2017. Land Use Alters the Drought Responses of Productivity and CO₂
 438 Fluxes in Mountain Grassland. *Ecosystems* 1–15. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-017-0178-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-017-0178-0)
 439 0
 440 IPCC, 2013. Summary for Policymakers. *Clim. Chang.* 2013 Phys. Sci. Basis. Contrib. Work.
 441 Gr. I to Fifth Assess. Rep. Intergov. Panel Clim. Chang. 33.
 442 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324>
 443 Jackson, R.B., Canadell, J., Ehleringer, J.R., Mooney, H.A., Sala, O.E., Schulze, E.D., 1996. A
 444 global analysis of root distributions for terrestrial biomes. *Oecologia* 108, 389–411.
 445 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00333714>
 446 Knapp, A.K., Smith, M.D., 2001. Variation Among Biomes in Temporal Dynamics of
 447 Aboveground Primary Production. *Science* (80-.). 291, 481–484.
 448 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.291.5503.481>
 449 Kreyling, J., Beierkuhnlein, C., Ellis, L., Jentsch, A., 2008. and Fluctuating Physical
 450 Environment. *Environ. Res.* 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2008.0030-1299.16653.x>
 451 Kruschke, J.K., 2015. *Doing Bayesian Data Analysis: Markov Chain Monte Carlo*, 2nd ed.
 452 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-405888-0.00001-5>

453 Lemoine, N.P., Hoffman, A., Felton, A.J., Baur, L., Chaves, F., Gray, J., Yu, Q., Smith, M.D.,
 454 2016. Underappreciated problems of low replications in ecological field studies. *Ecol. Lett.*
 455 97, 2554–2561.

456 Lempereur, M., Martin-Stpaul, N.K., Damesin, C., Joffre, R., Ourcival, J.M., Rocheteau, A.,
 457 Rambal, S., 2015. Growth duration is a better predictor of stem increment than carbon
 458 supply in a Mediterranean oak forest: Implications for assessing forest productivity under
 459 climate change. *New Phytol.* 207, 579–590. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.13400>

460 Litton, C.M., Raich, J.W., Ryan, M.G., 2007. Carbon allocation in forest ecosystems. *Glob.*
 461 *Chang. Biol.* 13, 2089–2109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01420.x>

462 Lloret, F., Keeling, E.G., Sala, A., 2011. Components of tree resilience: Effects of successive
 463 low-growth episodes in old ponderosa pine forests. *Oikos* 120, 1909–1920.
 464 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0706.2011.19372.x>

465 López, R., Cano, F.J., Choat, B., Cochard, H., Gil, L., 2016. Plasticity in Vulnerability to
 466 Cavitation of *Pinus canariensis* Occurs Only at the Driest End of an Aridity Gradient. *Front.*
 467 *Plant Sci.* 7, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.00769>

468 Ma, S., Baldocchi, D., Wolf, S., Verfaillie, J., 2016. Slow ecosystem responses conditionally
 469 regulate annual carbon balance over 15 years in Californian oak-grass savanna. *Agric. For.*
 470 *Meteorol.* 228–229, 252–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2016.07.016>

471 MacGillivray, C.W., Grime, J.P., Team, T.I.S.P. (ISP), 1995. Testing Predictions of the
 472 Resistance and Resilience of Vegetation Subjected to Extreme Events. *Funct. Ecol.* 9, 640–
 473 649.

474 Moran, S.M., Ponce-Campos, G.E., Huete, A., McClaran, M.P., Zhang, Y., Hamerlynck, E.P.,
 475 Augustine, D.J., Gunter, S.A., Kitchen, S.G., Peters, D.P.C., Starks, P.J., Hernandez, M.,

476 2014. Functional response of U.S. grasslands to the early 21st-century drought. *Ecology* 95,
 477 2121–2133. <https://doi.org/10.1890/13-1687.1>
 478 Nimmo, D.G., Mac Nally, R., Cunningham, S.C., Haslem, A., Bennett, A.F., 2015. Vive la
 479 resistance: Reviving resistance for 21st century conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 30, 516–
 480 523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.07.008>
 481 Peñuelas, J., Prieto, P., Beier, C., Cesaraccio, C., de Angelis, P., de Dato, G., Emmett, B.A.,
 482 Estiarte, M., Garadnai, J., Gorissen, A., Láng, E.K., Kröel-dulay, G., Llorens, L., Pellizzaro,
 483 G., Riis-nielsen, T., Schmidt, I.K., Sirca, C., Sowerby, A., Spano, D., Tietema, A., 2007.
 484 Response of plant species richness and primary productivity in shrublands along a north-
 485 south gradient in Europe to seven years of experimental warming and drought: Reductions
 486 in primary productivity in the heat and drought year of 2003. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* 13, 2563–
 487 2581. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2007.01464.x>
 488 Pereira, J.S., Mateus, J. a., Aires, L.M., Pita, G., Pio, C., David, J.S., Andrade, V., Banza, J.,
 489 David, T.S., Paço, T. a., Rodrigues, a., 2007. Net ecosystem carbon exchange in three
 490 contrasting Mediterranean ecosystems – the effect of drought. *Biogeosciences* 4,
 491 791–802. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-4-791-2007>
 492 Petrakis, R., Wu, Z., McVay, J., Middleton, B., Dye, D., Vogel, J., 2016. Vegetative response to
 493 water availability on the San Carlos Apache Reservation. *For. Ecol. Manage.* 378, 14–23.
 494 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.07.012>
 495 Ponce Campos, G.E., Moran, M.S., Huete, A., Zhang, Y., Bresloff, C., Huxman, T.E., Eamus,
 496 D., Bosch, D.D., Buda, A.R., Gunter, S.A., Scalley, T.H., Kitchen, S.G., Mcclaran, M.P.,
 497 McNab, W.H., Montoya, D.S., Morgan, J.A., Peters, D.P.C., Sadler, E.J., Seyfried, M.S.,
 498 Starks, P.J., 2013. Ecosystem resilience despite large-scale altered hydroclimatic conditions.

