

A million and more trees for science

TreeDivNet is the largest network of biodiversity experiments worldwide, but needs to expand. We encourage colleagues to establish new experiments on the relation between tree species diversity and forest ecosystem functioning, and to make use of the platform for collaborative research.

Alain Paquette, Andy Hector, Bastien Castagneyrol, Margot Vanhellemont, Julia Koricheva, Michael, Scherer-Lorenzen, Kris Verheyen and TreeDivNet

Forests now cover approximately 30% of the Earth's land surface¹, support high levels of biodiversity and provide essential ecosystem services to humanity². About 30% of the world's forests were lost during the past 5,000 years following human population growth, and forest cover is still being reduced at unprecedented rates, through deforestation and conversion to agriculture¹. Reforestation and afforestation programmes exist in many countries to compensate for the loss of forest cover, with China's Grain-for-Green programme being the largest.

It is predicted that >50% of industrial timber will come from plantations by around the middle of this century³. While planting restores tree cover, virtually all industrial plantations are single-species monocultures, most often of fast-growing cultivars or hybrids of pine, eucalypt, acacia, spruce, poplar or larch. Foremost among the many reasons for this are the high yields normally achieved with intensive, high-input silviculture under a predictable and stable climate, low disturbances, and minimal pests and diseases. However, with increasing recognition of the environmental costs of high-input systems, a changing climate, increasing exotic pests and diseases, and the increasing importance given to other ecosystem services provided by forests, the historical arguments in favour of monocultures are becoming less persuasive⁴.

Indeed, over the past quarter century, research demonstrated a general trend for ecosystem functioning and the provisioning of ecosystem services to increase with higher levels of diversity⁵. This research was generally conducted with herbaceous plants that are more convenient experimental systems, but forests are now one of the main areas of research in this field despite the challenges they present.

Linking diversity and forest functioning

Whether biodiversity is positively related to ecosystem functioning has been a controversial idea and particularly

difficult to test for in arboreal systems for several reasons, including the large size of trees, slow growth and long lifespans. Observational approaches compare ecosystem functioning in existing forests of different tree diversity, while statistically controlling for other drivers of productivity⁶.

Observational studies have provided perhaps the strongest support for a positive effect of forest diversity on productivity, culminating with a recent study that included data from all forested biomes of the world⁷. Such studies are relatively easy to perform and have high relevance to real-world systems, but potential confounding factors (species identity, climate, soil, management history) may limit their ability to isolate the effect of tree diversity. A second possibility is to remove species from established communities while monitoring impacts on functioning⁸. While these removal experiments bring greater control than observational studies, the disturbance incurred can confound the results.

A third approach is to experimentally manipulate tree diversity (and identity) by planting trees in well-replicated designs⁹. In tree diversity experiments, plots of different levels of diversity are established to monitor the impacts on ecosystem functioning and stability. Experiments have the advantage of greater control of confounding factors as well as species composition and stem density, but they take time to develop, whereas evidence has shown that diversity effects tend to strengthen through time¹⁰. This could in part explain why so far, and contrary to expectations, observational studies have repeatedly shown larger diversity effects than did experiments⁵. In summary, there is no perfect approach: observational (comparative) studies, removal experiments and tree diversity experiments all have strengths and weaknesses. Some compromises (or hybrid solutions) are also possible, such as improved observational studies that aim for better control of exogenous factors through a careful plot selection process¹¹.

The Tree Diversity Network

TreeDivNet (www.treedivnet.ugent.be) is a global network of tree diversity experiments that provides a unique platform for research on the relationship between tree diversity and ecosystem functioning in all major forest types around the world⁹. TreeDivNet is the largest network of biodiversity experiments worldwide — of any group of organisms — and one of the largest research facilities in ecology in general. Many of the experiments are large scale and long term (planned to run for decades), whereas others work on smaller or shorter scales. To date, more than 1,115,000 trees have been planted in 25 experiments, covering a total area of more than 820 ha (Fig. 1). Key strengths of the network include a pool of 230 tree species, the wide biogeographic gradient covered, and the diversity and complementarity of the research teams involved.

Unlike traditional forestry trials, which monitor productivity between a monoculture and the same species mixed with a companion species, experiments within TreeDivNet typically have longer diversity gradients and investigate the effects of tree diversity (and not only the effect of mixture) on multiple forest ecological functions. In addition, many experiments within TreeDivNet manipulate not only tree species richness, but also other components of diversity such as species identity (plots of the same diversity level but using different combinations of species), intraspecific genetic diversity, functional or phylogenetic diversity and evenness. The ultimate goal is to identify the numerous and complex mechanisms through which trees, and species at other trophic levels such as microbes and insects, interactively influence ecological dynamics to promote coexistence, resilience, facilitation and complementary resource use^{12–14}. In addition, the network translates that knowledge into relevant guidelines to foster the use of well-designed, diverse tree plantations that are more resilient and productive, while maximizing synergies




Fig. 1 | TreeDivNet in winter 2017. The 25 experiments of TreeDivNet are spread across the globe and cover 821 ha. The 4,818 experimental plots differ in tree species diversity (along three gradients) and in tree species richness (ranging from 0 to 24).

with other forest functions (recreational, environmental) and biodiversity conservation¹⁵.

Key findings

TreeDivNet has already produced some key findings on the relationships between tree diversity and several forest functions¹⁶. Tree diversity often improved the survival and growth of trees, and the mechanisms involved variation in species traits, and included both selection and complementary effects^{14,17,18}. However the effect of tree diversity on herbivory damage is still elusive

as positive, negative and neutral responses have been observed, whereas the mechanisms involved included changes in concentration, frequency and apparency of hosts, herbivore breadth, the spatial scale of interactions and natural enemies¹⁹. This highlights the importance of environmental context for biodiversity research and the need for system-specific analyses²⁰. TreeDivNet is also playing a key role in highlighting the importance of other trophic levels, such as microbes, in mediating diversity effects in tree communities^{13,21}.

Real-world applications

The potential applications of the research conducted within the TreeDivNet platform are broad and varied.

Industrial plantations. Almost all fast-growing forest plantations are monocultures. Few polycultures exist and yet the potential benefits in terms of yield, increased stability and decreased risk in productivity, increased social acceptance, and ecosystem services to other users are high.

Forest landscape restoration. Large areas of degraded land, especially in the tropics and subtropics, are in need of restoration and global political initiatives such as the Bonn Challenge (www.bonnchallenge.org) are under way to improve human well-being through multifunctional landscapes. In many situations, new forests will have to be created with the opportunity to use specific mixtures to optimize resilience and the provision of multiple ecosystem services.

Agroforestry. A traditional use of trees that is gaining popularity is in agricultural fields. Again, most agroforestry systems use only one tree species, although the benefits of mixtures of arboreal species nested within a broader design including other plant growth forms could be high.

Urban forest planning. Trees are often planted alone or in small groups along streets or in parks, with no consideration for the possible benefits that a greater diversity of tree species could provide, if only to reduce the risks associated with global change factors such as introduced pests and diseases. To acknowledge that, TreeDivNet's millionth tree was planted at IDENT-Cité in spring 2015, in Montreal (Canada). This installation — a double spiral with increasing diversity as the visitor moves towards the centre — serves as an educational link between the science developed in TreeDivNet and the public.

Outstanding research priorities

The extension of biodiversity–ecosystem functioning research into forests is improving ecologists' capacity to understand the mechanistic bases sustaining diversity effects, and presents opportunities for new research¹⁶. As tree experiments enable measurements at individual, neighbourhood and plot levels, they allow some key questions to be asked, such as the scale on which diversity matters, and whether relationships and mechanisms change through time. Tree experiments also provide ample opportunities to use remote sensing and spectral approaches to study community dynamics, integrate belowground

and aboveground processes, and scale-up the consequences of individual physiology and plasticity for ecosystem functioning. Fuelled by mixed results from observational studies²², some of the more recent additions to the network are asking whether and how diversity may buffer against climate-change-driven stresses, such as increased drought through manipulating water availability.