499 Nature 494, 349–353. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11836>
 500 Pretzsch, H., Schütze, G., Uhl, E., 2013. Resistance of European tree species to drought stress in
 501 mixed versus pure forests: Evidence of stress release by inter-specific facilitation. *Plant*
 502 *Biol.* 15, 483–495. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1438-8677.2012.00670.x>
 503 Reed, D.E., Ewers, B.E., Pendall, E., 2014. Impact of mountain pine beetle induced mortality on
 504 forest carbon and water fluxes. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 9, 105004. [https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/10/105004)
 505 [9326/9/10/105004](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/9/10/105004)
 506 Reich, P.B., 2014. The world-wide “fast-slow” plant economics spectrum: A traits manifesto. *J.*
 507 *Ecol.* 102, 275–301. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12211>
 508 Reichstein, M., Bahn, M., Ciais, P., Frank, D., Mahecha, M.D., Seneviratne, S.I., Zscheischler,
 509 J., Beer, C., Buchmann, N., Frank, D.C., Papale, D., Rammig, A., Smith, P., Thonicke, K.,
 510 van der Velde, M., Vicca, S., Walz, A., Wattenbach, M., 2013. Climate extremes and the
 511 carbon cycle. *Nature* 500, 287–295. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12350>
 512 Rondeau, R.J., Pearson, K.T., Kelso, S., 2013. Vegetation Response in a Colorado Grassland-
 513 shrub Community to Extreme Drought : 1999 – 2010. *Am. Midl. Nat.* 170, 14–25.
 514 <https://doi.org/10.1674/0003-0031-170.1.14>
 515 Saatchi, S., Asefi-Najafabady, S., Malhi, Y., Aragao, L.E.O.C., Anderson, L.O., Myneni, R.B.,
 516 Nemani, R., 2013. Persistent effects of a severe drought on Amazonian forest canopy. *Proc.*
 517 *Natl. Acad. Sci.* 110, 565–570. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1204651110>
 518 Schwalm, C.R., Anderegg, W.R.L., Michalak, A.M., Fisher, J.B., Biondi, F., Koch, G., Litvak,
 519 M., Ogle, K., Shaw, J.D., Wolf, A., Huntzinger, D.N., Schaefer, K., Cook, R., Wei, Y.,
 520 Fang, Y., Hayes, D., Huang, M., Jain, A., Tian, H., 2017. Global patterns of drought
 521 recovery. *Nature* 548, 202–205. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature23021>

522 Schwalm, C.R., Williams, C.A., Schaefer, K., Baldocchi, D., Black, T.A., Goldstein, A.H., Law,
 523 B.E., Oechel, W.C., Paw U, K.T., Scott, R.L., 2012. Reduction in carbon uptake during turn
 524 of the century drought in western North America. *Nat. Geosci.* 5, 551–556.
 525 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo1529>

526 Stampfli, A., Bloor, J.M.G., Fischer, M., Zeiter, M., 2018. High land-use intensity exacerbates
 527 shifts in grassland vegetation composition after severe experimental drought. *Glob. Chang.*
 528 *Biol.* 12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14046>

529 Stuart-Haëntjens, E.J., Curtis, P.S., Fahey, R.T., Vogel, C.S., Gough, C.M., 2015. Net primary
 530 production exhibits a threshold response to increasing disturbance severity in a temperate
 531 deciduous forest. *Ecology* 96, 2478–2487. <https://doi.org/10.1890/14-1810.1>

532 Teuling, A.J., Seneviratne, S.I., Stöckli, R., Reichstein, M., Moors, E., Ciais, P., Luyssaert, S.,
 533 van den Hurk, B., Ammann, C., Bernhofer, C., Dellwik, E., Gianelle, D., Gielen, B.,
 534 Grünwald, T., Klumpp, K., Montagnani, L., Moureaux, C., Sottocornola, M., Wohlfahrt, G.,
 535 2010. Contrasting response of European forest and grassland energy exchange to
 536 heatwaves. *Nat. Geosci.* 3, 722–727. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo950>

537 Wolf, S., Eugster, W., Ammann, C., Häni, M., Zielis, S., Hiller, R., Stieger, J., Imer, D.,
 538 Merbold, L., Buchmann, N., 2013. Contrasting response of grassland versus forest carbon
 539 and water fluxes to spring drought in Switzerland. *Environ. Res. Lett.* 8, 35007.
 540 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/3/035007>

541 Wright, J.K., Williams, M., Starr, G., Mcgee, J., Mitchell, R.J., 2013. Measured and modelled
 542 leaf and stand-scale productivity across a soil moisture gradient and a severe drought. *Plant,*
 543 *Cell Environ.* 36, 467–483. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3040.2012.02590.x>

544 Zhang, J., Wang, M., Wu, S., Müller, K., Cao, Y., Liang, P., Cao, Z., Leung, A.O.W., Christie,

545 P., Wang, H., 2016. Land use affects soil organic carbon of paddy soils: empirical evidence
546 from 6280 years BP to present. *J. Soils Sediments* 16, 767–776.
547 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11368-015-1297-x>

548 Zhao, X., Wei, H., Liang, S., Zhou, T., He, B., Tang, B., Wu, D., 2015. Responses of natural
549 vegetation to different stages of extreme drought during 2009-2010 in Southwestern China.
550 *Remote Sens.* 7, 14039–14054. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs71014039>
551