Calling out to fellow scientists

The oldest experiments in TreeDivNet are approaching two decades, but many are planned to run for much longer, and the network offers a unique infrastructure for long-term ecological research. A large number of publications have already been published (175; 158 peer-reviewed papers and 16 PhD thesis; Fig. 1), and more research is underway. However, huge potential exists for further work, especially in areas outside the expertise of the current TreeDivNet teams. We encourage colleagues worldwide to suggest collaborative research making use of the TreeDivNet platform. Additional experiments in underrepresented forest biomes are also much needed in order to foster and strengthen synthesis studies, as well as enable transfer of well-founded knowledge to stakeholders worldwide⁷. The network needs to expand conceptually, for example by developing designs for the next generation of experiments that may better isolate the mechanisms that lead to diversity effects. We should also address the new questions and challenges posed to forest ecosystems by global changes, such as an increased frequency of severe droughts, floods and storms. Also, to be successful at turning the tide on the use of monocultures in plantation forestry, the network needs to foster operational scale experiments to demonstrate not only the benefits of diversity on scales that matter to managers, but their feasibility as well^{23,24}. In short, additional (long-term) data collection in existing experiments and the set-up of new experiments are needed to further increase the impact of the network. □

Alain Paquette^{1,43}, Andy Hector^{2,43}, Bastien Castagneyrol³, Margot Vanhellemont⁴, Julia Koricheva⁵, Michael Scherer-Lorenzen⁶, Kris Verheyen^{4*} and TreeDivNet

¹Centre for Forest Research, Département des Sciences Biologiques, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

²Department of Plant Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK. ³BIOGECO, INRA, Cestas, France.

⁴Department of Environment, Ghent University, Gontrode, Belgium. ⁵School of Biological Sciences, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham, UK. ⁶Geobotany, Faculty of Biology, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany.

TreeDivNet

Luis Abdala-Roberts⁷, Harald Auge⁸, Nadia Barsoum⁹, Jürgen Bauhus¹⁰, Christel Baum¹¹, Helge Bruehlheide^{12,13}, Bastien Castagneyrol^{3,14}, Jeannine Cavender-Bares¹⁵, Nico Eisenhauer^{16,17}, Olga Ferlian^{16,17}, Gislène Ganade¹⁸, Douglas Godbold¹⁹, Dominique Gravel²⁰, Jefferson Hall²¹, Andy Hector², Richard Hobbs²², Dirk Hoelscher^{23,24}, Kristin B. Hulvey²⁵, Mark Huxham²⁶, Hervé Jactel^{3,14}, Julia Koricheva⁵, Holger Kreft^{24,27}, Jingjing Liang²⁸, Simone Mereu^{29,30}, Christian Messier³¹, Rebecca Montgomery³², Bart Muys³³, Charles Nock^{6,10}, Alain Paquette^{1,34}, John Parker³⁵, William Parker³⁶, Victor Parra-Tabla⁷, Michael P. Perring^{4,22}, Quentin Ponette³⁷, Catherine Potvin³⁸, Peter B. Reich³², Boris Rewald¹⁹, Hans Sandén¹⁹, Michael Scherer-Lorenzen⁶, Andy Smith³⁹, Rachel Standish⁴⁰, Margot Vanhellemont⁴, Kris Verheyen⁴, Martin Weih⁴¹, Meike Wollni⁴² and Delphine Clara Zemp²⁷

⁷Departamento de Ecología Tropical, Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, Mérida, Yucatán, México.

⁸Department of Community Ecology, Helmholtz-Centre for Environmental Research, Halle, Saale, Germany. ⁹Centre for Ecosystems, Society and Biosecurity, Forest Research, Farnham, Surrey, UK.

¹⁰Faculty of Environment and Natural Resources, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany. ¹¹Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, Soil Science, University of Rostock, Rostock, Germany.

¹²Institute of Biology/Geobotany and Botanical Garden, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle, Saale, Germany. ¹³German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany.

¹⁴University of Bordeaux, Bordeaux, France. ¹⁵Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN, USA.

¹⁶Experimental Interaction Ecology, German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany. ¹⁷Institute of Biology, Leipzig University, Leipzig, Germany.

¹⁸Departamento de Ecología, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Natal, Rio Grande do Norte, Brazil. ¹⁹Institute of Forest Ecology, University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna, Austria. ²⁰Biologie, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec, Canada.

²¹Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Panama City, Panama. ²²School of Biological Sciences, University of Western Australia, Crawley, Western Australia, Australia.

²³Tropical Silviculture and Forest Ecology, University of Goettingen, Goettingen, Germany. ²⁴Centre of Biodiversity and Sustainable Land Use, University of Goettingen, Goettingen, Germany.

²⁵Department of Wildland Resources, Utah State University, Logan, UT, USA. ²⁶School of Applied Sciences, Edinburgh Napier University, Edinburgh, UK.

²⁷Department of Biodiversity, Macroecology & Biogeography, University of Goettingen, Goettingen, Germany. ²⁸Department of

Forestry and Natural Resources, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA. ²⁹Département of Agricultural, University of Sassari, Sassari, Italy.

³⁰Impacts on Agriculture, Forests and Natural Ecosystems (IAFES) Division, Euro-Mediterranean Center on Climate Change, Sassari, Italy.

³¹Centre for Forest Research, UQAM/UQO, Montreal/Ripon, Quebec, Canada. ³²Department of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota, Saint Paul, MN, USA.

³³Department of Earth & Environmental Sciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. ³⁴Département des Sciences Biologiques, UQAM, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. ³⁵Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, Smithsonian Institution, Edgewater, MD, USA.

³⁶Ontario Forest Research Institute, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada. ³⁷Earth and Life Institute, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

³⁸Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. ³⁹School of Environment, Natural Resources & Geography, Bangor University, Bangor, UK. ⁴⁰School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia, Australia.

⁴¹Department of Crop Production Ecology, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Uppsala, Sweden.

⁴²Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Development, Göttingen University, Göttingen, Germany. ⁴³These authors contributed equally: Alain Paquette and Andy Hector.

*e-mail: Kris.Verheyen@UGent.be

Published online: 16 April 2018

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0544-0>

References

1. State of the World's Forests 2012 (FAO, Rome, 2012).
2. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment 2005 Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Synthesis (Island Press, Washington DC, 2005).
3. Carle, J. & Holmgren, P. *For. Prod. J.* **58**, 6–18 (2008).
4. Bauhus, J., Forrester, D. I. & Pretzsch, H. in *Mixed-Species Forests - Ecology and Management* (eds Pretzsch, H., Forrester, D. I. & Bauhus, J.) 1–25 (Springer, Heidelberg, 2017).
5. Duffy, J. E., Godwin, C. M. & Cardinale, B. J. *Nature* **549**, 261–264 (2017).
6. Paquette, A. & Messier, C. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **20**, 170–180 (2011).
7. Liang, J. et al. *Science* **354**, aaf8957 (2016).
8. Diaz, S., Symstad, A. J., Chapin, F. S., Wardle, D. A. & Huenneke, L. F. *TREE* **18**, 140–146 (2003).
9. Verheyen, K. et al. *Ambio* **45**, 29–41 (2016).
10. Meyer, S. T. et al. *Ecosphere* **7**, e01619 (2016).
11. Baeten, L. et al. *Perspect. Plant Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **15**, 281–291 (2013).
12. Fichtner, A. et al. *Ecol. Lett.* **20**, 892–900 (2017).
13. Laforest-Lapointe, I., Paquette, A., Messier, C. & Kembel, S. W. *Nature* **546**, 145–147 (2017).
14. Williams, L. J., Paquette, A., Cavender-Bares, J., Messier, C. & Reich, P. B. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1**, 0063 (2017).
15. Barrette, M. et al. *For. Chron.* **90**, 748–762 (2014).
16. Grossman, J. J. et al. *Environ. Exp. Bot.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2017.12.015> (2018).
17. Van de Peer, T., Verheyen, K., Ponette, Q., Setiawan, N. N. & Muys, B. *J. Ecol.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2745.12839> (2017).
18. Tobner, C. M. et al. *Ecol. Lett.* **19**, 638–647 (2016).
19. Castagneyrol, B., Giffard, B., Péré, C. & Jactel, H. *J. Ecol.* **101**, 418–429 (2013).
20. Ratcliffe, S. et al. *Ecol. Lett.* **20**, 1414–1426 (2017).

21. Nguyen, N. H. et al. *Mol. Ecol.* **25**, 4032–4046 (2016).
22. Paquette, A., Vayreda, J., Coll, L., Messier, C. & Retana, J. *Ecosystems* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-017-0196-y> (2017).
23. Puettmann, K. J. et al. *For. Ecosyst.* **2**, 8 (2015).
24. Paquette, A. & Messier, C. in *Managing Forests as Complex Adaptive Systems: Building Resilience to the Challenge of*

Global Change (eds Messier, C., Puettmann, K. J. & Coates, K. D.) 299–326 (EarthScan, New York, 2013).

Author contributions

The concept was developed at the plenary TreeDivNet meeting in Bordeaux, February 2017. The first draft was

written by A.H. and A.P., with later input from B.C., M.V., K.V., J.K., M.S.-L. and all TreeDivNet members.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.